AGENDA

South East Lincolnshire
Joint Strategic Planning Committee

Committee	-	**SOUTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE JOINT STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE**
Date & Time	-	Monday, 25 November 2013 at 9.30 am
Venue	-	Boston Borough Council Offices, West Street, Boston

Membership of the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee:

South Holland District Council: Councillors B Alcock, R Gambba-Jones and H R Johnson (Chairman)
(Substitutes: Councillors F Biggadike, C J T H Brewis and R M Rudkin)

Boston Borough Council: Councillors P Bedford (Vice-Chairman), C Brotherton and R Leggott
(Substitutes: Councillors F Pickett, O Snell and M Wright)

Lincolnshire County Council: Councillors A Austin, M Brookes and C Davie
(Substitutes: Councillor C N Worth)

Substitutions – Substitute members will have full voting rights for individual meetings only; and Substitute members allowed to attend all meetings of the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee to contribute but not vote.

Terms of Reference – The preparation, submission, adoption, monitoring and revision of joint local development documents identified in a joint local development scheme; and the preparation, submission, adoption, monitoring and revision of a joint local development scheme, in respect of those documents.

A voting member who is unable to attend any meeting of the Joint Committee shall inform the Chair of the Joint Committee in writing as soon as practicable and in any event not later than 24 hours before the meeting is due to take place

Member Services Council Offices, Priory Road Spalding, Lincs PE11 2XE	Persons attending the meeting are requested to turn their mobile telephones to silent mode

Date: 11 November 2013

Please ask for Amanda Taylor: Telephone 01775 764837
e-mail: amandataylor@sholland.gov.uk

A G E N D A

1. Apologies for absence.

2. Minutes - To sign as a correct record the notes of the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee meeting held on 27 September 2013. (Copy enclosed.) (Pages 1 - 16)

3. Public consultation on the Combined Preferred Options and Sustainability Appraisal Report: consideration of representations - To seek approval of the recommended action in response to each representation. (Report of the South East Lincolnshire Joint Policy Unit Manager enclosed.) (Pages 17 - 26)

4. Appendix A Part 1 (enclosed). (Pages 27 - 154)

5. Appendix A Part 2 (enclosed). (Pages 155 - 228)

6. Appendix A Part 3 (enclosed). (Pages 229 - 260)

7. Appendix A Part 4 (enclosed). (Pages 261 - 330)

8. Appendix A Part 5 (enclosed). (Pages 331 - 690)

9. Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent

   Note: No other business is permitted unless by reason of special circumstances, which shall be specified in the minutes, the Chairman is of the opinion that the item(s) should be considered as a matter of urgency.

10. Proposed future meeting dates - To be confirmed during the meeting.

Minutes of a meeting of the **SOUTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE JOINT STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE** held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Priory Road, Spalding, on Friday, 27 September 2013 at 10.00 am.

PRESENT

H R Johnson (Chairman)
P Bedford (Vice-Chairman)

M Brookes	O Snell
R Gambba-Jones	C N Worth

Joint Policy Unit Manager (South Holland District Council), Deputy Joint Policy Unit Manager (Boston Borough Council), Senior Planning Policy Officer (South Holland District Council), Planning Policy Officer (South Holland District Council), Three Forward Planning Officers (Boston Borough Council), Strategic Planning Manager (Lincolnshire County Council), Two Officers (Environment Agency), Planning Solicitor (Legal Services Lincolnshire) and the Member Services Officer.

In Attendance: Councillors F Biggadike, F Pickett and R M Rudkin.

Apologies for absence were received from or on behalf of Councillors B Alcock, C J T H Brewis, R Leggott, A Austin and C Davie; together with the Head of Built Environment and Development (Boston Borough Council) and the Planning Manager (Breckland and South Holland District Councils).

7. **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 2 August 2013 were signed by the Chairman as a correct record, subject to the attendance records being amended to reflect that Councillor F Pickett had been in attendance.

8. **COMBINED PREFERRED OPTIONS AND SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT**

Consideration was given to the report of the South East Lincolnshire Joint Policy Unit Manager which sought approval of the recommended action in response to representations received as a result of the recent public consultation on the Combined Preferred Options and Sustainability Appraisal Report.

At the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee meeting on 5 April 2013, members resolved to approve the contents of the Combined Preferred Options and Sustainability Appraisal Report (Committee Version [April 2013]) for the purpose of public consultation subject to making a small number of amendments. At the same meeting, members also approved a Consultation Strategy for guiding the public consultation exercise on the Combined Preferred Options and Sustainability Appraisal Report (the Preferred Options document). The public consultation period commenced on 3 May 2013 and ran until 28 June 2013.

SOUTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE JOINT STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE - 27 September 2013

Members addressed the representations received in response to the public consultation exercise on the Preferred Options document, which were categorised under the following headings:

- Whole document;
- Introduction;
- Spatial Portrait;
- Vision and Strategic Priorities;
- Economy;
- Environment;
- Community, Health and Well-being;
- Transport;
- Delivery;
- Key Diagram;
- Glossary of Terms; and
- Appendices.

Appendix A within the report set out all the representations that had been received from various individuals and organisations which had been categorised under the above headings. The representations included comments in support of the contents of the Preferred Options document and other observations as well as objections. In total, Appendix A listed approximately 540 individual representations.

Members noted that the recommendations to the Joint Committee had been categorised under the following headings:

1. Support – no change to the approach is required;
2. Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD (Development Plan Document);
3. Objection – further work required which could result in a change to the approach;
4. Objection – a minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring); and
5. Objection – no change to the approach is required.

The Deputy Joint Policy Unit Manager reported on comments received from the Head of Built Environment and Development for Boston Borough Council.

The Head of Built Environment and Development Steve had advised that this was a large document to be presented and would be difficult to consider by the Joint Committee. He had wondered whether it might have been considered by the Steering Group first.

The Deputy Joint Policy Unit Manager expressed the view that the public could expect that their comments should be considered by the democratically accountable Joint Committee first and foremost. However, it was the intention of the report (that the Joint Committee considered) to recommend that the substantive issues that came out of the consultation would be taken back to the Steering Group for more detailed work. Officers would be guiding members through the report to identify those substantive issues and a discussion would be initiated at the end of the meeting to assess whether an alternative approach should be taken for the next Joint Committee.

The Joint Policy Unit Manager reported on comments received from the Planning Manager for Breckland and South Holland District Councils.

The Planning Manager had indicated his satisfaction that thorough consideration had been given to the representations received and that he was happy with the route taken in presenting them to members.

The Joint Policy Unit Manager also reported that the Monitoring Officers for South Holland District Council and Lincolnshire County Council, had both indicated that they had no comments to make on the report.

Consideration was given to each heading in turn:

Whole Document

The Deputy Joint Policy Unit Manager (Deputy Manager) advised that there were 23 representations relating to the whole document. Officer recommendations for those were classified as follows: 14 were Support - no change to the approach was required; 1 was Objection - a minor change to the approach may be required; and 8 were Objection - no change to the approach required. The last representation thought that more care had to be given to how documents were presented and the language that was used. In response, the Deputy Joint Policy Unit Manager agreed that vigilance was required in these respects.

Introduction

The Deputy Joint Policy Unit Manager advised that there were 2 representations on the section, both of which were classified as Objection - no change to the approach was required. The first one was concerned that the combined approach was difficult to navigate and expressed a preference for separate plan and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) documents. However, given that it was the only representation that criticised the approach, it had been recommended that no change to the approach was required. At the 'submission stage', there was a requirement to prepare separate plan and SA documents.

Spatial Portrait

The Deputy Joint Policy Unit Manager advised that there were 42 representations on the section, classification of which was as follows: 21 were Support - no change to the approach is required; 1 was Representation beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD; 6 were Objection - a minor change to the approach may be required; and 14 were Objection - no change sought to promote the area's suitability for cycling in the spatial portrait. It also requested a specific paragraph on cycling that it had drafted. However, it was considered that this level of detail would lead to demands for more detail on other aspects and that such issues would be better represented in the policy sections themselves.

Vision and Strategic Priorities

The Deputy Joint Policy Unit Manager noted that there were 82 representations on the section, classification of which was as follows: 47 were Support - no change to the approach was required; 16 were Objection - a minor change to the approach may be required; and 18 were Objection - no change to the approach was required. Typically, objections related to the view that the vision/strategic priorities were rather vague and generic and could be more representative of South East Lincolnshire e.g. what characterised the area. It was noted that the Local Plan Steering Group had discussed the matter in detail and had decided certain specific elements were to be removed, particularly in respect of concerns over deliverability. The recent Planning Advisory Service (PAS) 'Review of the emerging local plan' indicated that the vision for the plan area was distinctive to South East Lincolnshire but informal comments by the PAS representative had suggested that the vision could provide more detail on where the area expected to be by 2031. It was in this respect that officers felt there was scope for some minor tweaking to the vision.

The Deputy Joint Policy Unit Manager reported that another representation had noted the reference in the spatial portrait to 14,000 seasonal workers in the area and that the housing implications of the issue had warranted a policy approach. It was explained that this fact had been mentioned in the portrait in order to emphasise the importance of horticulture in South East Lincolnshire. At the present time, it was not known whether this would result in a change in approach as there was no awareness of any planning issues created by that number of migrant workers. Further work would be undertaken in respect of the matter.

Councillor R Gambba-Jones made a number of points regarding the general approach to the vision and strategic priorities and noted the importance of the seasonal workers issue. He was aware that Boston Borough Council was promoting a review of the 2011 Census figures given concerns about its accuracy in respect of migrant workers.

Councillor Gambba-Jones thought it was important that the historical understanding of the role of seasonal workers was not used to inform planning for the area. One of the striking features of his early experiences of the South Holland District, which involved commuting to the area during the night as well as the day, was the number of mini buses, and occasionally coaches, containing people travelling to work from the West Midlands. This picture had now changed, and on balance had changed for the better but had slipped under the radar. Boston Borough and South Holland District Council considered that there was a hidden body of people out there who were causing pressures on housing, schooling, health, social and leisure facilities, that must be taken into account; and if that generated a need to carry out further work to achieve more accurate assessments of housing need then so be it.

Councillor Gambba-Jones expressed concerns about the information upon which the emerging Local Plan housing provision was currently based. If it was based on 2011 Census data then there could be issues relating to the estimation of objectively-assessed need for housing. A better understanding of what was meant by 'the settled population' was required. He noted that there had been a Government view that a lot of migrants would go back home, but a lot of them had come to feel settled, and many of their children were English through birth but with a second language. He hoped that fact would not be ignored.

The Chairman agreed with the points which had been made by Councillor Gambba-Jones. The Deputy Joint Unit Policy Manager stated that further work on population estimates would be undertaken which should address the concerns raised.

DECISION:

That the recommendations contained within the Appendix relating to the headings of Whole Document, Introduction, Spatial Portrait and Vision and Strategic Priorities be approved.

Economy

The Senior Planning Policy Officer advised that there were 127 representations on the section, classification of which was as follows: 38 were Support - no change to the approach was required; 8 were Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD; 6 were Objection - further work required which could result in a change to the approach; 12 were Objection - a minor change to the approach may be required; and 63 were Objection - no change to the approach was required.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer stated that a large proportion of the representations referred to the Spalding Rail Freight Interchange (RFI), which the Joint Policy Unit Manager would discuss in further detail. He focussed on the employment land and retail preferred policy approaches. Overall, there had been general support for those two approaches, but there had been comments relating to expected levels of overall employment growth and the current extent of existing employment allocations, which would be addressed later in the Site Allocations DPD process. One specific area of objections related to a floor-space threshold for determining the need for an impact test in respect of proposed retail floor space outside of town centres. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) identified a threshold of 2,500 sq. m. but it was proposed that it be reduced to 500 sq. m. for the designated Small Town Centres within South East Lincolnshire.

In terms of subject areas on which further work was required, the Senior Planning Policy Officer advised that the Local Plan Steering Group had committed itself to preparing draft parking standards. Officers were also awaiting a draft retail capacity study and consideration needed to be given to specific policies for regeneration and ports.

Councillor Gambba-Jones enquired whether the officers could identify anywhere which might fit the thresholds. The Senior Planning Policy Officer stated that the aim was to protect town centres. Accordingly, there was concern that any proposed retail development of 2,500 sq. m. or more situated outside of a town-centre location could detract from the overall vitality and viability of one or more local town centres.

The Joint Policy Unit Manager added that, as an example, he thought the original Sainsbury's development in Spalding's Holland Market would have been in the order of 2,500 sq. m. net retail floor space; and further stated that proposed developments of such a size were not necessarily being ruled out but would need to be supported by a favourable full-impact assessment.

Proposed Spalding Rail-Freight Interchange (RFI)

The Joint Policy Unit Manger introduced this item by asking Mrs Jocelyn Kedzlie, Chairman of the Rally Against Industrialisation of the Landscape (RAIL) Group to address the Joint Committee regarding the objection that she, and a number of other residents of Deeping St Nicholas had, to the proposed broad location for the RFI situated to the north-east of the village. The statement was read as follows:

"The Council consulted upon and allocated the Deeping St Nicholas site in 2010 completely outwith the normal LDC framework planning process in order to hit a planning deadline fixed by Network Rail.

By its actions the Council has constrained its ability to challenge the site selection.

The Council has made it very difficult to consider any application that comes forward with an open mind.

As previously asserted this site breaches a number of national and the Councils own planning policies nor can now revoked regional planning policies be relied upon.

There is no sound business case for this proposal; lessons have not been learned from the complete failure of the Red Lion Quarter venture as a food heritage centre – funded as it was by public funds.

A proposed development of such magnitude for site allocation for inclusion in a local plan extant until 2031 should be based on something more than research carried out by Intermodality urged the Council to undertake.

I quote from the Intermodality report 2009:

"As the basic interchange activity will itself be unlikely to create a business case capable of private sector funding, any interchanged development will therefore require public-sector funding to "pump-prime" investment."

Why, when there has been such catastrophic mis-use of public funds previously for RLQ can it be assumed public funding will be forthcoming?

The Council has previously declined to match fund an offer from EEC Growth funds to progress the development.

Other sites were rejected as part of the options appraisal e.g. Surfleet and Gosberton Cheal which are not shown as being in ROY zones in the draft plan – they should be revisited.

RAIL is under no illusion that despite considerable objection to this proposal on environmental grounds, the loss of prime agricultural land (even though the Department of Transport lays out very clear criteria for the location of such facilities – urban areas), the loss of amenity noise and light pollution to name but a few – this proposal will be included in the local plan because of the restricted position in which the Council now finds itself.

It remains for the Planning Inspectorate, to consider this proposal - that same Government body who signed of the Magna Park Peterborough RFI in February 2012.

I leave you with these considerations:

How can an area realistically support two hubs in such close proximity – 15 miles apart?

Is this panel sufficiently confident that the business plan for an RFI in Deeping St Nicholas is viable or will we be facing another 'fiasco' in the future.

I urge further review before submission to the Planning Inspectorate."

The Joint Policy Unit Manager followed the presentation by informing members that he had not had the opportunity to see Mrs Kedzlie's statement prior to the meeting and therefore he would not be responding directly to it during the meeting. Instead, he proceeded to provide some background to the Spalding RFI proposal and noted that Mrs Kedzlie had rightly commented on Intermodality Ltd's 2009 feasibility study as identifying the potential for a RFI in Spalding.

South Holland District Council's Economic Development Team had thought it would be prudent to act upon the study's recommendations, and had therefore submitted a report to Cabinet which sought approval to develop the idea further and to work towards identifying a 'preferred site'. The recommendations had been approved by Cabinet at its meeting in December 2009 and, consequently, the Planning Policy section had been tasked with identifying a preferred site for the RFI.

The then (South Holland District Council) Local Development Framework Working Party had been required to consider and advise officers on how a preferred site should be identified. This had led to a public consultation exercise on four potential sites and, having regard to its findings, a report was submitted to Cabinet in June 2011. Cabinet had agreed to identify Option 4 (between Deeping St.Nicholas and Spalding) as the preferred site. It was made clear at the Cabinet meeting that there was no public money available as far as the District Council was concerned and that any development initiative would have to come from the private sector.

At the time there was some urgency attached to the identification of a preferred site, since it was understood that its location had to be incorporated into Network Rail's plans for the upgrade of the Joint Line. In retrospect, this consideration had not been seen to be as important as originally thought and it had appeared sufficient for Network Rail to be aware of the generality of the proposal insofar as its planning for the Joint Line upgrade was concerned.

The Joint Policy Unit Manager advised that, in light of the previously mentioned circumstances, it had been decided to promote the proposal for a Spalding RFI through the formal Local Plan process. Members noted that as officers were aware of both developer and operator interest in the proposal, there was considered to be sufficient justification to identify a 'broad location' for it.

The Joint Policy Unit Manager informed members that 60% of the representations received on the Economy section related to the RFI. Classification of the 77 representations was as follows: 22 were Support - no change to the approach was required; 9 were Objection - a minor change to the approach may be required (as they related to the SA scoring); and 46 were Objection - no change to the approach was required (those included
a petition with 130 names from 98 individual addresses).

The common reasons for objection to the RFI included the absence of a business case for the RFI; the detrimental effect on the character of the area/residential amenity; traffic congestion; inadequate road systems; loss of high-quality agricultural land; and reduction in house prices. Occasionally, the issue of blight was also cited.

The Joint Policy Unit Manager addressed each of the concerns in turn:

It had long been argued that there was no sound business case for the RFI and whilst, as officers, they were not experts in the logistics industry, they were aware of a developer interest in taking forward the proposal and who had been in discussion with site owners. Kilbride Holdings Ltd was the interested party and the Joint Policy Unit Manager quoted from a recent statement made by Peter Frost, its Managing Director, regarding the RFI proposal, which stated that:

'*Kilbride are looking to take forward the rail freight terminal development at Spalding, with further news to be announced and that Kilbride see the project as one of the best rail freight opportunities in the country at the moment*.'

The Joint Policy Unit Manager referred to some of the concerns that Mrs Kedzlie had raised, and advised that officers were not looking to dispute their importance. At the present time, they were simply promoting a broad location for the RFI and did not possess any details relating to how the proposal might evolve.

If the proposal was to be developed further, it would be through a private-sector initiative, and not a public-sector one. It was not known whether a planning application for the RFI would come forward before the Local Plan proposals were adopted. Should a planning application be received, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) would require substantial amounts of information to inform its consideration of the proposed development, particularly in respect of landscape and other environmental impacts and highway and traffic matters. Unfortunately, major infrastructure schemes had to go somewhere and, in the case of the RFI proposal, it had to be well related to existing railway infrastructure. The broad location currently identified did not involve any loss of residential property. However, it was located in close proximity to the village of Deeping St Nicholas.

In relation to the loss of high-quality agricultural land, there was no escaping the fact that the great majority of the South Holland District contained either Grade 1 or Grade 2 land. In respect of the impact of such a proposal on house prices, it would not be a valid planning consideration. It was also recognised that there were no 'planning blight' issues at the present time.

The Joint Policy Unit Manager concluded by stating that no new location or other options relating to the RFI proposal had been promoted through the public consultation exercise.

Councillor Gambba-Jones supported of the general principle of what was intended in respect of the RFI proposal. There were, and there would remain to be, concerns about the impact of the proposal on the settled community, and as with any development, there would be an impact. The proposal was not a casual exercise. It was being promoted in the context of a significant number of limitations on site identification; specifically, it had to be near a railway line and near to Spalding. If less work had been undertaken in 2010 (i.e. leaving the two areas of search to the north and south of Spalding), there would have possibly been double the amount of objections at the present time. The proposal was all about supporting business. The food industry had presented the idea which it was keen to see progressed.

The Chairman endorsed the comments made by Councillor Gambba-Jones and added that if should the proposal be taken forward it would be dealt within the correct and appropriate manner.

DECISION:

That the recommendations contained within the Appendix relating to the heading 'Economy' be approved.

Environment

The Forward Planning Officer advised that there were 123 representations on the section, classification of which was as follows: 65 were Support - no change to the approach was required; 2 were Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD; 6 were Objection - further work required which could result in a change to the approach; 33 were Objection - a minor change to the approach may be required; and 17 were Objection - no change to the approach was required.

The Forward Planning Officer stated that one of the objections requiring further work had been made by the Environment Agency (EA) and concerned the absence of the issue of regeneration in the policy approaches; and another concerned the re-opening of Littleworth Railway Station. However, those matters were to be addressed in the Economy and Transport sections respectively. Other objections requiring further work suggested that the Policy Officers should look above and beyond current Building Regulations e.g. Code Level 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and compliance with Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREAM) standards.

Councillor Gambba-Jones queried what aspirations there were for the provision of trees and open spaces which actually enhanced residential amenity. The Forward Planning Officer advised that those matters could be considered through the Site Allocations Development Plan Document process. He also cited Boston Woods as a good example of a joint local authority/private sector initiative in respect of creating new woodland.

Councillor F Biggadike expressed the view that South East Lincolnshire tended not to acquire the parks and open spaces due to the extensive coverage of high-quality agricultural land. He did not think that the South Holland District would be able to obtain any further woodland. Councillor R M Rudkin queried why the South Holland District could not aspire to further woodland provision, as she considered that if Boston Borough could achieve it then so could the South Holland District.

The Chairman supported the comments made by Councillor Gambba-Jones.

DECISION:

That the recommendations contained within the Appendix relating to the heading 'Environment' be approved.

Community, Health and Well-being

The Forward Planning Officer advised that there were 43 representations on the section, classification of which was as follows: 24 were Support - no change to the approach was required; 3 were Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD; 4 were Objection - further work required which could result in a change to the approach; 10 were Objection - a minor change to the approach may be required; and 2 were Objection - no change to the approach was required.

The Forward Planning Officer reported that the big issue that had come out of the representations was in relation to the delivery of community infrastructure, for example, community open space. This issue would be addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan or further along in the plan-making process.

Councillor Gambba-Jones referred to his previous comments, namely, how the creation of those areas of open space that benefited the public and contributed to their well-being was best achieved. He responded to Councillor Biggadike's earlier comment by stating that it only cost £7,500 per acre to deliver good-quality open space, and that he retained his hopes and aspirations in that regard. Councillor Gambba-Jones added that, in the wider context, when talking about community, health and well-being, he thought that PEDALS would be disappointed if progress was not made on developing some sort of cycling strategy. He considered that the local cycle network was poor and queried whether there was a way of developing a cohesive plan to bring some of those 'niggling' bits of cycle paths together. If it was not possible to achieve then a stop should be placed on their provision. Careful thought had to be given to how such matters were to be integrated in the future.

Councillor C N Worth mentioned that there a countywide Health and Well-being Board had recently been established and would be implemented once consultations had finished. He stated that it would be useful to seek feedback from the Board and its partners (the Clinical Commissioning Groups [CCGs]), of how they could impact on that area of the Local Plan. He requested that officers write to the Board asking whether it could make a presentation to the Joint Committee about its role.

DECISION:

a) That the recommendations contained within the Appendix relating to the heading 'Community, Health and Well-Being' be approved; and

b) That guidance be sought from the Health and Well-being Board in relation to comments that had been raised, above.

Transport

The Senior Planning Policy Officer advised that there were two policy approaches featured in the section: transport overall and the Spalding Western Relief Road (SWRR). A total of 62 representations had been received on the section, classification of which was as follows: 24 were Support - no change to the approach was required; 13 were Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD; 6 were Objection - further work required which could result in a change to the approach; 4 were Objection - a minor change to the approach may be required; and 15 were Objection - no change to the approach was required.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer stated that, overall, there was a good level of support for the proposals. However, a number of comments were not within the remit of the Local Plan, for example, changes to policy on parking fees, pot holes, highway safety and large- scale road improvement programmes. Other comments included the need to modify the A17, A52 and A16 roads from single to dual carriageways. Concerns had also been raised that there was no mention of the Boston Distributor Road, which had been the subject of significant discussion at meetings of the Local Plan Steering Group. It had been concluded that, due to a lack of evidence regarding delivery, it could not be included as a proposal in the Local Plan.

In respect of the SWRR, there was some support for it. However, questions had also been raised on the need for it and its influence over decisions regarding the location of development. A couple of areas had been identified where further work was required, specifically those relating to how it would be delivered.

Councillor M Brookes referred to the Boston Distributor Road (BDR) and voiced concerns that there was no reference in the Preferred Options for seeking funding and delivering, parts of the BDR, as piecemeal development opportunities arose. He requested that provision for realising such opportunities be included in the emerging Local Plan. Whilst he accepted the delivery constraints relating to the promotion of the BDR, he did not understand why the aspiration to deliver the BDR could not be featured.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer confirmed that the Preferred Options document did identify the BDR as an aspiration.

The Deputy Joint Unit Policy Manager reported that a recent meeting had been held to discuss the BDR, which had involved Boston Borough Council's Head of Built Environment and Development, Councillors P Bedford and M Brookes, along with County Council officers with a view to gathering evidence which could support a more positive approach to the delivery of the aspiration.

The Deputy Joint Unit Policy Manager indicated that the BDR could be safeguarded through other documents, which would suggest how future development could support its delivery. However, he emphasised that although it was key that the BDR continued to be treated as an aspiration, it also be made clear that further work in relation to it would continue behind the scenes during the plan period. The Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) only had a 10-year horizon and there was certainly 'a hook' in it relating to the BDR and the current preparation of the Local Plan.

Councillor Brookes requested the inclusion of a provision in the emerging Local Plan which could be used to ensure that developers were kept aware of what was being sought in respect of the BDR.

Councillor Gambba-Jones raised the need to consider bus routes, as he felt there was a need to learn from the limited experience of how they operated in new housing developments. Looking forward, if encouragement was going to be given to the building of a large swathe of housing, questions were going to be asked about the provision of bus services to support its occupants. One of the current hurdles experienced in established residential areas was the unsuitability of the roads to accommodate bus transport because of the amount of on-street parking. He stated that the provision of bus routes should be considered in the overall planning for new, large, residential developments.

Councillor Gambba-Jones queried whether, ultimately, the only realistic way of funding the SWRR was through a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Having regard to the issue of developer contributions, Councillor Gambba-Jones raised the issue of housing going 'next door' (i.e. to another LPA) under the 'duty to cooperate'. For example, if it were decided that Boston Borough was unable to accommodate several thousand more houses to meet its needs, and under the duty to cooperate it was agreed that the South Holland District was the most suitable place to relocate it, there would be a question about which authority should receive the benefits of that development.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer offered the view that if the houses were built within the South Holland District the money would go into South Holland District Councils CIL pot.

DECISION

That the recommendations contained within the Appendix relating to the heading 'transport' be approved.

Delivery

The Senior Planning Policy Officer advised that a total of 25 representations had been received on the section, classification of which was as follows: 17 were Support - no change to the approach was required; 13 were Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD; 6 were Objection - further work required which could result in a change to the approach; 1 was Objection - a minor change to the approach may be required; and 1 was Objection - no change to the approach was required.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer stated that there was a good level of support for the section. However, there had been a request for more detail on how proposals would be delivered. In response, he indicated that it would come through the Infrastructure Deliver Plan (IDP).

The Senior Planning Policy Officer reported that concerns had been expressed on too much reliance upon developer funding but he advised that it was a reality in the current economic climate. In response to comments seeking to promote the role of projects, such as the Boston Distributor Road and the Boston Barrier, the Senior Planning Policy Officer reiterated the officer view that the two issues should not be deemed as critical infrastructure for the purpose of delivering Local Plan proposals.

Councillor Gambba-Jones sought confirmation from the Senior Planning Policy Officer that the expression 'delivery' covered the delivery all the Local Plan development proposals plus supporting infrastructure and enquired as to whether the IDP would be a discrete document which would address what was deliverable/undeliverable.

The Senior Planning Policy Officer advised that, essentially, a lot of work was to be undertaken on the subject. The majority would be addressed through the IDP and, specifically, the broad locations for growth. The next step after confirmation of the broad locations would be to be draw up infrastructure schedules for them in association with the developer interests. At a recent conference, Keith Holland from the Planning Inspectorate had made it clear that local planning authorities (LPAs) needed to ensure that developers were 'signed up' to the infrastructure and other requirements being sought in respect of particular proposals. If such agreements were not achieved by examination then plans would not be deemed sound.

Councillor Gambba-Jones sought clarification on seeking a major piece of infrastructure where it was unclear as to how it would be funded and whether LPA's would have to ensure that developers were signed up to its delivery. The Senior Planning Policy Officer advised that, before developers were signed up, LPAs would need to know the source of infrastructure funding, have an infrastructure schedule in place and, where necessary, have prioritised the delivery of the infrastructure.

Councillor Gambba-Jones expressed concerns and questioned the next stage of plan preparation. He felt that there was a need to understand the relationship between delivery and the site allocations process as soon as possible.

The Environment Agency Officer requested clarification regarding how the Boston Barrier would be addressed and whether officers were seeking support for it. The Senior Planning Policy Officer advised that the Boston Barrier was not classed as critical to the delivery of the Local Plan proposals and that the IDP needed to focus on critical pieces of infrastructure.

The Deputy Joint Policy Unit Manager sought to allay the concerns expressed by the Environment Agency Officer and advised that it was always intended that the Boston Barrier would be represented in the Local Plan but would not be treated as a critical piece of infrastructure, as it had not been said that without the Barrier, development would not take place. In the longer term it was expected that the Barrier would improve the economy and the standard of flood defence in the area. Therefore, from that point of view it would be represented and supported but the Local Plan would not be saying that it was critical.

DECISION:

That the recommendations contained within the Appendix relating to the heading 'Delivery' be approved.

Key Diagram, Glossary of Terms and Appendices

The Deputy Joint Policy Unit Manager advised that there were 10 representations on the Key Diagram section, classification of which was as follows: 8 were Support - no change to the approach was required; and 2 were Objection - no change to the approach as required. The Glossary of Terms had 1 Objection - a minor change to the approach may be required (to clarify an issue).

DECISION:

That the recommendations contained within the Appendix relating to the heading 'Key Diagram, Glossary of Terms and Appendices' be approved

Remaining Representations

Members noted that the next meeting would be used to consider the remaining representations, and to deal with matters which had been categorised under the following headings:

- Housing Growth and Flood Risk;
- Sustainable Development and Spatial Strategy;
- Housing; and
- Promotion of Housing Sites.

Owing to the sensitive and contentious nature of the remaining items, it was agreed that the information would be presented separately for each heading, rather than compiled into one appendix, so that members could process the information more readily.

DECISION:

a) That the recommendations within each heading be approved, for the purpose of informing future work on the preparation of the Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD), subject to the comments received from members; and

b) That the remaining headings be considered at the Joint Committee's next meeting, in the format proposed and agreed by members.

9. **PROPOSED FUTURE MEETING DATES**

The next meeting of the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee was scheduled to be held on 25 November 2013 at 9.30 am at Boston Borough Council, Municipal Buildings, West Street, Boston.

(The meeting ended at 12.33 pm.)

(End of minutes.)

SOUTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE JOINT STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

Report of: **The South East Lincolnshire Joint Policy Unit Manager**

To: **South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee – 25 November 2013**

Author: **Gary Alexander, Joint Policy Unit Manager**

Subject: **Public consultation on the Combined Preferred Options and Sustainability Appraisal Report: consideration of representations**

Purpose: **To seek approval of the recommended action in response to each representation**

It is recommended that Members:

a) Consider the contents of this report and the associated Appendix A setting out the public consultation comments and the officer responses and recommendations; and

b) Agree to approve or revise each recommendation for the purpose of informing future work on the preparation of the Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD).

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Members will recall that, at its meeting on 5 April 2013, the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee (the Joint Committee) resolved to approve the contents of the **Combined Preferred Options and Sustainability Appraisal Report** (Committee Version [April 2013]) for the purpose of public consultation subject to making a small number of amendments. At the same meeting, the Joint Committee also approved a Consultation Strategy for guiding the public consultation exercise on the Combined Preferred Options and Sustainability Appraisal Report (the Preferred Options document).

1.2 The public consultation period commenced on Friday, 3 May 2013 and ran until Friday, 28 June. The nature of this public consultation exercise and a summary of the main issues arising from it and how they have been taken into account will inform the preparation of a 'Statement of Public Participation'. This will form part of the suite of documents that will eventually be submitted to the Secretary of State in relation to the independent examination of the Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD).

1.3 At its Annual Meeting on 2 August 2013, the Joint Committee considered an information report setting out some initial results of the public consultation exercise. In brief, this report revealed that the public consultation exercise had resulted in 155 individuals and organisations submitting a total of 1,409 separate representations. Together, these representations covered a wide variety of matters featured in the Preferred Options document.

1.4 At its meeting on 27 September 2013, the Joint Committee considered a report which addressed all those representations dealing with matters in the Preferred Options document categorised under the following headings:

- Whole document;
- Introduction;
- Spatial Portrait;
- Vision and Strategic Priorities;
- Economy;
- Environment;
- Community, Health and Well-being;
- Transport;
- Delivery;
- Key Diagram;
- Glossary of Terms; and
- Appendices.

1.5 The purpose of this report is to address all the outstanding representations which deal with matters categorised under the following headings:

- Housing Growth and Flood Risk;
- Sustainable Development and Spatial Strategy; and
- Housing (including promotion of housing sites).

2.0 CONSIDERATION OF THE REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 **Appendix A** to this report sets out in full the representations received from various individuals and organisations which have been categorised under the above-mentioned headings in paragraph 1.5. These representations include comments in support of the contents of the Preferred Options document and other observations as well as objections. In total, Appendix A lists over 860 individual representations. NB: the representations relating to the promotion of housing sites will be included in the ongoing preparation of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).

2.2 For each representation, Appendix A includes:

- the ‘Response Number’ and ‘Respondents Number’;
- the name of the person/organisation submitting the representation;
- where applicable, the name of the person/organisation on whose behalf the representation has been submitted;
- the ‘Officer Response’ to the representation; and
- the ’Officer Recommendation’ to the Joint Committee in respect of what action should be taken in view of the Officer Response.

2.3 Members are asked to consider each representation and the accompanying Officer Response and Officer Recommendation in response to it. At the Joint Committee meeting, Members will be asked to either approve or revise each Officer Recommendation.

2.4 Members will note that a number of the representations contain a significant amount of content. In order to make the process of considering such cases more manageable, officers have approached the preparation of their responses with a view to addressing the ‘essence’ of the representation rather than necessarily focussing on every detailed point.

2.5 As with the consideration of representations at the previous Joint Committee meeting, a number of standard phrases have been used in the Officer Responses with a view to lending more consistency to the process of considering the representations and to creating flexibility in dealing with a wide variety of potentially-conflicting issues. These, in turn, have been used to aid the identification of what course of action should be recommended to the Joint Committee.

2.6 Subsequently, the recommendations to the Joint Committee have been categorised under the following headings:

- Support – no change to the approach is required;
- Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD;
- Objection – further work required which could result in a change to the approach;
- Objection – a minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring); and
- Objection – no change to the approach is required.

2.7 It should be noted that the word 'approach' in the above-mentioned categories has been used to describe a variety of contents in the Preferred Options document (for example, individual chapters, paragraphs, options, tables, preferred policy approaches etc.). Therefore, its meaning in respect of an individual recommendation should be interpreted in the context of the representation to which it relates.

2.8 **Owing to the close relationship between the contents of the sections titled Housing Growth and Flood Risk, Sustainable Development and Spatial Strategy, and Housing, and having regard to the comments made by Members at the previous meeting of the Joint Committee, the final presentation of the information contained in Appendix A differs from that adopted in the report considered on the 27 September.**

2.9 Accordingly, Appendix A is separated into the following parts:

- **Part 1:** This sets out the 303 representations with a proposed officer recommendation of *Support – no change to the approach is required.* These are set out in the order of the following sections:

    - Housing Growth and Flood Risk;
    - Sustainable Development and Spatial Strategy; and
    - Housing.

- **Part 2:** This sets out the 107 representations with a proposed officer recommendation of *Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD.* These are ordered in the same way as Part 1.

- **Part 3:** This sets out the 50 representations with a proposed officer recommendation of *Objection – a minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).* These are ordered in the same way as Part 1.

- **Part 4:** This sets out the 90 representations with a proposed officer recommendation of *Objection – no change to the approach is required***, but excluding** those representations relating to objections to the 'cap' on housing development in the Red, Orange and Yellow [ROY] flood-hazard zones (which are addressed in Part 5 below) . These are ordered in the same way as Part 1.

- **Part 5:** This sets out the 318 representations with a proposed officer recommendation of either:

    (1) *Objection – no change to the approach is required*. Such representations relate to the cap on housing development in the ROY flood-hazard zones (relocated from Part 4 above); or

    (2) *Objection – further work required which could result in a change to the approach*.

Together (1) and (2) are ordered under the following headings:

A. Cap on housing development in the ROY flood–hazard zones
B. Objectively-assessed need for market and affordable housing
C. Main Service Centres
D. Service Villages and development in the Countryside
E. Broad locations for housing growth in Boston
F. Broad locations for housing growth in Spalding
G. Affordable Housing
H. Infrastructure/Delivery
I. Additional policy matters
J. Cross-boundary housing provision
K. Phasing of housing delivery/5-year housing land supply

NB: Representations under these headings are, in turn, ordered in the same way as Part 1.

2.10 Officers will take members through each of the five parts listed in paragraph 2.9 above. Each of the matters covered by the headings A.-K. in **Part 5** will be the subject of specific officer-led discussions with a view to informing members' consideration of the representations to which they relate.

3.0 THE NEXT STEPS

3.1 Following the Joint Committee's consideration of all the representations covered by the headings in paragraphs 1.4 and 1.5 above, officers will need to determine the 'issues' arising from:

- those representations generating either a possible minor change to the approach or further work which could result in a change to the approach (**see bullet points 3 and 4 in paragraph 2.6 above**);

- any new evidence (e.g. the outcomes from current work on the South East Lincolnshire Town Centre and Retail Capacity Study and the update of the Peterborough Partial Strategic Housing Market Assessment);

- key outstanding areas of work (e.g. the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and the South East Lincolnshire Whole Plan Viability); and

- a detailed examination of the emerging plan and policies with regard to the use of consistent terms, assessment that the policy objectives are both consistent and unambiguous and that outcomes are set that can be monitored.

3.2 This 'interim stage' and its consequences for the further stages of plan preparation will be explained to Members in more detail at the meeting.

4.0 **VIEWS OF THE HEAD OF BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT, BOSTON BOROUGH COUNCIL AND THE PLANNING MANAGER, BRECKLAND AND SOUTH HOLLAND COUNCILS**

4.1 The Head of Built Environment and Development at Boston Borough Council and the Planning Manager for Breckland and South Holland Councils have been consulted and have provided the joint response set out below.

4.2 'Whilst we would both have appreciated much more time within which to frame our response we appreciate that an enormous amount of work has gone into producing the documentation supporting the Joint Policy Unit Manager's report. It remains our conjoined view that we would benefit greatly from seeing this material at least a week in advance of the deadline for publication of the report.

4.3 Nevertheless, we remain satisfied that thorough consideration has been and is being given to the representations received and understand and acknowledge the need for these views to be formally reported and considered by Members. That said, and given the volume of consultation responses received, the reporting process at Committee needs to be undertaken in a manner which enables proper debate. In this context, the separation of the reporting process into five broad sections (1-5) is clearly well thought out and presents Members with the opportunity to consider over-arching topic areas in a manner which clearly identifies broad areas of support (where no changes are required); broad areas of concern outwith the remit of the current process; areas where minor changes are concerned; areas where no change is required; and, finally, areas where additional work is necessary in order to demonstrate both a soundness of approach and where consideration needs to be given to areas where a change of approach may be required. In this sense, we welcome as eminently sensible a reporting process which will begin with officers outlining the salient considerations that need to be taken into account in relation to those matters highlighted in the report under headings A-K at Part 5. It is essential to our view that officers engage fully with Members at this stage in order to highlight those areas where there will be a need to undertake further work. It will be equally important to this debate to explore and identify key issues which may have implications on, for example, new policy directions or indeed more fundamental issues affecting soundness.

4.4 In light of the above, there appear to be a number of potentially significant issues arising which would benefit from further exploration. Examples would include further consideration of the overall level of objectively-assessed need (based on ONS and LCC demographic projections) when set against the question of reasonable and unreasonable options. The potential for under-delivery needs exploring as does the issue of cross-boundary discussions, particularly in light of past performance. Back-loading the phasing of housing growth will warrant careful justification in light of the need to identify a five (or indeed 6) year land supply as this issue can become a somewhat 'circular' one; and this is all the more important with a strategy based on large urban extensions which may only yield significant numbers in their later stages. There is therefore a need to address whether or not service villages or other villages can support delivery in the shorter term. It does, however, need to be

understood that whilst delivery within the villages and service villages may be easier to achieve this needs setting against their overall sustainability and flood risk considerations. Admittedly, a fine line to tread but one which may need further positive policy support.

4.5 Overall, there remain a number of key pieces of work which are, in many ways, dependant upon each other; these relating to viability, deliverable levels of affordable housing and, potentially, house construction standards. These areas need drawing out in order to fully appreciate how competing demands may be reconciled within the plan.'

5.0 VIEWS OF OTHER CONSULTEES

5.1 The Strategic Planning Manager, Lincolnshire County Council, has been consulted and any comments received will be reported at the meeting.

5.2 The Monitoring Officer representative for Boston Borough Council has been consulted and any comments received will be reported at the meeting.

5.3 The Monitoring Officer representative for Lincolnshire County Council has been consulted and any comments received will be reported at the meeting.

5.4 The Monitoring Officer for South Holland District Council has been consulted and any comments received will be reported at the meeting.

5.5 The s151 Officer for Boston Borough Council has been consulted and any comments received will be reported at the meeting.

5.6 The s151 Officer for Lincolnshire County Council has been consulted and any comments received will be reported at the meeting.

5.7 The s151 Officer for Breckland and South Holland District Councils has been consulted and any comments received will be reported at the meeting.

6.0 OPTIONS

6.1 Members can accept the officers' recommendations or require amendments to them.

7.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 There is a current statutory requirement for the Joint Committee to prepare one or more development plan documents that will form the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The Preferred Options stage of the preparation of the Strategy and Policies DPD is identified in the Joint Committee's Local Development Scheme (LDS).

8.0 EXPECTED BENEFITS AND TIMELINES

8.1 This report deals with a particular stage in the preparation of the Strategy and Policies DPD (under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended) which will form part of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The completion of the Local Plan will enable planning decisions to be made in accordance with up-to-date planning policies and proposals. The timelines for the preparation of the Local Plan are set in the Joint Committee's LDS. This will need to be revised in the light of the considerations featured in paragraph 3.1 of this report.

9.0 IMPLICATIONS

9.1 Carbon Footprint & Environmental Issues

9.1.1 The preparation of the Local Plan will help to create sustainable development across South East Lincolnshire.

9.2 Constitution & Legal

9.2.1 See para 7.1.

9.3 Contracts

9.3.1 There are no relevant contractual implications of this report.

9.4 Crime and Disorder

9.4.1 There are no crime and disorder implications of this report.

9.5 Equality and Diversity & Human Rights

9.5.1 The Local Plan is being prepared in accordance with the Joint Committee's Statement of Community Involvement. This requires us to seek to cater for, and engage with, all sections of the community in preparing our plans, in particular those groups which have been underrepresented in previous consultation exercises (the so-called 'hard-to-reach' groups).

9.6 Financial

9.6.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from the consideration of this report.

9.7 Risk Management

9.7.1 Without up-to-date local planning policies for South East Lincolnshire, future planning decisions would have to rely upon the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework. This could result in decisions being made that did not properly reflect how the Government's presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied locally.

9.8 **Staffing**

9.8.1 There are no staffing implications arising from the consideration of this report.

9.9 **Stakeholders / Consultation**

9.9.1 This report deals with the comments received in response to undertaking a full public consultation exercise on the Combined Preferred Options and Sustainability Appraisal Report.

10.0 **WARDS/COMMUNITIES AFFECTED**

10.1 The implications of the proposed new Local Plan documents affect all wards/communities.

Background papers:- None

Lead Contact Officer
Name/Post: Gary Alexander, South East Lincolnshire Joint Policy Unit Manager
Telephone Number: 01775 761161
Email: info@sholland.gov.uk

Key Decision: Yes

Exempt Decision: No

Appendices accompanying this report:

Appendix A: South East Lincolnshire Preferred Options Consultation Report 25 November 2013:
Part 1 – Agenda Item 4
Part 2 – Agenda Item 5
Part 3 – Agenda Item 6
Part 4 – Agenda Item 7
Part 5 – Agenda Item 8

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A

South East Lincolnshire Preferred Options Consultation Report 25 November 2013

Part 1

This page is intentionally left blank

Officer_Recommendation **Support - No change to the approach is required.**

Response_ Number:	38	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	992	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Our client would accept that there is a need to outline an approach to flood risk within the local plan however it does have to be acknowledged that the detail as to how that approach is implemented in regard to specific proposals is a matter that should be dealt with at the Development Management stage in accordance with Part 10 of the NPPF. As such the Sequential Test would be a requirement for any proposal within an identified flood zone and as such this would give preference to sites at a lower risk.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Martin Bagshaw				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy				

Response_ Number:	162	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1752	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q7- Do you agree that there is a need for the preferred policy approach? The preferred policy approach which sets out the strategic flood risk in South East Lincolnshire is considered to be realistic and necessary. In order to meet the need for sustainable development in an area where a high proportion of the land is at risk of flooding, it is considered inappropriate to rely wholly on the generic advice contained in the NPPF.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Gregory Gray Associates				
Representing_Who?:	The Garden Centre Group				

Response_ Number:	283	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	967	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We acknowledge and support the approach towards the provision of additional housing within the identified ROY (Red-Orange-Yellow) flood risk zones. Additional, sustainable housing growth is clearly necessary within the extensive areas of South East Lincolnshire that are at flood risk, yet a capped provision in these areas combined with a new approach to greater and wider distribution to areas outside the ROY must be the positive direction for planning for growth in the future.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates				
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	284	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	967	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We acknowledge and support the approach towards the provision of additional housing within the identified ROY (Red-Orange-Yellow) flood risk zones. Additional, sustainable housing growth is clearly necessary within the extensive areas of South East Lincolnshire that are at flood risk, yet a capped provision in these areas combined with a new approach to greater and wider distribution to areas outside the ROY must be the positive direction for planning for growth in the future.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates				
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese				

Response_ Number:	298	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	858	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Our client also supports the preferred approach to housing provision, which sets out a requirement for an additional 4,520 dwellings to be provided in Boston Borough over the Plan period to 2031. This approach reflects the anticipated population growth in the Borough and seeks to provide additional housing provision to meet the needs of the growing population.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Peacock & Smith				
Representing_Who?:	Mr R Hardy				

Response_ Number:	543	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		It is agreed that there is a need for a flood risk policy.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	544	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The DPD explains the policy context in detail and sets out a reasonable approach.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Response_ Number:	545	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Response_ Number:	546	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options would appear acceptable for the South Holland District.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	547	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The preferred provision for housing policy approach for South Holland appears correct based on the historic build rate.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Response_ Number:	548	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We agree with an element of control of the number of homes to be built in the severest flood hazard zones	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Response_ Number:	549	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	595	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		It is agreed that there is a need for a flood risk policy.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Response_ Number:	596	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The DPD explains the policy context in detail and sets out a reasonable approach.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Response_ Number:	597	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	598	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options would appear acceptable for the South Holland District.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Response_ Number:	599	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The preferred provision for housing policy approach for South Holland appears correct based on the historic build rate.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Response_ Number:	600	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We agree with an element of control of the number of homes to be built in the severest flood hazard zones	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	601	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	644	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	988	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The overarching Government requirement, in the context of the presumption in favour of development, is to boost significantly, the supply of housing (NPPF Para 47). The Plan recites the NPPF in some detail in this respect and its provisions are not repeated here, save to say that crucially, Local Plans should: •Indicate broad locations for strategic development on a key diagram and land use designations on a proposals map; and •Allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary, and provide detail on form, scale, access and quantum of development, where appropriate. The councils have undertaken a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2012). In summary and bringing together the results from the study and in particular, the outputs of the housing needs and housing market models, it is suggested that between 58% and 100% of additional housing would need to be affordable if all needs are to be met. In reality, the private rented sector will continue to be used to meet some of this need, whilst targets will be constrained by the viability of individual sites. It will therefore be for the council to take a view on realistic targets based on economic viability, as well as the level of housing need. In the affordable sector, the data suggest that between 23% and 31% of additional housing should be intermediate, with a particular focus on intermediate rent for households with limited levels of capital. In the market sector, it is concluded that around 69% of additional homes should be larger (3 and 4+ bedroom) units, with the opposite being true of affordable housing (between 63% and 76% smaller (1 and 2 bedroom) units). Overall, the levels of both demand and need in the District are significant: •Growth in household numbers derived from Office for	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Graham Warren Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Broadgate Homes Ltd				

National Statistics (ONS) 2008 based population projections, results in a requirement for 470 additional dpa, with a recommendation that 35% of the dwellings should be affordable housing;
- growth based on East Midlands Regional Plan figures, results in a requirement for 540 dpa, with a recommendations that 35% of the dwellings should be affordable housing; and
- growth based on the abandoned 'Revised Draft East Midlands Regional Plan (Partial Review) housing provision figures, results in a requirement for 705 dpa, with a recommendation that 31% of the dwellings should be affordable housing.

The Plan states that it is essential to identify a dwelling target aimed at meeting the housing needs of S E Lincolnshire, which specifies separate targets for Boston Borough and South Holland District. Individual targets are necessary, in order to enable an individual five year housing supply for each Local Authority area.

Five policy options have been considered in determining the appropriate level of housing in the Plan area. These are Reasonable Options:
A. Setting targets in accordance with the NPPF and to use objectively assessed housing needs, set out in the respective SHMA's, covering both Local Authorities.
B. To use the annual housing apportionment contained in the former Regional Plan and to extend it up to 2031.
Unreasonable Options
C. Use the migration led A scenario in the "Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire " to inform housing targets for S E Lincolnshire.
D. Use the migration led B scenario set out in the "Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire ".
E. The zero growth option

The five different options for housing provision are set out in Table 1 below. However, when the earlier recorded historic rate of completions is considered against them, it is clear that Options C and D would appear to be undeliverable and

therefore unreasonable, based on the experience of the last 35 years or so. Option E is deemed unreasonable as it does not meet the objectively assessed housing need for the area and is therefore, contrary to the provisions of the NPPF.

Table 1 : Policy Options for determining a housing target for South east Lincolnshire

Dwellings per annum (2011-2031)	Historic Rate of Completions	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E
Boston Borough	226	270	553	520	772	63
South Holland District	470	540	683	627	1294	14
Total for S E Lincolnshire	696	810	1,236	1,247	2066	77

The delivery of both options will be guided by the framework provided by the Spatial Strategy, other housing related policies, the Site Allocations DPD where appropriate, and the development management process. Most significant housing proposals will require appropriate supporting infrastructure, which will be identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).

Given the historic rate of housing delivery in South East Lincolnshire and the uncertainty surrounding the economic situation, looking ahead over the next few years at least, it is considered that the lower housing target represented by Option A, is the most deliverable. The delivery of overall targets for additional dwellings will be monitored through an annual 'Monitoring Report'.

Option A is the preferred option because it is considered deliverable, when compared with historic building rates. If a higher growth target were to be identified, (e.g. Option B), there is an increased likelihood of the Local Planning Authorities being unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites and consequent fears about 'unplanned growth'.

Having regard to the evidence base, in conjunction with past build rates and flood risk issues, Broadgate Homes support the

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.

overall level of housing provision in the Plan to 2031. However, if market conditions dictate, given the identified SHLAA capacity, then the figures set out in Table 2 below should be regarded and stated as minima.

Table 2 – Proposed dwelling provision Lincolnshire 2011-2031

Local Authority Area	Annual Apportionment From 2011	Total Housing Provision 2011-2031	Maximum number of dwellings provided in areas categorised as Red, Orange or Yellow flood hazard zones (as defined in the Lincolnshire Coastal Study)
Boston Borough	226	4,520	3,600
South Holland District	470	9,400	1,200
South East Lincolnshire	696	13,920	4,800

Response_ Number:	663	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1057	Categorisation_of_further_work:		I note the stated difference between the housing markets of Boston and Spalding and agree that it is questionable as to whether housing located in Spalding would meet the needs of Boston.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr A Austin				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Response_ Number:	758	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		It is agreed that there is a need for a flood risk policy.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	759	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The DPD explains the policy context in detail and sets out a reasonable approach.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	760	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	761	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options would appear acceptable for the South Holland District.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	762	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The preferred provision for housing policy approach for South Holland appears correct based on the historic build rate.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	765	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	813	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		It is agreed that there is a need for a flood risk policy.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	814	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The DPD explains the policy context in detail and sets out a reasonable approach.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	815	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	816	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options would appear acceptable for the South Holland District.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	817	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The preferred provision for housing policy approach for South Holland appears correct based on the historic build rate.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	818	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We agree with an element of control of the number of homes to be built in the severest flood hazard zones.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	819	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	866	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		It is agreed that there is a need for a flood risk policy.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	869	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options would appear acceptable for the South Holland District.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	870	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The preferred provision for housing policy approach for South Holland appears correct based on the historic build rate.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	873	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	923	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		It is agreed that there is a need for a flood risk policy. Within South East Lincolnshire, particularly in relation to Boston Borough, development is required to take place on land that is identified in the Lincolnshire Coastal Study as within a hazard area. That land is within such a designation does not prevent sustainable and safe development from being delivered.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Response_ Number:	983	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		It is agreed that there is a need for a flood risk policy.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	984	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The DPD explains the policy context in detail and sets out a reasonable approach.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Response_ Number:	986	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options would appear acceptable for the South Holland District.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Response_ Number:	987	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The preferred provision for housing policy approach for South Holland appears correct based on the historic build rate.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	990	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1171	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1812	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Strategic Flood Risk General comments in relation to questions 7, 8 and 9. The general approach is supported whereby major new house allocations are directed towards the most sustainable of locations and those at least risk of flooding. However, it is important to consider the long term future of those settlements and areas of sporadic development that are located within areas of some risk. To exclude all housing development from such areas could have significant impact on the social fabric. With an ageing population, smaller families and an increase in the number of single parent families and lack of first time buyer homes, people who otherwise might want to remain in a particular location or area may have to relocate as a result of a lack of appropriate housing. What could effectively be moratorium should not be placed on proposals which may be at some risk but which clearly demonstrate that they have been designed to be flood resilient and future proof. Such proposals should be given favourable consideration. Building technology is improving in respect of flood resilience and the Local Plan should be sufficiently robust to recognise this and allow for small scale development in areas of higher risk as exceptions when it can be demonstrated that the scheme has been designed to address flooding and climate change in the short and long term.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Dadge				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs T Croxford				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1253	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1689	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q7 - Do you agree that there is a need for the preferred policy approach (see sections 4.5 – 4.10 under Approach to Flood Risk in the full consultation document for more information)? Please explain your view. We agree that there is a need for the preferred policy approach, which should clearly incorporate the spirit of the Lincolnshire Coastal Study (LCS) principles. The LCS is a major piece of evidence, produced as a result of the East Midlands Regional Examination findings, which considers sustainable options for the coastal settlements to develop given the increasing risk of flooding.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Ms A Hewitson				
Representing_Who?:	Environment Agency				
Response_ Number:	1382	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q 13 I agree with this approach. See previous text.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				
Response_ Number:	30	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1158	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Paul Tame				
Representing_Who?:	NFU				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	117	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	860	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Hollie Howe				
Representing_Who?:	St John's College				
Response_ Number:	119	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	860	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Hollie Howe				
Representing_Who?:	St John's College				
Response_ Number:	168	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1752	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q 15 and 16 – The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development Our client supports the preferred policy approach which adopts the PINS model policy.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Gregory Gray Associates				
Representing_Who?:	The Garden Centre Group				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	169	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1752	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Gregory Gray Associates				
Representing_Who?:	The Garden Centre Group				

Response_ Number:	187	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1754	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Page 76 – Spatial strategy – We support the status given to Moulton Chapel as a service village.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Ravell				

Response_ Number:	196	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1755	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We support the status given to Pinchbeck as a service village.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding Lifestyle owners				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	217	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1122	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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. 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). 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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Elizabeth Biott				
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	218	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1122	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Elizabeth Biott				
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust				

Response_ Number:	219	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1122	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Elizabeth Biott				
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust				

Response_ Number:	236	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1758	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Woods Hardwick Planning				
Representing_Who?:	Wheatley PLC				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	238	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1758	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The criteria as specified are supported.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Woods Hardwick Planning				
Representing_Who?:	Wheatley PLC				

Response_ Number:	248	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1759	Categorisation_of_further_work:		It is felt that the overall approach to the development management policy is appropriate.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Jonathan Ireland				
Representing_Who?:	Irelands Farm Machinery				

Response_ Number:	253	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1492	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Support Kirton as a main Service Centre.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr A Tunnard				
Representing_Who?:	Himself and Mr C Tunnard				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	285	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	967	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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 food risk yet at a scale and quantum that the respective settlements can safely identify and accommodate through Flood Risk Assessments.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates				
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese				
Response_ Number:	286	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	967	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Antony Aspbury Associates support the hierarchical approach as the method of guiding new development across SE Lincolnshire.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates				
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	297	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	858	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Peacock & Smith				
Representing_Who?:	Mr R Hardy				
Response_ Number:	322	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	932	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr Neil Osborn				
Representing_Who?:	Larkfleet Homes				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	323	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	932	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We have no comments on Development Management policies at this time.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr Neil Osborn				
Representing_Who?:	Larkfleet Homes				

Response_ Number:	330	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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. 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 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. 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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	D Braybrooks				

Officer_Recommendation	**Support - No change to the approach is required.**				
Response_ Number:	333	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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 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. 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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	D A and N Casswell				
Response_ Number:	337	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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 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. 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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs B Blundy				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	341	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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 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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs J Tetley				
Response_ Number:	344	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	N Ward				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	362	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	R Bingham				
Response_ Number:	368	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	M & J Woodroffe				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	372	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	R Bennett & M & J Woodroffe				
Response_ Number:	376	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	C Adams				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	380	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs E M H Todoroff				
Response_ Number:	385	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	C L Cave				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	393	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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 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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and M Hotchkin				
Response_ Number:	397	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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 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. 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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Louis				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	430	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1678	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Crowland Parish Council				
Representing_Who?:	Themselves				
Response_ Number:	450	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	B J Runciman				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	459	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs G Pell				
Response_ Number:	468	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	T Tyrell				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	472	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	E A Smith				
Response_ Number:	490	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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. 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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	D Coxen				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	495	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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. 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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs J Needham				
Response_ Number:	500	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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 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. 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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	C Clark				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	505	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Read				
Response_ Number:	510	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs G Jacko				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	519	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs P Thompson				
Response_ Number:	523	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	J Whiting				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	527	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	M & J Woodroffe				
Response_ Number:	550	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				
Response_ Number:	551	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	555	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Response_ Number:	556	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Response_ Number:	557	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	558	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We support the preferred Option A.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Response_ Number:	559	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Development Management preferred policy is consistent with other development plan policies and the criteria are acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Response_ Number:	560	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	602	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Response_ Number:	603	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Response_ Number:	605	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Spatial Strategy broadly reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	606	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No change is suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Response_ Number:	607	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Response_ Number:	608	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	609	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Response_ Number:	610	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We support the preferred Option A.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Response_ Number:	611	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Development Management preferred policy is consistent with other development plan policies and the criteria are acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	612	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	643	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	988	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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 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	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Graham Warren Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Broadgate Homes Ltd				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.

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.

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	682	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	870	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Bidwells				
Representing_Who?:	The Duchy of Lancaster				
Response_ Number:	690	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1688	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge				
Representing_Who?:	English Heritage				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	766	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	767	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	768	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	769	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Spatial Strategy reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	770	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	771	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No change is suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	772	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	773	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	774	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	775	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We support the preferred Option A.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	776	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Development Management preferred policy is consistent with other development plan policies and the criteria are acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	777	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	820	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	821	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	822	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	823	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Spatial Strategy reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	824	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No change is suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	825	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	826	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments: The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.	Officer_Response: Support noted.
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:			
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	827	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments: No changes are suggested.	Officer_Response: Support noted.
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:			
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	828	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments: We support the preferred Option A.	Officer_Response: Support noted.
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:			
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	829	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Development Management preferred policy is consistent with other development plan policies and the criteria are acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	830	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	874	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	875	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	876	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	877	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Spatial Strategy reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	878	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No change is suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	879	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	880	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	881	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	882	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We support the preferred Option A.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	883	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Development Management preferred policy is consistent with other development plan policies and the criteria are acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	884	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	931	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Response_ Number:	932	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	933	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				
Response_ Number:	934	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Spatial Strategy reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				
Response_ Number:	937	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	938	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Response_ Number:	940	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We support the preferred Option A.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Response_ Number:	941	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Development Management preferred policy is consistent with other development plan policies and the criteria are acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	942	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Response_ Number:	991	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Response_ Number:	992	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	993	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We agree with the approach.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Response_ Number:	994	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Spatial Strategy reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Response_ Number:	995	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No change is suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	996	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Response_ Number:	997	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Response_ Number:	998	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	999	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We support the preferred Option A.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Response_ Number:	1000	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Development Management preferred policy is consistent with other development plan policies and the criteria are acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Response_ Number:	1001	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No changes are suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1033	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	K Enderby				

Response_ Number:	1034	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Spatial Strategy reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	K Enderby				

Response_ Number:	1037	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	K Enderby				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1038	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	K Enderby				

Response_ Number:	1056	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option. 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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Richard Pearson Ltd				

Response_ Number:	1057	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Richard Pearson Ltd				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1079	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	J Grant				
Response_ Number:	1110	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	R C Tinsley				
Response_ Number:	1115	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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..	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	H Nundy				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1120	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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..	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	J Grant				
Response_ Number:	1124	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	The Casswell Family				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1128	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	The Casswell Family				
Response_ Number:	1132	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	J Grant				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1140	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1252	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Anne Casey				
Representing_Who?:	RSPB				

Response_ Number:	1166	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	894	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	P C Bradshaw				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs R Hamilton				

Response_ Number:	1167	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	894	Categorisation_of_further_work:		It is agreed that the proposed criteria are appropriate.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	P C Bradshaw				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs R Hamilton				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1185	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments: Yes	Officer_Response: Support noted.
Respondents ID Number:	1813	Categorisation_of_further_work:			
Persons_ Name:	Angela Newton				
Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett				

Response_ Number:	1187	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments: Yes	Officer_Response: Support noted.
Respondents ID Number:	1813	Categorisation_of_further_work:			
Persons_ Name:	Angela Newton				
Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1233	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				
Response_ Number:	1258	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1689	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Ms A Hewitson				
Representing_Who?:	Environment Agency				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1259	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1689	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Ms A Hewitson				
Representing_Who?:	Environment Agency				
Response_ Number:	1301	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 15 Yes	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				
Response_ Number:	1307	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 21 – Yes	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1310	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 24 – Yes	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1384	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1385	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				
Response_ Number:	1391	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q22 Yes	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1393	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				
Response_ Number:	1394	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q25 Yes	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	28	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1730	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No objections to the proposals for the Pinchbeck area. Information concise. Will not impact on village itself.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Tracey Meachen				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Response_ Number:	29	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1730	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No objections to the proposals for the Pinchbeck area. Information concise. Will not impact on village itself.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Tracey Meachen				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Response_ Number:	37	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1733	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The proposed new areas for housing development seem logical. The provision of a new relief road is very welcome as previous plans for past construction as far as Bourne Road would have inevitably led to more traffic (especially heavy traffic) on Wygate Park. This would have been further exacerbated by the proposed rail hub and increased rail traffic. In the meantime, in view of the proximity of schools and play areas, speed/weight limits on Wygate Park need reviewing.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	W Smith				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	58	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1017	Categorisation_of_further_work:		I think that these figures are about right. 1,000 homes in Holbeach up to 2031 is adequate but we will need extra medical facilities to accommodate the growth. I think the current allocation would be suitable to accommodate some of this growth	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr F Biggadike				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				
Response_ Number:	61	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1736	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Yes – However please see my response to Q 40 below	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Stuart Horton				
Representing_Who?:	Boston BC Housing				
Response_ Number:	62	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1736	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Unless there is a fixed agreed standard charge (or simple agreed calculation) for offsite contributions it would be extremely time consuming to negotiate an affordable housing contribution from proposals for very small sites of only 1 or 2 dwellings as it would need to be a financial contribution for offsite provision. This would also be the case in Boston Borough for sites of only 3 or 4 dwellings because of the proportion of affordable housing contribution proposed for Boston Borough (20%) and although financial contributions from these sites would be very welcome, to support the delivery of affordable housing on other sites, consideration needs to be given as to how this can be agreed with applicants without taking up considerable officer time negotiating.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Stuart Horton				
Representing_Who?:	Boston BC Housing				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	158	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1751	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Page 145. Para's 6.81.2 & 6.85 state that Option A is preferred. Treating dwelling no's as minimum requirements. This is supported.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Mr S Harris				
Response_ Number:	172	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1752	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q28 Distribution and Scale of Housing Development The preferred policy approach contains proposed housing allocation figures for several individual settlements, including a total of 300 units for Crowland. Given the fact that Crowland is outside the ROY zones, and that its existing size as a main service centre means that it supports a good range of existing facilities, it is considered entirely appropriate that Crowland support a significant number of new dwellings. It is noted that a significant proportion of these could be provided on my client's site which is ideally located in relation to the existing residential area and facilities.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Gregory Gray Associates				
Representing_Who?:	The Garden Centre Group				
Response_ Number:	189	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1754	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Para's 6.81.2 & 6.85 state that Option A is preferred. Treating dwelling no's as minimum requirements. This is supported.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Ravell				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	198	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1755	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Page 145. Para's 6.81.2 & 6.85 state that Option A is preferred. Treating dwelling no's as minimum requirements. This is supported.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding Lifestyle owners				

Response_ Number:	207	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1756	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Para's 6.81.2 & 6.85 state that Option A is preferred. Treating dwelling no's as minimum requirements. This is supported.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Mr S Hatter				

Response_ Number:	220	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1122	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the fifth criterion to ensure that developments of gypsy and traveller sites would not adversely affect areas of importance to nature conservation.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Elizabeth Biott				
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	254	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1492	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Support the allocation of 420 dwellings in Kirton. Land reference KIR 010 has been submitted to the SHLAA and has initially been considered Suitable, Available and Achievable. I now own this land along with my brother Mr Charles Tunnard. The SHLAA details may refer to my father Mr J W Tunnard and Mr E Brown who used to own the land and should be updated. This land can contribute to meeting the 420 dwelling allocation for Kirton.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr A Tunnard				
Representing_Who?:	Himself and Mr C Tunnard				
Response_ Number:	268	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1766	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Agree that additional housing should be restricted to Spalding, Holbeach, service centres and larger villages with development generally not permitted in the countryside i.e. all other settlements	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Sally Waltham				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				
Response_ Number:	291	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	967	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We support this approach. Infill and conversion opportunities are an appropriate level of development for these unnamed settlements below Service Village level.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates				
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	294	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	967	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We support the approach to and the outcome of the appraisal indicating that identifying a broad location for growth for Boston is the preferred option. With the significant scale of development proposed for the town and the inherent constraints of flood risk ,it is a sensible approach to seek to identify the most appropriate locations having due regard to delivery and flood risk issues.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates				
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese				

Response_ Number:	299	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	858	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We consider that it is necessary for a large percentage of the overall housing requirement for Boston Borough to be located within Boston itself, thereby reflecting its role as a Sub-Regional Centre. Our client considers that the preferred provision of 2,900 additional dwellings in Boston itself is a level that is commensurate with its role and can be reasonably and successfully delivered. It is also appropriate that all of the housing requirement in Boston can be provided on ROY sites. It is encouraging that the Joint Committee acknowledges that the majority of Boston is within ROY Zones and therefore the entire settlement is at risk of flooding to a lesser or greater degree depending on the specific location.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Peacock & Smith				
Representing_Who?:	Mr R Hardy				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	312	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	889	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We do not object to the three dwelling threshold or the 20% affordable housing requirement in Boston and the flexible tenure mix based upon the most up to date evidence of need.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr Mark Johnson				
Representing_Who?:	Assura Properties Limited				

Response_ Number:	313	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	889	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We do not object to the three dwelling threshold or the 20% affordable housing requirement in Boston and the flexible tenure mix based upon the most up to date evidence of need.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr Mark Johnson				
Representing_Who?:	Assura Properties Limited				

Response_ Number:	314	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	889	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We support the approach taken to the size, type and density of additional housing, that being to accord with the best available and up to date evidence i.e. outlined in the SHMA in relation to size and type. We support Option 2 in relation to density which proposes not to include a minimum density and proposes to deal with each proposal on a case by case basis.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr Mark Johnson				
Representing_Who?:	Assura Properties Limited				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	324	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	932	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We SUPPORT significant development in the Service Villages including Fishtoft as we consider that this is the appropriate balance that needs to be struck between delivering an appropriate spatial distribution of development, meeting the scale of growth required and balancing consideration of environment and flood risk.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr Neil Osborn				
Representing_Who?:	Larkfleet Homes				

Response_ Number:	326	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	932	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We have no comments on these matters at this time	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr Neil Osborn				
Representing_Who?:	Larkfleet Homes				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	327	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	932	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We SUPPORT Option B insofar as there should be no prescriptive control over density of affordable homes. Density should be a factor of site specific considerations, local character they type of housing required to be provided and in turn the assessed form of local need. We SUPPORT Option A in respect of the delivery of affordable homes. The delivery of market houses is essential to enable affordable homes to be secured and such delivery must be viable and may need to be assessed for viability in each individual case having regard to other planning obligations deemed necessary to support the development. Flexibility is required to respond positively to present market conditions and we support a policy approach that would enable such conditions to be reviewed in the event of an upturn in demand for housing and improved viability of housing costs and delivery.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr Neil Osborn				
Representing_Who?:	Larkfleet Homes				
Response_ Number:	328	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	932	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We SUPPORT the proposed policy that the density of new development should reflect the local circumstances of the site, taking into account the viability of the development.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr Neil Osborn				
Representing_Who?:	Larkfleet Homes				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	345	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for Crowland, set at an additional 300 dwellings over the 20 year plan period, is excellent , and will support the town's services, and hopefully provide for additional services to be willing to locate to the area.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	N Ward				

Response_ Number:	369	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for Crowland, set at an additional 300 dwellings over the 20 year plan period, is excellent , and will support the town's services, and hopefully provide for additional services to be willing to locate to the area.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	M & J Woodroffe				

Response_ Number:	373	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for Crowland, set at an additional 300 dwellings over the 20 year plan period, is excellent , and will support the town's services, and hopefully provide for additional services to be willing to locate to the area.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	R Bennett & M & J Woodroffe				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	377	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for Crowland, set at an additional 300 over the 20 year plan period, is excellent , and will support the town's services, and hopefully provide for additional services to be willing to locate to the area.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	C Adams				

Response_ Number:	425	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1778	Categorisation_of_further_work:		4.1 The team is supportive of for the use of a Site Allocations DPD to identify specific sites for gypsy and travellers, informed by the findings of the recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Matthew Hogan				
Representing_Who?:	South Holland District Council				

Response_ Number:	429	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1678	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We agree to Housing growth scenarios for Crowland (which align with our existing directional vision). Delivery must ensure parallel development of infrastructure, and prevent unintended "dormatorisation" of Crowland.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Crowland Parish Council				
Representing_Who?:	Themselves				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	511	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for Crowland, set at an additional 300 dwellings over the 20 year plan period, is excellent , and will support the town's services, and hopefully provide for additional services to be willing to locate to the area.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs G Jacko				

Response_ Number:	520	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for Crowland, set at an additional 300 dwellings over the 20 year plan period, is excellent , and will support the town's services, and hopefully provide for additional services to be willing to locate to the area.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs P Thompson				

Response_ Number:	524	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for Crowland, set at an additional 300 dwellings over the 20 year plan period, is excellent , and will support the town's services, and hopefully provide for additional services to be willing to locate to the area.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	J Whiting				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	563	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The broad approach is reasonable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Response_ Number:	564	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Response_ Number:	567	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is reasonable and the preferred policy wording is appropriate.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	568	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The preferred policy is concise and provides adequate guidance.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Response_ Number:	569	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No change is suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

Response_ Number:	616	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The broad approach is reasonable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	617	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Response_ Number:	620	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is reasonable and the preferred policy wording is appropriate.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Response_ Number:	621	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The preferred policy is concise and provides adequate guidance.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	622	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No change is suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	645	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	988	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The NPPF defines 'affordable housing' as: Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision'. South East Lincolnshire has an identified need for affordable housing, which has been evidenced in the separate Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAs) covering Boston Borough and South Holland District. Therefore, there is a requirement to set policies for meeting needs in these two areas, which reflect the relevant findings of the two SHMAs. Whilst some affordable housing is developed through Government grant funding, the planning system is also required to help in delivering sufficient affordable housing developments and secondly, through the provision of affordable housing on 'rural exception sites (known as 'rural exception schemes'). Accordingly, the emerging South East Lincolnshire Whole Plan Viability Assessment (VA) has been assessing the level of affordable housing provision that market housing developments can afford to fund, having regard to other matters impacting on their financial viability, and also the opportunities for funding rural exception schemes without Government grant. To date, the VA has produced draft findings. While affordable housing need in both authority areas is great, at present, 20% affordable housing is likely to be viable, with infrastructure provision and flood mitigation measures. Common practice, of course, is that site specific negotiations take place with individual planning applications and where to provision of affordable housing is seen in the context of other contributions that form the subject of negotiations surrounding Section 106 Agreements. Two policy options have been considered, i.e.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Graham Warren Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Broadgate Homes Ltd				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
				•Option A: To outline a policy approach to securing an element of affordable housing in new residential developments, which sets out provisions for a flexible response to site circumstances and changing market conditions over time; and provides guidance on the provision of rural exception schemes, which exclude any element of market housing; and •Option B: As Option A but allowing for the provision of an element of market housing in rural exception schemes. Option B is the preferred option because it confers a more flexible approach tom the delivery of affordable housing across S E Lincolnshire. Broadgate fully support the approach to affordable housing (Option B) because this would provide a greater level of affordable housing in rural areas.	

Response_ Number:	667	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1057	Categorisation_of_further_work:		I agree with the need for an appropriate of Boston Borough's housing to be within Boston town. The sub-regional status of such an historic town is a key part of the Borough's vision for the future and essential for the economy of the area.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr A Austin				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Response_ Number:	670	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1057	Categorisation_of_further_work:		I agree that sufficient housing land should be identified so that a supply of land can be available should there be an upturn in demand	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr A Austin				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	671	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1057	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The broad locations for housing growth for both Boston and Spalding are reasonable but boundaries should not be so rigid as to exclude land marginally outside these areas should windfall or other sites become available.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr A Austin				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Response_ Number:	781	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The broad approach is reasonable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	782	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	785	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is reasonable and the preferred policy wording is appropriate.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	786	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The preferred policy is concise and provides adequate guidance.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	787	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No change is suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	834	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The broad approach is reasonable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	835	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	838	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is reasonable and the preferred policy wording is appropriate.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	839	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The preferred policy is concise and provides adequate guidance.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	840	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No change is suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M				

Response_ Number:	885	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The appraisal in respect of Holbeach in paragraphs 6.28 to 6.29.2 is supported insofar as it confirms Holbeach's status as the largest Main Service Centre in South Holland. This representation is made in respect of the important urban extension to the west of Holbeach that is allocated in the current South Holland Local Plan. The land provides the opportunity for planned growth for the town. Option A identifies a provision of 1,000 dwellings of which 900 may be located in ROY areas. Option A is supported insofar as it will facilitate the delivery of the Holbeach West Urban Extension.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	886	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The provision of 1,000 dwellings in Holbeach is supported.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	887	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No change is suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	888	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The broad approach is reasonable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	889	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	892	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is reasonable and the preferred policy wording is appropriate.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	893	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The preferred policy is concise and provides adequate guidance.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	894	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No change is suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	947	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The broad approach is reasonable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Response_ Number:	948	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	951	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is reasonable and the preferred policy wording is appropriate.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Response_ Number:	952	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The preferred policy is concise and provides adequate guidance.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Response_ Number:	953	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No change is suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1005	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The broad approach is reasonable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Response_ Number:	1006	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Response_ Number:	1009	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is reasonable and the preferred policy wording is appropriate.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1010	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The preferred policy is concise and provides adequate guidance.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Response_ Number:	1011	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		No change is suggested.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Response_ Number:	1040	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The identification of Sutterton as a Service Village is supported.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	K Enderby				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1044	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The broad approach is reasonable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	K Enderby				

Response_ Number:	1045	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	K Enderby				

Response_ Number:	1060	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The broad approach is reasonable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Richard Pearson Ltd				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1061	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The approach is acceptable.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Richard Pearson Ltd				

Response_ Number:	1064	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1797	Categorisation_of_further_work:		I wish to comment upon the proposed plans for development in South Holland and concerning Crowland in particular. I am aware that there is a need for further housing for current and future generations and cannot argue with those aspects of the proposals which relate to this problem.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr and Mrs D Wren				
Representing_Who?:	Themselves				

Response_ Number:	1081	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sites, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the southern Boston parishes, such as a greater number being allocated to Swineshead.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	J Grant				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1101	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we note it has been proposed that Spalding will require 6,000 new dwelling allocations for 2011-2031.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	C Slooten				

Response_ Number:	1117	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sites, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the southern Boston parishes, such as a greater number being allocated to Swineshead.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	H Nundy				

Response_ Number:	1169	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	894	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Yes, this is supported.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	P C Bradshaw				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs R Hamilton				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1190	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1813	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Prefer Option A	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Angela Newton				
Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett				

Response_ Number:	1191	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1813	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Prefer Option B	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Angela Newton				
Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett				

Response_ Number:	1192	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1813	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Agree 1 and 2 houses should be exempt from making affordable housing contribution	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Angela Newton				
Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1195	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1813	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Yes	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Angela Newton				
Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett				

Response_ Number:	1204	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1546	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Most definitely agree. Villages with good facilities and access should be developed, but infrastructure should be improved to cope with extra population.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr and Mrs C Woods				
Representing_Who?:	Themselves				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1239	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q27 - Do you agree with the identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options outlined in sections 6.5 – 6.48 under Approach to Identifying the Distribution and Scale of Additional Housing to be provided in South East Lincolnshire up to 2031 in the full consultation document? Please explain your view. It is agreed that it is entirely appropriate to prepare a separate policy approach for Boston and South Holland governing the distribution and scale of housing development. It is considered appropriate that the limited housing target of 4,520 dwellings (see earlier comments) is set as a minimum figure, albeit with the proposed limitation of 3,600 units in ROY zones this only would enable additional growth within less sustainable secondary locations. The reference at paragraph 6.8.2 to the cap on development in ROY zones sits particularly uncomfortably within this section of the plan.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				
Response_ Number:	1241	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q29 - What is your view on the proposal not to identify new housing sites in settlements below Service Village level? Any significant growth in villages below the service village level would not be sustainable and would place a drain on the limited services and infrastructure that they do have. Smaller settlements should only grow organically in accordance with local need and it would be out of step with the wider strategic objectives to apportion significant growth to smaller villages, even where these would be outside of ROY zones.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1245	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q40 - Do you agree with the proposed affordable housing proportions? The general approach to allowing flexibility in affordable housing provision is supported. Given the differences in housing markets between South Holland and Boston it is considered imperative that discrete policy approaches to affordable housing targets should be adopted in each area. The 'one fifth' of total dwellings target proposed in Boston is at the lower end of the scale given the identified need. However, it is considered that any higher target would not be commercially viable. Given the current financial climate it is agreed that it would not be appropriate to set a specific affordable housing target to be applied on each site but rather rely on assessment of delivery potential on a site by site basis.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				
Response_ Number:	1261	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1689	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q37 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest? Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople - We appreciate the difficulties associated with finding suitable locations to meet the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people, which is particularly difficult in districts where the floodplain is significant. We have previously worked closely with South Holland District Council to identify suitable locations for these types of allocations and will continue to do so where exceptional need arises and it is demonstrated that low risk sites are not available. We support the policy, which secures the exceptional need criteria and requires appropriate mitigation to manage residual flood risk.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Ms A Hewitson				
Representing_Who?:	Environment Agency				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	1277	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1121	Categorisation_of_further_work:		This chapter deals with the distribution, scale and phasing of new housing. The preferred housing provision for Boston Borough, as set out under Housing Growth and Flood Risk above is a minimum of 4,520 dwellings of which a maximum of 3,600 (80%) should be provided in flood risk areas. Of this, it is proposed that 2,900 dwellings should be located in Boston Town (all in flood risk areas) to reflect its pre-eminent role as a service centre and main location for new housing in the Borough (c. two thirds of recent completions). Whilst LCC concerns about the provision in flood risk areas are noted in Para. 10 above it is necessary that a high proportion of that should be in Boston Town to maintain its Sub-Regional role. The other significant locations in the Borough are the main service centre of Kirton (420 dwellings, mainly in flood risk areas) and the service village of Swineshead (400) which is outside the flood risk areas... The remainder of the housing provision (1,200 dwellings) will be distributed across the service villages using the Site Allocations process. (Some of these have capacity outside the flood risk areas.) In South Holland a minimum of 9,400 dwellings is proposed with a maximum of 1,200 (13%) in flood risk areas. This is a larger percentage reduction than in Boston. Spalding is earmarked for 6,000 new dwellings to reflect its role as a sub-regional centre, the availability of development land unaffected by flood risk and the requirement to provide the Spalding Western Relief Road (SWRR) to support growth and address increased rail barrier closures after the upgrade to the "Joint Line". This provision is broadly supported. As the largest Main Service Centre, Holbeach is proposed to accommodate 1,000 dwellings which reflects the availability of suitable development land and its currents role as the second largest settlement in South Holland. The remainder of the new housing will be spread across Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge (150 dwellings each as entirely in flood risk areas), Crowland and Donington (300 dwellings each on land outside flood risk areas) and the service villages (a maximum of 25 dwellings per village).	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Coathup				
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire County Council				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.

This is considered by LCC officers to be a sensible distribution of development which balances the competing issues of flood risk, land availability and service provision.

Given the large amount of housing to be located in Boston Town and Spalding, it is necessary to identify possible broad locations for development. A number of broad locations were evaluated, leading to the following reasonable options:

a) In Boston, only one preferred option is proposed in the south west of the town (see Figure 6.1 in the Preferred Options document) with a capacity of 1,900 dwellings. This leaves sites for 1000 dwellings to be defined in the Site Allocation process but with the possibility of a second broad location left open at this stage.

b) For Spalding, three broad locations along the western edge of the town, all related to the SWRR, are considered reasonable options but the preferred option is a site in the north west (between Holland Park and the A151) with a capacity of 3,750 dwellings (see Figure 6.2 in the Preferred Options document. With 2250 dwellings at Holland Park already permitted this makes up the entire provision of 6000.

Both locations are supported as they have more potential to support key infrastructure.

SE Lincolnshire has a need for affordable housing in Boston Borough and South Holland District, identified through Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAs). Most of this will need to be built as part of new market housing developments and through the provision of affordable housing on "rural exception sites".

Based on market information, viability studies and recent planning decisions separate affordable housing target proportions have been proposed, of 20% for Boston Borough and 33% for South Holland, to reflect differing circumstances locally.

6.2.2 – 6.2.13 Just to confirm, the SHMAs do provide key evidence here and the text is agreed. The following points could,

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.

however, also be noted:
a) The SHMAs were produced at different dates, using different models, and this could be a factor in differing conclusions
b) The Peterborough SHMA (covering South Holland) is now to be updated
c) The last bullet point on Boston has since been superseded by the 2011 Census and an improved methodology for ONS population estimates.
6.6.2 This text repeats 6.2.40
6.69.2 Please clarify what is meant by "recent planning decisions". Presumably conclusions from the final Whole Plan Viability Assessment will be summarised in the Submission Draft.
6.87 Preferred Policy Approaches:
Distribution and Scale of Housing Development footnotes 2 and 3. It should be made clear wherever relevant earlier in the Section that New Allocations exclude existing commitments and that completions and existing commitments do not count towards the caps on development in ROY zones. (This does not significantly affect the proportion of all housing development in the ROY zones or therefore the comments in the Briefing Note.)
Housing Land Supply over the Plan Period
The earlier supporting text does not appear to explain the much greater back-loading of development in South Holland. Is this related to key infrastructure such as the SWRR? In any event the first 5 year delivery for Boston looks very optimistic compared to what has been delivered in the 1st year of the period.

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1320	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 35 – Yes	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1321	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 36 – Yes	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1323	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 38 – Yes	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1324	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 39 – Yes	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1325	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 40 – Yes	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1328	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 43 – Yes	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1329	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 44 – Yes	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1398	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q29 These settlements are unsustainable clusters of houses in the open countryside and should not be allocated any new build consents	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1402	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q33 Currently the town centre facilities in Spalding can be comfortably reached on foot in 20/25 minutes from the periphery of the urban area from any direction. The geography of the area direct that any major growth of the town must be to west. The alignment of the railway and the lack of a bridged crossing create urban expansion difficulties. These difficulties were appreciated three decades ago but achieving the potential solution was finally lost in the South Holland adopted plan. The solution; loop the railway to the west of the built boundary, Similarly the imaginative solution from resolving the road traffic flow problems have been identified and is not yet impossible to achieve. Relocate the port downstream in the haven and build an embanked eastern by-pass. At least the proposed urban extension for Boston could be Phase 1 of a potential solution. Spalding is stuck the its perceived problem. The land to the west of the current urban fabric and to the north of the Vernatt's Drain is the most appropriate for development. Any remaining sites to the east of the town could not accommodate the anticipated expansion of the town. (land to the east of the river ,south of the Coronation Channel and west of the A16 bypass falls within the yellow flood risk zone but has a high level of protection afforded by the embanked Welland Embanked Coronation Channel and the raised by pass route . It is well situated to access the Town centre facilities with the potential to accommodate up to 1500+ homes.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Support - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1404	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Tensions between the settled population and the itinerant people are historical Today's 'travellers' are the sturdy beggars of the first Elizabethan Age and they share a common characteristic , they do not like and rarely do as they are told by the representatives of the settled community. They live on the fringe of legality. Their existence is a challenge to any planning system. Q35 The settled community has an obligation to provide support measures that give some stability to the existence of these our fellow citizens who by choice are travelling people.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				
Response_ Number:	1406	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		What does affordable housing mean? Q38 The opportunity cost of a hectare of potential building land compared to its next most valuable use very large. That windfall gain only occurs because the planning system creates a shortage of land for development. There is no objection to transferring some of that gain in value to the public. The difficulty is in achieving this in ways that minimise any adverse effects on the housing market. As a society it is necessary to address the shortage of and the affordability of housing appropriate housing.	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				
Response_ Number:	1411	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q43 Fully supportive of the of Option B	Support noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	**Support - No change to the approach is required.**

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A

South East Lincolnshire Preferred Options Consultation Report 25 November 2013

Part 2

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Response_ Number:	130	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1572	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Why is it not a planning requirement to obtain council permission to block pave more than 10% of a household garden in a built up area? A great deal of urban flooding is exacerbated by so many people paving over their entire gardens in a built up area.	It is considered that this is beyond the remit of the Local Plan.
Persons_ Name:	Freya Trotman				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Response_ Number:	278	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1768	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Not enough weight is given to sea defence improvements to defences seem to be feeble to date. The vulnerability of high output multi cropping, land that is necessary to be retained to feed a growing population has not been made in strong enough terms.	Comments noted. Whilst it is recognised that existing coastal defences are crucial to horticulture, the economy and protecting the population Local Plans have no statutory remit in ensuring that such defences are maintained or improved. In fact there no one has a statutory responsibility for flood defences. However, non statutory plans, such as Shoreline Management Plans, provide the basis for the assessment and future policy for the maintenance and improvement of coastal flood defences. Both Boston Borough and South Holland District Councils are partner organisations in producing Shoreline Management Plans.
Persons_ Name:	M J Smith				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	689	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1688	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We do not have a view on the exact numbers of houses to be delivered across South East Lincolnshire, but the identification of specific sites will need to avoid harming the historic environment. We note the issues relating to flood risk and the need to limit the number of houses within those parts of the plan area of greatest risk. This has particular implications for the town of Boston given its flood risk status and raises questions in terms of how it might develop in the future (mindful of its role and function as a sub-regional centre and the need for investment and regeneration). Again, the identification of specific sites within and around the town of Boston will need to conserve the historic environment (both designated and undesignated assets).	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.
Persons_ Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge				
Representing_Who?:	English Heritage				
Response_ Number:	1139	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1252	Categorisation_of_further_work:		4.24.3 Provision for housing. The RSPB agrees that this section needs to be included in the HRA/AA. We strongly suggest that a Supplementary Planning Document is developed relating to incorporating biodiversity into urban areas and also a design guide that incorporates nesting boxes into buildings and habitat for wildlife into landscaping.	These need for an SPD will be considered in due course.
Persons_ Name:	Anne Casey				
Representing_Who?:	RSPB				
Response_ Number:	1184	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1813	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Yes. We do NOT believe site WSN 015 is in a Flood Risk area.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Angela Newton				
Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	1254	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1689	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q8 – Does the preferred policy approach 'Strategic Approach to Flood Risk' help you understand how flood risk issues will impact on planning decisions? Please explain your view. In the first instance, the strategic response to flood risk should be to identify the locations at lowest risk of flooding, which are appropriate to satisfy identified local needs. This approach does not come through in the text as written, which immediately moves to using flood resistance and resilience measure, i.e. mitigation before avoidance. Cont/d.. 4 We have significant concern that the strategic policies (Flood Risk and Development Management) do not include sufficient detail on the level of assessment and mitigation requirements that will need to be included in support of applications in flood risk areas to demonstrate that proposals are acceptable. This is an issue that the Planning Policy Statement 25 Practice Guide recommends is covered by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment but neither Boston nor South Holland were comfortable with their respective consultants including this in the last reviews. It is our opinion that this should now be covered in the production of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which would provide guidance and clarity to those promoting development. We note from the Local Development Scheme that the need for such documents will be considered in the future and we would be pleased to work in partnership with you to produce this. It would also be prudent to work with Lincolnshire County Council as it will become the SUDS approving body (SAB) in 2014. This would also be an opportunity to amalgamate all the flood risk „tools" such as information from our Standing Advice Matrix, Lincolnshire Coastal Study Principles, Pathfinder Projects, Surface Water Guidance Notes and the Surface Water Maps, which will be available later this year. We would recommend considering the Peterborough Flood and Water Management SPD and the Doncaster Development and Flood Risk SPD as examples of such documents.	The need for a dedicated SPD will be considered in due course.
Persons_ Name:	Ms A Hewitson				
Representing_Who?:	Environment Agency				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	121	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	860	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Hollie Howe				
Representing_Who?:	St John's College				
Response_ Number:	1179	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1813	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Angela Newton				
Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	1390	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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 toads and cycle ways) to facilitate access to services in Spalding and Pinchbeck.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	1392	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	70	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1693	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We note that in figure 6.1 the potential areas for housing are indicated. For Boston we would draw your attention to several sites of nature conservation interest within the marked area. There are three Local Wildlife Sites: South Forty Foot Drain; Botolph's Park Pond and Tytton Lane West Pitts. In addition there are areas of coastal and floodplain grazing marshes which are a BAP priority habitat. If this area is developed these areas should be incorporated into the green infrastructure network with sufficient buffer zones so that their nature conservation interest is protected. The identified housing area for Spalding is close to Vernatt's Drain which is a Local Wildlife Site. There are also small patches of coastal and floodplain grazing marsh which are a BAP priority habitat. If this site is developed these areas should be incorporated within the Green Infrastructure network. We note that paragraph 6.87.3 acknowledges that there is potential for both of these housing areas to have a significant effect on European sites and should therefore be screened by the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management process.
Persons_ Name:	Natural England				
Representing_Who?:	Themselves				
Response_ Number:	83	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1365	Categorisation_of_further_work:		I refer to our telephone conversation of today concerning the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan Consultation, a strategy that I support. I would wish to propose the parcel of land Title number: LL196618 which has been previously proposed in SHLAA ref: SOU002. Access provision was incorporated for this land in the design by Chestnut Homes when they re-developed the Old Wyberton Road dairy. I trust this layman's reply is fit for purpose.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Haynes				
Representing_Who?:	Parkinson's				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	112	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1747	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Having attended the exhibition at Crowland I was not happy with the proposed housing plots/sites in the area being sporadically placed. I believe future housing expansion should occur along highways from Crowland expanding from existing developments so as to reduce vehicle movements from home to services and keep them within (as near as possible) the existing built up area. I was also unhappy that land owners were going to profit from land sale direct to builders and developers. I believe the council should purchase this land first at agricultural rates, selling it to builders and developers at a profit to regional rate payers at large.	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Bird				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				
Response_ Number:	113	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1338	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Whilst appreciating that the terms of reference for the plan were set by government I think it is inadvisable to consider possible building sites in isolation. Obviously I do not know all the locations listed but I do have concerns about the one that I do have some knowledge of, i.e. the land west of Horncastle Road, Boston. From my address you will gather I have some interest in the future use of this site. I can remember that only a few years ago (2007?) the local plan for Boston included a section of the cemetery and crematorium which indicated that the former was filling up rapidly and would need to be extended. It was proposed that the land north of Red Cap Lane and west of Horncastle Road be reserved for that purpose. So if up to 150 houses are to be built on this land could you please advise me where the cemetery extension is to be situated? It would seem obvious that if a cemetery extension is going to be necessary within the next decade this site is the ideal place.	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.
Persons_ Name:	Mr C Shepherdson				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	122	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	860	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We support the apportionment of 1,000 dwellings to Holbeach. However we believe that further windfall sites should be allowed to come forward, if they meet the site allocations criteria. As part of this, we believe that land off of Branches Lane and land off of Barrington Gate should be considered as site options, as shown on the attached site location plans. This will help support Holbeach's role as a Main Service Centre.	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.
Persons_ Name:	Hollie Howe				
Representing_Who?:	St John's College				
Response_ Number:	126	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1572	Categorisation_of_further_work:		There are many existing buildings within the settlement boundaries which are unused and could be ideal for redevelopment. Could some of these be compulsorily purchased with a view to develop and the owners be given a share back of the profits from development. It makes sense to fully utilise what already exists rather than building massive developments on town margins. Some of these could be community projects helping the unemployed back into work and teaching young unemployed new job skills or even used for apprenticeship training if local colleges got involved. Apart from building our way out of a recession it would give local people back pride in their towns and provide a mutual sense of community spirit. I feel it is something most people actually aspire to being part of, but in such an ethnically unique culture as we have in this area, sadly the locals and the migrant populations tend not to mix freely and consequently build up suspicion and resentment.	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management process.
Persons_ Name:	Freya Trotman				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	160	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1751	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Objection: it is recognised that the document is intended to be broad brush, but it is difficult to see how the distribution of housing will be secured (in table 6.87). A parallel document should have been published to show where the allocated sites are likely to be. Until additional locations are presented, the table in 6.87 (distribution of housing) cannot be verified to see if it is realistic.	The proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Site-specific considerations will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Mr S Harris				
Response_ Number:	161	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1751	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Certain larger sites should be recognised as suitable for development given a need to show how the settlements can advance. Main Road Nursery, Drove Road, Holbeach Drove PE12 0PS should be allocated for housing . A preliminary report is attached on the site. The principle of this new allocation is sound. This site is generally part of a settlement where substantial new housing is appropriate. The representation sets out a detailed assessment of the site's suitability for development and the key features that any new housing development would provide.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Mr S Harris				
Response_ Number:	191	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1754	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q27 Objection: it is recognised that the document is intended to be broad brush, but it is difficult to see how the distribution of housing will be secured (in table 6.87). A parallel document should have been published to show where the allocated sites are likely to be. Until additional locations are presented, the table in 6.87 (distribution of housing) cannot be verified to see if it is realistic.	The proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Site-specific considerations will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Ravell				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	192	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1754	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Certain larger sites should be recognised as suitable for development given a need to show how the settlements can advance. A major site in Moulton Chapel should be allocated for housing as suits its sustainable position, and two sites are suggested (land off Roman Road and land off Woodgate Road). A preliminary report is attached on these sites. The principle of this new allocation is sound. These sites are generally part of a settlement where substantial new housing is appropriate. The representation sets out a detailed assessment of the sites' suitability for development and the key features that any new housing development would provide.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Ravell				
Response_ Number:	200	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1755	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q27 Objection: it is recognised that the document is intended to be broad brush, but it is difficult to see how the distribution of housing will be secured (in table 6.87). A parallel document should have been published to show where the allocated sites are likely to be. Until additional locations are presented, the table in 6.87 (distribution of housing) cannot be verified to see if it is realistic.	The proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Site-specific considerations will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding Lifestyle owners				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	201	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1755	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Certain larger sites should be recognised as suitable for development given a need to show how the settlements can advance. A major site in Pinchbeck (Spalding Lifestyle) should be allocated for housing as suits its sustainable position and location opposite the new hospital. The principle of this new allocation is sound. This site is generally part of the area where major residential expansion of Spalding is already anticipated in Para 6.87.2. There is no need to retain the site for industrial purposes given the more than ample supply elsewhere. The representation sets out a detailed assessment of the site's suitability for development and the key features that any new housing development would provide.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding Lifestyle owners				
Response_ Number:	209	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1756	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q27 Objection: it is recognised that the document is intended to be broad brush, but it is difficult to see how the distribution of housing will be secured (in table 6.87). A parallel document should have been published to show where the allocated sites are likely to be.	The proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Site-specific considerations will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Mr S Hatter				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	210	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1756	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Certain larger sites should be recognised as suitable for development given a need to show how the settlements can advance. This site in Holbeach Drove should be allocated for housing . A preliminary report is attached on the site. In my clients view, the principle of this new allocation is sound. This site is generally part of a settlement where substantial new housing is appropriate The representation sets out a detailed assessment of the sites' suitability for development and the key features that any new housing development would provide.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Mr S Hatter				
Response_ Number:	211	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1757	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q27 Objection: it is recognised that the document is intended to be broad brush, but it is difficult to see how the distribution of housing will be secured (in table 6.87). A parallel document should have been published to show where the allocated sites are likely to be.	The proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Site-specific considerations will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Mr Morris Wilson				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	212	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1757	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Land at Bridge House, Spalding Common, Spalding, PE11 3AU should be recognised as suitable for development given a need to show how the settlements can advance. This site in Spalding should be allocated for housing. The representation sets out a detailed assessment of the site's suitability for development and the key features that any new housing development would provide. In particular, it is argued that the site could form part of the sustainable urban extension to the west and south of Spalding. It will assist in providing much needed community infrastructure and affordable housing for the town. Certainty is offered that that the land in question will come forward, so that the necessary infrastructure can be properly planned and implemented in a logical and economic manner. The identification of the present site as housing land is desirable as an integral part of promoting sustainable and properly planned urban extensions.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Mr Morris Wilson				

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

Response_ Number:	251	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1761	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The SELLP sets out the strategy for the area for the next twenty years. The Plan recognises the need to protect the environment and character and appearance of local areas. Bicker, as you are aware, is a small village situated to the west of the A52 between Swineshead and Donington. The village has very little in the way of infrastructure and would not be capable of accommodating a large housing development. There is a village shop and Post Office and very limited transport facilities. There is no school except for a fee-paying primary/preparatory school, the fees for which are beyond the purse of many in the local area. The village has a local restaurant/public house which is a Grade 2 listed building. The building has been renovated by the owner at exceptional cost. The village has a conservation area which contains all the buildings of historic interest; the public house (Ye Old Red Lion) a 16th century building sits on the eastern boundary of the conservation area adjacent to Bic003. The Villages Plan for 1999, promulgated by Boston Borough Council, established a restricted building line at the eastern edge of the village overlooking the A52 beyond which no building could take place. By establishing that restricted building line it ensured that the village was set well back from the main road and it also helped maintain its character as a village by not overbuilding. In other words the last major construction of housing, completed c2001, was commensurate with Bicker's standing as a rural village and the number of completed dwellings was absorbed adequately by the local infrastructure. At the same time care was taken to maintain open rural surroundings. SELLP set aside seven areas in Bicker as part of the local plan for the next twenty years. Comments on the proposals are as follows: Bic001 - consider it is feasible for 1 property but not 2	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.
Persons_ Name:	Lt Colonel D B Burgess				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Bic002 - this is meadowland and as such should not be built on as it would affect the character of the area. Agree with SELLP recommendations.
Bic003 - the comment that it is suitable to build up to 7 properties on what amounts to .86 of an acre, adjacent to the Grade 2 listed Red Lion, the oldest building in Bicker, is fundamentally flawed. Any property constructed on Bic003 would seriously alter the character and setting of this beautiful building and its integrity and stand alone prominence should at all costs be maintained. Additionally any amount of building on Bic003 would not have an acceptable relationship to the existing built up area. It is interesting to note that a planning application for one dwelling to be built on Bic003 in 2004 was rejected by Boston Borough Council for the following reasons:
a. The site is adjacent to a Grade Two Listed Building and from the information supplied the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that a development will result that will not adversely affect its setting. Consequently the proposed is contrary to the Boston Borough Local Plan
b. The proposal is on a site outside the village envelope as identified in the Boston Borough Local Plan. It does not constitute infill development in accordance with Policy CO2 nor is it a dwelling needed for agricultural purposes in accordance with Policy CO4.
Bic004 - the SELLP report suggests that up to 27 homes could be erected on the site but then advises that the scale in inappropriate in scale for a village with a limited scale of services. This is agreed, however equal consideration should have been given to not destroying the outlook of the village by building too far towards the A52. The 1999 Plan adequately positions the forward edge of the building line on Donington Road. It should remain as such.
Bic005 - its agreed that building on Bic005 is feasible but not in the numbers suggested, fewer properties perhaps 5/6 would best suit the area
Bic006 - the comments on 006 as being too big and unsustainable for a village of this size are agreed
Bic007 - agree with recommendations

Any development on greenfield sites will have an impact on the landscape. The aim of any development in Bicker should be directed toward maintaining the character of the village and protecting and enhancing its environment. Open rural surroundings must be maintained. This can hardly be the case when, without exception, from Bic001 through to Bic007 the total amount of space allocated to construct each proposed dwelling is a little in excess of .12 of an acre.

Bicker, as a small village, must be allowed to retain its character and not be subjected to too much development. The infrastructure in the village would not support more than an additional ten properties. Schooling has to be sought outside the village which will add to the pressure on Primary schools in Swineshead and Donington. Both of these locations will be subjected to an increase in population thus compounding the problem over the availability of school places.

The preservation of the conservation area should be viewed as paramount. The Red Lion Public House, a listed building within the conservation area, should be allowed to stand alone as any attempt to infill, as suggested, with seven properties completely destroy the character and standing of the building on this green field site, bearing in mind that Planning Permission has already been refused and nothing has changed to alter the situation.

It is considered that in a rural environment the allocation of c .12 of an acre is too small. .12 of an acre would probably suit an Urban environment whereas in the village .20 of an acre would better suit the environment.

Finally, the public transport situation in the village is not good and almost every citizen has to rely on their own mode of transport, with ever increasing fuel costs this poses a problem with commuting for some especially with affordability. The lack of good public transport needs to be borne in mind when building additional properties.

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

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	271	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1767	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Bicker is a small village with very little in the way of infrastructure and totally incapable of accepting a large housing development. The village has one shop/PO, one pub/restaurant, one private school and one small motor garage. The roads are extremely poor, already busy and could not support extra traffic. The bus service is very limited and there is no trains. Almost everyone has to use a motor vehicle, and existing houses often take 5 years to sell. Current Proposals. 1 Bic 001. Probably suitable for one property but not two. 2 Bic 002. Grassland which should not be built on but left as open space. 3 Bic 003 Grassland which should not be built on so close to the listed Red Lion pub, also 7 properties on such a small area would seriously alter the character of the present properties. Planning permission for one property on the land was declined in 2004. Subject to severe noise problems from the A 52. 4. Bic 004 Suggestion for up to 27 houses totally inappropriate for Bicker village with very limited infrastructure and services. Far too close to A52. 5. Bic 005 Suggest present proposal acceptable if number of houses reduced to say 5. 6. Bic 006 Suggested development far too big, with all traffic going through the centre of the village, and totally unacceptable. 7. Bic 007 Agree with recommendations. Conclusion. The proposal that Bicker should become a service village is seriously flawed. Bicker has in the recent past suffered considerable adverse local development including 13 wind turbines, a massive electricity sub station, and a number of coloured prefabricated houses at Bishops Way, all on agricultural land. Bicker is also under threat of another three electricity sub stations covering circa 50 acres of agricultural land. Enough is enough, and Bicker should now be excluded from any prospect of more adverse and inappropriate development within the village boundaries in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr DJ and Mrs HP Bowler				
Representing_Who?:	Themselves				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD
	Bicker should be classified as countryside in the plan. Please note that since my previous e-mail it appears that Bicker is to lose its only bus service, which makes it even more imperative that no large scale housing is built in the Bicker parish. In addition, R.W.E. Has announced that the three new electricity sub stations covering circa 200 acres are to be built in Bicker and all in all the parish cannot stand either more industrial or housing development. Bicker is an agricultural area for the growing of much needed food supplies, Bicker must be re-classified as countryside.

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	301	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	958	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We appreciate the fact that you have classed our Site C (Kir007) as suitable for development. The site is bounded to the south by the new Health Centre, to the north by the Cemetery and to the west by Bungley Lane, with proposed accesses from Boston road to the East. We have been notified by a Parish Councillor that the existing Cemetery area is almost at its capacity. My clients would consider donating part of an adjoing field for this purpose is required, in exchange for Planning permission for residential development on Kir007. We consider the present "village envelope" boundary to the North is too restrictive. In our opinion, as the East side of Boston Road is fully developed up to the crossroads with West End Road and Middlegate Road. We repeat our previous suggestion that the envelope should be extended accordingly up to the crossroads. This would involve our site Kir001 being included within the developable area. This would allow for a Cemetery extension within Kir001. Taking this suggestion further, we feel that Kir007 could be developed with individual housing, to match the housing on the East side of Boston Road and, as Middlegate Road is partly developed on the South side, and as it is fully serviced, it would seem to make sense to develop affordable housing and small apartment blocks along the North side of Middlegate Road. As the remainder of the township is developed (Station Road) up to the by-pass, we feel that finalising the development of Middlegate Road up to the by-pass would be a sensible course of action. We have not changed our view that all the other Kirton sites and the Freiston site suggested under the SHLAA are also suitable for development, if not for housing, then for non-housing use.	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.
Persons_ Name:	John R Fearn				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	302	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1356	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Although some of our land is in the Conservation area, its quite plain to see that Low Road, Wyberton has quite a lot of properties built along it. The area where our glasshouses stand is sorely neglected now and we are retired. Its and eyesore for visitors to see and we think it would look much better if we were allowed to develop it with attractive properties. Although the area is not necessarily in the local plan area, there are two newly developed areas (i.e. Loveday Lane and Browns Close) which have appeared within recent years, and are in fact slightly off the Low Road, and fairly secluded. So I imagine a development on our nursery could arguably be compared to these two. We have not yet consulted with our architect as to the type of properties but will wait to hear from planning.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr and Mrs Hill				
Representing_Who?:	Themselves				
Response_ Number:	311	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	889	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Notwithstanding our earlier comments relating to the overall quantum of housing provision in Boston, we agree with the apportionment split of housing to be provided in Boston. We respect the requirement to identify broad locations for housing development in Boston and have no objection to the identified 'only reasonable option' for a broad location is that identified as B8 – Wyberton West road / Chain Bridge Road / Swineshead Road area of Boston with an approximate capacity of 1,900. This leaves a requirement of a further 1,000 dwellings within the Boston Borough. We consider this 1,000 dwelling requirement should be a minimum requirement which should be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD. Site SOU004, Land to the South of St Thomas Drive, Boston, is a suitable, available and deliverable site that will contribute to the dwelling requirement of Boston. This is a brown field site that is immediately available and its development will be in accordance with the Framework.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr Mark Johnson				
Representing_Who?:	Assura Properties Limited				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	355	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Pin 020, and as being classified as undevelopable. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Pinchbeck, and if developed in conjunction with site Pin 016, it would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential development on the frontage of the site.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	M Fragale				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	356	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Pin 016, and as being classified as undevelopable. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Pinchbeck, and if developed in conjunction with site Pin 020, it would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential development on the frontage of the site. Q32/Q33 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. Having studied the consultation on infrastructure document, it is considered that the S5 area is well located for Healthcare, and Childcare. It is also extremely well located for transport links. We consider some development on the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools. Additionally, our clients land at Cowbit Road, is a lower grade Silt land to the land on the western parts such as S10. From a flooding perspective , consideration should be made to assessments from the IDB's on land drainage and flooding problem, not only EA data on 'Sea and High Level water passing through the area'. The S5 area has little or no flood history or problems. The development of land in S5 would alleviate the problems caused by development is S10 – as all the traffic from that proposed area will feed into Spalding Road, Pinchbeck near the Johnson Hospital. We consider the development of s10 will contribute more to the public realm than the spend needed on two railway flyovers and a river crossing, which would be needed to deliver the SWRR..	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	C Slooten				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	357	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Crowland, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Cro 016 , which you classified as undevelopable due to the site having an open countryside character. Our client still wishes to put forward this land as considers the site provides for suitable development in this part of Crowland, very close to the school and with extremely good transport links to Peterborough and Spalding.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	N Ward				
Response_ Number:	358	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Whaplode, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Wha 022. We are aware of the comment that the site is considered inappropriate in scale for a village with a limited arrange of services and facilities. We consider the village's services are good, and this site is located well centrally to the village services.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs J Tetley				
Response_ Number:	359	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Gosberton to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Gos 005. We are aware of the comment that the site is considered appropriate in scale for a village with its range of services and facilities, but relates poorly to the existing built up area. Our clients wishes us to re-assert her view that the site is very well located for close proximity to transport routes	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs B Blundy				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	360	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Gosberton to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. Although not submitted by ourselves previously, you have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Gos 001. We are aware of the comment that the site is considered in-appropriate in scale for the village. Our clients wish to point out that Gosberton is one of only a very few local villages to have a Medical Centre, and consequently wishes us to re-assert their view that the site is extremely very well located for close proximity to this important Local and Community Service, and believes, Gosberton has a far greater range of Services than many other local villages of similar 'Service Village' classification. It has become a major shopping centre and we believe there is a case to support a re-classification in planning Spatial Strategy terms to Main Service Centre.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	D A and N Casswell				
Response_ Number:	361	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Moulton Chapel, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	D Braybrooks				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	367	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Quadring, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Qua 003 , which you classified as undevelopable due to being inappropriate in scale in a village with a limited range of services. Our client still wishes to put forward this land as considers the site provides for suitable development in Quadring, but would be prepared to agree to a smaller part of the site being developed.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	R Bingham				
Response_ Number:	371	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Crowland, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Cro 017 , which you classified as undevelopable due to being somewhat remote from the town, and unless developed with Cro 010,would relate poorly to the existing town. Our client still wishes to put forward this land as considers the site provides for suitable development in this part of Crowland, and could be developed with the adjacent land through a joint agreement. The site has extremely good transport links to Peterborough and Spalding via the new A16 route. Our clients have also additional land, shown on the other attached plans, together with accompanying site proforma, which they would like to be added to your database of sites available for Housing land. This land is now located within the curtilage of Crowland , by the opening of the new Crowland Bypass, and provides land, with excellent transport links, off Barbers Drove and Carrington Drove.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	M & J Woodroffe				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	375	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Crowland, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Cro018 , which you classified as undevelopable due to being close to industrial and warehousing uses. Our client still wishes to put forward this land as considers the site provides for suitable development in this part of Crowland, immediately adjacent to existing estate residential development, and there would still be a good buffer gap between the site and the Industrial development to the south. The site has extremely good transport links to Peterborough and Spalding via the new A16 route.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	R Bennett & M & J Woodroffe				
Response_ Number:	379	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Crowland, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Cro 019 , which you classified as undevelopable due creating ribbon development , and increasing the perceived extent of the built up area.. Our client still wishes to put forward this land as considers the site provides for suitable development in this part of Crowland, very close to the school and with extremely good transport links to Peterborough and Crowland.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	C Adams				
Response_ Number:	383	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Gedney Hill, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Geh 005 , which you classified as undevelopable due to scale.. Our client still wishes to put forward this land as considers the site provides for suitable development in this part of Gedney Hill, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given that it represents similar to that opposite at Sycamore View.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs E M H Todoroff				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	384	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We write on behalf of our above named clients, whose land at Holbeach has been previously referred to you in the SHLAA, ref Hob 013, and we understand it is currently allocated as part of an urban extension. 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. Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider that the proposed Housing allocation set for Holbeach - at an additional 1000 new allocations in the 2011-2031 time frame, is in proportionate to the housing needs in Holbeach. We consider the development of the land in the north west sector of Holbeach is an excellent location for this development to take place due to very good links to infrastructure and transport. We include a plan showing our client's site, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs H Goodley				
Response_ Number:	388	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's sites in Gedney Hill, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as sites Geh 006/007/008, the first two of which you classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame, the third as undevelopable due to scale. We agree the site provides for suitable development in this part of Gedney Hill, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given that it represents links to frontage infilling off Sycamore View.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	C L Cave				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	392	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Holbeach Hurn, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Hob 014, and as being classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Holbeach Hurn, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given that it represents frontage infilling.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	C A Cave				
Response_ Number:	396	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Whaplode, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Wha 021. We are aware of the comment that the site is considered to link the village's built up area to a separate group of dwellings to the north, but we consider this is only represents reasonable frontage infilling.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and M Hotchkin				
Response_ Number:	400	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Moulton Chapel, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Mou 013. We are aware of the comment that the site is considered inappropriate in terms of scale for the village, but we consider Moulton Chapel has more than a 'limited range of services, indeed it has a good range of Local services - Local Shop/Post Office, Butchers, Garage, Primary School/Play group, Local Public House,/Church, and Good Bus service, and these should be further supported by additional phased planned housing development .	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Louis				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	404	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Moulton Seas End, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Mou 012, and as being classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Moulton Seas End, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given that it represents frontage infilling.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	J L Crossland				
Response_ Number:	409	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Pin 019, and as being classified as un-developable. We would like to take this opportunity to ask for the site to be –re-assessed, as the site provides for suitable frontage in-filling in this part of Pinchbeck, both sides of the site. The development of the site would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed, given the presence of existing large scale Horticultural development at the rear of the site.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mr R and Mrs J Warrick				
Response_ Number:	414	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Pin 021, and as being classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Pinchbeck, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential development on three sides of the site.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	P Borst				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	419	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's sites in Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as sites Pin 015 and Pin 017, and as being classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mr & Mrs R Hart & the Exors of M W				

Response_ Number:	435	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1338	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Further to my letter of the 11th June it has occurred to me that there is no mention in the above plan of the land bounded by Norfolk Street on the south and the backs of the houses in Grand Sluice Lane on the east and Norfolk Street Industrial Estate on the west. This land appears to be waste land. This wasteland widens out to the east as far as the backs of the houses in Horncastle Road and goes as far north as the Norprint factory. Some of this land appears to be allotments or in use by a nursery. This land continues northwards as part of the now disused Norprint sports field and bowling green and, as I remember from several years ago, the town plan scheduled this land and the neighbouring nursery to the north for housing. Access was to be from Horncastle Road via a widening of the Norprint entrance. Should not this land have been included in the S.E. Lincs Plan and if not could you advise me why? In addition, the Norprint premises on the south side of Norfolk Street would be better positioned elsewhere on their main site. The building is squeezed between houses and part of it has been empty and for sale /let for several years. It is now an eyesore and would suggest this site is ripe for redevelopment and because of its position ideally suited for housing. Its derelict condition certainly isn't a good advertisement for Boston.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Colin Shepherdson				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	444	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1787	Categorisation_of_further_work:		South East Lincolnshire SHLAA draft findings (September 2012) The proposed site adjacent to the Red Lion Public House in Bicker (bic003). The site is adjacent to a Grade Two Listed Building. The Red Lion Public House is Grade Two listed, is over 400 years old and stands alone at the central entrance road to the village of Bicker. The setting has an open character and I believe that a development on this site will adversely affect the setting of the Red Lion. This area was designated a protected area of open space on the previous village plan and I believe that this should continue. The proposed site on Donington Road Bicker (bic004). This site has an open character and I believe that the character would be compromised if developed. The open character of this site re-enforces the rural nature of the village of Bicker. Bicker is a village with a limited number of facilities which I believe would not support the needs of the residents of large numbers of new homes. This area was designated a protected area of open space on the previous village plan and I believe that this should continue.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Lorraine Worrall				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				
Response_ Number:	453	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's sites in Weston, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Wsn 007, 008, 010. We are aware of the comment that the sites are considered too large, and affect the village's built up area, but our clients considers they represent reasonable in village infilling, and hopes they will be re-considered in the near future for possible housing development.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	B J Runciman				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	458	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Pin 018, and as being classified as developable in a 6-10 year time frame. Our client agrees with this planning allocation, and would only like to seek to allow development of individual frontage plots, similar to those in the immediate surrounding area.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	M J R Nell				
Response_ Number:	462	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Gedney Hill, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as sites Geh 004, which you classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame. We agree the site provides for suitable development in this part of Gedney Hill, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given that it represents links to frontage infilling on Mill Lane.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs G Pell				
Response_ Number:	467	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Spalding Common, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Stm 004, and as being classified as un-developable due to lack of services in the area. Our client considers this land as suitable as it is located on a good peripheral road on the outskirts of the town, allowing for quiet semi-rural development.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Parigo Horticultural				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	471	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's sites in Cowbit. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Cow 003, Cow 004, Cow 008, the first of which being classified as un-developable due to being too large, and inappropriate to the services in the village, and the other two being classified as developable in the 6-10 year time frame . Our clients consider the sites all provide for suitable rounding-off of this part of Cowbit, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of the new Spalding Bypass and residential development on the other sides of the sites.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	T Tyrell				
Response_ Number:	475	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Cowbit. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Cow 006, and as being classified as un-developable due to being inappropriate due to the lack of services in the village. Our clients consider the site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Cowbit, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of the new Spalding Bypass and residential development on the other sides of the site. In addition the site is now too small in size to accommodate modern farming machinery, land is lower quality Grade 1 land, than some of the areas. It is sandwiched between existing uses, that support residential development of the site.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	E A Smith				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	480	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Spalding Common, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Stm 006, and as being classified as un-developable due to lack of services in the area. Our client considers this land as suitable as it is located on a good peripheral road on the outskirts of the town.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs C Stratton				
Response_ Number:	484	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Holbeach Drove, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as sites Hob 012, which you classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame.. We agree the site provides for suitable development in this part of Holbeach Drove, and our client hopes that this will allow for housing development to be permitted on the site in the future..	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	I Login				
Response_ Number:	489	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's sites in Surfleet and West Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Sur 006 and Sur 007, and as being classified as undevelopable. Our clients are hopeful that this will be re-considered. Additionally at West Pinchbeck, sites Pin 022 and Pin 023, were submitted . Our clients feel these two sites represent reasonable frontage in-filing and that these site will be allocated for development in the near future.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	S Dobney				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	494	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Surfleet, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Sur 004, and as being classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Surfleet, with frontage in-filling, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential development on both sides of the site. Our clients are hopeful that this site will be allocated for development in the near future.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	D Coxen				
Response_ Number:	499	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Surfleet, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Sur 003, and as being classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Surfleet, with frontage in-filling, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential development on both sides of the site. Our clients are hopeful that this site will be allocated for development in the near future.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs J Needham				
Response_ Number:	504	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Gosberton to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Gos 004. We are aware of the comment that the site is considered appropriate in scale for a village with its limited range of services and facilities, and relates poorly to the existing built up area. Our clients wishes us to re-assert his view that the village is extremely well served with services and facilities, and indeed has a Medical Centre, not just a Doctors Surgery, and should have more housing provision provided to support these local services.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	C Clark				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	509	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Quadring, together with accompanying site proforma, which she would like to be added to your database of sites available for Housing land. This land is now located within the curtilage of Quadring. Our client wishes to put forward this land as she considers the site provides for suitable development in Quadring, and would be prepared to agree to its development in connection with other adjoining land.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Read				
Response_ Number:	513	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Crowland, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Cro 002 , which you classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Crowland, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential The site has extremely good transport links to Peterborough and Spalding via the new A16 route.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs G Jacko				
Response_ Number:	518	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as part of site Pin020, and as being classified as undevelopable. The site however, can have direct access form market Way, not Pinchbeck Road, and provides for suitable frontage plot rounding-off, of this part of Pinchbeck, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential development on three sides of the site Our client would only like to seek to allow development of individual frontage plots, similar to those on the opposite side of market Way.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mr J Tester				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	522	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Crowland, together with accompanying site proforma, which they would like to be added to your database of sites available for Housing land. This land is now located within the curtilage of Crowland, by the opening of the new Crowland Bypass, and provides land, with excellent transport links, off Barbers Drove	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs P Thompson				
Response_ Number:	526	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Crowland, together with accompanying site proforma, which they would like to be added to your database of sites available for Housing land. This land is now located within the curtilage of Crowland, by the opening of the new Crowland Bypass, and provides land, with excellent transport links, off Barbers Drove	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	J Whiting				
Response_ Number:	530	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We have submitted a response for our clients other land at Crowland, but our clients have also additional land at Deeping St Nicholas, shown on the other attached plan, together with accompanying site proforma, which they would like to be added to your database of sites available for Housing land. This land is now located within the existing frontage of housing at Deeping St Nicholas/Hop Hole, and provides land, with excellent transport links.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	M & J Woodroffe				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	536	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Pode Hole, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Mon 004, and as being classified as un-developable due to lack of services in the village. Our clients consider the site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Pode Hole, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential development on other sides of the site. In addition the site is now too small in size to accommodate modern farming machinery, land is lower quality Grade 1 land, than some of the areas. It is sandwiched between existing uses, that support residential development of the site.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Roe Family				
Response_ Number:	694	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1688	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We do not have a specific view on the housing figures for individual settlements, but would like to note that each settlement contains and adjoins a number of heritage assets (designated and undesignated). All contain listed buildings, most contain conservation areas (except Sutton Bridge), while Swineshead and Crowland incorporate a number of scheduled monuments (including the ruins of abbeys to the east of both settlements and monuments within the settlements themselves). Spalding and Boston also contain registered parks and gardens. Much will depend on the location of development sites, but the site allocation process should avoid harming the above heritage assets.	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management process.
Persons_ Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge				
Representing_Who?:	English Heritage				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	695	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1688	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We have not assessed the service villages in terms of their heritage assets, but requiring significant development at the above villages (due to their lower flood risk status) may have implications for a number of heritage assets within and surrounding these settlements. We advise that an appraisal of potential historic environment issues is undertaken before these villages are identified for development.	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management process.
Persons_ Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge				
Representing_Who?:	English Heritage				
Response_ Number:	698	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1688	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Based on the above comments, we would expect the next consultation document to provide more information about how both broad locations might be developed. The policy should set out some of the broad issues that need to be addressed, which would include the scheduled monument for the Boston location and archaeology issues for both locations. Further work on the significance of the monument at Boston should be pursued. We would happy to advise on this before the next consultation.	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management process.
Persons_ Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge				
Representing_Who?:	English Heritage				
Response_ Number:	728	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1792	Categorisation_of_further_work:		In relation to Spalding and Pinchbeck. The site allocated for new employment in Long Sutton has failed to produce a single new job over the last thirty to thirty five years. The allocation requires to be reviewed. There is nothing within the DPD to encourage our growers who together are the most important element of the local economy.	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management process.
Persons_ Name:	Douglas Dickens				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

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

Response_ Number:	729	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1795	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Bic 003 Bic 004 I have been a Bicker resident all of my life and I am deeply concerned with regards to the proposed land earmarked for future development within the village. Over the last twenty years or so the village has seen substantial development whereby housing has been built to effectively fill in gaps within the building line boundary of Bicker. Bicker is a quaint and peaceful village and its charm would be lost if massive development of monstrosity new builds are built along side traditional Lincolnshire cottages. Furthermore, to develop a piece of land adjacent to a grade 2 listed coaching inn (Ye Olde Red Lion) that sits in a conservation area is one of madness The domestic dwelling projections are far to high for a semi rural economy to sustain in terms of employment. Network Rail have refused the offer of a new Halt on the Peterborough line to cater for commuters on the Holland Park estate, ignored the case presented by Littlethorpe to reopen the station and the request by Pinchbeck Parish Council for a Halt. The new Peterborough road is overloaded and very dangerous. I do not know if allowing HGVs to ignore the 40 mph limit and travel up to 60 mph on this single carriageway makes it safer or not but I would suggest a major growth in traffic from new commuters would. I cannot accept the growth of Spalding onto Pinchbeck land up to Mill green leading to an absorption of the village. I note that Pin 034, The Flaxmill Field allotments, Parish land belonging to the people and considered in your preliminary assessment that if developed would "destroy the semi rural nature of the Village" has already been declared an "exemption site" by a District Cllr. Who stated she would like the job of sales lady on the site and a proportion of which was sold by the Parish Council for £54k as opposed to the £140k promised to a developer. I attended a meeting with SHDC planners where this site, not on the agenda was produced and they indicated it was ok. This is a site previously rejected in 2001 when nearly 600	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.
Persons_ Name:	Jonathan Fovargue				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD
	villagers signed a petition against and was the sole issue on the recent Parish Council election and again was rejected by the Electorate. The provisions of the Localism Act, and the more recent quotes of our M.P. To take account of local feelings have been ignored and circumvented by saying a planning application by a developer is not a community application, and as I have said if it goes to planning it already has the nod. I feel this field should remain as agricultural land and the initial reason for rejection be upheld. The point I am trying to make, especially about the Pin 034 field, is that extensive consultation, which came out against this development, on more than one occasion and the provisions of the Localism Act and the views of our M.P..have been ignored by the local Council and this calls into question the whole value of the consultation process when decisions have already been made to build on land outside the current development area.. The proposals in the draft plan suggest that nearly 5,000 dwellings will be built on Pinchbeck land during its duration it is not necessary to build 150 plus on the Flaxmill Field.

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

Response_ Number:	734	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	961	Categorisation_of_further_work:		3.1 The Site The site area proposed for consideration extends to some 2.4 hectares/5.9 acres. The Site Location Plan opposite identifies this land with a red boundary. The land lies between Daniel's Gate to the eastern side of the Site and Lime Walk to the western side of the Site. 3.2 Context The land is located to the north of John Swain's Way at the northern end of Long Sutton, with agricultural land adjoining to the west, to the opposite side of Lime Walk. The eastern boundary of the Site fronts onto the public highway of Daniel's Gate, with existing low density housing located to the opposite side along Daniel's Gate. The immediate South-Eastern boundary of the Site borders onto allotment holdings. Long Sutton is a Main Service Centre. It is a market town in the South Holland district of South East Lincolnshire, approximately 13 miles east from Spalding. It is located just off the A17 linking Newark-on-Trent, Nottinghamshire to Kings Lynn, Norfolk. 3.3 Current & Proposed Use The land is currently within agricultural use and the site offers the opportunity for a residential led development (medium density 30dph). 4.1 Flood Risk The Site is considered to be located in an area that could be affected by flooding if there were no flood defences. Environment Agency online flood mapping classifies the area as Flood Zone 3, although the likelihood of flooding is listed as low with a 0.5% or 1 in 200 probability. The Lincolnshire Coastal Study identifies the Site as located in a 'ROY' Zone on the boundaries of the orange and red categories denoting a significant to extreme degree of coastal flooding. 4.2 Land Use Designations The Site is not in the Green Belt. The land is partly designated as Open Space within the South Holland District Council Local Plan (2006). 4.3 Heritage Assets The Site does not lie within a Conservation Area. The proximity of the Conservation Area (black dashed line) can be viewed on the map extract taken from the existing Local Plan. It is not considered that views into or out of this area would be affected by development in this location. There are no listed buildings present within the Site or that fall within close proximity. 4.4 Ecology According to Natural England mapping the Site is not	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.
Persons_ Name:	Carter Jonas				
Representing_Who?:	RP Worth and Son				

designated as a SSSI; National or Local Nature Reserve; Country Park; Doorstep or Millennium Green. Magic Defra mapping also does not identify any constraints.

4.5 Highways

It is anticipated that vehicular access could be provided off Daniel's Gate, via the existing access.

4.6 Further work

This proposal will continue to evolve through the identification of any site constraints (both policy and physical) and it is proposed that these shall be mitigated against or compensation measures put in place to address any issues which may arise. This includes highways, flood risk and drainage, landscape, biodiversity, infrastructure and utilities e.g. gas, electricity and water.

The proposal will also progress through consultation with the relevant local authorities, including catchment schools, to identify if there is capacity to serve the needs of the new development, and if not, what improvements would be necessary e.g. physical expansion. In this case, financial contributions would be sought and agreed from the development as part of a legal agreement.

5.1 Growth Strategy & Settlement Hierarchy The site currently lies outside of the defined settlement framework for Long Sutton. However South East Lincolnshire must allocate land to provide space for housing growth to cover the Local Plan period up to 2031. The presumption, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, shall be for sustainable development. This therefore requires the Council to seek suitable and deliverable sites. The delivery of homes and employment within settlements such as Long Sutton in order to meet local needs and maintain a balanced and mixed community is key to the future long term viability and success of rural settlements and their economy. The existing South Holland Local Plan identifies Long Sutton as a Main Service Centre within the adopted settlement hierarchy. The current consultation document proposes for the settlement to retain this categorisation. Land allocated towards the south of the Site is designated for major housing development. The adopted South

Holland District Council Local Plan includes a housing allocation for Long Sutton up until 2021 for land off Lime Walk (80 units). The scale of these developments has been adequately absorbed into the settlement, and a similar approach should be taken for the Site. Consideration of these schemes is also important in terms of tenure for development of the Site. We are seeking a market-housing led scheme here in order to ensure a greater balance of tenures within this area of Long Sutton. 5.2 Sustainable Development – Existing Services & Facilities Long Sutton is a small market town, which hosts the following facilities: public houses; places of worship; recreation areas; leisure centre; a medical centre; dentist surgery; and library. The primary school serving this area is Long Sutton County Primary School and Nursery and the secondary school serving this area is The Peele Community College, Long Sutton. 5.3 Sustainable Development – Public Transport Availability Public transport links from Long Sutton are good, with a frequent seven day bus service operating between Kings Lynn and Spalding (no.505). There exists the opportunity for travel to work with bus timetables providing an early morning and evening service to/from Long Sutton. The nearest bus stops to the Site are located along Little London and High Street, both within 8 minutes walking distance. National Express coach services operate from nearby Boston, Kings Lynn, Spalding and Wisbech. Hourly train service is provided at Kings Lynn train station towards Cambridge and London Kings Cross, whilst Spalding and Peterborough train stations provide alternative routes across the UK.

5.4 Opportunities offered by Development The preceding information demonstrates that development within this location could provide a sustainable solution to the future growth requirements within South East Lincolnshire. This Site has the ability to satisfy demand for housing including providing market dwellings with the requisite number of affordable units. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, the council should seek to achieve ‘mixed and balanced communities’. By virtue of the location of the Site, new residents who occupy any properties subsequently constructed

here would be within easy walking distance of all local services and facilities. Sustainable growth in Long Sutton would assist in maintaining the vitality and viability of a currently active rural community. Development on the Site could be assimilated reasonably easily into the village given that it represents a logical extension adjacent to existing development, with potential access points taken from Daniel's Gate and/or Lime Walk.

Response_ Number:	735	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1796	Categorisation_of_further_work:		I should like to make my representation regarding the Spalding Western Relief Road, and housing developments between Spalding and Pinchbeck. I own a piece of land adjacent to the footpath which links Spalding with Pinchbeck from Two Plank Lane to Market Way. Up until now this footpath has provided a pleasant rural walk for many, many people. Not only dog walkers and families enjoying an afternoon walk or cycle ride, but also those going from home to work, school, or the shops - and they are all doing these things in the most environmentally friendly way possible! I therefore ask for this route to be preserved and possibly enhanced (landscaping and screening from the housing estate, for instance, while , of course, leaving access to it from the housing estate). I would also hope that other green space will be seen as important. At present, there are not many places around Spalding where children can go nutting, scramble through hedgerows or watch the wild animals, so odd little corners of sanitised open space are not what I had in mind. To my way of thinking, all people need access, not only to sports facilities, but also to substantial areas of wild space which they can reach, on foot, from their own homes.	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management process.
Persons_ Name:	Hilary Williamson				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	1078	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Fleet Hargate, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Fle 010. However we are aware of the comment that the site is considered to large for the scale of the village's services. We therefore have revised the site area concerned, and show this now on a revised plan. There is also a road – Hocklesgate which runs through the middle of the site, rather than it being one single field. The area to the east of Hocklesgate is adjacent to existing new residential development, and our client considers this site is very suitable for a continued development on this part of Fleet Hargate. The land at Saracens Head – Wha 025, has been mis-represented in the previous SHLAA and we attach two plans of the land correctly showing the areas in question, which we hope you can add to your database.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	O A Taylor				
Response_ Number:	1083	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's sites in Swineshead to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date, and relevant site proforma.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	J Grant				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	1087	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Cowbit Road, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. If considered suitable, this land, developed in conjunction with other immediately neighbouring landowners, in total 200 acres, would deliver housing to Spalding, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed, given the now natural/physical barrier to the countryside created by the Spalding Bypass. Our clients consider additional development led benefits for the community will arise from Residential development in this part of the town, in particular leisure uses.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	M Cobbin				
Response_ Number:	1091	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Cowbit Road, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. If considered suitable, this land, developed in conjunction with other immediately neighbouring landowners, in total 200 acres, would deliver housing to Spalding, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed, given the now natural/physical barrier to the countryside created by the Spalding Bypass. Our clients consider additional development led benefits for the community will arise from Residential development in this part of the town, in particular leisure uses.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	R Chappell				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	1095	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Cowbit Road, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date, together with accompanying Site Proforma. If considered suitable, this land, developed in conjunction with other immediately neighbouring landowners, in total 200 acres, would deliver housing to Spalding, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed, given the now natural/physical barrier to the countryside created by the Spalding Bypass. Our clients consider additional development led benefits for the community will arise from Residential development in this part of the town, in particular leisure uses.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding Rectory Feoffees				
Response_ Number:	1100	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Cowbit Road, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. If considered suitable, this land, developed in conjunction with other immediately neighbouring landowners, in total 200 acres, would deliver housing to Spalding, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed, given the now natural/physical barrier to the countryside created by the Spalding Bypass. Our clients consider additional development led benefits for the community will arise from Residential development in this part of the town, in particular leisure uses.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Johnson				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	1104	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Cowbit Road, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Stm 005. .If considered suitable, this land, developed in conjunction with other immediately neighbouring landowners, in total 200 acres, would deliver housing to Spalding, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed, given the now natural/physical barrier to the countryside created by the Spalding Bypass. Our clients consider additional development led benefits for the community will arise from Residential development in this part of the town, in particular leisure uses.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	C Slooten				
Response_ Number:	1108	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Holbeach Clough, together with accompanying site proforma, which they would like to be added to your database of sites available for Housing land. This land is located centrally within the curtilage of Holbeach Clough, with frontage to Clough Road.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs R Bridger				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	1109	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider that the proposed Housing allocation set for Holbeach - at an additional 1000 new allocations in the 2011-2031 time frame, is in proportionate to the housing needs in Holbeach. We consider the development of the land in the north west sector of Holbeach is an excellent location for this development to take place due to very good links to infrastructure and transport. We include a plan showing our client's site, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date, and a completed site proforma for the property which is now a discontinued employment site.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	N Brown				
Response_ Number:	1114	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's sites in Deeping St Nicholas to ensure your database of possible sites available for Housing land for allocations is up to date, together with relevant site proforma . This land is located within and behind some existing frontage of housing at Deeping St Nicholas, and provides land, with excellent transport links.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	R C Tinsley				
Response_ Number:	1119	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Swineshead to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date, and relevant site proforma.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	H Nundy				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	1123	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's site in Gosberton to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. As stated above, you have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Gos 006. We are aware of the comment that the site is considered in-appropriate in scale for the village. Our clients wish to point out that Gosberton is one of only a very few local villages to have a Medical Centre, and consequently wishes us to re-assert their view that the site is extremely very well located for close proximity to this important Local and Community Service, and believes, Gosberton has a far greater range of Services than many other local villages of similar 'Service Village' classification. It has become a major shopping centre and we believe there is a case to support a re-classification in planning Spatial Strategy terms to Main Service Centre.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	J Grant				
Response_ Number:	1127	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's sites in Quadring. You have already considered one of these in the earlier SHLAA as site Qua 002. We appreciate the comment that the site is considered suitable in scale for a village with its range of services and facilities. Our client also has other land which they would like to put forward, and we attach herewith two proforma for these sites. They wish us to re-assert their view that all the sites are very well located for close proximity to transport routes, and centrally located in the village	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	The Casswell Family				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	1131	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's sites in Sutterton You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as sites Sut 009, 010, 011. We are aware of the comment that the first two site are considered inappropriate in scale for a village with its range of services and facilities, but that Sut 011 is considered a possible suitable site. Our clients wishes us to re-assert their view that all the sites are very well located for close proximity to transport routes, and centrally located in the village	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	The Casswell Family				
Response_ Number:	1135	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We include a plan showing our client's sites in Quadring, together with accompanying site proforma, which they would like to be added to your database of sites available for Housing land. This land is located within the village of Quadring	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.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	J Grant				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	1149	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	901	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The SHLAA makes reference to our client's site (Don008), classifying it as undevelopable . We do not believe that the reasons set forward in this assessment are robust enough to justify this classification. The site is established as being both available and achievable for development and it is also determined that the scale of the site is appropriate to the village s range of services (which is highlighted as an area for concern in paragraph 6.40.2 of the DPD) and that it has a satisfactory relationship with the existing built-up area. The only reason provided for the undevelopable classification is the potential for conflict with existing neighbouring industrial and haulage uses. We do not agree with this classification nor do we believe that there is sufficient justification for deeming the site undevelopable. A recent housing development on Cowley Road has resulted in new homes being located just 23 metres from the neighbouring depot boundary. As well as this, because of the size and nature of our client s site, a noise buffer or other mitigation measures, could be easily incorporated into the scheme. In light of these points, we would request that the classification for our client's site is revised to indicate that it is developable.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Angela Reeve				
Representing_Who?:	Cemex UK Properties				
Response_ Number:	1158	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1626	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Parish Council and residents are concerned of the proposed sites Bic003 and Bic004. This land was refused planning permission previously and is adjacent to a Grade II newly renovated public house and any development would not be in keeping with the surrounding area. There is also a further plot of land that has not been nominated which requires access along the boundary of Bic003 for farming. Additional utilities for water, drainage etc would be a further drain on what the village has in place already and we strongly oppose any development on this land. It is hoped that you would look kindly on the comments of the local people.	Comments noted. The sites mentioned are not currently allocated for development. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management process.
Persons_ Name:	Bicker Parish Council				
Representing_Who?:	Themselves				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	1177	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1812	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Final Comments Future site allocations – the application of the above comments can be demonstrated with reference to a particular settlement. Shepeau Stow is in the countryside in the spatial strategy. It is in close proximity to a number of other small hamlets where services are limited but it does have a village school that is much valued by the local community. Limited new development in Shepeau Stow with market and affordable housing would help support the village school. Similarly small scale employment uses e.g. B1 workshops or workplace home / live work units would help rural employment opportunity and putting these together as a mixed use site would be an eminently sustainable solution. The plans below show a potential site off Gypsy Lane within a 50m of the village school.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Dadge				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs T Croxford				

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

Response_ Number:	1206	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1817	Categorisation_of_further_work:		I have read and looked at the SELLP with interest. At first i was not unduly concerned as I understood the plan was an amalgamation between Boston BC and South Holland DC and there would be service villages. I saw in the local press that exhibition shows were being held at Swineshead and Donington which are villages either side of where my family live and I thought that these were the service villages. As Bicker wasn't mentioned I naively thought that there was no need to attend the exhibitions. I have since spoken with a Lincolnshire county Councillor involved in the process and realised I should have attended the said exhibitions. Thanks to an observant friend and neighbour I have discovered that housing is proposed for land opposite to our property and next to Ye Olde Red Lion which is a 16th century Grade 2 listed building which has recently been restored and is an asset to our village. When we moved to our property in 2007 we were under the impression that the land mentioned above was in the conservation area, out of the village envelop and that a building application on the land for 1 dwelling had been refused in 2004. I am very surprised when reading the Evidence Based section of the SEELP the land named Bic 003 is deemed as suitable building land for 7 houses. I would like answers to the following questions please: How is it possible that when 1 dwelling was previously refused now 7 dwellings are proposed on the same area of land. How after 9 years the land does not remain in the conservation area or not be in the village envelope. How can 7 dwellings fit on .86of and acre and not look out of place next to the beautiful 16th century Grade 2 listed building. Why Bic003 not considered to remain as it is and be allowed to be pretty area of the village with its stand alone building when Bic 002 is not being considered and will remain as meadowland. Bicker is a small, relatively peaceful village to live in but we do not have many amenities to sustain more housing. We do not have a school, children go to neighbouring village schools which	Comments noted. The sites mentioned are not currently allocated for development. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management process.
Persons_ Name:	Mrs S Wing				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD
	in turn will be under pressure due to development. We use neighbouring Healthcare services which will have the same pressures. Our limited bus service is now under threat of closure. We do have a post office and small shop but for how long. I would urge that consideration is given to above points that I have make when decisions are made concerning Bic 003.

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

Response_ Number:	1217	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	885	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We act on behalf of PREM (Rooster) II LLP, owner of the former cold storage facility at Horseshoe Road, Spalding. By way of background, the property has been vacant since April 2010 and despite being actively marketed there has been little interest to date in a storage/ industrial facility. On behalf of our client we wish to submit representations to the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan – Preferred Options which was published on 3rd May for public consultation. The subject site is located approximately 500 metres from the western edge of Spalding and comprises the following components: •A large factory/ warehouse building; •A three storey office building; •A single storey canteen building which also includes house stores, changing rooms and other ancillary facilities; •A yard to the rear of the main factory building which provides parking; and •A field to the rear. Submissions were made to the SHLAA in October 2012, which promoted the site for housing. The site extends to 6.94 hectares, is vacant and Brownfield in nature. Horseshoe Road has a number of residential properties located in close proximity to the site. A new residential development has been completed at the Raceground which also sits in close proximity to the site. Redevelopment of the site for housing would relate well to the existing settlement and is considered to be appropriate in scale. National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that to boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities	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.
Persons_ Name:	Alan Fitzpatrick				
Representing_Who?:	Prem (Rooster) II LLP				

should:

• Use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as consistent with the policies set out in this Framework." and
• Identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites… sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land…"

NPPF considers that to be deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development, is viable and development could be delivered on site within a five year period.

NPPF also encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed. The redevelopment of the subject site complies with this approach.

It is considered that the site complies with the themes of NPPF in that the development of the site can contribute and create sustainable, strong communities. There are a number of benefits associated with the proposed development of this site for housing and includes an excellent opportunity to regenerate a Brownfield site.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan Strategy and Policies DPD

The Local Plan will cover the period from 2011 to 2031.

Paragraph 4.1.15 advises that Boston and Spalding are defined as Sub-Regional Centres on the basis of their size, the range of services they provide and their potential to accommodate further growth; and their capacity to support sustainable development objectives.

Paragraph 6.1.3 notes that: "Local planning authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens."

Furthermore, paragraph 6.1.5 acknowledges that local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty buildings. They should normally approve planning applications for change to residential use and any associated development from commercial buildings.

The proposed site performs well when tested against the criteria above. The subject site is considered to be in a sustainable location where many of the aspirations of the Greenbelt can still be met.

Spalding Western Relief Road Technical Note: Core Strategy Option Testing (March 2013)

Paragraph 6.2.38 considers that to deliver the required housing provision and new road infrastructure in Spalding by 2030 is achieved through the completion of all three phases of the relief road:

- Outstanding housing commitments at Wygate Park;
- The Holland Park Urban Extension; and
- Up to 3,750 dwellings in a broad location to the north of the Vernatt's Drain.

The Holland Park Urban Extension has outline planning permission for 2,250 dwellings, a district centre, 2 local centres, primary school, open space, access and estate roads. It is our understanding that a reserved matters planning application will be submitted in early course. The site could take around 16

years to complete and responds to the Holland Park Development Brief.

Within the Council's reasoned justification, it is noted that: "The site is appropriate in scale to the town's range of services, and is allocated as an urban extension which relates well to the existing town. Impacts upon the area's character can be mitigated thanks to its scale."

The above is a comprehensive mixed use development and extends to nearly 103 acres of intensively managed farmland. It is noted within the Committee Report that the site itself is critical to the planned strategy of delivering most of the District's housing development within or adjoining existing towns but concentrating primarily upon Spalding as the major urban centre.

It is considered that the redevelopment of this Brownfield site could contribute to the south west expansion of Spalding. If the site for 2,250 dwellings is developed then it is further considered that the subject site would not be a large, incongruous and isolated group of dwellings in the countryside.

It is considered imperative that the Council should identify additional land for housing beyond and above that identified over the plan period as this will help to support the need and demand for new housing within Spalding. Of the sites which have been identified by the Council, a number are complex sites which would require up-front investment and infrastructure. There are no guarantees that these sites are deliverable through the plan period and could result in a shortfall of housing. Furthermore, it is considered that there is reliance by the Council on the Holland Park Urban Expansion Area and land to the north of Vernatt's Drain and there should be a strategy in place to ensure that if these sites are not delivered then a mechanism is in place to allow for other sites to be brought forward.

It is considered that the emerging local plan should include a strategy to replace sites, which become non-effective. It is considered likely that during the plan period not all of the sites which have been allocated will be implemented. The provision for longer term housing options which could be accelerated to fill any deficiencies within the 5 year land supply is also recommended. An alternative mechanism would be a strategic reserve of land or a policy mechanism to bring additional sites forward through the LDP.

If allocated for housing and an application progressed, a contribution could be made to the delivery of the Spalding Western Relief Road. The redevelopment of this Brownfield site could respond positively to its landscape setting by regenerating a site which has been vacant since April 2010.

Conclusions

It is considered that the site complies with the themes of NPPF in that development of the site can contribute and create sustainable, strong communities. There are a number of benefits associated with the proposed development of this site for housing and includes an excellent opportunity to regenerate a Brownfield site.

We are of the opinion that the Council should identify further land to ensure an effective land supply. There is reliance by the Council on the outstanding housing commitments at Wygate Park, Holland Park Urban Extension and an undefined site at Vernatt's Drain. We would question why the Council is identifying a Greenfield site at Vernatt's Drain before my client's Brownfield site.

The development of this site offers an excellent opportunity to regenerate a Brownfield site which is in accordance with planning policy.

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD
	It is considered that the site should be included as a housing site within the next stage of the Council's Local Plan.

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

Response_ Number:	1220	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		ShrimplinBrown Ltd are instructed by Ambrose Lighton Ltd to submit the following representations to the current consultation on the South East Lincolnshire Strategy and Policies DPD Preferred Options draft. ShrimplinBrown have undertaken a comprehensive review of the Draft Development Plan Document as well as the relevant supporting evidence base. These representations also have regard to the tests of Soundness set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF emphasises the overall need for the planning system to work more effectively to stimulate development. It introduced a presumption in favour of sustainable development "so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay" (paragraph 15). This is now the basis for critically assessing all future planning proposals and in the spirit of this shift of emphasis the tests of soundness for judging whether a Local Plan is "Sound" have also been expanded to include a fourth criteria; that plans are "Positively Prepared." These representations are focused on the parts of the draft strategy which are relevant to Boston Borough and make specific reference to the suitability of focusing new growth on land within and immediately adjoining the 'Main Service Centre' of Kirton. Whilst the DPD does not at this stage seek to identify specific sites for development it is considered that in order to be Sound the apportionment of housing numbers should be based on evidence that there are sufficient sites that are suitable, available and deliverable within the plan period but also that it in accordance with the overarching policy framework, in particular the settlement hierarchy. These representations promote the suitability of land within Ambrose Lighton's control in various locations surrounding the Kirton settlement with a particular focus on land at Boston	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				

Road, Kirton which has been identified within the Boston SHLAA as a suitable and developable location.

Our representations are divided into two parts; Part 1 provides summary context setting out the opportunities and merits of focusing development in Kirton and the specific role and potential function of land at Boston Road- as well as other wider opportunities. Part 2 then sets out our client's specific comments and recommendations on the draft DPD. See also the attached completed consultation form which outlines the sections of the draft document on which comments have been made.

PART 1 - CONTEXT

The family associated with Ambrose Lighton Ltd have owned land in the Kirton area for over 100 years. They have in the past made land available to the local community and have, and continue to be, active in the community. As landowners they are not immune from the need to ensure development is viable, but unlike house builders and developers they are less focused on seeking immediate returns on their investment. Their focus is instead on long term secure income and their historic ties with the area mean that the quality and sustainability of what they deliver is of upmost importance.

The sustainability of Kirton

Table H4 of Boston's Interim Local Plan (February 2006) sets out a settlement hierarchy which has Boston, a Sub Regional Centre, at its top. Kirton is identified as a "Main Service Centre", the top of the hierarchy of the rural settlements. The Local Plan explains that Kirton, along with four smaller "Service Villages", are "sustainable villages providing a range of services and facilities for both themselves and nearby smaller settlements" (paragraph 8.20). The difference between Kirton and these other villages is that they provide "a more limited" range of services and facilities to Kirton, whilst Kirton is more sustainable

"because of its two schools, the range of shopping, community, leisure and recreational facilities and the diverse range of employment opportunities" (paragraph 8.20).

The importance of Kirton at the top of the settlement hierarchy is repeated in the draft Strategy and Policies DPD Baseline Settlement Hierarchy (Para 5.2.5). This maintains Kirton's important status as the only 'Main Service Centre' within the Borough.

The sustainability credentials of Kirton were confirmed in the Council's 2008 'Sustainability Study of Rural Settlements'. Of 28 settlements assessed, Kirton was the most sustainable of the rural settlements (p74), with the most services and the best public transport accessibility.

This report is currently being updated by the South East Lincolnshire JSPU to cover both Boston and South Holland (13 July 2012 South East Lincolnshire JSPU Committee, Section 7, Appendix). This report, like its predecessor, is intended to discover "what makes a sustainable settlement that might take future development and what does not" (paragraph 1.3). As it explains, "Boston has a number of larger settlements outside of Boston itself, which are likely to be more than capable of taking certain levels of growth" (paragraph 1.4). This report concludes that Kirton remains the most sustainable settlement in Boston, below Holbeach and Long Sutton in South Holland. Kirton still scored the highest in terms of services for any settlement in Boston and had the highest public transport score of any settlement in either Council area.

In summary, the evidence base clearly points towards directing significant new growth to Kirton as it is as the top of the rural settlement hierarchy, is geographically very close to the sub-regional centre of Boston and, according to existing and emerging research, is the most sustainable rural settlement in Boston Borough. It should therefore be one of the principle focuses for sustainable new growth in the Boston Borough.

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD
	The role of Ambrose Lighton Ltd.'s sites Ambrose Lighton have a number of landholdings surrounding the village of Kirton. These sites were promoted and assessed through the SHLAA. The broad location of these sites is set out on the accompanying plan. Whilst we consider that all of the sites are well related to the existing settlement and merit consideration for future supply, the following sites are considered to have the most potential to contribute to supply during the current plan period. A number of potential longer term opportunities have also been previously promoted through the SHLAA. In calculating the capacity of these sites we have used the site areas in the SHLAA but consider that 30 dwellings/hectare is the most appropriate density. This enables the potential of the sites to be maximised and ensures the development is economically viable whilst also facilitating the delivery of associated necessary infrastructure. The sites are considered by reference to their identification number in the SHLAA. However, we have grouped certain sites together to form more sensible and effective development parcels.

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

Response_ Number:	1221	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Short term opportunities Kir004, Kir005, Kir006 and Kir007: Land at Boston Road (6.71ha, 201 units) These sites together comprise a parcel of land that is enclosed by Bungley Lane and the Kirton cemetery, thus creating a clearly defensible barrier to the countryside which could be reinforced by further landscaping. It is directly accessible via a main route through the village and is within walking distance of the centre. It is also next door to a medical centre. The Council's response to the SHLAA consultation makes clear that the "scale is appropriate to the village's range of services". Although the Council's response to Kir004 and Kir005 raise some concerns with visual impact, this is based upon an analysis of those individual plots and ignores the potential of the larger parcel of land which the Council accept, in relation to sites Kir006 and Kir007, has "an acceptable relationship to the existing settlement" and that "it does not have an open countryside character, and visual impacts would be acceptable". Existing water mains run along the northern edge of this land parallel with Bungley Lane. These would not be a fundamental encumbrance to development as it could accommodate either a service road or landscaping associated with the development. The level of land available here could accommodate 182 units together with community benefits such as allotments, public open space or a farm produce shop. Land adjoining was previously provided by Ambrose Lighton to accommodate the GP surgery. Kir001; Land at West End Road (2.38ha, 71 units) This is a smaller parcel of land is well related to existing	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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
				development. It lies to the south of West End Road and includes existing farm buildings which are not essential to the current farming operation. Although this site was not identified as 'Developable' in the SHLAA it is considered that in the context of the current shortfall in housing land supply and the strong merits of Kirton as a focus for growth the potential of this site should be considered again. These two land parcels are immediately available and could be brought forward immediately to contribute towards housing land shortfalls in the District.	
Response_ Number:	1222	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments: Medium Term Options Kir002, Kir003 Land at Church Lane (6.97ha, 209 dwellings) The land is enclosed by Church Lane and Woodside Road which form clear defensible boundaries. It is well related to the Centre of Kirton and potential employment opportunities on adjacent land. The Council support development of other sites in this part of the village and this land could provide a logical extension of these opportunities. Fra001, Fra002, Fra003 (2.89ha, 87 dwellings): The site would help round off this end of the village, tying the existing dwellings on the northern side of Middlegate Road into Kirton. It would not extend the perceived built up area of the village since the land is already seen against the backdrop of the existing houses on the southern side of Middlegate Road. It is also on a main road which has bus stops. It is on the northern side of the village with direct access to Boston, thus limiting traffic flows through the village.	Officer_Response: 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.
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:			
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	1317	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 30 – N.A.	The respondent's interest does not cover the Boston Borough Council area.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1365	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1822	Categorisation_of_further_work:		I write as a member of the public and Parish Councillor for Lutton Parish Council. Regards to the new plan to building permissions in the said village of Lutton. I and the main consensus of opinion of Councillors would like to see frontage quality houses on land east of Pudding Poke Lane and on Winfrey's Allotments site as it takes several allotments let to 1 - 2 persons as weak demand nowadays for allotments. I do declare a partial interest as I own a plot just west end of Pudding Poke Lane of which sometime shortly to be making application for affordable house or dwelling.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr D G Mountain				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Response_ Number:	1366	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1823	Categorisation_of_further_work:		I wish to suggest the small field shaded green should be considered for housing development. This field is now becoming un-economical to farm as machinery grows in size. It has mature Lime trees along the north side, and mature beech trees to the west, all of which have preservation order. This is a very smart eastern end of Holbeach and would make an excellent site for business people who could afford a smart house and help boost Holbeach. Please give this consideration, an my wife owns this field.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Wright				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD				
Response_ Number:	1403	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q34 The plan proposes to count windfall sites as windfalls : addition new build homes in excess of the planned provision and as windfalls it is difficult to assess the number of new dwellings built as windfalls. There are in Boston and Spalding areas of run down dereliction. If those sites were identified as suitable for residential development (there is no shortage of sites for employment uses) it could encourage landowners and developers to consider re-development as residential zones. By their location most are well related to and can easily access the town centre facilities. Surely the re-development of such available sites should be a priority and if necessary the authorities should take the lead.	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Appendix A

South East Lincolnshire Preferred Options Consultation Report 25 November 2013

Part 3

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Response_ Number:	136	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and
Respondents ID Number:	1750	Categorisation_of_further_work:	
Persons_ Name:	Mr J S Birkett		
Representing_Who?:	Himself		

Respondents_Comments:

It feels here as though the cart has been put before the horse. Firstly the amount of housing development that the area needs to fulfil local and wider strategic needs should be determined. Then consideration should be given as to how and where this growth might best be achieved taking into account limiting factors, one of the most important of which is flood risk.

It needs to be clarified as to whether flood hazard or probability is going to be the critical factor in measuring flood risk. Government policy appears to centre on probability rather than hazard.

The meaning of the second sentence of this Para is far from clear – largely due to the double use of the word, 'where'. The sentence is also far too long.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. As it currently stands both hazard and probability are considered and, dependent upon particular site locations and proposed uses, hazard or relative probability might be the critical consideration. The wording of the second sentence of the Policy is accepted as being somewhat complex. This comment will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	163	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1752	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q8 - Does the preferred policy approach 'Strategic Approach to Flood Risk' help you to understand how flood risk issues will impact on planning decisions? The wording of the preferred policy approach is unclear and the requirement to 'show why the need for the development is exceptional' appears unsubstantiated. Previously developed sites such as that occupied by my client offer the opportunity to achieve a redevelopment which, as a result of a reduction in the total amount of floor space on the site and appropriate flood mitigation measures, could result in a reduced flood risk on the site and in the surrounding area. This could be demonstrated by means of a site specific FRA. In such an instance, there would not necessarily be an 'exceptional need' for the development that would justify its construction but it might be desirable in flooding terms by providing a sustainable form of development which could reduce the risk of flooding on the site and elsewhere. The desirability of such a development could constitute the 'wider sustainability benefits to the community' required by the Exception Test set out in national policy guidance. The preferred policy approach should allow for such an eventuality.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Gregory Gray Associates				
Representing_Who?:	The Garden Centre Group				
Response_ Number:	164	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1752	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q9 – What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text would you suggest? The preferred policy approach should be reworded to include the provision "In instances where development is proposed on previously developed land, there will be no requirement to show an essential need for the development where it can be demonstrated, by means of a site specific FRA, that the proposed development will not be at risk from flooding and offers material sustainability benefits in terms of reduced flood risk to the wider community".	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Gregory Gray Associates				
Representing_Who?:	The Garden Centre Group				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	176	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1690	Categorisation_of_further_work:		There are few specific references to the coast or marine environment/activities within the strategic policies. For example we believe that within SP8 'climate change and flood risk' reference could be made to coastal flooding.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Angela Atkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Marine Management				

Response_ Number:	867	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The DPD explains the policy context in detail and sets out a reasonable approach. The reliance on the ROY zones is consistent with the Statement in Appendix 8, but there should be recognition that this is strategic data that is not intended to be used to determine planning applications that are accompanied by site specific flood risk assessments. It should be recognised that these will be more robust than the cruder broad brush data and assumptions used to determine the ROY zones, particularly at their periphery and on their boundaries.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	868	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		References to the Regional Plan should be amended or qualified to take into account its revocation on 12 April 2013, which is referred to in paragraph 1.2.2, but not in paragraphs 4.1.13 through 4.1.20.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	924	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The DPD explains the policy context in detail and sets out a reasonable approach. The reliance on the ROY zones is consistent with the Statement in Appendix 8, but there should be recognition that this is strategic data that is not intended to be used to determine site specific planning applications. Where site specific information becomes available during the development management process, it should be recognised that this will be more robust than the cruder broad brush data and assumptions used to determine the ROY zones, particularly at their periphery and on their boundaries.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				
Response_ Number:	925	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		References to the Regional Plan will need to be updated to take into account its revocation on 12 April 2013, which is referred to in paragraph 1.2.2, but not in paragraphs 4.1.13 through to 4.1.20 that are written on the basis it may be revoked and is still part of the Development Plan.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				
Response_ Number:	985	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		References to the Regional Plan should be amended or qualified to take into account its revocation on 12 April 2013, which is referred to in paragraph 1.2.2, but not in paragraphs 4.1.13 through 4.1.20.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	1137	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1252	Categorisation_of_further_work:		4.14.2– Quantity of additional housing This section needs a criteria to ensure that site allocation do not impact on designated sites.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Anne Casey				
Representing_Who?:	RSPB				

Response_ Number:	1138	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1252	Categorisation_of_further_work:		4.20.2 Additional housing This section needs a criteria to ensure that site allocation do not impact on designated sites.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Anne Casey				
Representing_Who?:	RSPB				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	1159	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1694	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We are encouraged by the focus on flood risk. However, we recommend it should clearly state within the policy that risk needs to be considered from all forms of flooding. Whilst fluvial flood risk is a significant constraint to the location of development, other forms of flooding, such as surface water should be a consideration particularly in design and layout. Appropriate management of surface water is critical for the long term resilience. Further consideration of the surface water management is required in order to mitigate and adapt to climate change. In particular some of the sewer systems in Boston are combined (conveys both foul and surface water). We recommend the flood risk policy includes a requirement to separate surface water from the combined system in any redevelopment in accordance with the NPPF technical guidance and the surface water management hierarchy in part H of Building Regulations.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mrs J Dean				
Representing_Who?:	Anglian water				

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

Response_ Number:	1255	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1689	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q9 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest. We suggest that consideration is given to how the Policy could be rewritten to make it clearer or expanding supporting text within the local plan on the following: 1. where the definitions of Essential Infrastructure, Highly Vulnerable and More Vulnerable can be found, i.e. the Technical guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework; 2. the need to fully apply the flood risk sequential test as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and further expanded to incorporate the use of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) hazard maps. Please note that the use of the SFRA relative probability maps for individual planning applications should not be promoted as these were only intended to be used to assist with strategic allocations, if several sites were found to be within the same hazard zone, i.e. a final step to assist strategic decision makers to differentiate the risk between given locations. The methodology used to produce these maps (as explained in paragraphs 9.29-9.33 of the SFRA) outlines that they are based on hydraulic modelling using current day defence conditions and are, therefore, not an appropriate tool for individual planning application decision making over the lifetime of residential development, i.e. 100 years; 3. how the Principles of the LCS have been used to inform the development of this strategic approach. For example, the NPPF advises that highly vulnerable development is not appropriate in flood zone 3, but due to the nature of flood risk in South East Lincolnshire it may be necessary to facilitate such development e.g. police stations, fire stations etc. We also request that the supporting text specifically outlines those unacceptable uses, i.e. caravans intended for year round occupation and basement dwellings. As a minimum, we would request that the reference to „Major development" in the Policy text is replaced by „All development" as there are no further references in other	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Ms A Hewitson				
Representing_Who?:	Environment Agency				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
				policies (i.e. Development Management or Design) to the need for proposals to be sequentially tested. This minor text change will ensure it is clear that all development proposals in flood risk areas need to demonstrate compliance with the sequential test.	
Response_ Number:	1257	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1689	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q13 – The preferred policy approach 'Provision for Housing' proposes limits on the number of new homes that can be built in the severest flood hazard zones. Do you agree with this approach and, if not, please explain your views? We accept that in order to sustain the existing communities" housing development will be necessary but it is paramount that development in the ROY areas is limited to that identified to meet local need, a recommendation from the LCS evidence. We, therefore, support Option A (paragraph 4.6.2), which advocates that the Local Plan must include a policy that sets out the strategic approach to housing and flood risk in South East Lincolnshire. We request this Policy makes clear that the maximum numbers for the two districts include within the provision figure both open market and affordable housing within the ROY zone. We also request that the local plan policy is specific in terms of the starting date that applies to the cap for monitoring purposes.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Ms A Hewitson				
Representing_Who?:	Environment Agency				

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

Response_ Number:	1275	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1121	Categorisation_of_further_work:		This is covered as a key issue, before the Spatial Strategy, because South East Lincolnshire has a significant number of communities and services in vulnerable but otherwise sustainable locations where flood risk is a significant threat. In particular, the sub-regional centre of Boston is almost entirely in a flood risk area. 85% of Boston Borough's and 19% of South Holland's population live in flood risk areas. SE Lincolnshire has experienced population growth much higher than the national average since 2001. As a result current household projections result in historically high figures which are approximately twice the average house building rate experienced since 1976. These are considered unrealistic as a target, which must be deliverable in order to receive support from the Planning Inspector. There will be a need for new development of all types in areas at risk from flooding and the Local Plan will need to ensure that, where justified, such development is provided in the safest locations and in itself does not increase the threat of flooding. The preferred approach is to set separate housing targets for Boston Borough and South Holland which are: a. Slightly below the historic building rate (to reflect current economic conditions); b. Lower in the flood risk areas as a proportion of the resident population (to adjust for flood risk) representing a maximum cap on development ; c. Located in the lowest flood risk areas possible using a sequential approach, with appropriate mitigation measures As a partner, LCC broadly support this approach and will work with the JPU to strengthen the evidence base, by updating household projections using the latest available data. It is also considered, however, that the small reduction in development proposed in the flood risk areas compared to their existing population needs stronger justification, especially in Boston (80% compared to 85%). There a larger reduction (e.g. to 70%) could be appraised as a reasonable option, given the major	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Coathup				
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire County Council				

potential conflict between the Sub-Regional role of Boston and flood risk concerns. Whilst this could have a disproportionate effect on the rest of the Borough (30% compared to 15% or 20%), there may be capacity to accommodate some of this in the northern part of South Holland.

The rejection of zero population growth option (as a precise interpretation of Principle 1 of the Lincolnshire Coastal Study) as an unreasonable option is supported but needs stronger justification than the current wording in Para. 4.19.3. This should be similar to Para. 4.19.1 rejecting the option of preventing any housing growth. The suggested wording is:

"The Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire study indicates that this would result in a limit of 62 dwellings per year in the Boston Borough ROY zones and 20 per year in the South Holland ROY zones. This approach could raise concerns about the future roles and functions of Boston as a sub-regional centre and the Main Service Centres in South Holland."

We would also like to see references to the statutory Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and to surface water flooding at appropriate places in the document. The preferred policy approach should also state specifically that mitigation includes flood resilient forms of development where its location in flood risk zones is unavoidable..
Greater use of maps and plans in this Section would be helpful to increase understanding of the flood risk issues.
(Amplification of Para. 12, 1st sentence in Executive Councillor Briefing Note)
4.1 The Local FRM Strategy could be mentioned under strategic priorities, but LCC would insist that the section on policy context in chapter 4 explicitly identifies and describes it with its own paragraph, possibly at 4.1.25, though preferably earlier. It should be listed under its full title 'Joint Lincolnshire Flood Risk and Drainage Management Strategy', and a descriptive paragraph could be lifted from the introductory section of the Strategy document Part 1.

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).
	4.2 – no mention is made of assessing risk from surface water flooding. Although this will be low in this area it should be mentioned, together with the expected publication of new surface water risk maps in December 2013 by the Environment Agency, which will provide a national reference tool that planning documents will need to take into account. The key findings of both SHMAs (Paras. 4.2.3 and 4.2.4) actually relate to affordable housing requirements and the mix of housing types required, and are therefore more relevant to Ch. 6. The housing requirement options were simply fed into the SHMA process from the sources quoted. Para. 4.2.11 Suggest deleting the word "growth" in line 3, as two scenarios are zero growth "baseline" projections. Para. 4.12.1 Please re-instate the reference to Option A being based on 2008 based household projections: as noted above the SHMAs did not assess "objectively assessed housing need", which is a term introduced in NPPF after they were produced, but simply used projections that were fed into them. This change would help clarify the justification of the Preferred Option (Paras. 4.16.1. and .2), which is supported.

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	1370	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1689	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We have concerns that some of the SA text through the document may be unrealistic. In particular, we refer to the entry at 4.20.6 (and other SA sections) that states „there is also the potential for new development to support the funding of new flood-defence-related infrastructure". Numerous discussions have taken place during recent years on the economic difficulties faced by developers in delivering development, particularly in the Boston area, due to depressed land values. Despite the fact that we actively seek partnership funding for flood defences, you have advised us that the cost of including flood mitigation measures into developments can in many instances make proposals unviable. We would, therefore, suggest that the SA text that implies development could contribute to flood defence infrastructure be used with caution as it may not be a viable mitigation measure for delivering the local plan.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Ms A Hewitson				
Representing_Who?:	Environment Agency				
Response_ Number:	140	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1750	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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'.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J S Birkett				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	157	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1751	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Mr S Harris				

Response_ Number:	170	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1752	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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".	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Gregory Gray Associates				
Representing_Who?:	The Garden Centre Group				

Response_ Number:	188	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1754	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Ravell				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	197	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1755	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding Lifestyle owners				

Response_ Number:	206	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1756	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd				
Representing_Who?:	Mr S Hatter				

Response_ Number:	247	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1759	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Jonathan Ireland				
Representing_Who?:	Irelands Farm Machinery				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	264	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1237	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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."	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Smith				
Representing_Who?:	Pedals				

Response_ Number:	288	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	967	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates				
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	691	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1688	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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 by 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”	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge				
Representing_Who?:	English Heritage				
Response_ Number:	692	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1688	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge				
Representing_Who?:	English Heritage				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	693	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1688	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge				
Representing_Who?:	English Heritage				

Response_ Number:	716	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1263	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Helen Cattle				
Representing_Who?:	Sport England				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	1168	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	894	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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'.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	P C Bradshaw				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs R Hamilton				

Response_ Number:	1174	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1812	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Dadge				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs T Croxford				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	1236	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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. 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.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				
Response_ Number:	1237	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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? 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.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	1238	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q23 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest? The policy is considered sound other than the recommended shift in the approach to managing growth in areas of coastal flood risk.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	1276	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1121	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Coathup				
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire County Council				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	1302	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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 …”	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1303	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		See comments for Qus 18 - 20	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

PD2015-252

Response_ Number:	1306	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Questions 20 – P. 76, Blue Box, Countryside Section, Opening sentence – Strengthen. Replace “in accordance with” by “provided it accords [complies?] with” P. 76, Blue Box, Countryside Section, bullet point 1 – add “and horticulture” 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?	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	1308	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Yes - with the modifications refered to under Q23.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1309	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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”	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1311	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Yes subject to the comments made to Q26	Comments noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	1312	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.”	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	143	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1750	Categorisation_of_further_work:		I would suggest a further clause be added to the policy on rural exception schemes: 'the identified site needs to be well located to the settlement visually and in terms of access to services'. Not all sites adjoining the boundary of a settlement are going to be suitable, and this clause would give the opportunity for some discretion.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J S Birkett				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

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

Response_ Number:	696	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1688	Categorisation_of_further_work:		In terms of the both the reasonable and unreasonable options, it should be noted that none of the broad locations have “no historic environment constraints” (as currently stated in Appendix 12). At the very least, any of the locations could have archaeological implications given the nature of the fenland countryside and higher potential for preserved remains. In addition, most of the locations could impact on the significance and setting of nearby designated heritage assets given their size and the nature of the topography allowing long distance views. In terms of the unreasonable locations, we have a few comments as follows in terms of designated heritage assets (archaeological issues should also be examined through the councils’ archaeological advisers): Boston Locations B1 and B2 have the potential to impact on the Grade II registered park and garden of Boston Cemetery as well listed buildings around Rawson’s Bridge. Location B3 has the potential to impact on the north-eastern end of Spilsby Road Conservation Area and the Grade II* listed Burton Hall. Location B4 is situated between the existing urban edge and the scheduled Rochford Tower (also Grade I listed), with high potential for disruption of views between the tower and the town centre, and therefore harm to its significance and setting. Location B6 could impact on Wyberton Conservation Area to the south, which includes the Grade I listed Church of St Leodegar and the Grade II* Wyberton Park. The scheduled monument of Wybert’s Castle is located to the south-east. Location B7 could impact on one or two listed buildings, including the Grade II* Frampton House to the south-west. Spalding Location S1 has the potential to impact on Pinchbeck Conservation Area to the west, particularly on views of the Grade I listed St Mary’s Church, which is visible from the A16 and other locations. Location S2 is very likely to impact on the scheduled monument of Pinchbeck engine draining pump house (also Grade II listed), which is currently located in a very isolated position in the landscape. It is difficult to see how development here would not harm the significance and setting	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge				
Representing_Who?:	English Heritage				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).
	of this scheduled monument. Furthermore, to the east is situated the scheduled monument of a medieval moated monastic grange and retreat house at Wykeham (which includes a Grade I listed chapel). Location S3 could also have impacts on the heritage assets at Wykeham depending on size and scale of development. Location S4 could impact on a Grade II* listed building within the industrial estate at Low Fulney (the old office block of the Land Settlement Association which is an 18th century building with medieval fabric). Location S5 is situated at the southern end of Spalding Conservation Area with potential impacts on views between the town centre and countryside. Location S7 refers to “some elements of historical interest” in Appendix 12, but it is not clear what this means. There are scheduled Roman settlement sites to the south-west at Poplar Farm and the wider landscape will have archaeological potential (as elsewhere). Locations S8 and S9 have the usual archaeological issues as well as potential impacts on listed buildings, including the Grade II* Monk’s House

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

Response_ Number:	697	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1688	Categorisation_of_further_work:		In terms of the broad locations (B8 for Boston and S10 for Spalding), we would like to make the following comments: Boston Location B8 This broad location appears to incorporate a scheduled monument in the form of a medieval moated site fronting Wyberton West Road (details on the monument can be found at http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/resultsingle.aspx?uid=1019528). There is also a Grade II listed building at West Skirbeck House. It is not clear from the consultation documents whether location B8 includes the monument or not, but it is likely that development would impact on the significance of this heritage asset through change within its setting. Much will depend on the detail of any proposed development in terms of land use, scale and proximity to the monument, but we would like to see general principles established as early as possible. The monument is situated at the north end of a green wedge of countryside that extends into Boston between Wyberton West Road and Garfit's Lane, meaning that the setting of the monument to the south-west is predominantly rural. The fields beyond the monument have high archaeological potential particularly where they remain in non-arable use (i.e. Not ploughed). There are a number of well-established field boundaries of trees and hedges within the green wedge that give the countryside in this location an intimate character. Taken as a whole, the green wedge contains a number of environmental assets (including the monument) and could form a large part of the green infrastructure for any housing development. We assume that vehicular access to the housing development would not go through the green wedge, as this would have major implications for the monument. Furthermore, the relationship between the monument and the development needs to be carefully considered to ensure that new buildings do not turn their back on the monument or create hard boundaries, but instead allow natural surveillance of this heritage asset to help with its management. The proximity of built development to the monument needs to be based on an understanding of significance and setting impacts, and it may not be possible to	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge				
Representing_Who?:	English Heritage				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).
	build much into the green wedge. At the same time, the provision of open space in the green wedge should be more informal than formal, avoiding lots of physical changes such as landscaping and lighting. Access to the monument itself may be tricky, but there are opportunities for better interpretation, management and understanding of this heritage asset. We would expect the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, including the Strategy and Policies DPD, to demonstrate an understanding of the monument's significance and setting, based on desk-top assessment and initial field surveys (utilising various evidence documents and liaising with the councils' archaeological advisers). Our setting guidance (www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications/setting-heritage-assets/) is a useful way of assessing how setting contributes to the significance of heritage assets and how this assessment can be used to inform development proposals. Better understanding of the location's archaeological potential should also be sought, particularly those fields closest to the monument. Some early indication of how the broad location could be developed, and how the monument would be managed, should be expressed at this stage. Spalding Location S10 Although the broad location for Spalding does not appear to have an obvious impact on any designated heritage assets, there may still be considerable archaeological issues given the scale of development and the likelihood for well-preserved remains. We therefore disagree with the Sustainability Appraisal and Appendix 12, which both state there are no historic environment constraints with this location. We recommend that further assessment is carried out with regards to the archaeological potential of this location, drawing on existing evidence and the support of the councils' archaeological advisers.

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	699	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1688	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We welcome the reference to heritage assets in the draft policy (5th bullet point), although “effect” should read “affect”.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge				
Representing_Who?:	English Heritage				

Response_ Number:	1322	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 37 – Bullet Point 5 – typo “effect” should be replaced by “affect”	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1330	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 45 – P.154, Blue Box, Para. 2 – Strengthen. Delete last 8 words	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				
Response_ Number:	1332	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 48 – P.156, Blue Box, Extra Bullet Point? Should there be a requirement that all infrastructure features for each phase of a development (such as roads, cycleways, pedestrian links , landscaping, etc.) are completed before the first houses are occupied.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1413	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q45 The development of the large urban extensions will be phased and while Option B ,which allows for some flexibility the overarching ideals of the Master Plan should not be allowed to fail by default. Linking the provision of public open space to a fixed number of dwelling units it is proposed to build can generate individual application just under the threshold that requires public space provision leading to an outcome of less than planned open space provision and what is provided being small pockets of unusable open space. The Text should require a Master Plan, drawn up in consultation with the strategic planning team, which will form the basic outline of the completed development. It is unlikely that any one developer would manage the completion such a major development from inception to the final release.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Appendix A

South East Lincolnshire Preferred Options Consultation Report 25 November 2013

Part 4

This page is intentionally left blank

Officer_Recommendation **Objection - No change to the approach is required.**

Response_ Number:	3	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1287	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The plan to put new housing in one large block does not seem ideal, especially if the block is remote from the life of the town centre. I would rather see it broken up into smaller blocks on Brownfield sites and to this end I would be glad to see greater use of compulsory purchase where sites are derelict and no longer serving a useful purpose. Railway land springs to mind and also large sites containing the most ugly derelict buildings, e.g. that dreadful old post office building in the Crescent opposite the Free Press. One further thought: - rural areas around here are dotted with no longer needed farm yard complexes of considerable size. These are large enough to make space for complete new mini villages and would do something to alleviate pressure for new housing in town.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Given the level of housing that is required to be delivered over the plan period there is a need for significant greenfield development at Spalding in the form of an urban extension. Furthermore, the need to control residential development is also adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Persons_ Name:	Carol M Burton				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Response_ Number:	49	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1734	Categorisation_of_further_work:		You talk about climate change bringing the threat of extensive flooding when most of the predictions regarding climate change have been shown to be vastly over-estimated. There were serious floods in the 1950's from Mablethorpe and all the way down the East coast when there was a fraction of the road vehicles we have today and air travel was rare.	Comments noted. The Preferred Options Document has been produced in the context of the best available evidence in all regards and in accordance with the accepted national policy approach on climate change and flood risk.
Persons_ Name:	Mrs J Hill				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	134	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1750	Categorisation_of_further_work:		My understanding is that the Regional Plan was revoked in 2013, and that the Coastal Strategy has never enjoyed any statutory status. This is important to the amount of weight to be given to their provisions, and their status should be made clear if they are referred to in any future local plan documents.	Comments noted. The Coastal Strategy (Study) has been given similar status to that which might have been given it had it been taken forward in informing the review of the RSS, i.e. material evidence to be assessed in deciding policy approaches.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J S Birkett				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				
Response_ Number:	181	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1690	Categorisation_of_further_work:		As part of the discussion of the East Midlands Regional Plan the need for a coastal strategy is mentioned. It is unclear if this is still going ahead and whether the associated coastal study is to be used to influence this current local plan. If possible, clarification on this matter would be welcomed.	Comments noted. The Coastal Strategy (Study) has been given similar status to that which might have been given it had it been taken forward in informing the review of the RSS, i.e. material evidence to be assessed in deciding policy approaches.
Persons_ Name:	Angela Atkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Marine Management				
Response_ Number:	257	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1762	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The road and area in which I reside is known and has been a flood hazard. The area has flooded quite often over many years. As recently as 2 years ago our residential road was flooded causing much damage and inconvenience. My own garden frequently floods in winter.	Comments noted. Whilst the respondee highlights flooding as a issue no comments are made which might suggest a different approach in the Preferred Options Document. It should be noted, however, that a commitment of planning authorities (and Local Plans) is to reduce flood risk through assessment of the most up to date information and through control of development as appropriate.
Persons_ Name:	Richard Burrell				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	661	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1057	Categorisation_of_further_work:		It is good that recognition is given to the sub-regional status of Boston and also the location of choice for a large number of people to live. The policy should encourage developers to seek house designs that will enable redundant buildings and previously developed land that will enable more people to live within the town.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr A Austin				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Response_ Number:	662	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1057	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Although any new development will cause some increase in greenhouse gas emissions, the actual location of the development is irrelevant as emissions will be the same wherever the houses are built.	Comments noted. It is not agreed that where development is located is irrelevant when considering carbon emissions. For example, more isolated locations where more travel to services is needed will generate greater carbon emissions. They are also generally less sustainable locations in terms of other service provision (e.g. bin emptying and supply maintenance) and are less likely to benefit community scale benefits and potentially reduce the efficiency of such benefits for the community at large elsewhere.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr A Austin				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	725	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	907	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Chapter 4. Housing Growth and Flood Risk Attached is a map of the eastern part of the District apparently at risk of long term flooding from the sea. (Database 2115). It comprises very approximately 9000 hectares of some of the best arable land in Europe. This land has a current market value of between very approximately one hundred and eighty million pounds and two hundred and twenty five million pounds. I have no idea what the annual farm-gate value of the vital crops produced on this land, might be, but I would not be surprised to learn it exceeds a million pounds per annum with an end-user value of perhaps treble this figure. Extend this area which is also considered to be at a long-term risk of flooding from the sea or tidal rivers, to include Holbeach Marsh, Moulton Marsh, Kirton Marsh and Frampton Marsh; plus the Parishes of Fishtoft/Freiston/Butterwick/Leverton/Wrangle etc., and we now have a huge area of highly productive arable land of national food security importance. It is inconceivable that a large part of this area will be allowed to be inundated by sea water, thereby rendering the land incapable of production, not to mention major damage to properties and lives put at risk. If the Environment Agency has no faith in Central Government providing suitable long-term flood protection as seems to be the case, then the South-East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Committee must start work now on this requirement. For example, by creating an aptly named “sinking fund” which will enable the Committee in say fifty years time to raise sea banks and carry out such works (e.g.. flood barriers etc.) sufficient to eliminate the risk of flooding from rising sea levels etc. If the Committee is not up to the job then perhaps the requirement should be handed to a task force created from within the Internal Drainage Boards. The money would be raised through additional Council Tax/Business Rates and additional Drainage Rates. Say £250,000 per annum over the next fifty years. May be an additional 1% per annum surcharge on all Council Tax and Business Rate bills plus say £5. per annum per hectare. Otherwise, the suggestion is the residents at Long Sutton/Sutton Bridge/Boston and all the marshland villages, etc. will drown in	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.34-6.40.
Persons_ Name:	D D Wilson				
Representing_Who?:	Himself and Clients				

their beds on 1st January 2015. Its time to re-read the wonderful poem by the Boston poetess, Jean Ingelow (The High Tide on the Coast of Lincolnshire!) Perhaps Central Government could be persuaded to revisit the benefits of a Wash Barrage which could include fresh water and tidal energy.
Long Sutton had a population of 7,260 in 2011 and Holbeach a population of 7,346. It is proposed Long Sutton will receive a preference Option 'A' allocation of 150 dwellings. It is proposed Holbeach will receive a preference Option 'A' allocation of 1,000 dwellings. Long Sutton has one or two amenities not available in Holbeach, and Holbeach has one or two amenities not available in Long Sutton. Broadly speaking, the two Towns have the same amenities. Long Sutton does, however, have land suitable for development which is much closer to amenities than is the case in Holbeach.
The sensible approach of a Sequential Search for land accessible to amenities seems to have died a death.
Yes, Long Sutton is apparently falls within ROY zones.
However, it is proposed to build 2,900 dwellings in ROY zones within Boston, up to 400 in the village of Kirton, up to 300 in the service villages of Boston Borough and up to 900 in Holbeach, some or all of which may also fall in ROY zones. The approach of restricting development in Long Sutton because it falls within ROY zones is illogical. The suggestion the provision of new homes in Long Sutton should also be curtailed because not many have been built in the Town during the last ten years or so is disingenuous. Not many have been built during this period because the Local Authority proposed the current Local Plan would not include an allocation of residential development land. It was necessary to obtain in 2006 a modest allocation at the Public Local Enquiry, and in the face of fierce resistance on the part of the Authority.
Rural Exception Schemes:
We negotiated the sale of the Rural Exception Site in Weston. A land owner who can secure a ten fold increase in the current use value of his land needs no further incentive. Allowing market houses of up to a maximum of 50% of the total number of dwellings of rural exception sites will inevitably result in a

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
	proliferation of proposals outside the settlement boundaries. Generally: The proposal that no further dwellings with ground floor bedrooms shall be built in those areas classified as ROY zones is Draconian. The number of retired home owners in the area is well above the national average. Many homeowners throughout the future will continue to require accommodation all on the ground floor. We are of the opinion that provided developers consider there is a market for such properties plus a proportion of “affordable homes”, they should continue building properties with bedrooms on the ground floor provided there is at least one double bedroom with an en-suite on the first floor which would act as a refuge on the 1st January 2115, and approached via a single flight of stairs designed to accommodate a stair lift. Long Sutton is deserving of a similar allocation to that proposed for Holbeach. And what of poor old Sutton Bridge?! Hundreds of new jobs predicated on cheap electricity from the proposed Biomass Power Station, and nowhere locally for those people to live! The approach to “other rural settlements” could be a little more positive. Encourage perhaps one or two additional dwellings per annum in order to give some encouragement to existing amenities. For example, no new houses have been built in Gedney Dyke during the last ten years. The village shop is for sale. Encourage someone to take over the business by indicating that perhaps up to an additional twenty dwellings could be built in the village during the plan period. Identify those settlements which still have one or two facilities worth preserving.

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	764	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We agree with an element of control of the number of homes to be built in the severest flood hazard zones, but would seek greater flexibility in the Local Plan to ensure development is facilitated in sustainable settlements.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 5.11-5.16.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	872	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We agree with an element of control of the number of homes to be built in the severest flood hazard zones, but would seek greater flexibility in the Local Plan to ensure development is facilitated in sustainable settlements.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 5.11-5.16.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	929	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We agree with an element of control of the number of homes to be built in the severest flood hazard zones, but would seek greater flexibility in the Local Plan to ensure development is facilitated in sustainable settlements in the Boston Borough area outside the town of Boston.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 5.11-5.16.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	989	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We agree with an element of control of the number of homes to be built in the severest flood hazard zones, but would seek greater flexibility in the Local Plan to ensure development is facilitated in sustainable settlements.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 5.11-5.16.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties				

Response_ Number:	1201	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1546	Categorisation_of_further_work:		I am continually exasperated at the lack of recognition and understanding to the professional role played by the Internal Drainage boards in our region. They successfully manage our inland waterways and this should be taken into account to a greater degree when assessing fluvial flood risk.	Comments noted. Fluvial flood risk is assessed (as is the role and functional infrastructure of the Internal Drainage Boards) within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessments. These are, in turn, key pieces of evidence in the assessment of particular sites. The Preferred Options Document uses such evidence extensively. It is unclear how specific reference to Internal Drainage Boards, or indeed other organisations whose work contributes to a plan area, would benefit the Plan.
Persons_ Name:	Mr and Mrs C Woods				
Representing_Who?:	Themselves				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	1227	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q7 - Do you agree that there is a need for the preferred policy approach (see sections 4.5 – 4.10 under Approach to Flood Risk in the full consultation document for more information)? Please explain your view. Q9 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest? We fully support the need to provide a policy which sets out the approach to strategic flood risk in the plan area. The approach adopted must, however, be carefully balanced against other equally important objectives in the Plan. The overall strategy recognises that to meet the Vision and Strategic Priorities (in particular 1 and 3) development will be essential in flood risk areas. The level of overall growth which is targeted and how much of this should be provided within ROY zones must be critically assessed. In apportioning growth it may be necessary for a more refined assessment of ROY zones to distinguish between relative flood risk and flood hazard. This more forensic sift is proposed by the Plan, but will be delayed until the site allocations stage. However, it is considered that this should be assessed now in order that the maximum level of housing can be directed to the most sustainable locations. In terms of the Preferred Policy wording (paragraph 4.24), this should be consistent with the adopted Spatial Strategy and reflect the reality that a large proportion of growth will need to go within high potential flood risk areas. In taking forward broad locations, and ultimately in site selection, the Joint Policy Unit should provide an updated strategic assessment of flood risk in order to provide a clear position on the delivery of identified sites.	Comments noted. There is general agreement with the approach taken on housing provision and flood risk. As the Preferred Options Document is not proposing site allocations the step of the flood risk assessment of particular sites will not be a part of this DPD. However under the terms of the preferred policy approach on 'Site Allocations', the proposed SHLAA will be assessed to give a broad indication of site availability. This, however, will not remove the need for site owners, in support of planning applications, to supply Flood Risk Assessments etc. for their sites. Land owners and developers need not wait for the Site Allocations DPD to be produced to seek a site's development as the planning application route is always available.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1298	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		I'm afraid we have found this whole section almost impossible to get to grips with, partly because the question of actual housing requirements is difficult to disentangle from flood risk issues. Strategic Approach to Flood Risk – We find the second sentence of the Blue Box "Strategic Approach to Flood Risk" (p. 50) simply unintelligible. Table 4.1 – We find the note quite extraordinary. If the categorising of different "flood zones" ignores "the presence of defences", then the whole of the discussion and the policies arising from it are built on circumstances that do not actually exist on the ground, as East Lincolnshire is possibly one of the best defended areas from flood risk in the country. Indeed, it has been suggested to us that, if both sea and river defences are maintained properly, then the whole Plan area is at equal, negligible risk, rather than the more alarming pictures presented in some of the studies.	It is considered that this issue is adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. It is recognised that balancing housing needs and taking account flood risk is a complex and contentious matter. The Plan needs to reflect a host of issues but within the context of local and national policy considerations. The preferred policy approach 'Strategic Approach to Flood Risk' attempts to set out a process for the consideration of all development proposals and the assessment of flood risk. It is considered that the approach reflects the approach of the NPPF and gives it local context.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				
Response_ Number:	1299	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Para 4.2.4 – We do not understand how the SHMA estimates of South Holland's housing "needs" have been arrived at. Who are all the people wanting to come to South Holland? Why would they want to come?	Comments noted. The SHMA is not an estimate of who wants to come to South Holland. In fact there have been challenges to the approaches on the SHMA's that the 2011 census population growth has not been accounted for. The evidence included in the SHMA's is due to be updated. However, in general the current SHMA assessments are the housing needs of the population mainly reflecting new household formation (e.g. generated by family split ups and children leaving the family home to make their own homes)
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1300	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 11 – How would an ordinary member of the public know?	Comments noted. The questions are provided to prompt opinions to be expressed, these may be informed or uninformed. Clearly someone who has no interest in the matter is unlikely to respond.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1377	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q8 It is the responsibility of the Planning system to prohibit inappropriate changes in land use not to encourage them. The current national government stance is that who benefit from flood prevention or mitigation measures should pay a larger proportion of the cost of prevention and mitigation measures than they currently do. New build in the red zone is the equivalent of granting new build consent yards from the crumbling cliffs at Withernsea (East Yorkshire). NB the ABI will confirm that the most expensive flood damage claims arising from rising ground water tables. Currently DEFRA do not accept that rising ground water levels are a flood hazard.	The impact of flood risk on the proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1378	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q9 see Q7 & 8 . Achieve a better balance between the need for some growth, sustainability and flood risk. See Transport. ADDITIONAL HOUSING NEEDS. There is some merit in determining the projected housing needs for Boston Borough and South Holland. An area Plan covering both Planning Authorities ought to be a co-ordinated Plan. There is little of a serious attempt to address the planning issues facing the two Authorities. South Holland is to participate in a Greater Peterborough Strategic Housing Needs Assessment Survey whose outcomes could prejudice the emerging area Plan. New build residential development in Boston Borough is constrained by the need to minimise residential development in those areas most at risk from potential flooding. Peterborough is constrained by the close proximity of its political boundaries with neighbouring Authorities and its rapidly growing need for more potential building sites. Boston Borough and South Holland have the similar need to provide more affordable housing in Boston and Spalding and in their rural hinterland.	Comments noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				
Response_ Number:	1383	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q 14 the evidence that justifies the total of new build to be permitted should be made public.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	42	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	992	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	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'.
Persons_ Name:	Martin Bagshaw				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy				
Response_ Number:	43	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	992	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	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'.
Persons_ Name:	Martin Bagshaw				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	118	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	860	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	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'.
Persons_ Name:	Hollie Howe				
Representing_Who?:	St John's College				
Response_ Number:	120	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	860	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 5.13.
Persons_ Name:	Hollie Howe				
Representing_Who?:	St John's College				
Response_ Number:	127	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1572	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Waterways must be maintained properly, also if properly drained this may free up some land for new development on margins of existing settlements.	Comments noted. Sustainable drainage systems and Flood Risk Assessments will be primary considerations in the identification and implementation of sites for development.
Persons_ Name:	Freya Trotman				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	263	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1237	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The list of sustainable development considerations fails to reflect Strategic Priority 11, and Government policy in relation to sustainable development and sustainable transport.	Comments noted. The preferred policy approach does refer to "meeting sustainable development considerations" and "access and vehicle generation levels". The supporting text to the policy will amplify that these considerations embody Strategic Priority 11. Were the policy to use the same wording as all the elements of the Strategic Priorities then it would be unwieldy and difficult to understand. It is, by design, intended to be a more compact form of wording but will be supported by explanatory text.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Smith				
Representing_Who?:	Pedals				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	732	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	961	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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 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.	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'.
Persons_ Name:	Carter Jonas				
Representing_Who?:	RP Worth and Son				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	1067	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1798	Categorisation_of_further_work:			
Persons_ Name:	Mr B Collins McDougall				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

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 Commonside, 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.

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

Comments noted. The respondee 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 respondee. 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.

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.

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	1143	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1800	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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 Commonside, 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. 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	Comments noted. The respondee 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 respondee. 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.
Persons_ Name:	Mrs J M Blundell				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

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.

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1147	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	901	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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.	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'.
Persons_ Name:	Angela Reeve				
Representing_Who?:	Cemex UK Properties				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	1234	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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? 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	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'.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
	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 most 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.

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1235	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q20 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest? 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.	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'.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	1386	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		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. 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.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 5.13.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
				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.	

Response_ Number:	1387	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments: 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. The classification should be Sub Regional Centres, Main Service Centres , Village Service Centres and Other Rural Settlements. The latter should all be treated as open countryside.	Officer_Response: This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:			
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1395	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q26 Only to suggest that the overarching statement of policy must be available to applicants, developers and third party objectors.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				
Response_ Number:	4	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1287	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The plan to put new housing in one large block does not seem ideal, especially if the block is remote from the life of the town centre. I would rather see it broken up into smaller blocks on Brownfield sites and to this end I would be glad to see greater use of compulsory purchase where sites are derelict and no longer serving a useful purpose. Railway land springs to mind and also large sites containing the most ugly derelict buildings, e.g. that dreadful old post office building in the Crescent opposite the Free Press. One further thought: - rural areas around here are dotted with no longer needed farm yard complexes of considerable size. These are large enough to make space for complete new mini villages and would do something to alleviate pressure for new housing in town.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Given the level of housing that is required to be delivered over the plan period there is a need for significant greenfield development at Spalding in the form of an urban extension. Furthermore, the need to control residential development is also adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Persons_ Name:	Carol M Burton				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				
Response_ Number:	12	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1289	Categorisation_of_further_work:		In Boston town there are many properties empty that could be put into housing use. There should not be a policy of converting fields into Housing Estates.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Given the level of housing that is required to be delivered over the plan period there is a need for significant greenfield development at Boston in the form of an urban extension.
Persons_ Name:	Mark Price				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	44	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	992	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Proposals to focus development on Spalding with a secondary focus on Holbeach as the second largest settlement in South Holland are broadly supported by our client. It is however suggested that Holbeach, as a Main Service Centre is capable of accommodating additional housing numbers should the results of an objectively assessed housing needs survey for the South Holland area dictate an increased requirement. There is considered to be no justification to support the provision that nearly two thirds of the housing requirement in the plan period be provided in Spalding and despite the indication that the SHLAA may identify land which is potentially available to deliver that level of development there is no guarantee that the individual dwellings will be delivered to the scale proposed. It is therefore our clients considered opinion that at least an additional 200 dwellings should be accommodated within Holbeach in the plan period where there are sites similarly identified in the SHLAA to accommodate the additional development. The previous level of housing requirement has not necessarily been commensurate with its role as the second largest settlement and therefore further opportunity for growth should now be acknowledged and encouraged in this plan period.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.29.
Persons_ Name:	Martin Bagshaw				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	45	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	992	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Proposals to focus development on Spalding with a secondary focus on Holbeach as the second largest settlement in South Holland are broadly supported by our client. It is however suggested that Holbeach, as a Main Service Centre is capable of accommodating additional housing numbers should the results of an objectively assessed housing needs survey for the South Holland area dictate an increased requirement. There is considered to be no justification to support the provision that nearly two thirds of the housing requirement in the plan period be provided in Spalding and despite the indication that the SHLAA may identify land which is potentially available to deliver that level of development there is no guarantee that the individual dwellings will be delivered to the scale proposed. It is therefore our clients considered opinion that at least an additional 200 dwellings should be accommodated within Holbeach in the plan period where there are sites similarly identified in the SHLAA to accommodate the additional development. The previous level of housing requirement has not necessarily been commensurate with its role as the second largest settlement and therefore further opportunity for growth should now be acknowledged and encouraged in this plan period.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.29.
Persons_ Name:	Martin Bagshaw				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy				
Response_ Number:	46	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	992	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Our client objects to proposals to phase housing land delivery by back-loading delivery to the latter part of the plan period. Whilst it is accepted that the economy is having an influence, it is important to plan positively to boost significantly the supply of housing in accordance with Paragraph 47 of the NPPF. Our client would be pleased if these comments could be given due consideration in progressing the preparation of the Local Plan and as such we would appreciate confirmation of receipt and being informed on the further stages in the process of preparing the Local Plan.	The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.
Persons_ Name:	Martin Bagshaw				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	47	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	992	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Our client objects to proposals to phase housing land delivery by back-loading delivery to the latter part of the plan period. Whilst it is accepted that the economy is having an influence, it is important to plan positively to boost significantly the supply of housing in accordance with Paragraph 47 of the NPPF. Our client would be pleased if these comments could be given due consideration in progressing the preparation of the Local Plan and as such we would appreciate confirmation of receipt and being informed on the further stages in the process of preparing the Local Plan.	The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.
Persons_ Name:	Martin Bagshaw				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy				
Response_ Number:	51	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1734	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Judging by the number of new homes that are planned for this area, a great deal of land is going to be required but I could not find anything explaining what land will be used so I can only assume it will be farmland. If this is the case then this is something I would oppose most strongly. You mentioned land west of Spalding. All that land is prime farming land and where a much opposed wind farm is proposed.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Given the level of housing that is required to be delivered over the plan period there is a need for significant greenfield development at Spalding in the form of an urban extension.
Persons_ Name:	Mrs J Hill				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	54	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1734	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Your criteria for a satisfactory traveller site does not take into account the lack of suitable sites. South Holland Council have so far taken some 9 years to find suitable a site for one illegal traveller, which is still not resolved, after taking some 8 years to expensively find site for another. Again you are saying that such sites should be well-related to local services and at the same time respect the scale of the nearest settled community. This is simply not possible since settled communities are already built around such amenities, that is sensible planning. How can you then plan to impose traveller sites within the same areas. Commonsense should tell you that such sites will always impinge on the settled communities and also will place undue pressure on the local infrastructure. Nothing is said about the settled communities and their wishes which are, once again, totally ignored since they have no say in the matter. It is well known that once a travellers site moves near to a settled community the value of property is greatly reduced, this is not bigotry or anti-traveller, this is a pure and simply fact. Any estate agent will tell you this is correct. Have you even asked the travelling community where they would like sites to be located. Usually they are not too concerned about being "near to local facilities" since, as their name implies, they are used to travelling but prefer to live in caravans rather than bricks and mortar. So before imposing all these conditions relating to the placement of these sites, talk to the travellers and get some input from the settled community as well who should be taken into consideration.	This issue is adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. We are duty bound to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply of Gypsy and Traveller sites.
Persons_ Name:	Mrs J Hill				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	123	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1572	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The proposed site my clients have offered for development is off Wagnall's Gate in Holbeach. I note from your Distribution and Scales of Housing Development that Spalding has an allocation of 6000 dwellings and Holbeach only 1000. There is already massive development in Spalding. Holbeach presently has very little low cost housing available, consequently there are few let properties and so what could be a thriving town is being strangled by lack of investment, housing, provision of facilities in transport etc. The high street shops are struggling through lack of strategic planning. I most strongly the planning office to consider this. Holbeach is ideally placed on the natural silt ridge to provide housing on low flood risk land. The Wagnall's Gate site has good access to all amenities, shops, transport, roads, utilities, schools etc.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.29.
Persons_ Name:	Freya Trotman				
Representing_Who?:	S Pratt and J Haresign				
Response_ Number:	214	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1163	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The policy needs to recognise the need to allocate and/or grant permission for sites in accordance with an up-to-date analysis of need. The criteria should make it clear that it will be used to guide allocations and decisions on applications. The first criterion does not accord with government guidance in “Planning Policy for Traveller Sites” in that criteria for determining applications should be applied irrespective of need. This criterion can only be used in regard to allocation of land for traveller sites, not in relation to the consideration of applications. The second criterion should not include “employment opportunities” as to qualify as a Gypsy or Traveller, persons must travel for work.	It is considered that the Preferred Policy Approach for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople is in accordance with national policy.
Persons_ Name:	Mr A R Yarwood				
Representing_Who?:	National Federation of				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	237	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing
Respondents ID Number:	1758	Categorisation_of_further_work:	
Persons_ Name:	Woods Hardwick Planning		
Representing_Who?:	Wheatley PLC		

Respondents_Comments:

With specific regard to Crowland, the identification of new housing is supported. As the plan highlights, Crowland is free from any coverage by ROY zones and is also identified as a Main Service Centre i.e. a sustainable location for future growth. Part of the evidence base for the plan comprises an Assessment of the Sustainability of Rural Settlements, excluding Boston and Spalding.

Crowland was ranked 5th, providing a number of key services and as such is entirely appropriate to accommodate a significant amount of housing required over the plan period.

The option of identifying 300 homes is therefore supported in principle. However, as argued elsewhere in respect of the plan, higher levels of housing are required over the plan period. It then follows that the respective settlements in the hierarchy should receive a proportionate increase to meet that need.

The unreasonable options identified relate to both lower and higher levels of housing growth. The allocation of a lower level has been rejected as to do so could undermine the role of Crowland as a main service centre and would be inconsistent with levels of growth in the past. This is fully supported as it complies with guidance within the NPPF which seeks to direct growth to such centres to support and increase their level of service provision for the settlement itself and surrounding settlements.

Allocating higher levels of growth has been rejected as a reasonable option on the basis of their relatively lower provision of services and facilities compared to Holbeach. In making this statement it is accepted that Crowland is entirely outside of the ROY zone. Holbeach in comparison lies largely within the ROY zone, the plan proposing 900 of the 1000 dwellings identified within that zone.

In order to support Crowland as a main service centre and

Officer_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.40.

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
				facilitate the extension of the facilities that could be offered, it is considered appropriate to increase the numbers of dwellings that could be accommodated within the settlement. The fact that these can be delivered wholly outside the ROY zone further supports this. The SHLAA (2012) also shows that there are a number of sites that could come forward to meet need.	
Response_ Number:	239	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments: Representations have been made to other sections of the plan stating that an increased level of housing is required. This is supported by recent ONS figures published in May 2013. An overall increase in housing delivery therefore by definition means that each tier within the settlement hierarchy should accommodate a proportionate increase in housing numbers. Notwithstanding this, Crowland has been identified as the 5th ranked settlement in terms of sustainability and the settlement is also entirely outside of the ROY zone. It is therefore appropriate to allocate additional housing which would further support its role as a service centre.	Officer_Response: This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.40.
Respondents ID Number:	1758	Categorisation_of_further_work:			
Persons_ Name:	Woods Hardwick Planning				
Representing_Who?:	Wheatley PLC				
Response_ Number:	245	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments: If the growth potential of Sutterton is recognised (see response number 244) it would require the delivery of an increased number of new houses within Sutterton which may have to exceed the current proposed 300 target on ROY sites within the service villages. This figure is considered to be unnecessarily restrictive for a village like Sutterton. Sutterton would only be likely to receive a limited level of new housing growth which could restrict it's future potential and also reduce it's current sustainability. It is considered important that the potential of Sutterton, and therefore in all likelihood some other settlements, should be recognised within the spatial approach. This would point towards adopting option B in determining the distribution of development.	Officer_Response: It is considered that Option A does provide the potential for housing growth in Sutterton as suggested in the representation.
Respondents ID Number:	1759	Categorisation_of_further_work:			
Persons_ Name:	Jonathan Ireland				
Representing_Who?:	Irelands Farm Machinery				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	256	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1629	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Freiston is well connected for services and amenities and could support limited housing development on the eastern side of the parish.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. The designation of Freiston as a Service Village has been ruled out on the grounds of flood risk.
Persons_ Name:	Freiston Parish Council				
Representing_Who?:	Themselves				

Response_ Number:	258	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1762	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Affordable housing is already a problem in this and other rural areas. Problem is parking space with most houses having at least one vehicle and visitors in own transport. Where is the work and employment for these occupants?	These issues have been addressed adequately in the Preferred Options Document.
Persons_ Name:	Richard Burrell				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Response_ Number:	269	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1766	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Do not agree that Exceptions Sites Planning might be permitted in the countryside since this goes against the overall objective of the plan to permit only sustainable development and the specific draft policy on housing that Exceptions sites should be permitted only as extensions of service centres.	The Preferred Policy Approach to 'Affordable Housing', specifically in relation to exceptions sites, is adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document and is in general conformity with national policy.
Persons_ Name:	Sally Waltham				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	270	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1464	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We feel that villages like Fosdyke should be included in future development plans for the following reasons: excellent access to the A17 is not a "backwater" remote village has main sewerage, with a capacity of more dwellings to be added excellent and widely used village hall one of the best playing fields in the Borough together with Bowls Club, Football Club, and Social Club - again widely used Marine, boat workshop facilities, which continue to grow strongly Popular public house Best riding and walking facilities- off road- more popular than ever, also cycle route, more children in the village than when the school closed because of development in past Employment opportunities available locally. We feel Fosdyke has excellent opportunity for potential growth if steady future development is allowed.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. The designation of Fosdyke as a Service Village has been ruled out on the grounds of flood risk.
Persons_ Name:	Alan Mowton				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	329	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	932	Categorisation_of_further_work:		We strongly OBJECT to any form of phased provision of housing. Where it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing, and particularly as this is consistent with regional policy which sought to ensure that housing allocations were treated as a floor rather than a ceiling, the Plan would not be rendered unsound by the delivery of new homes at a rate greater than prescribed, given the tenor of Government policy. It would, for the same reasons however, be rendered unsound by failure to deliver sufficient housing and to artificially delay or constrain supply. Policies in the development plan should be enabling not restraining. Phasing is a constraint on development coming forward and now falls contrary to the Government's expectation that local planning authorities should boost significantly the supply of housing land (NPPF paragraph 47). The proposal to phase the delivery of housing can only reflect a regime provided by Planning Policy Statement 3 and the principles of 'plan, monitor, manage' in which Government advice stated that: "Local Planning Authorities should set out the circumstances in which action will be needed to ensure performance is achieved in line with the housing and previously developed land trajectories". Such advice is no longer extant and any reliance upon it is no longer appropriate. In that respect, the Joint Local Plan would not be in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework, whose provisions should assume the greater weight for the purposes of development management and plan-making.	The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.
Persons_ Name:	Mr Neil Osborn				
Representing_Who?:	Larkfleet Homes				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	436	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1497	Categorisation_of_further_work:		I am writing to your to put a number of points forward for land in Leverton to be considered for inclusion in the forthcoming South East Lincolnshire Local Plan. After seeing the "Draft Plan" for local villages I was surprised that no land in Leverton was included as Leverton is better situated than some areas included for the following reasons: 1 Proximity to Boston 2 Distance from Main Road and bus route (including bus stopping point) 3 adjacent to existing development (one of which is very recent). 4 We have in the village the following: a. Shop b. Church and church hall c. Village community Centre d. Public house e. Childs Nursery f. Village grass playing area with slides, climbing frames and swings etc. G. Fire station (Hopefully not needed) 5 Nearness to: a. Doctors Surgery b. Post Office c Primary School d. Secondary School 6 Recent upgrade to main sewerage system 7 Various types of employment with a variety of nearby business' both permanent and seasonal.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. The designation of Leverton as a Service Village has been ruled out on the grounds of flood risk.
Persons_ Name:	Tony Dickinson				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	666	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1057	Categorisation_of_further_work:		My comments regarding housing development are confined mainly to Boston Borough although some are applicable to both districts. I question the statement that there is a surplus of intermediate housing due to the availability of cheap private sector housing in Boston. The town is well known for the high cost of private rented property. There is already a shortage of 1-bedroom social-rented accommodation.	Comments noted. This evidence is taken from the Coastal Lincolnshire SHMA.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr A Austin				
Representing_Who?:	Herself				
Response_ Number:	895	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The policy should set a more ambitious target for South Holland for the earlier plan periods. The current targets indicate that nearly one third of the housing target is anticipated in the last quarter of the plan period. It is important that the targets are achievable, but they should also be ambitious.	The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				
Response_ Number:	896	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The phasing should set more ambitious targets for South Holland for the periods 2011-2016, 2016-2021 and 2021-2026.	The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	897	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The phasing targets for South Holland for the periods 2011-2016, 2016-2021 and 2021-2026 should increase with a corresponding reduction for the period 2026-2031.	The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley				

Response_ Number:	943	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The appraisal in respect of Service Villages (Boston Borough) is too crude and provides only two options, neither of which appear to be fully justified. Option A relies on Swineshead being outside the ROY zone, but this relates to only part of the settlement and predetermines land to be allocated for development irrespective of its relationship with the village. The logical locations for new development in Swineshead would be to the north and east of the settlement, but large parts of both of these areas would be in the ROY zone, as shown in the Boston Borough Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2010. To allocate one third of the total service village housing allocation to that single settlement, therefore, cannot be justified. Option B is wholly unacceptable, as it makes no allowance for whether there are suitable sites for the housing provision.	The proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. It is considered that Swineshead contains an adequate supply of developable sites.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Page 203

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	944	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Service Villages (Boston Borough) housing provision is too low and should be increased to provide a greater allocation for the 20 year period, as explained in the response to Q14. The reliance on Boston to deliver large quantities of housing is unrealistic and promotes development in the area at highest risk of flood – it is not a case of development in the ROY zone, but development in the red zone. The Service Villages are more commonly within either the orange or yellow zones and at lesser risk.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.8 and 6.18.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	946	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The policy should categorise the different Boston Borough Service Villages in terms of their size, review the relative level of development likely to be proposed in the ROY zone, assess the potential for sustainable development and set the allocation provision accordingly. The cap of 300 dwellings to be on ROY sites places a disproportionate burden on the Service Villages. The proportion is 37.5% when compared to the original option A and B target of 80 and 85%m which is caused by the fact 100% of Boston town allocations are to be on ROY land. It dictates the approach to site allocation in the Service Villages unreasonably, with the ROY zone becoming the determining factor irrespective of whether land that falls within ROY zone, but is safe development. The Evidence Base for the Local Plan includes the document Boston Borough rural settlements dated 2008. This includes settlement specific assessments and then a review of service and facility provision. The result of the service provision is that Sutterton is ranked second of all settlements including Kirton, thus it is the highest ranking Service Village. There is a similar review of public transport where Sutterton is ranked third behind Kirton and Wrangle. The concluding analysis ranks Sutterton third overall behind Kirton, which is a Main Service Centre, and Butterwick. Sutterton is a key settlement in the Borough and should be allocated a substantial level of new housing. The housing provision for the Services Villages (Boston Borough) should be increased overall to reflect the response to Q14. The cap on allocations on ROY land should be increased and the policy should provide flexibility where sites are shown to be safe by site specific flood risk assessments.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.8 and 6.18.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	954	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The policy should be applied to a higher Boston Borough housing provision, as referred to in Q14, and set a more ambitious target for the earlier periods.	The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Response_ Number:	955	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The phasing should set more ambitious targets for Boston for the periods 2011-2016 and 2016-2021.	The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Response_ Number:	956	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The phasing targets for Boston for the periods 2011-2016 and 2016-2021 should increase to reflect a higher housing target in accordance with the response to Q14.	The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1041	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The Service Villages (Boston Borough) housing provision is too low and should be increased to provide a greater allocation. An increase would enable the proper planning for future growth of Sutterton and attract investment.	It is considered that Option A does provide the potential for housing growth in Sutterton as suggested in the representation.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	K Enderby				

Response_ Number:	1043	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	Categorisation_of_further_work:		The policy should categorise the different Boston Borough Service Villages in terms of their size, review the relative level of development likely to be proposed in the ROY zone, assess the potential for sustainable development and set the allocation provision accordingly. Sutterton is a key settlement in the Borough and should be allocated a substantial level of new housing. The housing provision for the Services Villages (Boston Borough) should be increased overall to reflect the response to Q14.	It is considered that Option A does provide the potential for housing growth in Sutterton as suggested in the representation.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	K Enderby				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	1068	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1798	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Industrial , Commercial & Housing development in Areas of High Flood Risk It is irresponsible madness to propose allowing 4,800 new homes and large scale industrial development to take place in flood hazard areas in south east Lincolnshire. The Environment Agency warn that they expect flooding to increase in the future due to climate change. They predict increasing coastal erosion, rising sea levels and more stormy weather. Http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/floods/31668.aspx In the past decade the incidence of flash flooding throughout the United Kingdom has increased to previously unprecedented levels. The folly of building in a flood plain was brought home in December 2012. In Ruthin in North Wales, a designated flood hazard area permission was given by planning authorities to built a estate of new homes which was subsequently badly flooded. Residents now find themselves with homes that are impossible to ensure and difficult to sell. They live in fear of further flooding. Around 5.2 million homes in the country are at risk of sea, river or surface water flooding and flooding is the natural disaster most likely to affect the United Kingdom. Advice from the insurance industry is that building on a flood plain should be avoided wherever possible. It makes no sense whatsoever to add to their number by allowing further development of any kind within the area designated a ROY zone in your plan (your jargon not mine). The hazards and risks of industrial and commercial development in a flood zone are so obvious that it is impossible for any reasonable person to understand why the South East Lincolnshire Planning Authority is considering it. The potential	The impact of flood risk on the proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Persons_ Name:	Mr B Collins McDougall				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.		
		for environmental pollution with consequent risk of harm to human health, damage to natural habitats and contamination of the food chain are good reasons for not allowing this type of development. The guiding principle of not allowing anything to be built on a flood plain that can be located elsewhere is surely sound.	

Officer_Recommendation **Objection - No change to the approach is required.**

Response_ Number:	1144	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing
Respondents ID Number:	1800	Categorisation_of_further_work:	
Persons_ Name:	Mrs J M Blundell		
Representing_Who?:	Herself		

Respondents_Comments:

Industrial , Commercial & Housing development in Areas of High Flood Risk

It is irresponsible madness to propose allowing 4,800 new homes and large scale industrial development to take place in flood hazard areas in south east Lincolnshire. The Environment Agency warn that they expect flooding to increase in the future due to climate change. They predict increasing coastal erosion, rising sea levels and more stormy weather. Http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/floods/31668.aspx

In the past decade the incidence of flash flooding throughout the United Kingdom has increased to previously unprecedented levels.

The folly of building in a flood plain was brought home in December 2012. In Ruthin in North Wales, a designated flood hazard area permission was given by planning authorities to built a estate of new homes which was subsequently badly flooded. Residents now find themselves with homes that are impossible to ensure and difficult to sell. They live in fear of further flooding.

Around 5.2 million homes in the country are at risk of sea, river or surface water flooding and flooding is the natural disaster most likely to affect the United Kingdom. Advice from the insurance industry is that building on a flood plain should be avoided wherever possible. It makes no sense whatsoever to add to their number by allowing further development of any kind within the area designated a ROY zone in your plan (your jargon not mine).

The hazards and risks of industrial and commercial development in a flood zone are so obvious that it is impossible for any reasonable person to understand why the South East Lincolnshire Planning Authority is considering it. The potential

Officer_Response:

The impact of flood risk on the proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.		
		for environmental pollution with consequent risk of harm to human health, damage to natural habitats and contamination of the food chain are good reasons for not allowing this type of development. The guiding principle of not allowing anything to be built on a flood plain that can be located elsewhere is surely sound.	

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	1148	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	901	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Paragraphs 6.39 6.43.1 provide the approach to the scale of additional housing to be provided in the Main Service Centres of Crowland and Donington. Only one Policy option, Policy Option A, is provided for this approach and this policy sets a target of 300 additional dwellings in both Crowland and Donington over the plan period. Paragraphs 6.40.1 and 6.40.2 provide unreasonable Policy Options for Crowland and Donington strategic housing growth aims, one of which is that: It is deemed unreasonable to provide a greater proportion of housing, despite both settlements being outside of the ROY zone, given their relatively lower provision of services and facilities compared with Holbeach. The other of which suggests it would be unreasonable to appraise any option that: considers the provision of less than 300 dwellings . By establishing both of these options as unreasonable, this provides no prospect for flexibility and creates a rigid and unrealistic policy target of exactly 300 new dwellings. We feel that it can not be considered that both of these policies are unreasonable. We would argue that a higher housing requirement at Donington should be considered a reasonable policy option. This is on the grounds listed below. Firstly, paragraph 4.22, which establishes the council s preferred policy approach to flood risk mitigation in relation to housing growth, identifies that lower levels of housing growth should occur in ROY zones. As the majority of the plan area is covered by the ROY zone, it is suggested that as much growth as possible should be encouraged in areas located outside of the zone. It is therefore not appropriate to put a restriction of no more than 300 additional dwellings in Donington which is situated outside of the ROY zone. The ability to provide higher levels of housing at this MSC to assist in meeting the requirements outlined in the Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire Report 2012 is therefore not being taken by the Councils. In addition to this, it is outlined in the Local Plan that the rationalisation behind deeming higher levels of housing unreasonable is that the provision of facilities and services in these two MSCs are relatively low compared to Holbeach. We	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.40.
Persons_ Name:	Angela Reeve				
Representing_Who?:	Cemex UK Properties				

would argue that there is no reason to believe that further housing development in Donington would not facilitate the delivery and improvement of services and facilities in the area and would go so far as to argue that Donington already has a good range of existing services and facilities. We would also argue that the reference to Holbeach is irrelevant as although it may have a better provision of services, this approach does not take into account the prevalence of ROY zones in the north and east of Holbeach compared to the status of both Donington and Crowland as non-ROY zones. The data provided in Appendix 9, illustrates that whereas Donington has land available for development in non-ROY areas with a potential cumulative capacity of 1568 additional dwellings, Holbeach only has an available land capacity for 613 additional dwellings in non-ROY areas. In spite of this, Holbeach has been identified as being able to accommodate 1000 additional dwellings over the plan period. We therefore suggest that the housing targets set for Donington should be increased to reflect the favourable approach to building on non-ROY land, rather than focussing on existing services and facilities provision as a benchmark for future development. As a further point, the Local Plan identifies a preference for a dispersed approach to the distribution of development (paragraph 5.16.1) by encouraging growth in the SVs. This is on the basis that it would enable development to occur in non-ROY zones. In this policy instance, the DPD does not appear to consider the lack of facilities within the Service Villages as an issue, it focuses rather on the importance of developing in non-ROY zones; this is contradictory to the justification for the preferred policy option established for housing growth in Crowland and Donington. Based on the above points, we propose that housing growth figure for Donington should be increased in order to allow for it to maintain its role as a MSC and provide additional dwellings for South East Lincolnshire in a sustainable, non-ROY location. There is clear scope for this proposed increase; the available sites submitted through the SHLAA (draft findings) provide a potential capacity for an additional 1568 new dwellings in Donington.

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1150	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	901	Categorisation_of_further_work:		In conclusion, it is considered that, while the wider principles within the South East Lincolnshire preferred options DPD could be considered acceptable, there are some details which are contradictory to one another and some which are not appropriate and suitable within the wider policy context. We do not believe that the overall housing growth targets which have been set for South East Lincolnshire are reflective of the need indicated in the most up to date background evidence documents. Instead they are only reflective of what the authority believes is deliverable. This is an unacceptable method for setting housing growth targets and we therefore believe that the overall targets should be increased to reflect more the levels of housing shown to be required in the Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire Report 2012. We would also contend that the strategic approaches to development distribution, alongside the policies on flood prevention, are in contradiction with the housing allocation targets identified for Crowland and Donington. At present the Plan promotes a wider distribution of development, including the SVs, in order to make best use of non-ROY zones and therefore reduce exposure to flood risk. However, for Donington and Crowland, despite being located in non-ROY zones, the Plan outlines that they should have a relatively low additional dwellings target because of their lack of services and facilities. These two preferred policies contradict each other and should be amended. We propose that the distribution of housing development should focus on the sub-regional centre and the MSCs and provide limited growth in the Service Villages to meet local need. It is also proposed that an increase in the housing requirements for Donington and Crowland is achievable and reasonable.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.40.
Persons_ Name:	Angela Reeve				
Representing_Who?:	Cemex UK Properties				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	1157	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing
Respondents ID Number:	1183	Categorisation_of_further_work:	
Persons_ Name:	Mr S Marthews		
Representing_Who?:	CPRE		

Respondents_Comments:

Developments in Spalding and Boston
CPRE is opposed to both of the large green field developments contained in the plan and seeks their withdrawal.
The first is a development of 1900 new homes to the south west of Boston, and the other 3750 new homes to the west of Spalding. Both are on green field sites and there will be enormous loss of natural habitat and visual intrusion into the landscape as well as danger from flooding
According to CPRE research, in Boston Borough, 80% of the new buildings are to be built in areas at risk of flooding. In South Holland 12.5% of the buildings are at risk. Housing need should be met by better use of existing stock, for example empty residential accommodation above shops and offices, and building only in areas where there is a minimal risk of flooding and properties can be made suitably resilient. Anything else is playing with people's lives and livelihoods
To provide such unsafe housing will do nothing for the reputation of planners or housing departments in either Boston Borough or South Holland District.
It has been suggested to CPRE that the main driver for these large and ill-considered developments is profit, but not private profit, but profit for both Boston Borough and South Holland District, out of which both authorities intend to fund road infrastructure. Boston Borough wants to build a new road linking the A16 and the A52, South Holland wants to see the Spalding Western Relief road built. In neither case in present financial circumstances is there likely to be much government finance. So the political solution enshrined in the draft plan is to let housing rip in unsafe flood-prone green field sites, do irreparable harm to the environment and agricultural production and use the resulting housing development levy to fund the roads.
If safe and sustainable land cannot be provided then CPRE demands that local councillors find the political determination to explain the realities to national politicians and refuse planning permission
The future of rural villages

Officer_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Given the level of housing that is required to be delivered over the plan period there is a need for significant greenfield development at Spalding and Boston in the form of an urban extension. The impact of flood risk on the proposed distribution of additional housing has also been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.

Local politicians are caustic about the villages in the south east of England around London. which they scoff have ceased in many cases to have any real village life or identity and have become mere "dormitory areas" for London. This is sadly true. Local politicians do not appear to understand that continuation of their existing freeze on development in villages, which is deeply resented, will condemn the rural villages in South Lincolnshire to a similar fate.
The scoring applied to villages and the arbitrary classification into sustainable and unsustainable villages destroys social cohesion and guarantees an exodus of young talented people away from the Fens.
CPRE calls for a recognition that on grounds of social justice, all villages should be permitted the development of minimum facilities which would ensure that they become sustainable. The draft plan should set out how the rural villages can become sustainable.
Concentrating development in the main towns of Boston and Spalding denies the villages the ability to develop to meet the needs of their residents or provide alternative safe housing. CPRE calls for an end to this pernicious policy.
The draft plan is silent also with regard to the provision of commercial and industrial land. Although South East Lincolnshire is a predominantly agricultural area, some thought should be given to provision for diversification and development of leisure and culture within the plan area.
The developments in Spalding and Boston which CPRE opposes would be unacceptable even if they were not in an area of serious flood risk. There is no provision in the plan for the facilities which will be needed to support the 10,000 plus additional residents. Already facilities are over stretched, and these developments will overwhelm them.
One test of sustainability is the ease with which residents can reach shops and other normal facilities on foot of by bicycle. If this is a serious criterion, then much of the existing development in Spalding and Boston is unsustainable and the new developments will likewise be uninhabitable without the use of the car or van.

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
				Summary 1. The proposals for developments in flood risk areas on green field sites are irresponsible damaging and potentially dangerous, and should be withdrawn. 2. The sacrifice of Greenfield sites to fund a road building program is, if true, quite scandalous and must be opposed 3. The Red and Orange Zones in South East Lincolnshire should be closed to new development and serious efforts should be made to protect citizens in villages as well as towns by encouraging adaptation for flood resilience. 4. Infrastructure should also be made flood resilient 5. The resented freeze on development in the villages must end and plans put in place to bring all villages to sustainability by permitting the development of minimum facilities taken for granted in larger towns.	
Response_ Number:	1219	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments: Consider allocation of 300 for Donington to be too small. Donington is the 3rd largest town in the District. Has Junior and Secondary School plus all major facilities. Think the number should be increased to 500. The owners of DON 006 request that their site be brought forward into the 0-5 year category. They have developer interest in the land. We supplied evidence when we submitted Availability Assessment that SHDC intimated in May 12 that there were approx. 179 people on their council house waiting list, even though a site of affordable homes had just been delivered by Larkfleet Homes. There is still a need NOW for more homes in Donington. The site is on the same side of the road as the Primary School, play area, within easy reach of the town centre, bus stops and all facilities.	Officer_Response: This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.40. 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.
Respondents ID Number:	1813	Categorisation_of_further_work:			
Persons_ Name:	Angela Newton				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Hartfil				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1240	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q28 - The preferred policy approach 'Distribution and Scale of Housing Development across South East Lincolnshire (2011-2031)' contains proposed housing figures for several individual settlements. Are these about right, too high or too low? Please explain your view. As outlined above, the overall housing target is considered to be at the lower end and could be considered too conservative, particularly if projections for inward migration are even partially accurate. Paragraph 6.8.1 states that it would be unreasonable to appraise any option that considers the provision of less than 2,900 of Boston Borough's additional housing provision within the town itself. This is based on the historic delivery of 65% of the Borough's growth within the town. It is considered, also that the status of Kirton as the only main service centre in the Borough, should mean that housing is also apportioned on at least the same historical basis; this would mean an apportionment of 542 dwellings (12% of the minimum housing target). Land within Ambrose Lighton's control could help to address any current shortfall in supply to achieve this target. The fact that large parts of Kirton are rated as significantly lower flood hazard to Boston, together with the close proximity of Kirton (a main service centre) to Boston, should make this a key focus for sustainable growth.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.13.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1243	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q31 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest? Whilst the provision of 420 units in Kirton is supported and the settlement is considered an appropriate focus for growth it is recommended that the role of Kirton as the only main service centre should be revisited. It is considered that the level of growth in Kirton should reflect as a minimum the historic rate of delivery; 12% which would equate to 542 dwellings, based on the proposed housing targets.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.13.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				
Response_ Number:	1246	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q45 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest? It is considered that there should preferably be a minimum density target set in order to maximise the potential of the limited sites available. Bearing in mind the wider restrictions in the Borough, a minimum threshold of 30 units per hectare would be appropriate and would still allow the creation of family housing at a reasonable density at the base level and could allow for higher densities in more urban locations. There should, however, be flexibility with any target to ensure that a mixture of units, sizes and development types are provided and that development in more rural locations can adapt to any characteristically lower densities.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1247	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q47 - Do you agree with the phasing of development outlined in the preferred policy approach 'Housing Land Supply over the Plan Period'? The approach to housing supply cannot ignore the need to secure a five year supply of deliverable sites in order to be Sound. Accordingly, to comply with the NPPF, sufficient sites must be identified to secure a five year supply (and in Boston's case a five year supply + 20% to reflect historic under delivery).	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				
Response_ Number:	1248	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q48 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest? The only solution to ensure that the housing strategy would be compliant with the NPPF will be to identify additional land on deliverable sites to meet the five year housing land supply target.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown				
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton				

Officer_Recommendation **Objection - No change to the approach is required.**

Response_ Number:	1269	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing
Respondents ID Number:	989	Categorisation_of_further_work:	
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Hobson		
Representing_Who?:	Chestnut Homes		

Respondents_Comments:

Question 27 – Approach to identifying the distribution and scale of additional housing to be provided in South East Lincolnshire up to 2031.

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.

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

Officer_Response:

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

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 competiveness 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

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
				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:	1271	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments: Question 46-48 – Housing Land Supply over the Plan Period It is unclear why a lower rate of housing target has been set for the first five years of the Plan Period i.e. 208 dwellings per annum between 1 April 2011 and 31 March 2016. It is appreciated that mortgage availability has been a constraint but the Government's New-Buy scheme has been designed in collaboration with lenders and house builders to address this problem. We are therefore unconvinced by the rationale for setting a lower target for the initial period. In our view the overall requirements should be averaged out over the whole of the Plan Period rather than seek to impose an artificial restriction particularly when the NPPF is seeking to significantly boost housing development in the short term. The Council states that the lower target for the first five years is necessary to take into account the fragile nature of the housing market. We would question this. Delivery can be assisted in various ways and there are many positive planning measures that could be adopted to assist delivery.	Officer_Response: The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.
Respondents ID Number:	989	Categorisation_of_further_work:			
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Hobson				
Representing_Who?:	Chestnut Homes				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1315	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 28 – Too high for Spalding	Comments noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1318	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Question 31 – See response to Para. 6.2.38	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1319	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Questions 32-34 - See response to Para. 6.2.38	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
Response_ Number:	1331	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Questions 46-48 – As we do not agree with the housing numbers allocated to Spalding (with regard to the huge development north of the Vernatt's), we cannot accept these figures either.	Comments noted.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth				
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic				

Response_ Number:	1368	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1679	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Residential development should not be allowed South of the A17 by-pass, the Town is already cut in halves, there are no facilities South of the by-pass. A dangerous road has to be crossed to get to into the town of Sutton Bridge. Further residential development should not be allowed period. The medical centre is hard pushed to cope with all residents at the moment. Further development would exacerbate the problem. Sutton Bridge is in a high flood risk area and it doesn't make sense to build another 180 houses in the area.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.35.
Persons_ Name:	Sutton Bridge P C				
Representing_Who?:	Themselves				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	1401	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q32 What is the evidence that Spalding needs a Western Relief Road ? The alignment of the railway creates bottlenecks in the east to west and west to east traffic flows through the town. The aim of the Western Relief Road (WRR) is to relieve the anticipated road traffic congestion arising from increased use of the railway and the down time on the level crossing from each train pass. The proposed two large urban extensions to the west of the town will generate additional traffic flows into the town centre. The current traffic flow model assumes up to 20 vehicular movements per dwelling. All the town centre facilities lie to the east of the railway. To access these facilities vehicular traffic has to utilise the three railway level crossing in the town. The implication in the Plan is that the WRR would not be completed until 2031. The Town is already a destination for most of the traffic flows into the town which is the largest centre for retailing (convenience and comparative,) professional services, educational and medical services , entertainment and leisure , public administration financial services , nodal point for traffic mode exchanges . There are alternate routes for road through traffic . Building by 2031 @ 7000 new homes mostly to the west of the railway (+ any windfall site completion numbers) can only generate a considerable additional traffic flows into the town centre. The WRR may after it is completed divert some of the through traffic from the town centre. The addition new homes would result in significant additional inward flow of traffic into Spalding (at 12 movements per house @ 50000 + vehicle movements into the town centre). Most of the vehicle movements originating from the urban extensions will still cross the railway at the level crossings. If the WRR is completed the alternative routes to avoid the level crossings could quadruple the vehicle mileage each trip. Can anyone explain how new build to the west of Spalding is going to reduce the congestion in the town? Through traffic is not the problem; destination traffic is. Do the housing allocations justify using development levy	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
				monies to finance the road or will the road reduce potential future traffic congestion in Spalding. Novel solution to a congestion problem create more congestion	
Response_ Number:	1405	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q36 The criteria are appropriate for identifying suitable locations in all aspects but one. Differences in lifestyles make for bad neighbour relations when the settled community and 'travellers' live closely together. In my limited contacts with the travelling community I have learned that their preference is to live on land in ' common ' ownership or which they own in the open countryside but with reasonable access to the community facilities they need. They also like the settled communities like their privacy . I would suggest that the concept of a cordon sanitaria reinforced by landscaping is insisted on as a planning consent condition to protect privacy and maintain good neighbour relations. The development management process should robustly resist any unauthorised temporary or permanent travelling peoples encampments but should accept that any proposal to establish such a site which meet the plans consent conditions would carry a presumption of consent unless there were significant relevant material planning considerations of sufficient weight to justify a refusal. Travelling people should be encouraged not to purchase a site outright but to secure an option to purchase until that had received outline consent.	It is considered that this issue is adequately addressed by other preferred policy approaches in the Preferred Options Document, for example 'Development Management' and Design of New Development'.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	1407	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		Q39 For those eligible to claim housing benefit almost any rental is affordable because your rent is wholly or partially paid for you by the benefit system. @ 60% of South Holland's council house tenants receive housing benefit. If affordable housing means low cost to build housing, then costs for new build can be reduced by reducing the internal and external spatial specification and fitments specifications. The UK new build homes have the smallest spatial specifications among the developed world affordable housing is less profitable to build. The J Rowntree Trust regularly surveys the size of house people want to live in. '20% want 4+ bed homes, @60% want 3 bed homes and @ 20% want a 1/2 bed hone. The annual completion returns show the 30% of completions are 4+ bed homes , 40% are 3 bed homes and 30% ate 1/2bed homes Not only are too many new homes small they are overcrowded and too many families live in homes with mortgage repayment levels they struggle to meet. The SEL Housing Survey returns indicate the extent of the latent demand for 3 bed dwellings. Affordable Housing Obligations distorts the Housing Market. How many affordable did South Holland build in 2012 ? Social engineering through mixed housing is not always successful however desirable it might be. Site costs are a very significant element in the cost of new build. The housing affordable housing obligation could be secured through the transference if plot ownership or an equivalent cash payment to the Council. The Council could then in partnership with Socially Responsible Landlords , Housing Charities (Spalding TOVSTI Husbands) or the SHDC's own housing company seek grant funding or raise money from the capital markets and build more of the size of affordable housing that is needed . These socially owned properties would lie outside the Housing	These issues have been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.				
				Revenue Budget not subject to right to buy legislation or rent level restraint.	
Response_ Number:	1410	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments: Q42 Build the type and size of affordable housing people need housing with space for their families to grow and small clusters of specialist 1/2 bed housing 2 to 4 units in or near housing into which older citizens and the disabled can continue to live independently with help from their familial or neighbour support network. Community Wellbeing??	Officer_Response: These issues have been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:			
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				
Response_ Number:	1412	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments: Q44 The evidence base for size of dwellings to be built on a particular site ought to be related to the size of individual building plots. Too many large plots will utilise too much of the land allocated for housing. Large plots may reduce the need to allow space for public facilities it is unlikely to diminish the need to traffic and utilities infrastructure It will still be necessary to generate the funding through the affordable housing obligation and the development levy to create the road infrastructure and the necessary public service facilities. A Master Plan approach to the development of the large urban extensions would have to set limits to the size and type of housing expected in each urban extension.	Officer_Response: This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:			
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_ Number:	1414	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	Categorisation_of_further_work:		HOUSING LAND SUPPLY AND RELEASE OVER THE PLAN PERIOD Delivery of housing will depend on the housing market or more accurately the mortgage market. The access to credit and mortgages finance will be more tightly regulated by the Financial Services regulatory regimes for the foreseeable future, or at least the lifetime of this Plan. The proposed release of land does not seem to have any correlation to projected population growth or the even more unpredictable supply of housing finance nor even the capacity of the local and national development industry. The aim is to ensure that there is at least of 5 year supply of land that is available now in a suitable location and be achievable with a reasonable prospect of being completed with a five year period. Available and achievable sites will be spread across the Plan area. Because of the reliance on the 'housing market' there can be no certainty that the major public infrastructure projects dependant on the development levy for completion will be in fact be complete. In Spalding the congestion the WRR project is designed to relieve might not be completed but if substantial development has taken place their will be congestion. Even more alarming is the indication that there may not be a development levy in place or more alarming still that there will be different development levies in place as a tool to attract development. Different affordable housing obligations, differing development levies would render most of the policies contained in the Plan irrelevant. Why have a south East Lincolnshire Development Plan at all?	These issues has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
	Q46 Emphasis that the planned housing release figure are an inspirational target only.

Appendix A

South East Lincolnshire Preferred Options Consultation Report 25 November 2013

Part 5

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Response_ Number:	41	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	992	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	Our client does not support the figures set out in Figure 4.1 as it is considered that setting a limit as to the amount of development that will be allowed within the ROY flood areas jeopardises the ability of the individual LPA's to meet their housing requirements where sites outside of the ROY area do not come forward. A significant proportion of South East Lincolnshire falls within the ROY areas resulting in very few unaffected sites being available and in locations where new development would be most sustainable in terms of accessibility to services and facilities. In this regard our client also does not support Option B (Paragraph 4.22.1) as there is no evidence base to support the respective figures and percentage reductions set out in paragraph 4.18.3 of the document.	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Martin Bagshaw					
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy					

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

Response_ Number:	135	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1750	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	It is important that an artificial lid is not put on development that may suppress economic growth, prevent the area from fulfilling its envisioned role and lead to overcrowded housing. The recent history of the area has amply demonstrated that population growth and economic activity are not constrained (nor stimulated) by numerical planning targets. If the economic conditions are right, the people will come anyway, and restrictions will simply produce overcrowding and sub-standard living conditions.	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J S Birkett					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

Response_ Number:	137	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and
Respondents ID Number:	1750	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**
Persons_ Name:	Mr J S Birkett		
Representing_Who?:	Himself		

Respondents_Comments:

Question 13 states that limits have been placed on the numbers of new homes that can be built in the 'severest flood hazard zones'. I would question whether this is the correct approach as:
- National Planning Policy Framework refers to 'probability', not 'hazard' (See NPPF Para 101)
- The NPPF also advises that where flood risk cannot be avoided altogether, then development should be sited in an area with a lower probability of flooding (see NPPF Para 102)
- 'Hazard' is only an appropriate factor to take into consideration when a choice needs to be made between zones of similar flooding probability. It would not be sensible to favour development in a zone where hazards are low, but the probability of flooding is 1 year in 10, compared to an area where hazards are high but probability is 1 year in 500.
- As far as I have been able to read, no account has been taken of the proposed flood barrier to be built on the Haven, which will greatly reduce probability of flooding in Boston. It seems very strange to plan to spend over £40m on such a project and then completely ignore its benefits.
- It would be more sensible to calculate the likely future need

Officer_Response:

The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

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

				and demand for housing in each locality within the local plan area, and then accommodate it within the areas of lowest flooding probability which are available. It would not make sense to 'transfer' demand from Boston to Algarkirk or Spalding. If people wish to live in Boston then that is where they will go. They will not consult the local plan first.		
Response_ Number:	167	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1752	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	Q12 and Q13 – Do you agree with the identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options for the provision of new housing in ROY Zones and the preferred policy approach which limits the number of new homes in this, the severest flood hazard zone. The identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options for new housing in the ROY zones is accepted. It is considered that some new housing will be required in these areas in order to prevent population lost and economic decline. However, it is considered that there should be a limit on the number of new homes proportionate to existing population figures for these areas.	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Gregory Gray Associates					
Representing_Who?:	The Garden Centre Group					

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

Response_ Number:	660	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1057	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	Too much emphasis is given to flooding, the likelihood of which is only a probability and by no means a certainty. Rather than seeing this as something negative, greater emphasis should be made of designing development that can withstand and mitigate flooding as well. Although areas of greatest flood risk should be avoided, the improved flood defences currently being built in Boston must be taken into consideration when designating land for possible development in the long term future as well as up to date predictions regarding climate change. Limits on numbers of houses must not be so rigidly adhered to so as to cause a shortage of housing at some later stage but should be seen as guidelines.	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr A Austin					
Representing_Who?:	Herself					

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

Response_ Number:	731	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and
Respondents ID Number:	961	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**
Persons_ Name:	Carter Jonas		
Representing_Who?:	RP Worth and Son		

Respondents_Comments:

Provision for Housing: Approach to Identifying the Quantity of Additional Housing to be Provided in South East Lincolnshire up to 2031

Support is given for 'Option B', which is provided as a reasonable option for determining future housing targets across South East Lincolnshire. A fear over future planning applications being submitted on the grounds of a housing shortfall should not deter authorities from seeking greater levels of housing growth, which is much needed within this region. Housing shortfall applications are still required to be determined on the grounds of a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development', and therefore development on such justification would manifest itself in-line with the established strategic pattern of development; being located in higher tier settlements.

Approach to the provision of Additional Housing in those parts of South East Lincolnshire that are Categorised as either Flood-Hazard Zone Red, Orange or Yellow.

Support given for 'Option A', preferred policy option, as it provides a balanced approach that will meet both the housing growth needs of the area and also

Officer_Response:

The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

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

				seek to reduce, as far as practically possible, the incidence of flood risk to both new and existing development.		
Response_ Number:	763	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	Option A is generally a reasonable approach, but Option B is not supported. Option B unduly restricts the amount of development that can occur on ROY land, whereby sustainable development that can be proved to be safe in flood risk terms may be prevented from coming forward simply because of the cap. We do not support the preference for Option B, but support Option A in principle.	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey					

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

Response_ Number:	871	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	Option A is generally a reasonable approach, but Option B is not supported. Option B unduly restricts the amount of development that can occur on ROY land, whereby sustainable development that can be proved to be safe in flood risk terms may be prevented from coming forward simply because of the cap. We do not support the preference for Option B, but support Option A in principle.	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley					

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

Response_ Number:	928	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	Theoretically Option A is a reasonable approach and Option B would appear less so. The policy discussion relating to Option B identifies the fact that, in respect of Boston Borough, the greatest housing proportion will be targeted for Boston town, which is all within the ROY zone. This then effectively relies on development in the surrounding settlements to provide a high proportion of housing delivery outside the ROY zone, irrespective of whether they are the most sustainable locations. This can be addressed either by reducing the proportion of housing that can be provided in the ROY zone or by reducing the housing target for Boston in favour of settlements at lesser risk, but still within the ROY zone. We do not support the preference for Option B, but support Option A in principle.	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes					

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

Response_ Number:	988	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	Option A is generally a reasonable approach, but Option B is not supported. Option B unduly restricts the amount of development that can occur on ROY land, whereby sustainable development that can be proved to be safe in flood risk terms may be prevented from coming forward simply because of the cap. We do not support the preference for Option B, but support Option A in principle.	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties					

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

Response_ Number:	1156	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1183	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	The Executive Committee of CPRE Lincolnshire has asked me to write in response to your consultation relating to the above plan. In making its response to the consultation with regard to the draft South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, the Lincolnshire Branch of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) wishes to concentrate on the housing policies proposed in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan and the need to protect the fenland from flood risk. Also it takes this opportunity to comment on the future viability of rural life and the rural economy in the light of the proposed freeze on development outside of the main towns and “service centres”.. Housing Need CPRE recognises that the last twenty years have seen a substantial increase in household formation which has created a demand for housing which is far outstripping supply and cannot be accommodated in the area covered by the draft plan. The increase is the result of changes in mortality rates, relationship breakdown, inward migration of labour, inward migration of retirees and also the easier commuting provided by improved	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Mr S Marthews					
Representing_Who?:	CPRE					

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

rail services to Spalding.
CPRE does not see the justification for the acceptance in the plan of a lower rate of population growth than was experienced in South Holland in the decades 1991-2001 (13.4% more residents) or 2001 -2011 (15.4% more residents.) Growth experienced in Boston Borough was similar.
At first glance the plan area appears an obvious choice for substantial house building, with low population density and wide open spaces, but this is a misleading impression. CPRE takes the view that because of existing and increasing flood risk the plan area should be one of the last to be developed for this purpose.
A better informed assessment of the area and consideration of its history shows at once that the plan area has always been to a large extent unsafe for house building as a result of the flood risk. This is reflected in the way in times gone by settlements have developed only where silt mounds above sea level offered safe locations. The flood risk is set out in the draft plan and is confirmed by research both by Boston Borough and by South Holland District, which in turns confirms research by DEFRA..

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

The continuing flood risk from sea inundation, river flooding and excessive rainfall is now aggravated by increased water run-off from developments outside the fens and the fact that the land underlying the fens is tipping down into the sea at a rate of some 1.5cms a year.
The danger is increasing not just as a result of natural changes but because of the ill-judged decisions to reduce maintenance of secondary sea defences around the Wash and allow continuing damage to such sea defences.
Some sections being ploughed down by local farmers.
While CPRE acknowledges the national need for new housing, its members are adamant that housing permitted under the plan, must be safe and sustainable.
CPRE Lincolnshire supports the more prescriptive approach to flood risk by the National Planning Policy Framework and urges both Boston and South Holland planning authorities to accept the national guidance that urges planning authorities to direct development away from areas at the highest risk from flooding.
CPRE takes the view that the considerable success of the Internal Drainage Boards in the fens in controlling water content and preventing flooding has lulled

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

residents and businesses into a false sense of security
For flood risk purposes, the draft plan divides South east Lincolnshire into three zones:
- Red where all property is at risk,
- Orange where most properties are at risk and
- Yellow where some properties would be at risk from sea flooding.
The remaining land has a residual risk from river flooding or excess rainfall.
The statement in paragraph 4.7.2 of the draft plan which is a refusal to impose guidelines on development on the plan area is in CPRE's view a breach of the duty of care owed by local authorities to its residents. It is irresponsible.
CPRE calls for a recognition that the Red & Orange Zone must be closed to further development and in all zones there is an urgent need to make existing properties and vital infrastructure including the pumping stations flood resilient.
Inundation of the plan area will not only put lives in jeopardy, and destroy livelihoods, but will seriously damage the nation's food security.

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

Response_ Number:	1165	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1053	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	Flood Risk The Draft Local Plan constantly refers to flood risk as if it was a certainty. It is not a certainty it is only a possibility. The last time that Boston suffered a serious flood was over 200 years ago and with improved defences it may well be another 200 years before there is a significant problem. I am pleased to say that after years of lobbying by local councillors the Environment Agency have softened their hard line and this softening policy should continue. However in the current Daft Plan the perceived flood risk still will unnecessarily restrict housing development in many parts of the Borough. The many new arrivals in Boston choose to live near the centre of the town, close to facilities. In the lifetime of this local plan they will need improved housing. Flood risk can be mitigated by appropriate building design so development should not be unduly hampered by the flood risk issue.	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr Richard Austin					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

Response_ Number:	1230	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	Q12 - Do you agree with the identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options outlined in sections 4.17 – 4.22 under Approach to the Provision of Additional Housing in Those Parts of South East Lincolnshire that are Categorised as Either Flood-Hazard Zone Red, Orange or Yellow in the full consultation document? We agree with the conclusions of this document that it would be unworkable and without justification to consider providing for Boston's housing needs within South Holland (4.17.1 to 4.17.4). Option A is, however, essentially an artificial construct which will as a result put significant pressure on smaller settlements which are less well equipped to deal with new growth. Growth should be directed to the most sustainable settlements, such as Kirton which is a Main Service Centre, as it has the facilities to support new population. Large parts of Kirton are a low probability of flooding and with appropriate mitigation measures will be entirely appropriate to accommodate new growth. It is considered to be a flawed	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown					
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton					

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

approach to simply overlook the potential of locations on the basis of a blanket restriction of all ROY zones without more of a critical examination to weigh up Red, Orange and Yellow locations, their relative flood hazard status and the sustainability and deliverability of growth.

If a more rigorous up front assessment of sites is not feasible then any final cap on development in ROY zones should be in order to limit genuine flood risk/hazard and should not be so restrictive that it undermines wider growth objectives.

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

Response_ Number:	1231	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	Q13 - The preferred policy approach 'Provision for Housing' proposes limits on the number of new homes that can be built in the severest flood hazard zones. Do you agree with this approach and, if not, please explain your views? It is recognised that the spatial approach must take account of the issue of coastal flood risk in determining the appropriate locations for future growth. The preferred Policy Option B compounds the concerns raised above with Option A by further limiting the level of development in ROY areas with an arbitrary cap. The problem with a cap on ROY zones is best illustrated by looking at the housing delivery figures. We can see from paragraph 4.24.2 that it is intended to deliver no more than 3,600 units in ROY zones which leaves over 920 units to be delivered in non-ROY zones. Currently, however, the SHLAA has only identified capacity for up to 242 units in non-ROY zones, which leaves a significant shortfall (assuming that all of the housing identified in the SHLAA can be delivered, which is by no means certain).	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown					
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton					

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

To ensure that there is no impact on an already conservative housing target it is essential that the correct balance is struck between allowing development in sustainable locations, which are attractive to the market, in low flood hazard locations whilst ensuring that development is as far as possible steered away from the highest flood hazard/risk locations.

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

Response_ Number:	1232	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	Q14 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest? Given the fact that the key development centres (Boston and Kirton) are both located within ROY zones, it is considered that rather than providing a blanket cap on development in ROY zones the JPA should instead consider applying at the strategic level the refined sequential approach for selecting location at least hazard and/or probability of flooding (advocated for the selection of Broad Locations at paragraph 4.22.2). This will ensure that the policy objectives set out at paragraph 4.24 are fulfilled but that suitable sites, which through appropriate mitigation would be safe from flooding, are not overlooked.	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown					
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton					

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

Response_ Number:	1376	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	Q7 The area with the greatest threat of significant damage in the event of a major flood incidence have been identified. Some of these settlements satisfy the sustainability criteria in part because the existing flood management measures reduce the possibility of major flood event occurring. An increasing threat from rising sea levels predates the current concerns around climate change . Addressing the increasing threat from rising sea levels is not a technical problem but the associated expense and a diminishing political will to emulate king Canute. It would not be prudent to ignore the fact of rising sea levels and the increasing expense and erosion of the political will. The question is what to do about the existing settlements and isolated properties in the red most at risk zone. The first response is not to unnecessarily add to the problem. No more residential development in areas with the greatest risk from flooding and only any necessary infrastructure development for which there is no appropriate subject to an insistence that such development has the highest	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

technically possible standard of mitigation and resilience protection.

Development in the orange most properties face some risk and the yellow some properties at risk zones In these areas development could be permitted subject to robust planning consent conditions relating to appropriate flood prevention and flood resilience measures. (These issues can be addressed through design - 3 storey dwellings with garaging and utility facilities at ground level, return valves of water supply and disposal, electricity circuits at waist level of ground floor spaces) Building regulation specifications like those in the Netherlands.

Flood resilience compliance will be an addition cost pressure on new build and in adapting existing properties to satisfy flood resilience standards. It need not make new build properties unaffordable (it doesn't in the Netherlands) and would confer substantial benefits on property owners making their properties insurable, mortgagable and sellable. In itself compliance with flood prevention and flood resilience measures would not inhibit development. It would

Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.		
	address the political questions. If you choose to live in a high flood area should those who choose not to do so subsidise the property and contents insurance of those who do? And if you chose to live in areas of high flood risk should those who don't pay more tax than they need to so you can continue to enjoy your property and life style?	

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

Response_ Number:	1381	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	Q 12 There should be no new residential development in the red zone areas most likely to flood. In the orange and yellow flood risk zones planning consent conditions to enforced appropriate flood risk mitigation and resilience measures areas should apply. The setting of caps to limit the number of new build in areas of potential flooding while it may placate local landowners and help to maintain some settlement's sustainability comes at a price. Homeowners through insurance premiums and taxpayers will be expected to subsidise peoples right to live where they choose. This is unfair and unjust. The expectation of unlimited economic growth is unreasonable. Service provision that benefits householders and residents in a defined geographical area should expect to make the major contribution to the cost of providing that benefit. Part of that cost would be some restriction to live where you choose. Some equitable way needs to be found to help existing home owners render the properties as safe from flooding and its consequences. If a policy of prohibition reduces the sustainability and hence attractiveness of threatened	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.			
		communities then let it happen. The policy of planned retreat in the face of coastal erosion is more viable then playing Canute. The Plan should make it clear that not every house or settlement can be fully protected from the consequences of natural change.	

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

Response_ Number:	1268	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	989	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	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.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.7-6.11.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Hobson					
Representing_Who?:	Chestnut Homes					

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.

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

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

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 competiveness 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

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

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

Response_ Number:	141	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1750	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	There appears to be a considerable imbalance between proposed development in Boston and in Spalding, bearing in mind that between 2001 and 2011, the increase in population was slightly higher in Boston than in South Holland. The figures on your table show that currently there is more house building activity in Boston than in Spalding (although that is for a very limited period). It is understood that the main reason for this imbalance, allocating twice as much development in the smaller town than the larger, is the flood risk situation. But flood risk is only one factor of many to be taken into account. It is a very important factor, but does appear to be driving decision making almost single handedly, wielding far more weight than any other planning considerations, or set of considerations. In any future documents this will need to be carefully and explicitly justified in some detail. I would reiterate my opinion that demand for housing in Boston cannot be successfully diverted to Spalding	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J S Birkett					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

Response_ Number:	246	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1759	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**A**	It is accepted that a criteria-based policy approach should be adopted in guiding site allocations. It is not accepted that the level of housing should be capped within ROY zones if the settlement hierarchy is to be adhered to and the relevant site selection criteria are met. The limit to the level of development on ROY sites in a village such a Sutterton could restrict future development with a consequent detrimental impact on the sustainability of the settlement with existing services and facilities coming under economic pressure to remain viable and open. Whilst the principles behind the ROY approach are understood a greater capacity for development on those sites within the most sustainable settlements should be considered as these settlements including Sutterton are likely to remain the most desirable places for people to live in the future given their existing range of facilities and services.	The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.	Objection - No change to the approach is required.
Persons_ Name:	Jonathan Ireland					
Representing_Who?:	Irelands Farm Machinery					

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

Response_ Number:	17	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1725	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	Basically the planned provision is dramatically too low, particularly for Boston. Following the 2011 census the latest ONS estimate is for Boston's population to increase by 11,000 during the period 2011 – 2021. If the average household remains constant at about 2.4 persons this equates to 4583 houses in total or 458 per year. Just over double what's in the plan. For South Holland the numbers are 14,000, 5833 & 583. This is better but still some 25% under the ONS projections. Given that the council is constantly arguing that central government consistently under estimates Boston's population growth to disbelieve them at this time seems a little strange. I would also state that I want to live in a modern thriving community with good services, transport links & opportunities. To provide this the area needs to achieve a suitable critical mass to attract and fund this provision. Being sparsely populated has been tried and does not bring many rewards to the population. Let's grasp this opportunity and go for a modern properly populated community with the improved provision of	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Jeff Elms					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

opportunities that brings.

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

Response_ Number:	39	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and
Respondents ID Number:	992	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**
Persons_ Name:	Martin Bagshaw		
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy		

Respondents_Comments:

The proposed approach to delivering housing identifies two reasonable options of which Option A suggests that housing targets are identified following objectively assessed housing needs surveys in accordance with Paragraph 47 of the NPPF.
Our client considers this to be the correct approach but would question the use of figures for the South Holland area which were last assessed in the Peterborough Sub-Region SHMA of 2010. These figures are now considered to be significantly out-of-date, fail to represent an up to date and objectively assessed housing need and do not examine requirements up to the end of the plan period.
In this regard our client is of the considered opinion that the level of annual housing provision required to be provided in South Holland over the plan period is likely to be in excess of the 470 dwellings per annum set out in Table 4.6, although the proposed figure would need to be determined through the completion of an up to date SHMA.
With regard to the second option our client considers that it is not appropriate to apportion and extrapolate figures from the East Midlands Plan as this has now

Officer_Response:

The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.		
	been abolished although it is accepted that this has occurred in the period since the consultation document was approved for publication by the committee for the purposes of consultation.	

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

Response_ Number:	40	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	992	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	The proposed approach to delivering housing identifies two reasonable options of which Option A suggests that housing targets are identified following objectively assessed housing needs surveys in accordance with Paragraph 47 of the NPPF. Our client considers this to be the correct approach but would question the use of figures for the South Holland area which were last assessed in the Peterborough Sub-Region SHMA of 2010. These figures are now considered to be significantly out-of-date, fail to represent an up to date and objectively assessed housing need and do not examine requirements up to the end of the plan period. In this regard our client is of the considered opinion that the level of annual housing provision required to be provided in South Holland over the plan period is likely to be in excess of the 470 dwellings per annum set out in Table 4.6, although the proposed figure would need to be determined through the completion of an up to date SHMA. With regard to the second option our client considers that it is not appropriate to apportion and extrapolate figures from the East Midlands Plan as this has now	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Martin Bagshaw					
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy					

Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.						
				been abolished although it is accepted that this has occurred in the period since the consultation document was approved for publication by the committee for the purposes of consultation.		
Response_ Number:	138	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1750	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	Option A is chosen as the preferred option as, 'it is considered deliverable when compared with historic building rates' and due to the problem of demonstrating a 5 year supply of land. I believe that these reasons are insufficient, and too pragmatic. They should be based on a substantiated conviction that they are appropriate in terms of the needs and aspirations of the area.	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J S Birkett					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

Response_ Number:	165	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and
Respondents ID Number:	1752	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**
Persons_ Name:	Gregory Gray Associates		
Representing_Who?:	The Garden Centre Group		

Respondents_Comments:

Q 10 – Do you agree with the identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options?
The assessment of the reasonable and unreasonable options for the provision of housing is considered to be overly conservative given the Government's drive for economic growth and stated aim to 'boost significantly the supply of housing' as set out in the NPPF.

The preferred option (Option A) appears to have been chosen on the basis purely that it is 'deliverable when compared with historic building rates' and yet it appears to propose housing numbers significantly below both ONS projections, the figures from the RSS 2009 and indeed the building rate between 2001 and 2010 identified in Appendix 11 of the Plan.

It is not considered appropriate to base the reasonableness of housing figures purely on their deliverability in light of historic building rates. The emerging Plan is being formulated within a new policy climate provided by the NPPF. This is substantially more 'Pro-Growth' than the previous regime and sees the provision of a greater supply of appropriately

Officer_Response:

The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.						
				located housing as fundamental to achieving economic growth.		
Response_ Number:	166	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1752	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	Q11 – Does the preferred policy approach 'Provision for Housing' feature housing figures that are about right, too high or too low? It is considered that the proposed housing figure is too low given that the provision of an appropriate supply of housing is recognised as essential to achieving the sustainable development of an area. Accordingly, it is requested that the proposed housing figures are revised upwards and that, as a minimum, Option B which provides for a total of 810 dpa within South East Lincolnshire, is adopted.	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Gregory Gray Associates					
Representing_Who?:	The Garden Centre Group					

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

Response_ Number:	234	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1758	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	The approach to identifying the quantity of additional housing is clearly set out within the NPPF. At the heart of this document is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, 'a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.' With regard to plan-making this is stated as meaning the following: •Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of the area; and •Local plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. The NPPF does not specifically define what 'objectively assessed housing needs' means but it does clearly offer guidance on using a proportionate evidence base. This includes: •The assessment is up-to-date; •The preparation of a Strategic Housing Market Assessment which: meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change; addresses the need for all types of housing; and	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Woods Hardwick Planning					
Representing_Who?:	Wheatley PLC					

caters for demand.
- Prepare a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment to establish realistic assumptions about suitability of land to meet the need for housing over the plan period.

It is worth noting an on-going issue relating to a Core Strategy that is currently going through the examination process. The West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Examination Hearings commenced in Mid April 2013 and ran through to early May 2013. In view of the revocation of the East Midlands Regional Strategy and representations made at the Hearing regarding updated population projections, the Inspector called a halt to proceedings in light of concerns about whether the West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit had objectively assessed housing need.

There are two key lessons to be drawn from this particular situation, which provide clear guidance moving forward:
- The importance of meeting the test of 'objectively assessed needs'. This reinforces the status of the NPPF as the primary basis for guidance in the plan-making process;

- The Inspector, through the Programme Officer, stated that the assessment:

'…will take into account both the latest Office of National Statistics (ONS) household projections and the early 2011 Census results, including by reference to the "How Many Homes/What Homes Where Toolkit", recently launched by Lord Taylor at the House of Lords.'

This example, as highlighted in the penultimate bullet point above, clearly places the NPPF as the principal guidance document for the preparation of a development plan and the NPPF at paragraph 159 offers a clear steer as to what the evidence base should comprise to objectively assess housing need. The key point is that the evidence base for establishing need should be comprehensive and up-to-date.

The approach of the Joint Planning Committee

The Draft Strategy sets out a number of documents which it considers forms the evidence base for identifying the housing need for the Plan Area. These comprise:

- The East Midlands Regional

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

Strategy;
- Strategic Housing Market Assessments – Coastal Lincolnshire which covers Boston Borough (2012) and Peterborough Sub Region which covers South Holland (Update 2010);
- Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire 2012;
- South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2012; and
- Housing Completion data for South East Lincolnshire.

In addition to the above documents, the Plan quite rightly has regard to flood risk.
In light of this evidence base, the Plan sets out what are considered to be reasonable and unreasonable policy options in seeking to identify the quantity of additional housing to be provided over the plan period to 2031.

The reasonable options identified are:
- Option A – Setting targets in accordance with the NPPF, using objectively-assessed housing needs set out in the respective SHMA's; and
- Option B – Use the 'Annual (housing) Apportionment from 2006' contained in the East Midlands Regional Plan and

extend this to 2031.

The unreasonable policy options identified are:

- Option C – Use the 'Migration-Led A' scenario set out in the Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire to inform housing targets for South East Lincolnshire.

- Option D – Use the 'Migration-Led B' scenario set out in the Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire to inform housing targets for South East Lincolnshire.
- Option E – Zero population growth.

These representations disagree with the both the reasonable and unreasonable policy options as set out. Dealing with them in turn:

Option A

This option is considered acceptable in so far as it goes. As clearly stated within the NPPF and highlighted by the West Northants example, the evidence base that informs housing need will comprise a SHMA(s) but it is not limited to that.

The Inspector in the West Northamptonshire case, referred

specifically to recent good guidance centred around updated census statistics. Therefore, whilst on the face of it, Option A is in accordance with the NPPF, it is not considered to provide a sufficiently robust basis for quantifying the housing need i.e. it does not take account of the latest ONS figures and projections, which are utilised in Options C and D.

Option A quantifies the need as being 696 per annum over the plan period, totalling 13,920 over the Plan Period. This is split into 226 per annum in Boston Borough and 470 per annum for South Holland.

The Preferred Option for the Plan is Option A and the justification for this is that it is considered deliverable when compared to historic building rates. The historic build rates are based on an average taken over the period 1976-2012, which are as follows for the two areas:

- Boston Borough – 263 dwellings per annum;
- South Holland District – 414 dwellings per annum.

It is not considered to constitute sound planning for a number of reasons.

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

First and foremost it is not appropriate to justify future growth on the basis of past trends. There is a debate to be had with regard to the total annual requirement identified. However, to justify this on the basis of previous completions is not appropriate. The average completions set out above are taken over a period of 26 years, during which the United Kingdom has been subject to a number of economic recessions.

The Coalition Government, since taking office, has consistently sought to streamline and simplify the planning system as it places this central to implementing the recovery and growth of the country's economy. In that context the Coalition's key messages include securing a step change in delivery and getting Britain building again.

In light of the Coalition's approach and the overall thrust of the NPPF, it is not appropriate to plan for the future, based on trends from the past.

Option B
Events have in all likelihood overtaken this option now, with the East Midlands Regional Strategy now having been

abolished. It therefore forms no basis for establishing housing need. Notwithstanding this, the evidence base that supported the annual apportionment from 2006 would now be considered to be out of date and therefore does not comprise a robust evidence base on which to carry out an objective assessment of housing need.

In light of the abolition of the Regional Strategy and the evidence base that supported the Plan, Option B is submitted as being an unreasonable option.

Option C
This option provides a 'Migration-Led' 'trend' scenario taking account of evidence from mid-year estimates released by the Office of National Statistics published in November 2011. These are set out in Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire. The document sets out official and indicative mid-year estimates for Boston and South Holland in 2010 and they are as follows:

	Official MYE	Indicative MYE
Boston Borough	59,042	63,098
South Holland	84,561	87,442

Since the production of these

figures, ONS published on the 30th May 2013 updated 2011 mid-year population estimates which are 64,615 for Boston and 88,390 for South Holland. These provide credence to the indicative MYE estimates set out above and suggest that previous work has under estimated population growth in these areas.

The Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire report states that ONS has an on-going programme of 'improvement' to its estimation technologies to ensure that accurate data on immigration and emigration is used in its mid-year estimates.

In the context of the requirements of the NPPF, it is submitted that the latest figures published by ONS should form an important part of the evidence base for the assessment of the housing need over the plan period. Currently, the need proposed to be planned for is based on the latest SHMA. The use of an up-to-date SHMA is supported by the NPPF but recent advice and approach clearly shows that the use of ONS figures should also form a key part of carrying out an objectively based assessment of housing need.

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

Option C should therefore not be rejected as an unreasonable option.

Option D
The rationale behind this scenario is similar to Option C, except that it constrains population growth. The comments made in respect of Option C apply equally here in terms of up-to-date evidence and support the fact that option D should not be rejected as an unreasonable option.

Option E
This option of zero growth is unreasonable as it does not plan to meet the objectively based assessment of need.

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

Response_ Number:	235	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and
Respondents ID Number:	1758	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**
Persons_ Name:	Woods Hardwick Planning		
Representing_Who?:	Wheatley PLC		

Respondents_Comments:

The NPPF clearly states that local plans should meet objectively assessed needs and it goes on to say that this should be established by using an evidence base that includes an up-to-date SHMA. Recent advice and practice in plan making has also identified the use of up-to-date ONS figures as forming a key part of that evidence base.

The preferred policy approach bases the housing figures on the recent SHMA's. It does not consider that basing housing need on more recent population/household estimates is a reasonable option. Those figures, whether you take the 2011 figures or the latest 2013 figures, clearly show that a higher level of housing is required over the plan period. The use of the most up-to-date information should inform the assessment of need.

The plan rejects the population/household estimates based assessments but does not appear to offer any substantive reason why.

Based on clear guidance within the NPPF regarding the undertaking of an objectively

Officer_Response:

The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.			
		based assessment of need, it is submitted that additional housing needs to be identified to meet a need clearly evidenced by up-to-date population growth figures. The figure is therefore too low.	

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

Response_ Number:	281	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	967	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	AAA have concerns that the selection of Option A as the preferred option for the provision of overall housing across South East Lincolnshire reflects an over cautionary approach to providing housing growth for the respective Districts. It is disturbing that recent demographic studies commissioned on behalf of the local authorities that factor in migration trends are discounted as unreasonable options because they generate housing levels deemed undeliverable compared against the benchmark of historical housing completions. The NPPF requires authorities to meet the full objectively assessed housing needs for their areas using the most up to date evidence and so a constraint- led approach based on historical performance will not boost significantly the supply of housing if previous housing completions do not met all future housing needs established through up to date forecasting. In these circumstances the LPA's should be examining the opportunities available to address constraints to housing delivery going forward rather than looking back to historical performance as a benchmark for the future provision.	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates					
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese					

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

Response_ Number:	282	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	967	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	On the basis of the response to Q10 above, we consider that the overall provision for housing figure is probably too low. With due respect to the constraints of flood risk within South East Lincolnshire, the starting figure for housing provision should be higher than that currently proposed when considering projected population growth and in-migration trends.	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates					
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese					

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

Response_ Number:	309	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	889	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	We consider the housing provision in Boston should be higher. We disagree with the Council's own approach of planning for a lower housing target of Option A, based on future economic uncertainty (paragraph 4.15.2). This goes against the ethos of the National Planning Policy Framework('the Framework'), to plan for growth. Option A allows for an annual target of 226 dwellings in Boston which is based on the SHMA. The SHMA uses 2008 based household projections. There is no reference to the latest 2011 based household projections which for Boston between 2011 and 2021 equate to 500 households per annum. This is considerably higher than the preferred option for an annual requirement of 226 dwellings in Boston. Given the sub-regional centre status of Boston we would recommend a higher annual housing figure is taken forward which more positively plans for growth. Paragraph 47 of the Framework requires local planning authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing – Paragraph 50 requires local planning authorities to plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr Mark Johnson					
Representing_Who?:	Assura Properties Limited					

Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.			
		needs of different groups in the community. Paragraph 158 and 159 clearly set out the requirements for establishing a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. This includes using up-to-date and relevant evidence including housing and population projections. We suggest reference should be made to the most up to date evidence of housing need in the 2011 based household projections (April 2013).	

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

Response_ Number:	310	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	889	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	We consider the housing provision in Boston should be higher. We disagree with the Council's own approach of planning for a lower housing target of Option A, based on future economic uncertainty (paragraph 4.15.2). This goes against the ethos of the National Planning Policy Framework('the Framework'), to plan for growth. Option A allows for an annual target of 226 dwellings in Boston which is based on the SHMA. The SHMA uses 2008 based household projections. There is no reference to the latest 2011 based household projections which for Boston between 2011 and 2021 equate to 500 households per annum. This is considerably higher than the preferred option for an annual requirement of 226 dwellings in Boston. Given the sub-regional centre status of Boston we would recommend a higher annual housing figure is taken forward which more positively plans for growth. Paragraph 47 of the Framework requires local planning authorities to boost significantly the supply of housing – Paragraph 50 requires local planning authorities to plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr Mark Johnson					
Representing_Who?:	Assura Properties Limited					

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

needs of different groups in the community. Paragraph 158 and 159 clearly set out the requirements for establishing a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. This includes using up-to-date and relevant evidence including housing and population projections.
We suggest reference should be made to the most up to date evidence of housing need in the 2011 based household projections (April 2013).

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

Response_ Number:	319	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and
Respondents ID Number:	932	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**
Persons_ Name:	Mr Neil Osborn		
Representing_Who?:	Larkfleet Homes		

Respondents_Comments:

We SUPPORT the recitation of national policy and obligations as set out at paragraphs 4.0.1 – 4.1.12. This sets an appropriate framework for consideration of the issues. Reference to the East Midlands Regional Plan is wholly inappropriate unless expressed in the past tense and where it is made clear that it is a matter of historic record. It is for the Joint Local Authorities to establish their own strategy based upon evidence which can be justified under examination in terms of a strategy to address potential flood protection measures in relation to the scale and distribution of growth that is needed to sustain a viable community.
Overall however whilst it is appropriate to set out a thumbnail picture of the evidence base we are significantly concerned that some of the data appears either out of date or not to have been specifically researched for the preparation of the Local Plan. However we welcome the acknowledgement at paragraph 4.3.1 that "In the proposed absence of a regionally-imposed target, there is a need to identify a requirement for housing growth in South East Lincolnshire up to 2031. Given that Boston

Officer_Response:

The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

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

Borough and South Holland District Councils retain their separate roles as local planning authorities for development management purposes, this requirement needs to be based on separate specified targets for Boston Borough and South Holland District"

Reference to the Duty to Co-operate might also be spelt out so that there is a clear understanding that, whilst individually responsible, the Authorities will work together to achieve an appropriate balance of housing distribution having regard to all material considerations.

Specifically in relation to the assessment of housing need, we note the contents of paragraphs 4.2.10 – 4.2.12 under the heading Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire and that analytical work was completed in March 2012. The Joint authorities will be aware that subsequent population projections have been published by the ONS and that before proceeding further the baseline data on household projections and housing demand should be fully revised and updated.

We note and suggest that the Joint Authorities reflect upon the recognition that some settlements whilst nominally at

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

risk of flood have, in practical terms, a low potential flood risk – in particular we welcome reference to Kirton and Fishtoft as such locations at paragraph 4.2.13 and consider that the housing development strategy should have regard to such considerations.

Overall, with regard to the approach to flood risk we broadly SUPPORT Option A as we acknowledge the specific constraints and issues as the affect the Joint Planning Area. However the issue of flood risk does not in our view abrogate responsibility to the existing and prospective population to ensure that adequate economic and housing opportunities are provided and that the obligations of other national planning policies are met in full. It is therefore for the Local Plan to demonstrate that Option A will have only a neutral impact upon economic development and housing considerations.

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

Response_ Number:	320	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and
Respondents ID Number:	932	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**
Persons_ Name:	Mr Neil Osborn		
Representing_Who?:	Larkfleet Homes		

Respondents_Comments:

We OBJECT to preferred Policy Option A for housing provision.

Policy Options A and B are not reasonable policy options as they are based on only partial evidence of need. Whilst the SHMA provides a picture of the housing market as it presently affects the Joint Authority areas this is now 2010 based and out of date. In particular it references policies in the East Midlands Regional Plan now revoked and specifically covers changes in the housing market in the most difficult period 2007-2010. It is based upon ONS 2008-based sub-national population projections which have now been replaced. It is explicitly not a tool for policy setting but merely a part of the evidence base. The SHMA in fact concludes:

"Overall, the levels of both demand and need in the district are significant and the findings of the SHMA update can support the local authority to develop policies which will assist them in meeting housing needs and demands both now and into the future."

Demonstrably a SHMA cannot and is not intended alone to form the basis of determining the scale of future housing provision, and Option A fails to recognise the requirement of Paragraph 50 of

Officer_Response:

The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

the Framework to plan on the basis of a range of policy demographic, market and social considerations.

Policy Option B is also wholly inappropriate. The East Midlands Plan – which was based on even earlier demographic data has now been revoked. Whilst it may play a role in providing an assessment of the scale of housing requirements for the purposes of appeals until it is formally replaced by more up to date information contained in an adopted Local Plan it is not a suitable basis for preparing that Local Plan without rigorous testing.

Options C and D must be the starting point for housing policy and it is insufficient merely to say that such provision levels are undeliverable. The level of need which they reflect has regard to consideration of wider sub-regional issues and unless it can be demonstrated that the housing needs of the Joint Local Plan area are being accommodated elsewhere the provisions of the Framework Paragraphs 14 and 47 requiring Plans to meet in full objectively assessed need, which proactively drive economic growth and which boost significantly the supply of housing must prevail.

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

We therefore strongly OBJECT to Table 4.7 and paragraphs 4.14.1-4.14.13 as they do not provide a rigorous assessment of impacts and provide no rational basis for assessing choice or the outcomes of choice of strategy. The failure to do so and the failure of the Plan to properly assess housing need, based on proper evidence, will render the Plan unsound.

We consequently OBJECT to the preferred option for delivery. It follows that the failure to rigorously assess need and to plan accordingly for its provision renders the Local Plan unsound and that its strategy for delivery – which appears to be little more than an expectation that if a certain number of dwellings have been constructed in the past it must be possible for a similar number to be constructed in the future is a wholly inadequate approach to development planning. It is an abrogation of the requirement under Paragraph 47 of the Framework to boost significantly the supply of housing land and it is a failure of the Local Plan to deliver national planning objectives including those pertaining to development in rural areas.

In principle Larkfleet Homes SUPPORT the distribution of development set separate limits

Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.			
		on the number of additional dwellings provided in the Red, Orange and Yellow flood-hazard zones (the ROY zones) for Boston Borough and South Holland District based on the approach outlined in Principal 1 in Planning for Coastal Flood Risk in South East Lincolnshire. It is considered that such differentiation is appropriate in seeking to address the specific flood risk issues that are identified. However that should not rule out development where it is needed and where it can be adequately defended. We therefore note the Strategic Approach to Flood Risk as set out at paragraph 4.24 but OBJECT to the absence of any clear evidence within this Plan as to the actual capacity of areas around key identified settlement which are within the different ROY categories and how this can be reliably used to inform the scale of development to be allocated.. We OBJECT to the Provision for Housing for the reasons set out above.	

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

Response_ Number:	926	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	The identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options would appear acceptable, but it does not appear that the preference for one option to serve both administrative areas is suitable. Paragraph 4.16.1 explains that Option A is preferred because the historic build rates would suggest this is achievable. In respect of Boston Borough the historic rate of development of 263dpa substantially exceeds the Option A target of 226dpa, whereas the Option B target of 270dpa would appear consistent.	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes					

Response_ Number:	927	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	The preferred provision for housing policy approach for Boston is too low in terms of the housing target, as the historic build rate is far greater (15%) than the preferred Option A.	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes					

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

Response_ Number:	930	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	We request that the provision of housing target for Boston is increased to the Housing Quantity Option B figure of 270dpa, to match the current build rate, and that the Reasonable Policy Option A is used to provide the final Provision for Housing. This increases the annual Housing Target to 270dpa of which 230dpa (85%) can be delivered in the ROY zone. This equates to a total housing provision of 5,400 in the Boston Borough of which 4,590 can be built in the ROY zone.	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes					

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

Response_ Number:	1146	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	901	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	Paragraphs 4.11 4.16.2 of the DPD set out the approach to identifying the quantity of additional housing to be provided in South East Lincolnshire up to 2031 and establishes the preferred option to be Option A. Option A comprises an overall target of 696 additional dwellings pa for South East Lincolnshire; 226 allocated in the Boston Borough and 470 allocated in the South Holland District. Option A uses the housing needs set out in the respective SHMAs to establish a target and is identified as the preferred policy option as it is considered deliverable when compared with historic build rates. Option A is the lowest of the options provided, bar Option E which is based on a scenario of zero population growth . Although the use of SHMAs in setting housing targets is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, Paragraph 159), we would not consider that the chosen target is the best option in this instance for the reasons outlined below. The main purpose of the SHMA is to quantify demand and assist in establishing targets for types of market housing and the need for affordable housing; it should not necessarily be used to inform	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Angela Reeve					
Representing_Who?:	Cemex UK Properties					

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

overall growth targets. After reviewing the SHMA for the Peterborough Sub-region, we have identified that the housing target for South Holland provided in Policy Option A (470 dwellings pa), is just one of three scenarios for growth set forward for the district in this document. The main analysis in the report is based
on an assumed house building rate of 540 dwellings pa and not 470. The SHMA also identifies an estimated need for 587 additional affordable housing units per annum in order to meet the needs of the population. It is therefore unclear to us why the lower target has been chosen when a higher housing figure will go further in addressing the affordable housing need. The SHMA identifies that the higher the level of house building, the lower the likely requirement for additional affordable housing; therefore a policy option which encouraged building more houses rather than less should be promoted for viability purposes within this context. We would suggest that housing targets should be set in accordance with the assessed need for new homes rather than on what is considered the most deliverable option. The SHMA relevant to Boston Borough

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

(Coastal Lincolnshire SHMA) was completed in 2012 however the SHMA upon which the target figures for the South Holland District are based (Peterborough Sub-Region) was completed in 2010. In the absence of an up to date SHMA for South Holland, we consider that the housing targets informed by the Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire Report 2012 (Options C and D), are more reflective of the current need for housing in the South Holland District.
The Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire Report, identifies two migration-led growth scenarios to distinguish the average number of additional dwellings needed pa. Migration-led A scenario, uses evidence from the 2011 MYE to ascertain a need for an additional 1236 dwellings pa; 553 in Boston Borough and 683 in South Holland District. Migration-led B scenario is similar to migration-led A scenario except that the projections are constrained to the populations evident in ONS SNPP 2010 . Scenario B establishes an estimated need for 1147 additional dwellings pa; 520 in Boston Borough and 627 in South Holland District. There is no clear reasoning provided for why Policy Options C and D are considered

unreasonable other than that they would appear to be undeliverable based on the experience of the last 35 years or so.

We consider this is insufficient justification for dismissing these targets. The targets should be based on the needs identified in the evidence base, as is stated in the NPPF (paragraph 47). We would also argue that the experience of the last 35 years is irrelevant, especially within the context of the NPPF, which encourages Local Authorities to significantly boost the supply of housing; not to set targets which are shaped by past occurrences.

Notwithstanding the above, it is also noteworthy that the SHMA identifies that in 2007/8, 560 homes were built in the South Holland district; with the housing market widely reported to be improving, we would argue that there is a capacity and a demand for a higher overall housing target. A potential argument for dismissing Options C & D is that they require a higher level of dwellings pa to be built within the Boston Borough which, due to flooding concerns, could be deemed unsustainable. However, we can see no reason why higher housing targets cannot be assigned to South

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

Holland whilst keeping targets for Boston Borough at an appropriate level. We would argue that the options provided are too restrictive in this sense and that they do not allow for flexibility across the two local authority areas. Overall, the evidence provided is not robust enough to support the relatively low housing targets that have been set for South East Lincolnshire in the current version of the Local Plan. We believe that Option A does not truly reflect the objectively assessed housing need in the South Holland District. In relation to the Housing Growth options C and D it is not appropriate to discard higher housing options for one local authority area because of substantial deliverability issues associated with the other. The Council should consider the options for growth where the housing targets for South Holland District and Boston Borough are determined independently from one another. We therefore suggest that the South Holland District target should be increased to be reflective of the housing need outlined in the Demographic Projections
for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire Report 2012 without the Boston Borough target also having to increase.

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

Response_ Number:	1202	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1546	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	How can you dismiss options C and D out of hand as unreasonable, solely on the premise that the numbers are too big to achieve!	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr and Mrs C Woods					
Representing_Who?:	Themselves					

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

Response_ Number:	1228	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	Q10 - Do you agree with the identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options outlined in sections 4.11 – 4.16 under Approach to Identifying the Quantity of Additional Housing to be Provided in South East Lincolnshire up to 2031 in the full consultation document? Please explain your view. We consider that in determining the appropriate level of growth consideration should be given to the following key factors: •The current five year housing land supply makes provision for only 3.6 years supply, which represents a significant shortfall; •The persistent under delivery of housing in Boston Borough; •The proposed housing target falls below the conservative interim approach set out within the RSS of 270 per annum. •No allowance has been made for the impact from potential further inward migration Whilst the challenging economic conditions and weak local market conditions understandably suppress the local housing market at the current time, the role of the Local Plan is to plan positively	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown					
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton					

for objectively assessed housing needs over a longer timeframe and to provide a framework to encourage delivery of growth. To ensure that the Plan meets to objective of being "positively prepared", and can therefore be considered Sound, the above elements should be determining factors in setting the overall housing target.

In principle it is considered a valid approach to utilise objectively assessed housing needs drawn from the SHMA (Option A). The findings, assumptions and conclusions of the SHMA cannot, however, be taken as read and accordingly the Soundness of the housing target thus relies on careful independent scrutiny of this document.

The in principle problem with Option B is that this would roll forward a baseline target which adopts a precautionary approach to growth.

It is of concern that the Migration Led Options C and D have been set aside solely on the basis that, with reference to historic rates of delivery, "these would appear to be undeliverable and thus unreasonable." We are concerned that these are not

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

		clear and fully justified grounds for rejecting these options. The NPPF directs that plans should be positively prepared to meet the homes and jobs that are needed in an area, not what it is considered could be delivered based on past performance.	

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

Response_ Number:	1229	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	Q11 - Does the preferred policy approach 'Provision for Housing' feature housing figures that are about right, too high or too low? Please explain your view. The housing target for Boston Borough is largely predicated on the basis of historic delivery data. However, the level of historic delivery has fallen short meeting of projected needs. We consider that the housing figures for Boston should be based on the level of genuine need. Whilst the full level of 553 units per annum (assuming scenario C, Migration led approach) may not be attainable in the short term, if this is closer to actual housing need then it should be the longer term objective of the Plan. We are concerned that the justification for Preferred Option A that it is considered deliverable when compared with historic building rates is not Sound, and would be in conflict with the Strategic Objectives of the Local Plan, because it would not meet objectively assessed housing needs and would be in conflict with national policy requirements to ensure the delivery of a five year supply of housing.	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown					
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton					

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

Paragraph 4.16.2 also raises concerns on the basis that the housing needs indicated by the SHMA are considered to be the most objective and comprehensive assessments for the short to medium term. This suggests that the housing target is being driven by what it is estimated could be delivered rather than what is needed.

Land is available on the edge of Kirton which is well located to the settlement and which could contribute to housing meeting needs during the plan period, thus ensuring the Soundness of the Plan.

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

Response_ Number:	1379	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	Q 10 It would be an unreasonable option to use the out of date Annual Housing Allocations contained in the defunct East Midlands Regional Plan which totally failed to anticipate the rapid population growth that has occurred as a consequence of inward migration. The more recent demographic projections postulated housing targets that used migration based information to inform potential housing targets for South East Lincolnshire, the excess growth in the population of the Plan actually underestimates the impact of inward migration which coincided with a fall in the inward migration of relatively affluent elders.. This upsurge in migrants created a shortage of 1 / 2 bed accommodation resolved in part by a subdivision of older properties and multiple occupation of housing below the need for registration as a dwelling in multiple occupation) The demographic profile in the Census 2011 suggests that the inward flow of migrant labour will continue. Nothing like this flow has been seen in the Plan area since the peak of the inward flow of affluent elders up to the early 'noughties'. In the late 1990's new build completion rates in South	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

Holland regularly exceeded 600 units. The relevant experience is over the last 20 years not the last 35. Why are the migration led options undeliverable? There are currently @ 2800 extant permitted consents not yet completed. There are some 2250 outline consents not yet started in the South West Spalding urban extension alone which could be started quickly. In Spalding alone there are some 3200 sites that are deliverable in the event that there are no legal ownership constraints. The most recent completions data suggests that there could well be no capacity restraints. At current rates of construction the available supply of greenfield building plots in Spalding alone would last for 15 years. I do not agree with your analysis or your options.

Response_ Number:	1380	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	Q11 I have previously indicated why I consider your housing predictions to be too low.	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls				
Representing_Who?:	Himself				

Officer_Recommendation:

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

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

Response_ Number:	289	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	967	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	We support the basic approach to identifying the Distribution of Housing Development across South East Lincolnshire. However, as set out in our responses to Questions 10 and 11 we consider that the starting point of the overall housing provision is too low and does not appear to adequately address issues such as levels of high in-migration.	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates					
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese					

Response_ Number:	290	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	967	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	To be consistent with our response to the previous question (and Questions 10/11), the specific figures for the individual settlements are too low. However in terms of the proportion of the housing to be allocated to these settlements relative to the overall provision, we would not object to this balance of distribution.	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates					
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese					

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

Response_ Number:	325	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing
Respondents ID Number:	932	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**
Persons_ Name:	Mr Neil Osborn		
Representing_Who?:	Larkfleet Homes		

Respondents_Comments:

Subject to our objection to the assessment of the basis of housing provision and to the scale of provision that is needed, we note the reference at paragraph 6.6.2 to the fact that completions in the Boston urban area have amounted to approximately 65% of dwellings built and that Kirton has accommodated an additional 12% of dwelling completion. We consider that this is a significant factor and that emerging policy should support significant continued growth in principal locations where there is demonstrable capacity and demand.

Specifically with respect to Kirton we SUPPORT Option A so far as it addresses the principle of making further positive residential allocations however we OBJECT to the restrictive scale of such allocations having regard to:

- The failure of the Plan to identify sufficient housing to meet the needs of the Plan area based on a full objective assessment of need and of capacity;
- The capacity of the settlement to accommodate growth to support local services and facilities having regard to environmental constraints;
- The availability of land as identified in the SHLAA at

Officer_Response:

The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

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

Appendix 8; and
- The inappropriateness and untested level of the cap on ROY land as proposed.
- Overall with respect to the scale of growth within the non-ROY zone settlements in Boston and in particular South Holland, we consider that there is an opportunity to reflect the capacity of settlements to continue planned growth that will help support local economies, aid diversification and assist in meeting overall housing need as objectively assessed.
- In respect to Service Centres in Boston we OBJECT to Option A as we consider that this will fail to make use of unconstrained capacity where it exists, will not help support local communities for their own sake and will not assist the Joint Local Plan to deliver its objectively assessed housing requirement. It is clear however that there are some Service Centres which are better placed both in relation to proximity to Boston, capacity identified in the SHLAA and the extent of areas either excluded from the ROY or that are within the ROY but able to support development and that guidance should be given to direct development accordingly.
- In respect to Service Centres in

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

South Holland we OBJECT to Option A as we consider that this will fail to make use of unconstrained capacity where it exists, will help support local communities for their own sake and will help the Joint Local Plan area to deliver its objectively assessed housing requirement. In particular this reflects the availability of land identified in the SHLAA at Appendix 8 and will assist the Authorities in resisting development in ROY areas in furtherance of other general strategies sought to be established in the Plan.

Overall we OBJECT to the policy on the Distribution and Scale of Housing Development across South East Lincolnshire (2011-2031) as it fails to reflect a properly objective assessment of housing need and capacity. We generally SUPPORT the distribution save for OBJECTION to the classification of Pinchbeck as a Service Village failing to reflect its relationship with Spalding.

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

				Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Response_ Number:	1313	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	At the risk of being presumptuous, not having read the SHMA report, we do find ourselves questioning how the predicted housing “needs” for Spalding have been arrived at. Not least because the figures presume the creation of an enormous number of local jobs. Is this realistic? Or is mass commuting envisaged? In which case, good-bye to sustainable development. Is it realistic, either, to envisage an average annual new-build rate of 407 in South Holland, when a mere 167 house were built 2001-2012? Para. 6.2.38 – We note that the evidence is “not conclusive”. Indeed, the paragraph seems to consist of a circular argument. The Spalding Western Relief Road is needed by the 3,750 houses north of the Vernatt’s, which are themselves needed in order to fund the road! Moreover, we simply do not accept that there is any suitable space in Spalding for another 3,750 houses on top of the 2,500 for which planning permission has already been granted on Spalding Common. To the east, rightly, the Coronation Channel has always been regarded as an unreachable boundary to development; to the	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Respondents ID Number:	1134	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**			
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth					
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic					

north the Vernatt's forms an equally natural boundary to sprawl. With the proposed relief road and a water-course between them and the rest of the town, there is no way the residents of the huge development proposed will feel themselves to be part of Spalding. How long before the pressure builds to run a road across that 500m cordon sanitaire to the closer facilities of Pinchbeck? It is wishful thinking that this huge development will not lead to the coalescence of Spalding and Pinchbeck.
Further, with all Spalding's sub-regional facilities located east of the railway line – industrial estate, large shops, secondary schools, hospital, doctors' surgeries, council offices, library, South Holland Centre, swimming pool, sports hall, youth club, etc., etc. – what sense does it make to expand west of the line, piling further huge pressures on to both the Winsover Road level crossing and the already overloaded Spalding Road/Pinchbeck Road?
The allocation of huge swaths of greenfield land for development will inevitably direct developers away from the regeneration of Brownfield sites, as greenfield pickings are easier than Brownfield, just as the allocation of extra employment land for the

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

				RFI at Deeping St Nicholas "could serve to undermine the successful development of existing employment land allocations elsewhere" (Para. 7.25.1). It's the same for housing. Thus, we cannot support this vast development proposed for north of the Vernatt's. Complicating the picture are the 14,000 seasonal workers, a housing problem the document makes no attempt to address, although the planning consequences are highly material.		

Response_ Number:	1314	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	Question 27 – No, see above	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth					
Representing _Who?:	Spalding and District Civic					

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

Response_ Number:	1396	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**B**	The major influences on the demand for additional housing is the rate of demographic growth. The Census information confirms that the rate of population growth in the Plan area significantly exceeded that of the County. The Census return also identified trends in the pattern of and growth in the population and indicated that the demand for sufficient suitable employable labour would be exacerbated by changes in the population by age cohort. Their continues to be a significant increase in the annual birth rate . The formation of new households is influenced by the breakdown of family and partner relationships. The housing market in London and the Home Counties remains buoyant and the price differential between comparable housing by size continues to widen a factor that encourage older home owners to realise the capital gain in the equity of the homes and relocate. South Holland remains an attractive place to live. I am not persuaded that the target for new build will properly reflect demographic and social change I am also concerned that the proposed allocation of new build dwellings will match the	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

distribution of employment opportunities or people's preferences about where they choose to live. I support a prohibition of new build in areas of the highest threat from flood risk and maximum resilience flood protection for all developments in the orange and yellow flood risk zones. This must curtail new build in the rural areas. I am supportive of policies that enhance the role of genuine service villages and their associated isolated clusters of dwellings in the open countryside. To sustain the sustainability properly identified service more development should be permitted to prevent the slow strangulation of the rural hinterland.

The policy of directing new build development into large urban Greenfield extensions will require considerable investment in public facilities (schools, medical centres, community facilities and sports and recreation libraries/) and be able to attract commercial investment in retailing, pubs and personal services. It is not unreasonable to expect new developments which meet the needs of residents arising from organic population growth to be meet in part by the developers though the new development

Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.			
		levy. There is still a requirement that the development levy should not be used as a subsidy to cover expenditure that arises from organic population growth and that there should be some geographic connection between public infrastructure made necessary by the development. These principles are the safe guard against developers bribing Planning Authorities into granting a planning consent. I am concerned that the number of new dwellings allocated to the major Greenfield extensions is being driven by the County Councils desire to fund a Spalding Western Relief Road rather than a distribution relevant to the needs of the whole district or the plan area.	

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

Response_ Number:	733	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing
Respondents ID Number:	961	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**C**
Persons_ Name:	Carter Jonas		
Representing_Who?:	RP Worth and Son		

Respondents_Comments:

Main Service Centres of Long Sutton & Sutton Bridge Support is given for the proposed intention to allocate land to accommodate up to 150 dwellings within Long Sutton during the Local Plan period. It is appropriate that a sufficient level of housing is delivered within the Main Service Centres in order to maintain enough growth within such settlements to support existing amenities and to meet local housing needs. Despite the ROY zone designation which covers much of the available land for development, a balance has to be achieved in order to provide for a sustainable distribution of growth. Mitigation measures are available where necessary to reduce any impact of development upon flood risk. Taking into account the higher chance of flood hazard in the locality of Sutton Bridge, it is argued that consideration should be given to Long Sutton accommodating a suitable proportion of the 150 dwellings currently reserved for Sutton Bridge. This approach would remain consistent with the spatial strategy, whilst also providing a sequentially lower risk strategy and minimising vulnerability, in comparison to that currently proposed within the preferred

Officer_Response:

The consideration of pooling Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge's housing allocation is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.		
	policy option. This approach would be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. It should be noted that much of the available land located within Long Sutton is highlighted as Flood Zone 3 on Environment Agency mapping; however the risk has been assessed as 'low', taking into account the presence of existing flood defences.	

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

Response_ Number:	7	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1554	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	John Honnor					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

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

Response_ Number:	8	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development
Respondents ID Number:	1290	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**
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

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:

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

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

				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.		

Response_ Number:	15	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	868	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Bob Merchant					
Representing_Who?:	David Alexander					

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

Response_ Number:	57	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1017	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr F Biggadike					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

Response_ Number:	139	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1750	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J S Birkett					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

Response_ Number:	156	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1751	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd					
Representing_Who?:	Mr S Harris					

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

Response_ Number:	205	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1756	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd					
Representing_Who?:	Mr S Hatter					

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

Response_ Number:	244	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1759	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Jonathan Ireland					
Representing_Who?:	Irelands Farm Machinery					

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

Response_ Number:	287	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	967	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates					
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese					

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

Response_ Number:	321	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development
Respondents ID Number:	932	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**
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

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:

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

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.
- 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

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

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

Response_ Number:	347	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	C Slooten					

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

Response_ Number:	351	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	M Fragale					

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

Response_ Number:	389	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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 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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	C A Cave					

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

Response_ Number:	401	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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 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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	J L Crossland					

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

Response_ Number:	405	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mr R and Mrs J Warrick					

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

Response_ Number:	410	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	P Borst					

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

Response_ Number:	415	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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 an 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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mr & Mrs R Hart & the Exors of M W					

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

Response_ Number:	454	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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 .	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	M J R Nell					

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

Response_ Number:	463	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Parigo Horticultural					

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

Response_ Number:	476	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs C Stratton					

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

Response_ Number:	481	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	I Login					

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

Response_ Number:	485	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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, 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. 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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	S Dobney					

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

Response_ Number:	514	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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 .	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mr J Tester					

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

Response_ Number:	531	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Roe Family					

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

Response_ Number: 552 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: R S Earl	Chapter_ Name: 05 Sustainable Development **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	Respondents_Comments: The failure to identify modest development opportunity in villages below the Service Village designation is unacceptable. 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. The land shown on the enclosed plan provides an excellent opportunity to develop the village in a planned sustainable pattern.	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: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 553 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: R S Earl	Chapter_ Name: 05 Sustainable Development **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	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: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	554	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl					

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

Response_ Number:	604	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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. The land shown on the enclosed plan provides an excellent opportunity to develop the village in a planned sustainable pattern. 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. The land shown on the enclosed plan provides an excellent opportunity to develop the village in a planned sustainable pattern.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall					

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

Response_ Number:	665	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1057	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr A Austin					
Representing_Who?:	Herself					

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

				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.		
Response_ Number:	935	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes					

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

Response_ Number:	936	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes					

Response_ Number:	939	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes					

Response_ Number:	1035	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	K Enderby					

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

Response_ Number: 1036 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: K Enderby	Chapter_ Name: **Categorisation_of_further_work:**	05 Sustainable Development **D**	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: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 1039 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: K Enderby	Chapter_ Name: **Categorisation_of_further_work:**	05 Sustainable Development **D**	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: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number: 1053 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: Richard Pearson Ltd	Chapter_ Name: 05 Sustainable Development **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	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: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 1054 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: Richard Pearson Ltd	Chapter_ Name: 05 Sustainable Development **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	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: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	1055	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Richard Pearson Ltd					

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

Response_ Number:	1074	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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 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. 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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	O A Taylor Ltd					

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

Response_ Number:	1105	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs R Bridger					

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

Response_ Number:	1172	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1812	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Dadge					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs T Croxford					

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

Response_ Number:	1173	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1812	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Dadge					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs T Croxford					

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

				and the prospect of retaining valued local services, for example village schools, pubs and shops would be enhanced.		
Response_ Number:	1186	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1813	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Angela Newton					
Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett					
Response_ Number:	1203	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1546	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr and Mrs C Woods					
Representing_Who?:	Themselves					

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

Response_ Number:	1304	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Questions 18 & 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).	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth					
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic					

Response_ Number:	1305	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth					
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic					

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

Response_ Number: 1388 Respondents ID Number: 1819 Persons_ Name: Mr P Walls Representing_Who?: Himself	Chapter_ Name: 05 Sustainable Development **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	Respondents_Comments: 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.	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: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 1389 Respondents ID Number: 1819 Persons_ Name: Mr P Walls Representing_Who?: Himself	Chapter_ Name: 05 Sustainable Development **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	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: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	19	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1726	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	The separation of each settlement and the allocation of properties that can be built is inadequate for the period of years the plan refers to. Development should be allowed in all villages within the district. The determining factors should be focused on the style and quality of the build . i.e. materials and what the building will deliver in terms of character for the village it is in.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr Des Ford					
Representing_Who?:	D Brown Builders					

Response_ Number:	59	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1017	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	I think rather than providing a max of 25 dwellings in Tydd St Mary these should go to Weston and Whaplode because of the closer proximity that they have to Spalding/Holbeach.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr F Biggadike					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

Response_ Number: 142 Respondents ID Number: 1750 Persons_ Name: Mr J S Birkett Representing_Who?: Himself	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	Respondents_Comments: 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.	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: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 159 Respondents ID Number: 1751 Persons_ Name: Matrix Planning Ltd Representing_Who?: Mr S Harris	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	Respondents_Comments: The cap of 25 dwelling in any one service village is unhelpful to the practical planning of each area. Sites need first to be allocated then a number established. The number ‘25’ is a false creation that is only convenient for statistical assessment. Objection as we think you should remove the cap of 25 houses, and consider additional allowances for ‘other rural settlements’ .	Officer_Response: It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	190	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1754	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Objection. The cap of 25 dwelling in any one service village is unhelpful to the practical planning of each area. Sites need first to be allocated then a number established. The number '25' is a false creation that is only convenient for statistical assessment. Objection as we think you should remove the cap of 25 houses.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd					
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Ravell					

Response_ Number:	199	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1755	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Objection. The cap of 25 dwelling in any one service village is unhelpful to the practical planning of each area. Sites need first to be allocated then a number established. The number '25' is a false creation that is only convenient for statistical assessment. Objection as we think you should remove the cap of 25 houses.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd					
Representing_Who?:	Spalding Lifestyle owners					

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

Response_ Number: 208 Respondents ID Number: 1756 Persons_ Name: Matrix Planning Ltd Representing_Who?: Mr S Hatter	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	Respondents_Comments: Objection. The cap of 25 dwelling in any one service village is unhelpful to the practical planning of each area. Sites need first to be allocated then a number established. The number '25' is a false creation that is only convenient for statistical assessment. Objection as we think you should remove the cap of 25 houses, and consider additional allowances for 'other rural settlements' .	Officer_Response: It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 231 Respondents ID Number: 1760 Persons_ Name: James Daniels Representing_Who?: Himself	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	Respondents_Comments: The council should adopt Plan B (50 new build houses) for the smaller villages, spreading housing out will reduce traffic congestion. It will also keep the villages vibrant. Planning permission should be given for locations within, say, 200m of existing sewer, water main, and telephone and electricity mains, to minimise the costs of having to provide services to new houses.	Officer_Response: It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	274	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1768	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Housing should be assessed as appropriate where there is: a) an adequacy of routes for commuters b) an adequacy of drainage c) and adequacy of services in general d) and adequacy of facilities i.e. shopping. So far as Weston is concerned most of the above apply and a moratorium would be appropriate on the grounds of limits safe vehicular routes and drainage, until such times as improvements are made.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	M J Smith					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

Response_ Number:	292	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	967	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	We support this approach. These are potentially the sustainable supporting centres within Boston Borough going forward into the future in terms of minimal flood risk and capacity and so planned growth for supporting facilities should also be a consideration in land use terms. In the same context we feel that the restriction of development within the South Holland Service Villages to a maximum of 25 dwellings is too low a ceiling for these settlements. We would prefer the option with higher ceiling figure of a maximum of 50 dwellings applied subject of course to a critical assessment of the capacity and sustainability of the individual Service.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates					
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese					

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

Response_ Number:	293	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	967	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	We would wish to see an increase in the baseline housing provision for South East Lincolnshire and pre-rata increases in the proportion of housing allocated to the respective settlements in the hierarchy. We would wish to see the maximum housing provision cap for the South Holland Service Villages increased. With the exception of the ROY village sites where a cap on provision is justified, we do not see any justification in a ceiling or capping of provision in other non-ROY settlements (such as is proposed in the South Holland Service Villages. The Provision for Housing 'policy' sets out a provision for a net increase of at least 13,920 dwellings and so the emerging policy of scale and distribution of housing should be consistent in setting a minimum figure (excepting the justified stance on ROY settlements)	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates				
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese				

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

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

Response_ Number:	331	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Qu 28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	D Braybrooks					

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

Response_ Number:	334	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Qu28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	D A and N Casswell					

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

Response_ Number:	338	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs B Blundy					

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

Response_ Number:	342	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs J Tetley					

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

Response_ Number:	348	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, whilst stating above our view that this village should be re-classified, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	C Slooten				

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

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

Response_ Number:	352	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, whilst stating above our view that this village should be re-classified, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	M Fragale					

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

Response_ Number:	363	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	R Bingham					

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

Response_ Number:	381	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs E M H Todoroff					

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

Response_ Number:	386	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	C L Cave					

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

Response_ Number:	390	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	C A Cave					

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

Response_ Number:	394	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mr and M Hotchkin					

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

Response_ Number:	398	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Louis					

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

Response_ Number:	402	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	J L Crossland				

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

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

Response_ Number:	406	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, whilst stating above our view that this village should be re-classified, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mr R and Mrs J Warrick				

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

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

Response_ Number:	411	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, whilst stating above our view that this village should be re-classified, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	P Borst					

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

Response_ Number:	416	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mr & Mrs R Hart & the Exors of M W				

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

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

Response_ Number:	451	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	B J Runciman				

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

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

Response_ Number:	455	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, whilst stating above our view that this village should be re-classified, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	M J R Nell					

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

Response_ Number:	460	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs G Pell					

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

Response_ Number:	469	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	T Tyrell					

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

Response_ Number:	473	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	E A Smith					

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

Response_ Number:	482	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	I Login					

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

Response_ Number:	486	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	S Dobney				

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

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

Response_ Number:	491	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	D Coxen					

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

Response_ Number:	496	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs J Needham					

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

Response_ Number:	501	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	C Clark					

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

Response_ Number:	506	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Read					

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

Response_ Number:	515	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, whilst stating above our view that this village should be re-classified, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mr J Tester					

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

Response_ Number:	528	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	M & J Woodroffe				

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

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

Response_ Number:	532	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Roe Family				

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

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

Response_ Number:	561	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	The appraisal should include reference to an allowance for modest development in the villages that fall between the Service Villages and the Countryside.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

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

Response_ Number:	562	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl				

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

Response_ Number:	613	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	The appraisal should include reference to an allowance for modest development in the villages that fall between the Service Villages and the Countryside.	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.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall				

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

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

Response_ Number: 614 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: A W Tindall	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	Respondents_Comments: We consider the proposed housing figure for Moulton is too low and should be increased to at least the 50 dwellings set out in Option B.	Officer_Response: It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.	

Response_ Number: 615 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: A W Tindall	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	Respondents_Comments: The New Allocations entry for Service Villages such as Moulton should be increased to allow for 50 dwellings in any one village, if not more where there is a suitable site and a good level of service provision. The total housing number for Service Villages should be increased following a review of the various settlements and an assessment carried out to determine the potential capacity of each.	Officer_Response: It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.	

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

Response_ Number:	646	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing
Respondents ID Number:	988	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**
Persons_ Name:	Graham Warren Ltd		
Representing_Who?:	Broadgate Homes Ltd		

Respondents_Comments:

The Plan states, and Broadgate agree, that it is necessary to determine an approach that guides the distribution and scale of additional housing in accordance with the preferred policy approaches relating to the 'Spatial Strategy' and 'Provision for Housing' which, in turn, are underpinned by the two strategic priorities relating to sustainable development. Another factor which should inform the determination of the approach, are the emerging results of the 2012 SHLAA exercise which, it should be noted, have not been informed by the Spatial Strategy and Provision for Housing preferred policy approaches.

It is considered appropriate to prepare a separate policy approach governing the distribution and scale of housing development for Boston Borough and South Holland District for the following reasons:
•The separate housing targets set out in the Provision for Housing preferred policy approach; and
•The differing circumstances relating to these two areas (e.g. the great majority of Boston Borough, including all of its principal settlements, Boston is

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:

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

covered by the ROY flood hazard zones (the 'ROY zones') whereas such zones cover less than half of South Holland District, and Boston Borough only has two higher order settlements compared to South Holland's six.

Given the number of dwellings and designated settlements involved in this process, it is clear that a significant number of options for assigning dwellings to settlements could be generated in both Boston Borough and South Holland District are considered in the Plan, with a view to promoting further consideration of this matter through formal public consultation
The preferred housing provision, as outlined in the Housing Growth and Flood Risk chapter, is intended to be met through extant planning permissions (at 31st March 2012) and new allocations. Regardless of future 'windfall' planning permissions, it s intended that the full amount of new allocations will still be brought forward. This will be delivered through the identification of broad locations in the Strategy and Policies DPD and further allocations through the Site Allocations DPD.

Boston

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

The preferred option for Boston is a minimum of 4,520 dwellings, of which a maximum of 3,600 can be provided in the ROY zones. The preferred Spatial Strategy identifies fourteen designated settlements. Other than Boston, Kirton and Swineshead, no other settlements in the Borough have seen residential development that could be regarded as strategic.
The Plan proposes 2,900 dwellings in Boston town itself, all of which may be located in the ROY zones. Kirton is identified for 420 dwellings. This approach is supported by Broadgate Homes.

Proposals for the service villages in Boston Borough are considered below, and are made when considering the Plan's proposals for the rural areas.

South Holland

The preferred option for housing provision for South Holland district is a minimum of 9,400 dwellings, of which a maximum of 1,600 can be provided on sites in ROY zones. The preferred Spatial Strategy identifies twenty designated settlements.
The importance of Spalding is evidenced by rates of house building over the last 8 years

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

where completions in Spalding have amounted to circa 51%, Holbeach 7%, Sutton Bridge 6%, Long Sutton 3% and Crowland 3%.

Therefore, in recognition of Spalding's important and growing sub-regional role, and particularly because it is significantly less constrained by ROY zones considerations, it is considered appropriate to allocate some two thirds of the district's dwelling provision to the town, i.e. 6,000 dwellings. This figure is supported by evidence available in the SHLAA and is supported by Broadgate.

This level of growth is also linked to the need to provide a Spalding Western Relief Road (SWRR) to support growth and rail downtime issues at level crossings, resulting from the upgrade of the railway that serves the town.
This dwelling provision will be delivered through the identification of broad locations in the Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document and the Site Allocations DPD.
The Plan proposes 1,00 dwellings at Holbeach, 150 at both Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge, 300 dwellings to Crowland and Donington.

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

Service Villages

A list of these villages is set out at table 6.11 of the Plan, where two options are considered as follows:

Table 3 – Service Villages, South Holland

Service Villages	Option A	Option B
Cowbit, Deeping St Nicholas, Fleet Hargate, Gedney Hill, Gosberton, Moulton Chapel, Pinchbeck, Quadring, Sutton St James, Surfleet, Tydd St Mary, Weston and Whaplode	Up to 25 dwellings in each Service Village	Up to 50 dwellings in each Service Village
Maximum Service Village Total	350	700

The Plan identifies the role of the service villages as accommodating a level of development commensurate with their role as a focus for social and economic activity. It goes on to state that it is therefore not appropriate that significant numbers of dwellings should be accommodated in the villages.

When the two options are assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that accompanies the Plan, there is no difference between them in terms of impact. On this issue, the Plan concludes, at 6.46.13, as follows: “Whilst

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

there is some potential for minor negative impacts, both options have a major positive impact in seeking to meet the housing needs of South Holland District in particular. They also seek to support the role and function of Service Villages. The precise nature of some of the impacts will be dependent on the specific locations for development, which will be outlined in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD, but it is probable that Option A, due to its smaller dwelling total, will result in less overall environmental impact"

The Plan then goes on the prefer Option A, stating that it should result in less overall environmental impact, which could occur with a greater level of dispersed growth; a conclusion not borne out by the SA.

Broadgate are of the opinion that there needs to be greater flexibility towards development in the rural area.

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

Response_ Number:	648	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing
Respondents ID Number:	988	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**
Persons_ Name:	Graham Warren Ltd		
Representing_Who?:	Broadgate Homes Ltd		

Respondents_Comments:

The villages that make up England's countryside face problems directly related to the fact that housing and economic development have been highly constrained. High house prices and lower wages, result in a paradox, where many of the people who work in the countryside cannot afford to live there, while those who can afford to live there, increasingly do not work there.

This means that people who do work in the countryside, in farm shops, in local businesses, providing the practical services and employment needed in rural communities, will be priced out. Many will have to commute from less expensive property in the towns to employment in the rural areas.

With fewer families in the villages, services such as schools, public houses, buses, post offices, become even less viable and when lost, result in communities being less sustainable. These pressures, to varying degrees, undermine the opportunities for rural communities to be economically vibrant, environmentally sustainable, socially mixed and inclusive.

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:

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

Travel to Work Patterns

Research has shown that in England and Wales, between the 1981 and 2011 Censuses, there was an increase of some 417,000 in the number of people travelling from urban homes to rural workplaces. To an extent, this contradicts the presumption that people living in rural areas have a disproportionately negative impact on the environment.

The assumption that people living in the country have to use cars to get around, travel longer distances and make a relatively large contribution to climate change. It is this assumption that is used to limit rural development.

However, the table below, shows that the key difference in travel to work patterns is actually that rural residents are more likely to commute under 1km, 35.8%, compared to 21.5% urban working residents. The most common commute for urban residents was between 1 and 5 km.

Table 2
Distance Travelled to Work

	% of rural residents who work	% of urban residents who work

Less than1 km	35.8	21.5
1 to 5 km	17.3	31.7
5 to 10 km	17.1	18.8
10 to 20 km	17	15.3
20 to 40 km	8.4	7.8
Over 40 km	4.5	4.5
Total	100	100

Source: The Taylor Review 2008

Further, rural and urban residents are almost equally as likely to drive to work (60.5 and 54.8 per cent respectively), and whilst rural residents are less likely to use public transport, they are twice as likely to work from home (see Table 3).

Method of Travel to Work

	% of rural residents who work	% of urban residents who work
Car Driver	60.5	54.8
Car Passenger	6.2	6
Work from Home	16.7	7.5
Walk	8.7	9.5
Bicycle	2.7	2.8
Train/Underground	0.7	8.7
Bus	2.6	8.8
Other	1.8	1.9

Source: The Taylor Review 2008

These figures highlight that rural areas are no more unsustainable on the grounds of the environmental impacts of commuting to work than urban areas. The modes of travel and distance travelled are similar.

Indeed, although the distances are similar, rural journey times may be quicker (and therefore less polluting) due to less incidence of congestion compared to urban journeys.

The evidence that emerges from, amongst other things, the Taylor Review, suggests that it is misplaced to condemn villages as unsustainable simply because they do not have a bus service, meaning those living there rely on the car for travel.
Similarly, those villages should not be penalised because they lack services and do not feature within the council's scoring mechanism to determine the sustainability of rural settlements.

It is noted that it is recognised that the scoring mechanism only provides a broad indication of settlement sustainability at a single point in time.

Broadgate would recommend that the research conducted by Taylor is interrogated by the authorities and updated. The trend toward people choosing to live in the countryside has not diminished.

If new affordable housing earmarked for local people,

means that more people in a particular community have a chance to afford to live there, that will help reduce the need for the rural workforce to commute from town in the future. The trend of young people migrating out of the district could also be slowed.

Similarly, if local business growth means more people already living in rural communities are able to work locally, then commuting to town may be reduced, thereby improving economic and environmental sustainability.

If the provision of more affordable housing means that people on a broader range of incomes can afford to live in rural communities, then that may increase the social diversity and sustainability of the community by supporting a broader range of community services, shops and employment, so people need to travel less, not more.

It is for these reasons that Broadgate support Option B for the service villages (and propose that up to 50 dwellings are identified for the service villages during the Plan period), thereby enabling greater flexibility in the consideration of housing

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

provision and development generally in the rural villages. There needs to be a policy in the Plan that enables the provision of affordable and niche market housing in the villages, thereby responding to the issues outlined above.

Response_ Number:	668	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1057	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Places classified as "other villages" must be allowed sufficient infill /peripheral development to enable these existing communities to survive. Amber Hill is an example. Rural exception schemes should be looked on favourably in these circumstances.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr A Austin					
Representing_Who?:	Herself					

Response_ Number:	669	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1057	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Emphasis is given on several occasions in the plan document to the protection of listed and other historic buildings. Most of the area's churches come in this category and village communities need sufficient population to be able to maintain their viability.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr A Austin					
Representing_Who?:	Herself					

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

Response_ Number:	683	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	870	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Paragraph 6.48.1 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan Strategy and Policies PDP Preferred Options consultation document states that the preferred option for the delivery of housing in Service Villages is Option A. We object to this option being taken forward. Two options are provided within the Local Plan Strategy and Polices DPD (hereafter 'the DPD') which are as follows: Option A: To deliver a scale of new housing in each of South Holland's 14 Service Villages not exceeding 25 dwellings, none of which will be located in ROY zones. Option B: To deliver a scale of new housing in each of South Holland's 14 Service Villages not exceeding 50 dwellings, none of which will be located in ROY zones. The DPD also incorporates the necessary Sustainability Appraisal of each of the Policy Options as part of the balancing process in choosing how to move forward. Table 6.12 on Page 124 of the document demonstrates that both of the Options will have the same impacts when scored against the different topic areas. The supporting text provided on Page 125 supports this, with there	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.
Persons_ Name:	Bidwells				
Representing_Who?:	The Duchy of Lancaster				

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

being no discernible differences in the evaluation. Ultimately Option A is chosen as it will likely have less overall environmental impact due to the lower number of dwellings provided. There is concern, however, that this level of housing will not only overly restrict the level of market housing which can be potentially provided over the Plan Period to 2031 in these locations but that at the same time, it will restrict the level of affordable housing which can reasonably be provided.
Paragraph 55 of the NPPF sets out that to promote sustainable development, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and in consideration of this, identify where housing in one settlement might support services and facilities in another nearby. It should not be automatically considered that, especially in light of the results of the
Sustainability Assessment contained on Pages 124 and 125 of the DPD, the perceived impacts of providing an increased housing threshold, including affordable dwellings, in Service Villages will outweigh the potential benefits.
As set out below, the majority of the Preferred Policies within the Joint Strategy and Policies DPD

build in flexibility so as to be able to respond to changes in the market over the Plan Period and meet the necessary criteria in the NPPF.
The Spatial Strategy proposes a settlement hierarchy in which Service Villages, whilst receiving limited development, will support or improve their role as a focus for social and economic activity in their capacity as service centres for the surrounding rural area. The provision of additional housing will further support existing services and facilities and provides great likelihood for the improvement of these, or even introduction of new amenities. This will not only benefit potential future residents, but also improve the range of services and facilities available to the existing populations. In discussing the need for affordable housing, the preferred policy option within South Holland is to provide 1/3 of all new residential developments over three dwellings as affordable housing. In the case of rural exception schemes, up to 50% of dwellings can be provided for market occupation so as to maintain viability, but should represent the lowest proportion necessary in favour of affordable provision.
The 2010 SHMA Update found

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

that 587 affordable dwellings will be required per annum to 2026. Whilst the majority of these may be provided in the larger sub-regional centres and main service centres, flexibility should be provided for the needs of service villages, particularly when considering the elevation of some settlements due to their location outside of any ROY zone designations.
It is also considered that when taken in conjunction with other Proposed Policies within the DPD that Option B provides the greatest flexibility and potential to meet the future need of both market and affordable demand. The Council's housing implementation strategy and approach to maintaining a deliverable supply of housing also references the need to build in flexibility so as to be able to 'respond positively to an upturn in demand for housing should it arise sooner rather than later.' The Plan Period runs to 2031 and there is a reasonable expectation that the economy will recover to better levels of growth than are currently being experienced. The Joint Local Plan should Plan Positively for Growth and it is considered that adopting the higher threshold will allow for this.

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

Response_ Number:	778	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	We agree with the appraisal of Service Villages (South Holland District) as set out in paragraphs 6.44 to 6.46.12, but support Option B rather than Option A. Option B provides a greater opportunity in the Service Villages and enables larger development proposals to come forward that are more likely to support local services and deliver greater levels of affordable housing.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

Response_ Number:	779	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	We consider the proposed housing figure for Surfleet is too low and should be increased to 50 dwellings in accordance with Option B.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey				

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

Response_ Number:	780	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	The New Allocations entry for Service Villages such as Surfleet should be increased to allow for a maximum of 50 dwellings in any one village. The total for Service Villages should be increased following a review of the various settlements and an assessment carried out to determine the potential capacity of each.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey					

Response_ Number:	831	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	We agree with the appraisal of Service Villages (South Holland District) as set out in paragraphs 6.44 to 6.46.12, but support Option B rather than Option A. Option B provides a greater opportunity in the Service Villages and enables larger development proposals to come forward that are more likely to support local services and deliver greater levels of affordable housing.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M					

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

Response_ Number: 832 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	Respondents_Comments: We consider the proposed housing figure for Gosberton is too low and should be increased to at least the 50 dwellings set out in Option B.	Officer_Response: It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

Response_ Number: 833 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	Respondents_Comments: The New Allocations entry for Service Villages such as Gosberton should be increased to allow for 50 dwellings in any one village, if not more where there is a suitable site and a good level of service provision. The total housing number for Service Villages should be increased following a review of the various settlements and an assessment carried out to determine the potential capacity of each.	Officer_Response: It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	945	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty		
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes		

Respondents_Comments:

Algarkirk is immediately adjacent to Sutterton and allocation of development there would be acceptable, but development would rely on the services and facilities in Sutterton, which emphasises the fact that Sutterton is a more appropriate location for new allocations.

Bicker is a small settlement that is outside the ROY zone, but it is heavily reliant on Donington for services. Any allocation should reflect the level of services and facilities in the village.

Fishtoft is within the red 'Danger to All' designation within the ROY zone and at the highest level of risk. It is not appropriate to allocate significant amounts of housing in such a settlement.

Kirton End is a relatively small settlement that is largely within the ROY zone. Any allocation should reflect the level of services and facilities in the village.

Leake Commonside is another small settlement, where the benefits in flood risk are not outweighed by its sustainability for new housing allocations. It is not appropriate to allocate significant housing provision in

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:

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

the settlement.

Swineshead Bridge is a small settlement without village character that is shown in the Boston Borough Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to be wholly within the ROY zone. It is unclear why the Local Authority has suggested this settlement as suitable for any housing allocation.

Wigtoft is another small settlement that is in the lesser ROY zone designations, but it is heavily reliant on other villages, such as Sutterton, for services. Any allocation should reflect the level of services and facilities in the village.

Wrangle is a settlement with a level of services that reflects it size, but it is largely within the ROY zone. It would appear to be a suitable location for a modest amount of housing allocation.

In summary, the allocation of development in Algakirk, Fishtoft and Swineshead Bridge is not supported. Any allocations in the remaining villages should reflect their size and service provision.

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

Response_ Number:	1042	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Algakirk is immediately adjacent to Sutterton and allocation of development there would be acceptable, but development would rely on the services and facilities in Sutterton, which emphasises the fact that Sutterton is a more appropriate location for new allocations. Bicker is a small settlement that is outside the ROY zone, but it is heavily reliant on Donington for services. Any allocation should reflect the level of services and facilities in the village. Fishtoft is within the red 'Danger to All' designation within the ROY zone and at the highest level of risk. It is not appropriate to allocate significant amounts of housing in such a settlement. Kirton End is a relatively small settlement that is largely within the ROY zone. Any allocation should reflect the level of services and facilities in the village. Leake Commonside is another small settlement, where the benefits in flood risk are not outweighed by its sustainability for new housing allocations. It is not appropriate to allocate significant housing provision in	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	K Enderby					

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

the settlement.

Swineshead Bridge is a small settlement without village character that is shown in the Boston Borough Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to be wholly within the ROY zone. It is unclear why the Local Authority has suggested this settlement as suitable for any housing allocation.

Wigtoft is another small settlement that is in the lesser ROY zone designations, but it is heavily reliant on other villages, such as Sutterton, for services. Any allocation should reflect the level of services and facilities in the village.
Wrangle is a settlement with a level of services that reflects it size, but it is largely within the ROY zone. It would appear to be a suitable location for a modest amount of housing allocation.

In summary, the allocation of development in Algakirk, Fishtoft and Swineshead Bridge is not supported. Any allocations in the remaining villages should reflect their size and service provision.

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

Response_ Number:	1058	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	The appraisal should include reference to an allowance for modest development in the villages that fall between the Service Villages and the Countryside.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Richard Pearson Ltd					

Response_ Number:	1059	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Richard Pearson Ltd					

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

Response_ Number:	1075	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	O A Taylor Ltd					

Response_ Number:	1076	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q29, we consider that is would be incorrect not to identify new housing sites in villages below 'Service Village' level. Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	O A Taylor Ltd					

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

Response_ Number:	1080	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 73 per settlement (3.7 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	J Grant					

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

				Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Response_ Number:	1106	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	In response to Q29, we consider that is would be incorrect not to identify new housing sites in villages below 'Service Village' level. Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**			
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs R Bridger					

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

Response_ Number:	1111	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 75 per settlement (3.6 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	R C Tinsley					

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

Response_ Number:	1116	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 73 per settlement (3.7 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	H Nundy					

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

Response_ Number:	1121	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	J Grant					

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

Response_ Number:	1125	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	The Casswell Family				

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

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

Response_ Number:	1129	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	The Casswell Family					

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

Response_ Number:	1133	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	J Grant					

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

Response_ Number: 1178 Respondents ID Number: 1813 Persons_ Name: Angela Newton Representing_Who?: Mr J and Mr G Eyett	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	Respondents_Comments: Believe Option B should be supported. Service villages should be allocated at least 50 each and allowed to extend to support amenities and facilities in each village. Growth in villages has been curtailed for too long. 25 dwellings in each of the service villages is not enough. We produced evidence that on 15th May 2-12, AHDC Housing Dept. Said there were 149 people on the council waiting list. These people want housing now not in 6 years time.	Officer_Response: It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 1188 Respondents ID Number: 1813 Persons_ Name: Angela Newton Representing_Who?: Mr J and Mr G Eyett	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	Respondents_Comments: Support Option B in Table 6.11 of main document. Services should be allowed to expand.	Officer_Response: It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number: 1189 Respondents ID Number: 1813 Persons_ Name: Angela Newton Representing_Who?: Mr J and Mr G Eyett	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	Respondents_Comments: Do not agree	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: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

Response_ Number: 1196 Respondents ID Number: 1813 Persons_ Name: Angela Newton Representing_Who?: Mr J and Mr G Eyett	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	Respondents_Comments: Service villages should be allowed 50 houses each	Officer_Response: It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

Response_ Number: 1200 Respondents ID Number: 1480 Persons_ Name: Mr and Mrs B Tidswell Representing_Who?: Themselves	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: D**	Respondents_Comments: That there should be an easing of the restrictions on building in non service villages	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: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	1215	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1662	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	I have missed the comments deadline due to annual leave. However at our last parish council meeting my members did express concern that there is a provision for only 20 further affordable homes to be built in our area until 2031. This will not meet demand or encourage the next generation to remain living in their local community as they will be forced to look for alternatives out of area.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.
Persons_ Name:	Surfleet Parish Council				
Representing_Who?:	Themselves				

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

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

Response_ Number:	1242	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Q30 - The restriction of development on ROY sites within the 'Rest of Service Villages' in Boston Borough to a maximum of 300 dwellings could potentially require significant development at Algarkirk, Bicker, Fishtoft, Kirton End, Leake Commonside, Swineshead Bridge, Wigtoft and Wrangle. Do you support this? This approach would be out of step with the rest of the Plan (specifically the spatial strategy). In many instances would also be out of step with the site allocation criteria based policy. It is therefore not considered a Sound approach. As explained in response to Q19, many of these proposed service villages score badly in terms of sustainability and the Council's own SHLAA has identified limited opportunities for development within many villages. Both Option A (400 to Swineshead and up to 800 in remaining villages) and Option B (up to 100 dwellings in all service villages) are considered to pose significant issues. The focus on Swineshead would see nearly double the historic rate of delivery and would put significant pressure on services and infrastructure.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown					
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton					

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

				Swineshead does not have a secondary school, bank, library or police station, or fire station (unlike Kirton which has all of these facilities) and thus does not represent a sustainable location for further development.		
Response_ Number:	1316	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Question 29 – Wrong. See our response to questions 18 and 20.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth					
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic					

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

Response_ Number:	1397	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Q28 The number of new dwellings allocated to service villages over the time period of the plan makes no provision for organic growth, separates families particularly the young and the old from their family support group , erodes the educational and financial viability of the village school and all other facilities by inhibiting natural organic growth and is contradictory to so many other policies in the proposed plan . The necessity for limiting residential development in areas of high flood risk is a significant constraint. South East Lincolnshire is a living thriving vibrant rural economy which will be slowly strangled by this Plan. This is the opportunity cost of focusing development in large urban extensions. The numbers of new Build allocated to the service villages is too low.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

Response_ Number:	1399	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Q30 No these settlements are not service villages and without substantial addition new build will never have a sufficient consumer base to make commercial or public service facilities economically viable. Most of the named settlement are close to Swineshead which is already scheduled for expansion (as is Donington) Focus development in these two locations creating another main service centre.	The promotion of Swineshead 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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

Response_ Number:	1400	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**D**	Q31 Create uniform classification of Regional Sub centres, Main Service Centres, Village Service Centres and Other Rural Settlements. Treat Other Rural Settlements as open countryside. Reduce the number of defined Service Villages and permit more new build particularly of affordable housing. Reconsider the policy of large urban extensions .	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

Response_ Number:	721	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1793	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**E**	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.	Following consideration of the representation, further work will be required on broad locations for housing growth in Boston.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Steve Williamson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs EA Wing, Mr JA Wing, Mrs A					

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

Response_ Number:	110	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1742	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**E**	I believe that the proposed location for housing development at Boston would wipe out an area of natural beauty, and wildlife habitation unnecessarily. Within the proposed area there is grassland and mature hedgerows. This is one of the few areas around Boston which contains such habitats, and it should not be destroyed for housing when there are other areas that could be developed. The proposed development site also has a poor network of roads, and I believe the development would be better placed between the new A16 and the River Haven, extending along the road to Wyberton East, or between the \a16 and A52 to the north. If the proposed area is developed then all the existing hedgerows should be retained and building should only take place on existing farmed agricultural land, not grassland.	Following consideration of the representation, further work will be required on broad locations for housing growth in Boston.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Miss Sally A Minns					
Representing_Who?:	Herself					

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

Response_ Number:	114	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1192	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**E**	Further to the recent meeting and your email below please note the following comments in respect to possible development areas within our catchment. I am aware that these locations have been excluded from your initial determination of suitable locations but these comments may be of use should those decisions be re-visited. B1 – drainage infrastructure improvements required and benefit from proximity of IDB watercourses and a good outfall (Cowbridge Drain) B2 - no existing IDB infrastructure (outfall to EA Maud Foster?) B3 - drainage infrastructure improvements required and benefit from proximity of IDB watercourses and a good outfall (Cowbridge Drain) B4 – existing IDB infrastructure can support no more development. Major drainage infrastructure improvements required as no convenient outfall (most difficult all the proposed sites in our area to drain) B5 – existing capacity within IDB system to receive attenuated flows B11 – no existing IDB infrastructure (outfall to EA River Witham?)	Following consideration of the representation, further work will be required on broad locations for housing growth in Boston.
Persons_ Name:	Mr A Carrott				
Representing_Who?:	Witham Forth IDB				

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

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

Infrastructure improvements could take 2 to 4 years from first discussions through design and modelling to completion depending on size. It's a real ball park guestimate but costs could range from £50,000 (B1, B3) to £250,000 (B4, especially if road openings are required for new culverts). Responsibility for delivery – developer and/or Board (depends on scale and type of project). For the bigger schemes the Board would have to look seriously at the areas of benefit and consider partial funding of projects however I suspect that would depend on the Borough's long term plans for development. For example a scheme to provide adequate drainage for area B4 would be very expensive. It may be that Board contribution or even grant aid funding could be sought if a scheme was also able to benefit B2 and B3 at the same time, however that requires a commitment by the BBC to developing a significant area north east of Boston.

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

				Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Response_ Number:	295	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	We have no evidence to question the preferred broad location for growth for Boston yet note that this accommodates only 1900 dwellings of the proposed requirements for the town. We would question the need for an additional large scale broad location for growth and consider that the residual housing requirement could be distributed around the town at site allocation stage, having due regard to flood risk and other delivery considerations.	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is more appropriate to identify a second broad location for housing growth in Boston or, alternatively, smaller allocations to be promoted through the Site Allocations DPD.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Respondents ID Number:	967	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**E**			
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates					
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese					

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

Response_ Number:	300	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing
Respondents ID Number:	858	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**E**
Persons_ Name:	Peacock & Smith		
Representing_Who?:	Mr R Hardy		

Respondents_Comments:

As stated above, our client is in control of the land that forms the site to the south of Wainfleet Road in Boston. It is understood that this broad location was assessed (potential location B4) for its potential to accommodate a strategically significant amount of housing development required to contribute to the need to provide 2,900 additional dwellings in Boston over the Plan period to 2031.

Appendix 12 of the Preferred Options document provides an appraisal of each of the considered broad locations for housing development and seeks to rate them against a number of criteria. It then comes to a conclusion as to which broad location is a reasonable option for moving forward.

Our client's site has previously been put forward through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA, September 2012) process as Site FIS017 (Land to the south of Wainfleet Road, Boston) (an extract from the SHLAA document is attached for reference). The site proforma attached to the Draft Findings of the SHLAA (September 2012) states that this site covers a total

Officer_Response:

Following consideration of this representation, it is evident that further work will be required to determine whether it is more appropriate to identify a second broad location for housing growth in Boston or, alternatively, smaller allocations to be promoted through the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

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

of 76.81ha and is capable of accommodating 2,300 dwellings.

Our client notes that Appendix 12 of the Preferred Options document states that the broad location identified as 'land to the south of Wainfleet Road' only covers an area of 8.12ha of deliverable land. Accordingly, our client would like to provide further up-to-dated information about the status, suitability, deliverability and availability of the site, along with details of how we consider the site would successfully contribute to the identified housing requirement in Boston.

Availability and Deliverability

The site (in excess of 180 acres) is available for development and is capable of accommodating up to 2,300 dwellings. The entire site is under the sole control of our client. Furthermore, Mr Hardy has been in contact with Lindum Homes, part of Lindum Group Ltd, who has shown interest in developing the site for housing. Discussions are on-going with Lindum Homes and our client will endeavour to update the Council as soon as further progress is made.

Given that the entire site is under

the sole control of Mr Hardy, the ability of the site to come forward will not be hampered by the need to assemble numerous plots of land.

Furthermore, our client acknowledges that a site of this scale would require development phasing over a number of years, however the land is in principle available immediately for development.

We consider that the site is clearly available for development given that the majority is under the ownership of our client and given that interest has been received from a known house builder and live discussions are underway, the site is also considered to be deliverable. We consider this broad location therefore complies with the size (1,000+ dwellings) and deliverability tests as set out at Appendix 12.

Flood Risk

Appendix 12 goes on to assess each of the broad locations against flood risk criteria. The broad location of our client's site is considered to have a predominantly medium (some low) relative probability of tidal flooding and a low relative

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

probability of fluvial flooding.

Although our client's site does not have the least potential for flooding out of the assessed broad locations, it is by no means the worst. There are 3 sites that have been identified as having a medium relative probability of tidal flooding and some have a worse probability of fluvial flooding.

When considering the larger potential locations for growth (those capable of accommodating 1,000+ dwellings), our site sits favourably in terms of flood risk, with the exception of potential location B8, which is the preferred location for growth.

Our client acknowledges the challenges faced with areas of flood risk, however this assessment is based solely on the undeveloped land as it currently stands. Should the site be brought forward for development, flood mitigation measures will be explored that would be to the overall benefit of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the SHLAA proforma confirms that the presence of flood risk on this site does not impact on its achievability.

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

Development of a larger site for housing development, such as our client's, outweighs the development of a number of smaller sites as it provides the opportunity to offer a significant amount of land for flood mitigation measures

Location

The site is located to the north east of Boston. New housing development in this location would form a natural extension to the existing neighbourhood and would contribute to a balanced distribution of growth across Boston, as opposed to a concentration of development elsewhere, particularly in the south west.

Adopting this approach would ensure that the entire road network surrounding Boston is utilised to its full potential and that the existing infrastructure that is currently concentrated in the south west is not put under adverse pressures.

The Wainfleet Road site is in an accessible location, with access to the A52 and A16, which has been acknowledged as a positive point in the assessment at Appendix 12.

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

Recommendation

Appendix 12 identifies only one reasonable option for a broad location for housing development, however paragraph 6.51.2 of the Preferred Options document acknowledges that the additional housing requirement that the preferred site will not bring forward, could be realised through the identification of a second broad location should new information come to light during the preparation of the Strategy and Policies DPD. Otherwise, the outstanding housing requirement will be addressed through the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD.

In light of the additional information and clarification provided by our client in relation to land to the south of Wainfleet Road, we consider it necessary for the Joint Committee to review the suitability and deliverability of the site to come forward as a strategic location for housing growth through the Strategy and Policies DPD.

Furthermore, our client will be following up these representations with a letter to the Joint Authority confirming the status of the Wainfleet Road site

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

for the purposes of updating the SHLAA.

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

Response_ Number:	448	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1115	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**E**	Following a review of the documents and attendance at a recent consultation event held by the South East Lincolnshire Council Policy Unit and Lincolnshire County Council in relation to delivery of infrastructure, I wish to make the following comments in relation to the proposals for the Boston area. The majority of housing numbers (around 1900) proposed are located on one site in the area situated in the south west quadrant known as Wyberton West/Chain Bridge Road (ref B8). The reason for the housing numbers in this area appears to be because the proposed western relief road is planned for the area. Whilst we are not against the allocation of land in this area we believe that there is significant risk to delivering over half of the plan period housing numbers required in this way because of the following reasons:- 1. This land for the 1900 homes is predominantly controlled by one developer; development rates could therefore be restricted to 40-50 homes per annum, taking delivery of the scheme up to 40 years, well beyond your plan	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is more appropriate to identify a second broad location for housing growth in Boston or, alternatively, smaller allocations to be promoted through the Site Allocations DPD. The delivery of a Boston Distributor Road has not been a factor in identifying a broad location for development.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr D Logan					
Representing_Who?:	Themselves					

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

period.
2. In relation to the Relief Road the planning, purchase of land (CPO's), technical obstacles and arrangement of finances and contractors for delivery may take many years without which the delivery of homes from this site would be restricted. This would reduce the amount of homes being delivered in the plan period.
3. The allocation of one main site with major issues to be resolved prevents other less technically complicated sites coming forward. Other smaller sites could deliver homes quicker to aid delivery of homes in the area earlier in the plan period.

We believe that the following matters should be considered in order for the councils plan to be robust and delivery more likely:-

1. Rather than just one major allocation to the south west of the centre the Authority should identify broad areas of growth including urban extensions in a variety of locations to provide choice and proximity to employment, schooling and transport corridors.
2. A variety of locations may also make it easier to assimilate areas of new development into the existing townscape.

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

3. Allocation of a number of available sites within the town will provide the council with a better opportunity of meeting its annual housing numbers and overall plan period numbers.
4. A more balanced spread of developments should deliver the funds through CIL policy in a more predictable way ensuring that services and infrastructure are catered for as Boston grows.

I hope that our comments are of use during this consultation and confirm that we shall be pleased to attend any future workshop or consultation events in relation to the Local Plan, CIL or Infrastructure that the council may undertake.

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

Response_ Number:	647	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing
Respondents ID Number:	988	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**E**
Persons_ Name:	Graham Warren Ltd		
Representing_Who?:	Broadgate Homes Ltd		

Respondents_Comments:

The Plan states that the significant number of additional dwellings planned for the sub-regional centres of Boston and Spalding can best be accommodated in planned urban extensions to these towns.

Accordingly, it is necessary to identify 'broad locations' for accommodating this growth. In order to assist this exercise Appendix 12 to the Plan, entitled "Assessment of Broad Locations for Growth in Boston and Spalding" considers a number of sites promoted through the SHLAA process, and identifies reasonable options which have been subject to assessment in the Sustainability Assessment.

Boston

Appendix 12 claims to identify only one reasonable option (Option A), for a broad location in Boston (identified as B*), namely Wyberton West Road/Chain Bridge Road/Swineshead Road. This is based on the SHLAA, has a capacity for 1,900 dwellings and resurrects the proposal in the abandoned Local Plan Review, to provide a Distribution Road, initially to the south of the town.

Officer_Response:

1) Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is more appropriate to identify a second broad location for housing growth in Boston or, alternatively, smaller allocations to be promoted through the Site Allocations
DPD.

2) Support noted in terms of comments relating to Spalding.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

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

Because the preferred option for Boston is 2,900 dwellings, all of which can be located in the ROY zones, this leaves the need to identify a sustainable location for a further 1,000 dwellings. The Plan recognises that this could be the second broad location for growth in the town.

Broadgate has interests amounting to 22.65 hectares to the west of the town (South of North Forty Foot Bank) and identified as B9 in Appendix 12.

The assessment of this location concludes that there are no natural or historic environment constraints, the area is well related to the Distributor Road "Likely Area of Assessment", and it is proximate to edge of town retail facilities (Chain Bridge).

In these circumstances, Broadgate argue that B8 is not "the only reasonable option and has positive sustainability impacts, in terms of housing provision …"(6.55.1). Area B9 is equally sustainable and has been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal as such, as are a number of the sites identified in the SHLAA. B9 can accommodate more than 1,000 plus dwellings. Broadgate conclude therefore

that area B9 should be identified in the forthcoming Site Allocations Development Plan Document as the second identified area in the town to accommodate the required 1,000 plus additional dwellings.
To this end, Broadgate will liaise with the Boston Borough Council to discuss the merits of the area I relation to the town as a whole and in particular, the virtues of developing it in parallel with B8. The development merits of B9 are equal to those of B8.

Spalding

The preferred option for Spalding is 6,000 dwellings, none of which will be located in ROY zones. The Plan notes that the Holland Park urban extension (promoted by Broadgate), is to provide 2,250 dwellings, leaving 3,750 to be identified. Appendix 12 identifies three reasonable options for broad locations in Spalding, known as:
•S8' (land between Holland Park and the A151), which includes SHLAA sites amounting to 1,179 dwellings;
•S9' (Land between the Vernatt's Drain and the A151), which includes SHLAA sites amounting to 1,697 dwellings; and
•S10' (Land to the North of the

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

Vernatt's Drain), which includes SHLAA sites amounting to 6,965 dwellings.

For the purpose of identifying a broad location or locations for accommodating the outstanding requirement of 3,750 dwellings in Spalding, the reasonable options identified in Appendix 12 above, enable consideration of revised options, based on:
•The area alone;
•A combination of areas S8 and S9; and
•A combination of smaller versions of these two options

As outlined in the SA of S10 in Appendix 12, this option has the potential to impact on the settlement of Pinchbeck. Therefore, any consideration of an option based on S10 must ensure that there is no coalescence of Spalding with Pinchbeck and that a significant landscape buffer between the broad location for development and the village is achieved.

From this, three options have been selected:
Option A ; To identify a broad location for the development of approximately 3,750 dwellings to the north of the Vernatt's Drain and the line if the proposed

SWRR, with vehicular access onto the SWRR. However, this area is to be completely separate from Pinchbeck.
Option B; To identify a broad location for the development of approximately 3,750 dwellings lying to the north and south of the A151, with vehicular access onto the SWRR.
Option C; To identify two broad locations for housing growth, each for the development of approximately 1,875 dwellings, based on smaller versions of Options A and B above, with vehicular access onto the SWRR.

Transportation is a significant issue when considering which of these options is to be preferred. All options will have a mixed, minor, positive/minor negative impact. Large scale greenfield development will inevitably lead to greater levels of car use and, therefore, increased congestion. However, large scale development does offer the opportunity to design-in and establish critical mass for sustainable modes of transport. Furthermore, all options provide the opportunity contribute to the delivery of the SWRR, which will have the benefit of minimising increases in congestion within Spalding, as a result of planned

increases in rail crossing downtime.

Modelling work undertaken to date, suggests that Option A appears to offer the most beneficial impact on transport conditions in Spalding, especially if associated with the delivery of the entire SWRR during the plan period, as opposed to only Phase 3 (Pinchbeck Road up to, but not crossing, the Vernatt's Drain) and Phase 1 (Holland Park to the B1172), in that time.

Importantly, in response to the predicted increase in rail crossing downtime, Option A provides the opportunity for the construction of a bridge over the railway at an earlier point in time than Option B.

The Plan concludes that the above considerations show that there is a mixed impact in terms of sustainability. Any large scale new development has the potential to impact on the environment, although there are measures to minimise this. However, there are positive impacts in terms of social and economic considerations, such s access to housing. All options score similarly when compared against the baseline situation of no growth in these locations.

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

The overall assessment of Option A concludes “Crucially, Option A appears to offer the most beneficial impact o transport conditions in Spalding (preferably in association with the completion of the SWRR, rather than the completion of Phases 1 and 3 only), and for this reason, it is deemed the most preferable.”

Broadgate Homes support Option A. The company has been involved for the last 10 years, in shaping development in the sub-regional centre of Spalding and has committed to providing the first phase of the Relief Road, with the essential crossing of the railway. The development of land north of Vernatt’s Drain, that would come after Holland Park, will secure the completion of the SWRR.

Based in Spalding, Broadgate wish to see the continuing sustainable evolution of the town, which fosters growth, with the provision of social facilities and community services, and therefore support the provision of 6,000 dwellings at the town. Option A is also supported because it will ensure the completion of the SWRR during the Plan period.

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

Response_ Number:	649	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	988	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**E**	These representations now briefly comment on the SE Lincs Baseline Infrastructure Statement. The starting point in the background paper in Appendix 12 of the Plan, headed Purpose and Methodology, in the context of Broad Locations for Growth at Boston and Spalding. It should be made clear, that the purpose of the background paper is not to determine the preferred locations for growth or how to distribute levels of development between them. This is the role of the Housing Chapter of the Plan and SA Report. The background paper merely acts as a sieving process. The Appendix identifies the broad locations for growth and then sets out the advantages and disadvantages of the identified locations. The characteristics are clearly a matter for future consideration, not least with the application of the sequential and exception tests, when considering the allocation of 2,900 dwellings in the ROY zones of Boston. Transport Because development potential of major sites under consideration is	1) Support noted in terms of comments made relating to Spalding. 2) Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is more appropriate to identify a second broad location for housing growth in Boston or, alternatively, smaller allocations to be promoted through the Site Allocations DPD.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Graham Warren Ltd					
Representing_Who?:	Broadgate Homes Ltd					

predicated on the provision of transport infrastructure, these Representations now consider this issue for both Spalding and Boston, an issue which is considered in the SE Lincs Baseline Infrastructure Statement.

The infrastructure baseline paper has been prepared by Lincolnshire County Council (LCC), in its role as a partner authority in the South East Lincolnshire joint-working arrangements and in dialogue with Boston Borough Council and South Holland District Council. It has been prepared in support of the Local Plan (Strategy and Policies DPD) preferred options. The paper follows extensive discussions with LCC, discussions with District Council services and external organisations, such as utility companies.

The paper sets out details on major infrastructure issues that have been identified by the joint Planning Authorities and partner organisations in relation to existing and emerging infrastructure programmes, plans and projects. It also provides an assessment of potential infrastructure requirements and an action plan (at Appendix 1) for further assessment on these issues.

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

Spalding

The major piece of transport infrastructure expected to be delivered during the Local plan period is the Spalding western Relief Road (SWRR). The SWRR is considered key to the delivery of the housing growth strategy, as outlined in the housing chapter of the Local Plan and the assessment of broad locations for development. The SWRR has also been identified to respond to the impact of planned future increases in rail crossing downtime through Spalding.

The first phase (including a junction to the B1172 and a bridge over the railway) will be delivered adjacent to Holland Park through the Section 106 Agreement, associated with the 2012 outline consent and to which Broadgate are party. However, the Local Plan as it progresses to examination, will nee to include a clear policy context for this development and all relevant infrastructure, particularly phase one of the SWRR.

During 2011, two route options for potential second phase, were the subject of public consultation,

with option 2A considered by a small minority f the public (42%), compared to 2B (37%). Option 2A (the western most route) has been protected by LCC, on the basis that 2A has a lesser impact on existing properties and allotments and is less restrictive for potential residential-led development when compared to 2B.

LCC and SHDC are working with other parties on a complete SWRR route, that will deliver a holistic transport solution for the town and provide potential development land for the longer term. The proposed SWR would provide access from the B1172, in the south to the B1356 Spalding Road in the north, with a proposed junction at the A151 Bourne Road. Route options will be prepared for the northern section of the proposed SWRR, in preparation for a public consultation in 2013.

Lincolnshire County Council, in conjunction with the district authorities. Has undertaken transport modelling to help determine which phases of the road, in conjunction with potential locations for growth, would have the most benefit in transport terms. The results of

this modelling have informed the preferred broad location for development around Spalding.

Broadly speaking, the evidence highlights that with the levels of growth planned for Spalding, in conjunction with the planned increases in rail crossing downtime, should a SWRR not be delivered, the traffic impacts upon the town would be severe. For this reason, it is considered that the SWRR is critical to the delivery of the growth strategy for Spalding. As such, it is important to ensure that the emerging Local Plan facilitates its delivery.

There is an outstanding planning permission for development at Holland Park, which is a given. This will provide Phase 1 of the SWRR and crosses the railway. In order to enable further development led phases of the relief road, allocation of land north of Vernatt's Drain, following on from development at Holland Park is essential, not only to secure completion of the SWRR but to reinforce Spalding's role as a sub-regional centre.

The preferred option for growth that would secure the provision of the SWRR, is S10, in which Broadgate have an interest and

where the company will continue, as at Holland Park, to play a pivotal role, along with other stakeholders, in securing its eventual completion.

In terms of the provision of the Spalding Western Relief Road, the preferred options at Spalding, S10 and Option A are supported because this will ensure the completion of the relief road during the Plan period.

Boston

The potential to deliver a Boston distribution road is outlined in the latest Local Transport Plan. The Transport Strategy for Boston 2006 – 2021 and beyond, highlights a number of aims related to the Distribution Road, not least in accommodating future development in the town.

To date, no detailed modelling work has been carried out in respect of the Distribution Road's benefits and no technical work has been undertaken related to engineering a specific route or estimated costs. The Infrastructure Background Paper states that it is unlikely to come forward in its entirety in the Plan period.

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

		Broadgate's interest in area B9 in Boston, lies within the Distribution Road "Likely Area of Assessment" and as stated above, the company will seek to enter into discussions with the County and Borough Councils in respect of promoting a growth area for at least 1,000 dwellings and thereby taking into consideration, the provision of the Distributor Road. Initial work undertaken by Broadgate suggests that area B9 could accommodate more than 1,000 dwellings.	

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

Response_ Number:	722	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1793	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**E**	Housing The analysis set out in paragraphs 6.2.31 to 32 resulting in "a single reasonable option to the south west of Boston" is fundamentally flawed by giving weight to unsubstantiated "developer interest" which is not a reasonable criteria, paying scant regard to the genuine sustainability criteria set out in the report, and assuming that only that area can be developed in a manner that addresses flood risk issues. Paragraph 6.7.2 and 6.11.1 - Option A is reasonable. Paragraph 6.49.3 notes in regard to Appendix 12 that additional information on availability of land may come to light. For the record my clients are willing to make their land available for development to assist in meeting the plan's housing allocation. The land is identified as site Fis013 on the most recent SHLAA as being suitable for development, but over a longer timescale. Robert Bell and Co made submissions on the timescale, which will be on the Council's record. The land can be brought forward in the short term and in terms of the scenario set out in paragraph 6.51.2, of a second strategic broad housing	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is more appropriate to identify a second broad location for housing growth in Boston or, alternatively, smaller allocations to be promoted through the Site Allocations DPD.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Steve Williamson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs EA Wing, Mr JA Wing, Mrs A					

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

				location, the site could form the core of the development allocation.		
Response_ Number:	1244	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1722	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**E**	Q34 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest? It is concerning that "only one reasonable option for a broad location in Boston" with an approximate capacity of 1,900 dwellings has been identified. This leaves a significant shortfall of 1,000 dwellings to be provided within Boston on the basis of the current policy approach requiring a minimum of 2,900 units in Boston. A strategic level development of 1,000 units should be identified prior to the Site Allocations stage, even if just a broad location. Kirton is close to Boston and whilst it may not be possible to accommodate all 1,000 units there is land available including land within the control of Ambrose Lighton which could help to address this shortfall.	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is more appropriate to identify a second broad location for housing growth in Boston or, alternatively, smaller allocations to be promoted through the Site Allocations DPD.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Brown					
Representing_Who?:	Ambrose Lighton					

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

Response_ Number:	1260	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1689	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**E**	Q32 - Do you agree with the identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options outlined in sections 6.49 – 6.61 under Approach to Identifying Broad Locations for Accommodating Housing Growth and Boston and Spalding and Appendix 12 (Assessment of Broad Locations for Growth at Boston and Spalding) in the full consultation document? Please explain your view. We have concerns that the methodology for identifying broad locations for growth has not been undertaken through a robust application of the flood risk sequential test. The Technical Guidance to the NPPF requires decision makers to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding (Flood Zone 1). The Environment Agency's flood zones are the starting point for this sequential approach. Zones 2 and 3 are shown on the flood map with Flood Zone 1 being all the land falling outside Zones 2 and 3. These flood zones refer to the probability of sea and river flooding only, ignoring the presence of existing defences. These maps are to be used to test sites in the first instance and only where sites outside of the high	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine the final approach to broad locations and site selection in Boston Borough.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Ms A Hewitson					
Representing_Who?:	Environment Agency					

probability area are not available will SFRA information be required. The Guidance goes on to say that Strategic Flood Risk Assessments (SFRAs) refine information on the probability of flooding, taking other sources of flooding and the impacts of climate change into account. They also include the consideration of flood risk infrastructure (i.e. the with defences scenario, introducing hazard mapping which includes the relevant speed and depth of flooding). They provide the basis for applying the sequential test by exception. Only then, when there are no apparent flood risk variances of speed and depth between sites should „relative probability" of flooding be introduced, informed by Local Flood Risk Strategies. We recommend a glossary accompanying the Local Plan explains the difference between the terms „probability" within the NPPF and „relative probability" within the Boston SFRA.
It is apparent from Appendix 12 that this process has not been followed. Although the hazard category, depth and velocity of flooding is recorded in the tables on pages 283-289, and it is acknowledged that "there is considerable variation in the flood hazard/depth/velocity to which

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

they (the sites) are potentially exposed" the only differentiation criteria used for the assessment is that of relative probabilities, as detailed on page 291.
We cannot emphasis enough that „danger to people" for new development combines both speed and depth to give the hazard. We note that your individual references to either velocities or depths have been categorised as low, medium and high for the broad locations assessment in Boston. These definitions are misleading when you separate them out into their individual components, as any increase in speed or depth increases the hazard. Can you provide your rationale behind these categories as they do not appear to have come from any national guidance or local assessment and we would, therefore, question their validity.
We request that these entries are revisited, for example, B1 and B8 are said to lie predominantly in a „danger for most" hazard area (this hazard category includes the general public). However, an „advantage" for these sites records the velocity as predominantly low even though there are vulnerable areas at risk of velocities up to 1m/s – (at this speed the water level would need

to be below 0.2m depth for it to be classed as low, for the same velocity with depths above 0.2m it is classed as „danger for some" which is categorised as moderate) therefore you need to be very clear how you present part of the risk as it is currently misleading to record this as an „advantage". For velocities of 0.3m/s the water depth again would need to be below 0.2m depth to have a „low" impact on people, for the same velocity water depths only have to be 0.3m and 0.4m for it to be classed as „danger for most" which is categorised as significant. For clarity, we recommend inclusion of the hazard rating table within this section.
Our advice in terms of appropriate mitigation to make residential developments safe varies depending on predicted depths of flooding and this could have implications for the viability of developing sites. For example, where predicted flood depths exceed 1.6m it is our opinion that they can only be considered „safe" where they are a minimum 2 storey design with no ground floor habitable accommodation, i.e. by ensuring the habitable accommodation is above the highest predicted flood depth. Where predicted flood depths are between 0.5-1m finished floor

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

levels should be set 1m above ground level with flood resilient construction used to a height 300mm above the predicted flood level.
Parts of site B9 are within a lower hazard (predominantly „danger to all", some „danger to most") and depth (predominantly 1-2m, some 0.5-1m) category than sites B6 and B8 and it could, therefore, be concluded that from a flood risk perspective this site is sequentially preferable. There may also be implications for viability/deliverability in areas where there are significant flood depths. It is our opinion that the process as currently detailed could lead to challenges to the soundness of your plan.
The Sustainability Appraisal of this option is also misleading. Development of this scale would not have a neutral impact as it will result in more people living within a flood risk zone. Development of this scale also has the potential to increase flood risk to third parties, off site, if it is not properly managed. This increased risk should be acknowledged in the Sustainability Appraisal and consideration of the mitigation required to reduce that risk should be acknowledged.

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

Response_ Number:	1270	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	989	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**E**	Question 32 – 34 – Broad Locations for Housing Developments in Boston We would agree that to accommodate the additional dwellings proposed for the Sub-Regional Centre of Boston the most appropriate approach is through the identification of a large scale urban extension opportunity. This would have the opportunity to deliver a critical mass of development that would be planned in a coordinated manner to achieve key sustainable principles together with appropriate levels of infrastructure provision. We support the approach and methodology set out in Appendix 12 and concur that the identification of Site B8 as being the only reasonable location to deliver a broad location of housing development in Boston. Compared to the other sites assessed, we are of the opinion that the location of B8 has many planning and sustainable advantages particularly its ability to deliver well over 1,000 houses within the Plan Period and has a reduced probability of flooding. It is also well related to the	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine the final approach to broad locations and site selection in Boston Borough.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Hobson					
Representing_Who?:	Chestnut Homes					

proposed alignment of the proposed Distributor Road. Whilst it is acknowledged at Paragraph 10.2.2 that the infrastructure provision of the Distributor Road is not critical to the delivery of growth for Boston, it remains an aspiration nonetheless and we are of the view that Site B8 would be best placed to enable it to contribute to the delivery of this infrastructure provision.

There is also another related area to the south west of Boston (west of the A16) known as Tytton Lane and it is unclear as to whether this has been considered as part of the site selection process. Given my clients land ownership control of the Tytton Lane site and the opportunity for strong planning, sustainability and transport links with Site B8 we would suggest that it forms an integral part of the wider project being promoted by Chestnut Homes to deliver the proposed 1,900 houses that have been identified within this broad location for growth area. In our view, the Tytton Lane land would be the first logical phase of the overall broad location for growth site identified as Site B8.

To avoid ambiguity and to clarify our assumption that the Tytton Lane land is included within site

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

B8 it is recommended that the circle denoting this broad location for housing development in Boston within Figure 6.1 is slightly extended in size in a south east direction up to the edge of the A16.

(See attached amended Figure 6.1)

Whilst the principle of initially identifying the preferred location for large scale housing development to accommodate the level of growth required in a Sub-Regional Centre is supported, we raise concern regarding the suggestion in Paragraph 6.49.1 and 6.54.1 that the detailed proposals for the broad locations will be advanced through the Site Allocations DPD. We object to this approach and instead consider that the detailed process for assessing the suitability of the preferred broad location for growth should be accelerated so it become an integral part of the Strategy and Policies DPD and therefore it would ultimately be identified as a formal strategic allocation.

The single broad location will be a fundamental element in seeking to justify the soundness of the emerging spatial strategic framework and policies. By using

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

a proportionate evidence base, the Council should ensure there is sufficient commitment, clarity and certainty that a specific strategic site is suitable and is able to be delivered in order to satisfy a Local Plan Inspector that the plan is sound without requiring the introduction of contingency measures. At paragraph 6.54.1 there is no clear guidance as to how the Strategy and Policies DPD will assist in bringing forward a large scale urban extension to the Sub-Regional Centres. Instead, the reliance is placed upon the Site Allocations DPD and if a planning application is submitted before the Site Allocations DPD is produced, the onus would transfer to the development management process to deliver the growth.

As there is likely to be a significant lag time of over a year between the consultation process of the Strategy and Policy DPD and the commencement of the Sites Allocation DPD, it is unreasonable for a development opportunity that will have significant strategic implication to be reliant on the development management process in the intervening period. In contrast the upfront work required to demonstrate the

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

suitability of a formal strategic allocation would seek to foster certainty and continuity. In our view it is important for the Strategy and Policy DPD to provide a strong framework with clear guiding principles and objectives to plan positively for the large scale developments particularly in terms of planning and infrastructure requirements.

It should also be recognised that the delivery of large scale urban extensions often have long leading times so that complex technical and infrastructure delivery mechanisms can be resolved. However, it is apparent that the release of these strategic sites would be required in order to make a meaningful contribution to the housing land supply within the first five years of the Plan Period. This is particularly the case since at Paragraph 4.2.1 it is recognised that Boston BC only has an estimate of 3.6 years supply of deliverable sites. It is therefore important that as part of the policy making approach up front master planning work should be encouraged as early as possible so that key decisions and priorities can be made that can correspond with achieving the overall spatial strategy of this emerging DPD. In

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

		the circumstances, we recommend that the Strategy and Policy DPD should take the initiative and working in partnership with the relevant land owner/developers start to build upon the identified preferred Broad Location for housing development so that at the Pre Submission stage a proportionate evidence base (in the form of master planning work and the phasing and delivery of essential infrastructure) has been undertaken commensurate with the work required to support a strategic allocation at Site B8. This would give all parties the necessary degree of confidence (including the Local Plan Inspector) to confirm that the development opportunity is suitable, available and achievable and can therefore contribute to satisfying the aims and objectives of the underlying spatial objectives set out within the Strategy and Policies DPD.	

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

Response_ Number:	213	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1757	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**F**	Overreliance on too few new allocations within Spalding itself. A small number of large allocations will result in too much new development being under the control of a limited number of developers. Diversity of ownership will ensure that implementation is not restricted to a few landowners, whilst still securing a comprehensiveness of approach. The Holland Park development (Appendix 3) is one such example of a single owner driven development.	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Matrix Planning Ltd					
Representing_Who?:	Mr Morris Wilson					

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

Response_ Number:	464	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**F**	Q32 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. We consider some development on peripheral western parts, and the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools. Additionally, our clients land at Spalding Common, is now a discontinued horticultural use, and falls adjacent to residential development and as such an alternative use for the land would be beneficial.	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Parigo Horticultural					

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

Response_ Number:	477	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**F**	Q32 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. We consider some development on peripheral western parts, and the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools. Additionally, our clients land at Spalding Common, is now too small a field to farm in an efficient manner, and an alternative use for the land would be beneficial.	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs C Stratton					

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

Response_ Number:	533	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**F**	Q32 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. We consider some development on peripheral western parts, and the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools. Additionally, our clients land at Pode Hole, is now too small a field to farm in an efficient manner, and an alternative use for the land would be beneficial.	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Roe Family					

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

Response_ Number:	1084	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**F**	Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we note it has been proposed that Spalding will require 6,000 new dwelling allocations for 2011-2031. Q32/Q33 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. Having studied the consultation on infrastructure document, it is considered that the S5 area is well located for Healthcare, and Childcare. It is also extremely well located for transport links. Cont'/over Cont'd.. We consider some development on the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools. Additionally, our clients land at Cowbit Road, is a lower grade Silt land to the land on the western parts such as S10. From a flooding perspective , consideration should be made to assessments from the IDB's on land drainage and flooding problem, not only EA data on 'Sea and High Level water	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	M Cobbin					

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

passing through the area'. The S5 area has little or no flood history or problems. The development of land in S5 would alleviate the problems caused by development is S10 – as all the traffic from that proposed area will feed into Spalding Road, Pinchbeck near the Johnson Hospital. We consider the development of s10 will contribute more to the public realm than the spend needed on two railway flyovers and a river crossing, which would be needed to deliver the SWRR..

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

Response_ Number:	1088	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**F**	Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we note it has been proposed that Spalding will require 6,000 new dwelling allocations for 2011-2031. Q32/Q33 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. Having studied the consultation on infrastructure document, it is considered that the S5 area is well located for Healthcare, and Childcare. It is also extremely well located for transport links. Cont'/over Cont'd.. We consider some development on the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools. Additionally, our clients land at Cowbit Road, is a lower grade Silt land to the land on the western parts such as S10. From a flooding perspective , consideration should be made to assessments from the IDB's on land drainage and flooding problem, not only EA data on 'Sea and High Level water	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	R Chappell Esq.					

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

passing through the area'. The S5 area has little or no flood history or problems. The development of land in S5 would alleviate the problems caused by development is S10 – as all the traffic from that proposed area will feed into Spalding Road, Pinchbeck near the Johnson Hospital. We consider the development of s10 will contribute more to the public realm than the spend needed on two railway flyovers and a river crossing, which would be needed to deliver the SWRR..

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

Response_ Number:	1092	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**F**	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. Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we note it has been proposed that Spalding will require 6,000 new dwelling allocations for 2011-2031. Q32/Q33 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. Having studied the consultation on infrastructure document, it is considered that the S5 area is well located for Healthcare, and Childcare. It is also extremely well located for transport links. We consider some development on the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools. Additionally, our clients land at Cowbit Road, is a lower grade Silt land to the land on the western parts such as S10. From a flooding perspective , consideration should	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Spalding Rectory Feoffees					

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

		be made to assessments from the IDB's on land drainage and flooding problem, not only EA data on 'Sea and High Level water passing through the area'. The S5 area has little or no flood history or problems. The development of land in S5 would alleviate the problems caused by development is S10 – as all the traffic from that proposed area will feed into Spalding Road, Pinchbeck near the Johnson Hospital. We consider the development of s10 will contribute more to the public realm than the spend needed on two railway flyovers and a river crossing, which would be needed to deliver the SWRR..	

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

				Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Response_ Number:	1097	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we note it has been proposed that Spalding will require 6,000 new dwelling allocations for 2011-2031. Q32/Q33 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. Having studied the consultation on infrastructure document, it is considered that the S5 area is well located for Healthcare, and Childcare. It is also extremely well located for transport links. We consider some development on the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools. Additionally, our clients land at Cowbit Road, is a lower grade Silt land to the land on the western parts such as S10. From a flooding perspective , consideration should be made to assessments from the IDB's on land drainage and flooding problem, not only EA data on 'Sea and High Level water passing through the area'. The S5 area has little or no flood history	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**F**			
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Johnson					

Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.		
	or problems. The development of land in S5 would alleviate the problems caused by development is S10 – as all the traffic from that proposed area will feed into Spalding Road, Pinchbeck near the Johnson Hospital. We consider the development of s10 will contribute more to the public realm than the spend needed on two railway flyovers and a river crossing, which would be needed to deliver the SWRR..	

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

Response_ Number:	18	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1726	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	1. The provision of social housing in south Holland at 1 in 3 is preventing a lot of housing schemes getting of the ground. You should alter it to 1 in 5 as per the Boston area when you take into account the other building measures that planning requires such as 10% renewable etc and the landowners expectations then schemes cannot start. Maybe a temporary 2/3 year relaxation would be a possibility. Viability reports to demonstrate that schemes should achieve less are another pre planning permission cost that prevents investment into such schemes. 2. The affordable requirement at 1.3 ratio is too high other areas such as fenland, kings Lynn, Boston all have a lesser provision. 3. There is an ideal opportunity to create accommodation in the countryside by relaxing the residential aspect in relation to farm buildings. Again we seem to be out on a limb in south Holland when it comes to residential development. The plan can help stimulate the construction industry a major economic player in the area. Some measures which if time limited would stimulate the process.	1 and 2) A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. 3) The need to control residential development in the countryside has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr Des Ford					
Representing_Who?:	D Brown Builders					

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

Response_ Number:	55	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1735	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	1. Boston Contributions – whilst the current EVA shows 20% as a current maximum, the plan will outlive the EVA so I would suggest a Boston requirement of one third, negotiating accordingly, especially given that we say that we will use the most up to date assessment of housing need. 2. In respect of any 'off site contribution', the developer should provide sound evidence and proposals for an exceptional approach to be taken (including a robust open book financial model) which will be considered and scrutinised by the Authority. Although the Authority has a vested interest in securing affordable housing, there is a real danger (as experience tells us!) that developers submit poor quality and poorly justified reasons why schemes can't deliver anything and leave it to the Authority to provide the evidence and challenge. 3. Rural exception sites should be considered adjacent to any settlement that meets the tests set out within the consultation document at page 15; we should not limit ourselves to Main Service Centres and Service Villages only. 4. Whilst I agree that some exception sites will need an	1, 2 and 5) A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. 3 and 4) The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes and the consideration of a lower maximum percentage of market housing on rural exception schemes are not issues that have been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options Document. As such, both of these represent new options for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Andy Fisher					
Representing_Who?:	Boston BC Housing					

Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.			
		element of market housing to make then viable, we should be setting the maximum amount of market housing at 40% as the drafted 50/50 split masks that the driver for exceptions development is the need for social housing and not large private houses in the countryside! 5. Only single dwellings should be exempt from making a contribution towards affordable housing. Lifting Boston's affordable housing contribution to 'one third' of dwellings (as set out at point 1 above) would then support a simple financial contribution for anyone wanting to develop a pair of houses. Clearly we need to work in partnership with developers and take a real enabling role, however, we must not forget (most) developers are private businesses. Even in the difficult times we face now, I've never seen a developer roll up to one of our meetings in a hundred thousand mile six year old Ford Mondeo!	

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

Response_ Number:	60	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1017	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	I do not think the one third of total dwellings should be set in stone because some developments cost more to do than others and it could make them unviable.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Cllr F Biggadike					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

Response_ Number:	63	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1736	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Although the proposed level of contribution for Boston Borough is supported by current viability information we need to make sure that it is regularly updated / reviewed to ensure that we maximise affordable housing delivery when the housing market improves/recovers. Alternatively we should seek a higher contribution (25% or keep the current 30%) but implement the flexible approach proposed to allow us to reduce the level of contribution sought by agreement on a case by case basis. This will ensure that we maximise the delivery of affordable housing as the market changes/ improves without the need to update and change our policy frequently. Although I agree with a flexible approach the proposed affordable housing contribution required for Boston Borough should not, unless there are very exceptional circumstances, be negotiated below 20% as we are supposed to be developing new housing to meet local needs, a significant proportion of which (50% +) is for affordable housing as identified in the Coastal Lincolnshire SHMA. The policy currently seems to give the impression that in Boston Borough we are starting at a 20% requirement but that this is an	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Stuart Horton					
Representing_Who?:	Boston BC Housing					

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

open door to reduce.

Response_ Number:	64	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1736	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Rural exception sites should not just be restricted to main service centres and service villages but should also be permitted in other settlements where there is strong evidence of local need. However, although I agree that an element of market housing should be permitted to cross subsidise the development, the maximum of 50% market housing is a little too high for an exception site and should be limited to 35 or 40%. With a potential element of intermediate (shared ownership) affordable housing making up some of the affordable housing this should be sufficient to help ensure delivery and that the exception site is being developed to meet local housing need.	The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes and the consideration of a lower maximum percentage of market housing on rural exception schemes are not issues that have been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, both of these represent new options for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Stuart Horton					
Representing_Who?:	Boston BC Housing					

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

Response_ Number:	65	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1736	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	As in my responses to the questions above I would: 1. Seek a higher contribution for Boston Borough than the 20% proposed (25% or keep the current 30%) but implement the flexible approach to allow us to reduce the level of contribution sought by agreement on a case by case basis. This will ensure that we maximise the delivery of affordable housing as the market changes/ improves without the need to update and change our policy frequently. It should also help ensure that we meet the need for affordable housing for Boston Borough identified in the Coastal Lincolnshire SHMA and that housing is actually developed to meet local need. 2. Limit the maximum percentage of market housing to 35% or 40% on exception sites. (With a potential element of intermediate (shared ownership) affordable housing making up part of the affordable housing this should be sufficient to help ensure delivery and that the exception site is being developed to meet local housing need). 3. Unless an agreed standard sum or method of calculation is set and agreed with developers as part of the policy it may be worth considering increasing the	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy that considers a lower maximum percentage of market housing on rural exception schemes is not issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Stuart Horton					
Representing_Who?:	Boston BC Housing					

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

			threshold for the number of dwellings exempt from making a contribution in Boston Borough to a slightly higher level, in line with the proportion of affordable housing to be sought, to avoid protracted negotiations between applicants and the Council about commuted sums. (As much as it pains me to miss out on any contribution to affordable housing I am concerned that it could be very time consuming to pursue this along with the other proposals)		

Response_ Number:	66	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1736	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	In addition to the assessments already undertaken to assess the suitability of the broad location for housing development around Boston it may be worthwhile conducting an Economic Viability Assessment on the most reasonable options/sites to assess what they require and may be able to contribute depending on the level of the market over the likely forecast delivery timeframe. As well as providing information on what the site may be able to contribute e.g. affordable housing etc, this would provide further evidence to support the most appropriate site/s.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform what the site can contribute in terms of supporting infrastructure.
Persons_ Name:	Stuart Horton				
Representing_Who?:	Boston BC Housing				

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

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

Response_ Number:	84	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1737	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	The percentage of affordable housing on new sites should at least be in line with the "Government Guidelines", and in line with those proposed in Boston Borough i.e. 20% or 1 in 5 affordable homes on new sites.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mrs E Portass					
Representing_Who?:	Herself					

Response_ Number:	108	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1741	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Affordable housing should be brought in line with Government proposals and the same as Boston Borough Council i.e. 20% or one in five.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Neve					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

Response_ Number:	249	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1759	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	It is accepted that an affordable housing policy will be included within the Local Plan. It would be expected that the evidence basis for the policy would justify the levels of affordable housing required and the triggers requiring the delivery of affordable housing. In the current economic climate regard should be had to the impact of viability on the deliverability of housing schemes if these triggers are inappropriately set. It is a concern that this would be the case with all schemes of 3 units or more requiring an affordable housing provision. It is considered that this position should be reviewed or be subject to some form of viability criteria or assessment.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Jonathan Ireland					
Representing_Who?:	Irelands Farm Machinery					

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

				Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Response_ Number:	296	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	We support the Rural Exception Policy and consider that rural exception schemes could be extended beyond the current restrictions to Main Service Centres and Service Villages. We do not consider that exception schemes should be permitted in unsustainable countryside villages yet there are opportunities within the outlier settlements close to the Sub -Regional centres which are relatively accessible to services and facilities within Boston an Spalding. Settlements such as Wyberton, which are defined as part of the Boston area, yet separate from it , would be a classic example of an additional settlement where an exception scheme could potentially be developed. Within the towns themselves, some consideration would need to be given to setting a maximum threshold site size where this policy would apply at the edge of the urban area. There is a danger however that urban exception sites (promoted with elements of cross subsidy from market housing), could potentially threaten the delivery and viability of allocated housing sites.	The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Respondents ID Number:	967	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**			
Persons_ Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates					
Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese					

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

Response_ Number:	332	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	D Braybrooks					

Response_ Number:	336	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	D A and N Casswell					

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

Response_ Number:	340	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs B Blundy					

Response_ Number:	343	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs J Tetley					

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

Response_ Number: 346 Respondents ID Number: 935 Persons_ Name: Annabel Parkinson Representing_Who?: N Ward	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 349 Respondents ID Number: 935 Persons_ Name: Annabel Parkinson Representing_Who?: C Slooten	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	353	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	M Fragale					

Response_ Number:	365	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	R Bingham					

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

Response_ Number:	370	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	M & J Woodroffe					

Response_ Number:	374	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	R Bennett & M & J Woodroffe					

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

Response_ Number:	378	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	C Adams					

Response_ Number:	382	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs E M H Todoroff					

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

Response_ Number: 387 Respondents ID Number: 935 Persons_ Name: Annabel Parkinson Representing_Who?: C L Cave	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 391 Respondents ID Number: 935 Persons_ Name: Annabel Parkinson Representing_Who?: C A Cave	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	395	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mr and M Hotchkin					

Response_ Number:	399	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Louis					

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

Response_ Number:	403	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	J L Crossland					

Response_ Number:	407	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mr R and Mrs J Warrick					

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

Response_ Number:	412	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	P Borst					

Response_ Number:	417	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mr & Mrs R Hart & the Exors of M W					

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

				Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Response_ Number:	424	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	1.1. Affordable Housing Policy 1.1.1 The policy needs to make reference to the available evidence base, including specific references to the newly emerging evidence base around the SHMA and viability assessment. 1.1.2 The policy needs to refer to the evidence which justifies the proposed plan target of 470 units per year, including the findings of the emerging SHMA 1.1.3 The policy need to set out the evidence which justifies the policy 33% approach, both in terms evidenced need and development viability. 1.2 'Normally on-site provision will be made and a flexible approach will be taken to tenure depending upon need.' 1.2.1 The Strategic Housing team is of the view that the policy needs to firmly state that on-site provision is the council's default position, and that this position will only be deviated from in exceptional circumstances. 1.2.2 That wording to the following effect is considered… 'Affordable housing shall be provided on the development site, unless the developer can demonstrate exceptional circumstances which necessitate provision on another site. Where a developer can	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. In respect of South Holland District, an update of the Peterborough Partial SHMA is currently being prepared. Early findings of this study will also inform the next stages of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Respondents ID Number:	1778	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**			
Persons_ Name:	Matthew Hogan					
Representing_Who?:	South Holland District Council					

demonstrate that on or off site provision is not feasible, the council may consider, at its discretion, the payment of a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value to the council enable the delivery of affordable housing elsewhere'.

1.2.3 The team is also of the view that the policy needs to set out a broad split in terms of tenure, as opposed to being left open to interpretation. The wording of any adopted policy needs to be based around the findings of the emerging SHMA. Wording to the following effect should be explored… '70% of any affordable dwellings should be in the form of rented accommodation and 30% in the form of intermediate homes, adjusted where necessary to balance housing need and make schemes financial viable, subject to negotiation'.

1.3 'Where the size of the site… the authority or developer will provide sound evidence and proposals for an exceptional approach to be taken'

1.3.1 The wording of this aspect of the policy needs to place the onus on the developer to provide evidence that an exceptional approach needs to be taken, and not the local authority.

1.3.2 Furthermore, the policy needs to reiterate that any

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

evidence needs to be provided through an 'open-book' approach.
2. Exception Site Policy
2.1 The Strategic Housing team is of the view that exception site development should be led by considerations relating to evidenced local need and site sustainability, and should not be arbitrarily constrained to certain settlement types within a settlement hierarchy (namely the Main Service Centres and Service Villages as defined within the proposed policy).
2.2 Note that page 97 makes reference to rural exceptions affordable housing development being acceptable in 'the countryside', whereas the policy on page 153 restricts development to main service centres and service villages.
2.3 The Strategic Housing team is keen to ensure that the local planning authority retains control over the nature of development that takes place upon exception sites. Consequently, the team is of the general belief that the policy, relating to market housing on exception sites requires further consideration, specifically:
2.3.1 That the inclusion of market housing on exception sites should not be the default position. The policy wording needs to stress that first and foremost, exception

site development is for the purposes of delivering affordable housing. A market element should only be considered where viability issues (principally associated with infrastructure costs and a lack of public subsidy) can be clearly demonstrated by the developer.

2.3.2 With this in mind, If SHDC adopts an approach of allowing market housing on exceptions sites, the policy needs to state that the maximum level of market housing permitted on an exception site would be the minimum required make delivery of the affordable provision financially viable, as assessed on a case by case basis. The policy wording needs to make this clear, and the reference to an explicit limit should be removed.

2.3.3 The team is also of the view that market housing should only be permitted on an exception site for the purposes of meeting an identified local need/demand (as it is with affordable housing on such sites).

3. Dynamic Viability

3.1 The Strategic Housing team is of the view that in order a) maximise planning gain and affordable housing delivery and b) ensure that wider housing growth is supported, a 'dynamic viability' approach to target setting for affordable housing should be

Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.			
		explored. 3.2 This follows the example set by other authorities across the county who use a similar model, including Kings Lynn and West Norfolk. Under the Kings Lynn and West Norfolk model, a new affordable housing percentage and/or threshold level will be published on an annual basis. This percentage and/or threshold is informed by an analysis of the following factors: o RICS index of build costs o Prevailing house prices o Alternative land use values o The level of contributions sought for other matters KL&WN Core Strategy – http://www.westnorfolk.gov.uk/pdf/Complete%20Core%20Strategy%202011.pdf KL&WN Affordable Housing Policy - http://www.westnorfolk.gov.uk/pdf/Affordable%20Housing%20Policy%2012th%20May%2011.pdf	

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

Response_ Number:	452	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	B J Runciman					

Response_ Number:	456	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	M J R Nell					

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

Response_ Number: 461 Respondents ID Number: 935 Persons_ Name: Annabel Parkinson Representing_Who?: Mrs G Pell	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 465 Respondents ID Number: 935 Persons_ Name: Annabel Parkinson Representing_Who?: Parigo Horticultural	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	470	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	T Tyrell					

Response_ Number:	474	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	E A smith					

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

Response_ Number: 478 Respondents ID Number: 935 Persons_ Name: Annabel Parkinson Representing_Who?: Mrs C Stratton	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 483 Respondents ID Number: 935 Persons_ Name: Annabel Parkinson Representing_Who?: I Login	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	488	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	S Dobney					

Response_ Number:	493	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	D Coxen					

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

Response_ Number:	498	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs J Needham					

Response_ Number:	503	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	C Clark					

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

Response_ Number:	508	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Read					

Response_ Number:	512	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs G Jacko					

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

Response_ Number:	516	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mr J Tester					

Response_ Number:	521	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs P Thompson					

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

Response_ Number:	525	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	J Whiting					

Response_ Number:	529	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	M & J Woodroffe					

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

Response_ Number:	534	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Roe Family					

Response_ Number:	565	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	The provision of one third of dwellings on schemes in South Holland is an ambitious target. The policy should refer to “up to one third” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl					

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

Response_ Number:	566	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one third” in respect of South Holland District Council.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	R S Earl					

Response_ Number:	618	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	The provision of one third of dwellings on schemes in South Holland is an ambitious target. The policy should refer to “up to one third” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall					

Response_ Number:	619	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one third” in respect of South Holland District Council.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall					

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

Response_ Number: 726 Respondents ID Number: 907 Persons_ Name: D D Wilson Representing_Who?: Himself and Clients	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Chapter 6. Planning Policy for Traveller Sites The traveller site at Holbeach has been open for about two years. The site appears to be under-used. I question the need for an additional traveller site within the District. Provision of Affordable Housing The requirement of one third of total dwellings has curtailed development of smaller sites and re-development schemes. Sites of not more than say fifteen dwellings should contribute no more than 20% rounded down.	Officer_Response: 1) We are duty bound to address under provision as identified in the evidence base and maintain an appropriate level of supply of Gypsy and Traveller sites. 2)A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.	
Response_ Number: 783 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: The provision of one third of dwellings on schemes in South Holland is an ambitious target. The policy should refer to “up to one third” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.	

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

Response_ Number: 784 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one third” in respect of South Holland District Council.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

Response_ Number: 836 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: The provision of one third of dwellings on schemes in South Holland is an ambitious target. The policy should refer to “up to one third” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

Response_ Number: 837 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one third” in respect of South Holland District Council.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	890	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	The provision of one third of dwellings on schemes in South Holland is an ambitious target. The policy should refer to “up to one third” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley					

Response_ Number:	891	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one third” in respect of South Holland District Council.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley					

Response_ Number:	949	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	The provision of 20% of dwellings on schemes in Boston Borough is acceptable, but the policy should refer to “up to one fifth” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes					

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

Response_ Number: 950 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: Persimmon Homes	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one fifth”.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.	
Response_ Number: 1007 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: Fen Properties	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: The provision of one third of dwellings on schemes in South Holland is an ambitious target. The policy should refer to “up to one third” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.	
Response_ Number: 1008 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: Fen Properties	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one third” in respect of South Holland District Council.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.	

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

Response_ Number:	1046	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	The provision of 20% of dwellings on schemes in Boston Borough is acceptable, but the policy should refer to “up to one fifth” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	K Enderby					

Response_ Number:	1047	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one fifth”.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	K Enderby					

Response_ Number:	1062	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	The provision of 20% of dwellings on schemes in Boston Borough is acceptable, but the policy should refer to “up to one fifth” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Richard Pearson Ltd					

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

Response_ Number: 1063 Respondents ID Number: 957 Persons_ Name: Mr R Doughty Representing_Who?: Richard Pearson Ltd	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one fifth”.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

Response_ Number: 1077 Respondents ID Number: 935 Persons_ Name: Annabel Parkinson Representing_Who?: O A Taylor	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	1082	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	J Grant					

Response_ Number:	1085	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	M Cobbin					

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

Response_ Number: 1089 Respondents ID Number: 935 Persons_ Name: Annabel Parkinson Representing_Who?: R Chappell Esq.	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 1093 Respondents ID Number: 935 Persons_ Name: Annabel Parkinson Representing_Who?: Spalding Rectory Feoffees	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number: 1098 Respondents ID Number: 935 Persons_ Name: Annabel Parkinson Representing_Who?: Mrs M Johnson	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 1102 Respondents ID Number: 935 Persons_ Name: Annabel Parkinson Representing_Who?: C Slooten	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number: 1107 Respondents ID Number: 935 Persons_ Name: Annabel Parkinson Representing_Who?: Mrs R Bridger	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 1112 Respondents ID Number: 935 Persons_ Name: Annabel Parkinson Representing_Who?: R C Tinsley	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	1118	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	H Nundy					

Response_ Number:	1122	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	J Grant					

Response_ Number:	1126	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	The Casswell Family					

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

Response_ Number:	1130	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	The Casswell Family					

Response_ Number:	1134	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	J Grant					

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

Response_ Number:	1175	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1812	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Provision for Affordable Housing Question 41 – for the reasons mention earlier in the representation Rural Exception Sites should also be permitted in settlements designated as countryside. They would provide additional population to support local services, provide houses for those who do not want to move out of the rural area and free up houses that are currently under-occupied and may, subject to the nature of the affordable accommodation, offer choice to those with a specific housing need.	The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Dadge					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs T Croxford					

Response_ Number:	1193	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1813	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Think the proposed affordable proportion is too high in South Holland. They should be the same as Boston. This would encourage more building in SHDC area.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Angela Newton					
Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett					

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

				Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Response_ Number:	1194	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Should be permitted in sub-regional centres and settlements.	The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Respondents ID Number:	1813	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**			
Persons_ Name:	Angela Newton					
Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett					

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

Response_ Number:	1272	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	989	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Question 41 – Provision of Affordable Housing The provision of affordable housing policy seeks to restrict Rural Exception schemes to Main Service Centres and Service Villages. However, we consider a more flexible approach should be included so that Rural Exception schemes can also be permitted on the edge of the built framework of Sub-Regional Centres subject to the criteria identified within the policy. This approach would allow a greater opportunity to increase the provision of affordable housing throughout the Borough in line with the evidence set out within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. We also consider it is reasonable to promote the principle of exception sites introducing a proportion of market housing in order to cross-subsidise the affordable housing element. The proportion of up to a maximum of 50% the total number of dwellings being market housing is considered a fair and reasonable approach to adopt.	The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Hobson					
Representing_Who?:	Chestnut Homes					

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

Response_ Number: 1326 Respondents ID Number: 1134 Persons_ Name: Mr J Charlesworth Representing_Who?: Spalding and District Civic	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Question 41 – Should be permitted at Main Service Centres and Villages, but not Sub-Regional Centres and Open Countryside. (See response to questions 18 & 20 above for redefinitions.)	Officer_Response: The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 1327 Respondents ID Number: 1134 Persons_ Name: Mr J Charlesworth Representing_Who?: Spalding and District Civic	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Question 42 – P.153, Blue Box, Rural Exceptions Schemes – (In accordance with the redefinitions put forward in response to questions 18 & 20 above) rephrase: "… Main Service Centres and Villages …"	Officer_Response: The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 1408 Respondents ID Number: 1819 Persons_ Name: Mr P Walls Representing_Who?: Himself	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: G**	Respondents_Comments: Q40 Any difference in the affordable housing obligation threshold will be exploited by the development industry . The lower to affordable housing obligation threshold the greater the attract to build . The affordable housing threshold should be equal across the Plan area.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	1409	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1819	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**G**	Q41 Rural exception schemes should only be permitted in service villages. If a common definition for isolated clusters of rural dwellings as open countryside across the plan area and the reduction of settlements currently classified as service villages even when they have few services to offer as isolated dwelling clusters enhances the role of the remaining village service centres as the focus of a sustainable rural community. The current proposals severely restrict development in the service villages, It is important to maintain in rural communities the supportive familial and neighbour network if care in the community is to succeed. Villagers want their children to have the opportunity to remain in or near their home village. Rural exceptions policies with their occupancy criteria and affordability in perpetuity constraints would help service villages remain sustainable. Any market housing to make a rural exceptions scheme affordable is likely to have different specifications and have no limitations on ownership. Second home ownership should if possible be discouraged as a major threat to rural	The restriction of the rural exception schemes policy to Service Villages only is not an option that has 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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr P Walls					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.					
			sustainability. Only in exceptional circumstances (familial support network) should rural exception new build be permitted in the open countryside		
Response_ Number: 664 Respondents ID Number: 1057 Persons_ Name: Cllr A Austin Representing_Who?: Herself	Chapter_ Name: 04 Housing Growth and **Categorisation_of_further_work:** **H**		Respondents_Comments: Although some contribution towards infrastructure may be obtained from new housing development, it will be difficult to attract interest in development where it is needed in some places without improved infrastructure being in place first. Vital future development should not be penalized or deterred by the failure in the past by utility companies and other agencies to plan ahead and to upgrade their services.	Officer_Response: Infrastructure in it's 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.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	1161	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1694	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**H**	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 'he quality, quantity and availability of water resource' within the Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy. 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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mrs J Dean					
Representing_Who?:	Anglian Water					

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

Response_ Number:	14	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1724	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**H**	My concern is that the existing primary school in Abbey Road (Swineshead) will pose a greater threat to parking and through traffic, as it is not ideal and potentially dangerous to all who use the school. Also the school will be nowhere big enough if more housing near the Almshouses and Cragg Close goes ahead. There maybe noise issues if the school has to be extended nearer to the alms houses as the tenants are all well past pensionable age and enjoy their peaceful surroundings.	Infrastructure in it's 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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Hilda Gilding					
Representing_Who?:	Herself					

Response_ Number:	34	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1732	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**H**	With regard to the number of new houses to be built around Spalding, does anyone at the Council have any idea how difficult it is for those of us who have lived in the area our whole lives to get an appointment with our doctor NOW?	Infrastructure in it's 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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mrs J R Cooke					
Representing_Who?:	Herself					

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

Response_ Number:	203	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1750	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**H**	While I do believe that this the south western quadrant of town of Boston is suitable for development in many ways, there is the problem of how to integrate the development into the town's transport system. I suppose it might be possible, when the waterway proposals have been fully developed, to devise a river bus system joining the area to the town centre. But an adequate road system is going to be fundamental, and I anticipate that a road (like the old southern relief road proposal) joining the A52, near chain Bridge, to the former and current A16 roads will be crucial. So crucial in fact that before the Borough Council commits itself to a substantial housing scheme in this area, that question needs to be resolved, or the proposal will eventually need to be abandoned again, just as it was 8 years ago. Substantial new investment in junctions and bridges will be needed where any new road meets the A52/A1121. Also there needs to be an achievable, affordable and effective means of joining with the A16. It will not be acceptable to adopt this proposal and hope that these problems can be resolved at a later date.	Infrastructure in it's 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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J S Birkett					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

Response_ Number:	265	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1237	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**H**	There must be changes to the supporting text relating to the broad location of land for housing development for Spalding. This proposed land is within convenient cycling distance of Spalding's town centre and many of the town's facilities and amenities. However, the Vernatt's Drain, the railway line, and the proposed western relief road all present significant barriers to direct, safe movement between the identified land and the rest of the town. This is likely to result in excessive use of the motor car unless specific provision is made for safe, convenient cycling (and also walking). It is vital at this stage in the planning process to state that the development of this land will need to include the delivery of significant infrastructure to provide cycling links between the development and the rest of the town. This infrastructure is likely to include bridges for cycling over the Vernatt's Drain, the railway line and the western relief road.	Infrastructure in it's 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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Smith					
Representing_Who?:	Pedals					

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

Response_ Number:	272	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1768	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**H**	You make reference to housing needs but nothing is said about the necessary infrastructure improvements that will have to be undertaken before any building can take place. Where I live I note: a) The lack of capacity in the drainage system. From what I have learned the foul sewer capacity is practically on its limit. There is no reference to consultation with the relevant drainage authority. And alongside this where is the funding to prime the costs prior to development? b) The road system needs upgrading to cope with increased traffic. This was not done at the time of the A1073/A16 build and yet we now suffer faster and increased numbers of traffic with some very unsafe junctions. C) There is room for development particularly on difficult to access land within the villages. But once again the access to and from the sites would have to be laid before development. D) Any development should be in keeping with the community and enable the residents to sustain themselves. There must be no repetition of the idiotic siting of the bungalow on the High Road at Weston to the West of Broadgate. E) There should be an assessment of the facilities available to	Infrastructure in it's 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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	M J Smith					
Representing_Who?:	Himself					

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

residents now, and in the future. On the one hand you highlight the areas dependency on cars but do not, within developments, ensure the retail outlets are available to sustain the villages. This would reduce road usage.

Response_ Number:	717	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	1263	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**H**	Broad Locations for Housing Development in Boston and Spalding (page 148) Although it is understood that the above are only broad locations at this stage, the preferred options for 1,900 dwellings at Boston and 3,750 dwellings at Spalding would clearly generate additional infrastructure needs, including those relating to sports facilities. It will therefore be necessary to carry out a robust assessment of the needs associated with these allocations, including sports provision, in order to feed into an appropriate strategy for delivery / the IDP and underpin other relevant policies within the Local Plan. Consideration will also need to be given to any direct loss of outdoor or built sports facilities that could result from site specific allocations, both in terms of informing the appropriateness or otherwise of those allocations, and / or the need for replacement provision.	Infrastructure in it's 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.
Persons_ Name:	Helen Cattle				
Representing_Who?:	Sport England				

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

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

Response_ Number: 1415 Respondents ID Number: 1819 Persons_ Name: Mr P Walls Representing_Who?: Himself	Chapter_ Name: 06 Housing **Categorisation_of_further_work: H**	Respondents_Comments: Q47 Not convinced that the planned release figure will reflect the actual need. Unless all new build properties contribute to a development levy and as these planned release figures ignore possible (small windfall site developments or a plethora of rural exemption proposals part market financed) site developments insufficient funding to deliver the promised infrastructure enhancements will be forthcoming.	Officer_Response: Infrastructure in it's 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.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Response_ Number: 171 Respondents ID Number: 1752 Persons_ Name: Gregory Gray Associates Representing_Who?: The Garden Centre Group	Chapter_ Name: 05 Sustainable Development **Categorisation_of_further_work: I**	Respondents_Comments: 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.	Officer_Response: 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.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

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

Response_ Number:	1291	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**I**	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.	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth					
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic					

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

Response_ Number:	1362	Chapter_ Name:	05 Sustainable Development	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1134	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**I**	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	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.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr J Charlesworth					
Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic					

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

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.

The South Holland Local Plan had/has several specific polices: 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.

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

Response_ Number:	1002	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**I**	Spalding is appraised in paragraphs 6.23 to 6.27.1. Reference should be made to a potential marina and potential circumstances where housing may be allowed within the ROY zone if specifically proposed as part a larger development.	The consideration of a policy dedicated to a Spalding Marina is not an issue that has been dealt with in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be dealt with accordingly in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties					

Response_ Number:	1003	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**I**	The provision of 6,000 dwellings in Spalding is supported, but with reference to the potential for dwellings within the ROY zone if promoted as part of a marina development scheme.	The consideration of a policy dedicated to a Spalding Marina is not an issue that has been dealt with in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be dealt with accordingly in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties					

Response_ Number:	1004	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	957	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**I**	The preferred policy approach should be amended so that the provision of 6,000 dwellings in Spalding refers to the potential for dwellings to be within the ROY zone if promoted as part of a marina development scheme.	The consideration of a policy dedicated to a Spalding Marina is not an issue that has been dealt with in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be dealt with accordingly in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Mr R Doughty					
Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties					

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

Response_ Number:	1145	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	930	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**I**	Growing Elderly Population The National Planning Policy Framework stipulates that the planning system should be 'supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities' and highlights the need to 'deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive mixed communities. Local Planning Authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community… such as… older people' (emphasis added). My Client appreciates that the biggest population increases within the Borough are of young adults and children and the Core Strategy Review, quite rightly, focuses its attention on meeting the educational and housing needs of these demographic groups. It must also be noted however that the proportion of elderly people within the Borough is also projected to increase over the Plan period. The "What Housing Where Toolkit" developed by the Home	The consideration of a policy dedicated to the specialist accommodation for the elderly is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be dealt with accordingly in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Ziyad Thomas				
Representing_Who?:	McCarthy & Stone Retirement				

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

Builders Federation uses statistical data and projections from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) and the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) to provide useful data on future and current housing needs. The table below has been replicated from the toolkit and shows the projected changes to the demographic profile of South-East Lincolnshire between 2008 and 2033:

THE LETTER INCLUDES A GRAPH HERE THAT HAS NOT COPIED ACROSS.

In line with the rest of the country, this toolkit demonstrates that the demographic profiles of South Holland and Boston Councils are projected to age. The proportion of the population aged 60 and over in Boston Borough will increase from 28% to 36.7% between 2008 and 2033, with the same demographic projected to increase from 30% to 38% % over the same timescale in South Holland. The largest proportional increases in the older population of all three Councils are expected to be of the 'frail' elderly, those aged 75 and over, who are more likely to require specialist care and accommodation. It must be

noted that the proportion of the population aged over 60 is significantly higher in South East Lincolnshire than the average projected increase for UK authorities by the Office for National Statistics (23% of the population aged over 65 by 2033).

The provision of adequate support and accommodation for the increasingly ageing democratic profile of South East Lincolnshire is therefore a significant challenge and, unless properly planned for over the next 20 years, there is likely to be a serious shortfall in specialist accommodation for the older population, which will have a knock on effect in meeting the housing needs of the whole area and wider policy objectives. Specialist accommodation for the elderly, such as that provided by McCarthy and Stone, will therefore have a vital role in meeting the areas housing needs.

An overview of private sheltered schemes and the benefits they can provide to the elderly is provided below. In addition, examples and suggestions are given of how policy can support and encourage the development of this much needed type of elderly accommodation, and

deliver in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Community Benefits of Private Sheltered Accommodation

"Housing Markets and Independence in Old Age - Expanding the Opportunities", a new report by Professor Michael Ball of the University of Reading, was presented at a House Commons launch event in May 2011. The report highlights how owner-occupied retirement housing (OORH), such as that built by McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd, helps to address the challenges of housing an ageing population. In addition, Professor Michael Ball highlights how OORH provides numerous benefits to communities including increasing the availability of much needed family houses in areas of shortage. This is because most OORH residents will have freed up family homes they were previously under-occupying, the majority of which are located in the market area local to the retirement housing development. It is therefore clear that private specialised housing for the elderly has a key role to play in providing a suitable and sustainable housing mix that meets South East

Lincolnshire's wider housing needs.

Furthermore, the presence of specialised housing for the elderly often greatly enhances the sustainability of businesses in nearby town and local centres. A report compiled by 'The Opinion Research Business' (ORB) entitled A Better Life: Private Sheltered Housing and Independent Living for Older People shows how Retirement Living accommodation helps to underpin local shops services and facilities. The report found that 62% of residents in retirement living schemes preferred to shop locally, with 45% of resident shopping within one mile of their scheme.

Benefits of Private Sheltered Accommodation for Elderly Individuals

Sheltered housing is a proven housing choice for elderly people who wish to move into accommodation that provides comfort, security and the ability to manage independently to a greater extent. It enables older people to remain living independently within the community and out of institutions, whilst enjoying peace

of mind and receiving the support that they need.

All McCarthy and Stone developments are specifically designed to provide housing accommodation for elderly people, who have experienced specific life changing circumstances that prompt the move into a specialised, purpose built, living environment. The communal facilities and specific features within the apartments designed to meet the particular needs of these likeminded people, generally result in a much improved quality of life.

The peace of mind and contentment that this form of housing brings to its residents should not be underestimated. The maintenance of an organised, stress-free lifestyle that will benefit the general health and well-being of a like-minded group of people within a contained, communal living environment is of paramount importance to the success of this form of housing, and a desirable end-result for society at large, from an economic as well social perspective. As residents feel healthier and happier this inevitably has positive impact on their wellbeing and they will

therefore place less of a burden on local health and support facilities. The additional support available to residents within these developments means they are also able to return to their homes quicker after a stay in hospital.

Additionally, McCarthy and Stone also provide (Assisted Living) Extra Care Housing aimed at enabling independent living for the "frail elderly", persons typically aged 80 and over. The provision of suitable accommodation for the frail elderly will be of critical importance to the Borough and the provision of Extra-Care housing will need to be considered to meet the increasing demand for this type of accommodation.

McCarthy and Stone type developments assist in the delivery this type of accommodation, with the McCarthy and Stone Extra Care concept providing day to day care in the form of assistance and domiciliary care tailored to owners' individual needs, enabling the frail elderly to buy in care packages to suit their needs as they change. It provides further choice for the frail elderly allowing them to stay in their own home and maintain a better sense

of independence, enhancing their personal welfare over time rather than through the fixed costs of a nursing or residential care with its one for all approach. Accordingly, Extra Care accommodation possesses a number of 'enhanced facilities' in terms of the communal facilities available and provides a higher level of care when compared to private retirement housing. It is therefore a different form of specialised housing for the elderly than retirement housing and provides the increasingly elderly population with more choice and with an alternative type of accommodation to meet their needs as frailty increases. The benefits to the public purse as outlined above are even more evident here.

Suggestions for the Core Strategy Review
To ensure the adequate delivery of specialist accommodation for the elderly we would ideally recommend an additional policy specifically dealing with this matter.

To encourage Local Government to plan proactively for the development of specialist housing for the elderly a toolkit was developed by a consortium of

national housing interests with representation from both the private and public sector entitled 'Housing in Later Life: Planning Ahead for Specialist Housing for Older People'. A copy of this document has been attached for your convenience.

This toolkit encourages a joined up approach to planning, housing and social care policy both in the collection of evidence and the development of specialist accommodation for the elderly. Fundamental to achieving this is the inclusion of policies supporting specialist accommodation for the elderly into the Local Planning Framework. Whilst we appreciate that no one planning approach will be appropriate for all areas, an example policy wording is provided that could be included within the review of the Local Plan:

"The Council will encourage the provision of specialist housing for older people across all tenures in sustainable locations.

The Council aims to ensure that older people are able to secure and sustain independence in a home appropriate to their circumstances and to actively

encourage developers to build new homes to the 'Lifetime Homes' standard so that they can be readily adapted to meet the needs of those with disabilities and the elderly as well as assisting independent living at home.

The Council will, through the identification of sites, allowing for windfall developments, and / or granting of planning consents in sustainable locations, provide for the development of retirement accommodation, residential care homes, close care, Extra Care and assisted care housing and Continuing Care Retirement Communities."

In summary, McCarthy and Stone stress the need to consider addressing the current and future housing needs of older people within South East Lincolnshire and for the Council to take this opportunity to positively address this issue within the emerging Local Plan.

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

Response_ Number:	1256	Chapter_ Name:	04 Housing Growth and	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1689	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**J**	Q12 – Do you agree with the identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options outlined in sections 4.17-4.22 under Approach to the provision of Additional Housing in those Parts of South East Lincolnshire that are Categorised as either Flood Hazard Zone Red, Orange or Yellow in the full consultation document? 4.17 We note the comments and difficulties explained in respect of the different housing market areas and whether one area can meet the housing needs of the other. We suggest that a further option for your consideration would be the possibility of outlying settlements, i.e. Bicker, Donington, Gosberton, etc accommodating larger housing growth, which may still satisfy other sustainability considerations whilst reducing the need for housing in the Red, Orange, and Yellow (ROY) zones further. This should not be constrained to the South East Lincolnshire area but consideration should also be given to cross-boundary areas such as Sibsey, Stickney and Friskney (in East Lindsey District Council's boundary). 4.18.3, 1st bullet point – We request that the term „growth‟ is used with caution in the	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Ms A Hewitson					
Representing_Who?:	Environment Agency					

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

submission draft of the local plan. We would request that it is made clear that strategic housing growth being accommodated in the ROY zones would be contrary to the recommendations of the LCS. Delivering housing to meet local needs (i.e. sustaining the existing community) will result in the housing stock increasing, but the „growth" of Boston is designed to be of an economic nature. Economic growth is very much supported by the LCS recommending no restriction on the level of employment and business related uses that can come forward in the ROY zones. You may wish to consider making this recommendation more prominent within the Economy section of the Local Plan.
We note the options considered and do support the preferred policy Option B, which reflects the spirit of the LCS to lower the level of housing growth in the ROY zones in Boston and South Holland. However, we suggest that another option, some way between what is called "a precise interpretation of Principle 1 of the LCS" and the preferred option of a reduction from 85% to 80% is considered. An option to reduce the level of housing by a greater percentage would appear to contribute more to achieving the

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

				Plan's vision for “flood risk to guide the scale, distribution and nature of development across South East Lincolnshire” and developing a “response to the challenges of climate change, and particularly in respect of flood risk concerns”. We believe a more ambitious strategy to reduce the number of people at risk of flood hazard should be considered.		
Response_ Number:	335	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**J**	Qu 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sires, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	D A and N Casswell					
Response_ Number:	339	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**J**	We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sires, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson					
Representing_Who?:	Mrs B Blundy					

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

Response_ Number:	364	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**J**	Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sires, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	R Bingham				

Response_ Number:	487	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**J**	Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sires, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	S Dobney				

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

Response_ Number:	492	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**J**	Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sires, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	D Coxen				

Response_ Number:	497	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**J**	Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sires, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs J Needham				

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

Response_ Number:	502	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**J**	Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sires, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	C Clark				

Response_ Number:	507	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:
Respondents ID Number:	935	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**J**	Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sires, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.
Persons_ Name:	Annabel Parkinson				
Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Read				

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

Response_ Number:	652	Chapter_ Name:	06 Housing	Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:	Officer_Recommendation:
Respondents ID Number:	1207	**Categorisation_of_further_work:**	**K**	The JPU proposes a housing provision of 13,920 dwellings consisting of 4,520 dwellings in Boston and 9,400 dwellings in South Holland over the plan period of 2011-2031. These housing provision figures are derived from the objectively assessed needs as set out in the Coastal Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment (SHMAA) dated November 2012 for Boston District Council and the Peterborough Sub Region SHMAA dated August 2010 for South Holland District Council. These figures are in reasonable aligned with the DCLG 2008-based household projections and the What Homes Where? toolkit. The JPU is proposing an old style Local Development Framework (LDF) with a suite of documents including a LP Strategy & Policies DPD and a Site Allocations DPD rather than one all-inclusive Local Plan. All site allocations are deferred to the Site Allocations DPD. At this time there is no timetable for the preparation and adoption of the Site Allocations DPD unfortunately this type of approach causes an indeterminate period of uncertainty for the house building industry. The proposed LP Strategy &	1) Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine an approach to housing delivery that ensures the maintenance of a 6-year supply of deliverable sites. 2) Comments noted in terms of Strategic Priorities - these will be taking into consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process. 3) Comments noted in terms of the preferred policy approach to 'Housing Land Supply over the Plan Period'. This has been deliberately phrased to allow for the possibility of increased delivery of dwellings should market conditions permit.	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
Persons_ Name:	Home Builders Federation					
Representing_Who?:	Their members					

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

Policies DPD identifies a spatial strategy based on four types of place namely sub regional centres, main service centres, service villages and countryside together with broad locations for future housing growth. The preferred policy approach to the distribution and scale of housing development across South East Lincolnshire is shown in the Table below :-

TYPE OF PLACE	Boston District Council	South Holland District Council
Sub regional centre	3,545	7,137
Main service centre	432	2,629
Service village	1,445	350
Countryside	47	237
TOTALS	5,467	10,353

However it is not evident from Paragraph 6.87 whether or not shortfalls in one place can be made up elsewhere. The JPU should clarify this inter-changeability issue.

Home Builders Federation page 3
80 Needlers End Lane, Balsall

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

Common, Warwickshire, CV7 7AB
07817 865534 info@hbf.co.uk
www.hbf.co.uk
In Paragraph 3.2 Strategic Priorities for South East Lincolnshire Bullet Point 9 Environment refers to prioritising the re-use of previously developed land. This is contrary to the NPPF. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF encourages the re-use of brown-field land it does not advocate a brown-field before green-field policy. The JPU should consider deleting the reference to prioritising. The dictionary definition of priority is to place first in time, place or rank whilst the definition of the word encourage does not involve any such ranking mechanism. By inclusion in a DPD all sites are deemed sustainable and therefore should be granted planning permission as and when planning applications are submitted under the presumption in favour of sustainable development (Paragraphs 6-14 of the NPPF).
In the Housing Land Supply over the Plan Period section, the JPU proposes a 6 years supply of deliverable sites representing a 5 years land supply plus 20% buffer. However Paragraph 4.2.1 states that in Boston District Council there is only a 3.6 year supply of

Officer_Recommendation: Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.			
		deliverable sites. The JPU will need to demonstrate a 5 years supply plus 20% buffer in Boston District Council otherwise Paragraph 49 of the NPPF will take effect which states “relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites”. Likewise the housing trajectory for the South Holland District is significantly back loaded whilst the Boston District housing trajectory is much more even across the plan period. The JPU should give further consideration to the two proposed housing trajectories as a standard distribution is preferable.	

This page is intentionally left blank