

Smith Stuart Reynolds (Allison Homes Eastern Ltd), Stansgate Planning Consultants (M Parker and Sons), Development Land Planning (Southfield Business Park ), Roythornes (Heron Cottage), SM & D Johnson, Mr and Mrs Lorenze, Mrs M Bowley and others, Mrs V Fisher, Mr D Iddenden, Mrs F Minns, Litchfield Planning (Mr R Gallagher), Mr Hird, NFU,  
(and Appendix A)

## SOUTH HOLLAND LOCAL PLAN

### PUBLIC LOCAL INQUIRY

OBJECTIONS RECEIVED ON  
INQUIRY CHANGES  
AND COUNCIL'S RESPONSE

Objector: Smith Stuart Reynolds (Allison Homes Eastern Ltd), Stansgate Planning Consultants (M Parker and Sons), Development Land Planning (Southfield Business Park ), Roythornes (Heron Cottage), SM & D Johnson, Mr and Mrs Lorenze, Mrs M Bowley and others, Mrs V Fisher, Mr D Iddenden, Mrs F Minns, Litchfield Planning (Mr R Gallagher), Mr Hird, NFU, (and see Appendix A for Gypsy and Traveller policy objections)



This report sets out below in summary form the representations received to the Inquiry Changes to the Re-deposit Plan together with the Council's response to these matters.

---

**IC8 - Changes to Monitoring And Phasing Of Housing section.**

**Smith Stuart Reynolds (Allison Homes Eastern Ltd) (638)**

Object to IC and believe clarity on this issue can only be achieved through the production of SPD. Request the replacement of the phrase 'we will consider producing a SPD....' with 'we will produce a SPD...'. Also requesting clarity on the phrase 'other sources of supply' in Policy HS2.

Councils Response:

*The Council acknowledges the comments made. As part of the review of the LDS we will set out a timetable for the future preparation of an SPD on this subject. In terms of clarity other sources of supply refers to sites which the Council anticipates are likely to gain permission and deliver completions within a 5 year period. These would be sites the development of which is provided for under the policies of the Plan and would include an allowance for development based on trends and informed by the AMR. Such clarification could be included in the supporting text to Policy HS2.*

**IC9 - Changes to New Housing Allocations section.**

**Smith Stuart Reynolds (Allison Homes Eastern Ltd) (638)**

Objection to the further change as the plan will be committed to the development of a further 28 Ha beyond the end of the plan period. Objector considers this will prejudice preparation of the LDF. Suggest 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence of para. 4.26 be deleted or it stated that 28Ha be identified as a reserve site, its suitability to be considered as part of review of the Plan. Objects to the deletion of paragraph setting out the requirement for a continuing supply of land. Suggest it should be retained and amended to refer to reserve sites.

Council's Response:

*The Council is of the view that the changes made to the Plan regarding land allocated post 2021 is appropriate and will not prejudice preparation of the LDF. The Plan identifies Holland Park as the primary location for residential development during this plan period with other land phased beyond. As part of the production of the LDF and potential increased housing numbers arising from the review of RSS8 we will be looking to allocate other sites across the*

*District. The Council is not in favour of allocation reserve housing sites and has provided justification for this position throughout the Inquiry.*

#### IC10 - Changes to New Housing In The Area Centres section.

##### **Stansgate Planning Consultants (M Parker and Sons) (589)**

Objector suggests that the proposed change to HS2 will make it very difficult to develop on greenfield sites within the Area Centres. Objector believes the wording is ambiguous and does not explain when the development of greenfield land would be acceptable. The effect of the change will be to reduce the amount of housing which may be developed in Long Sutton as greenfield Urban Capacity sites will be knocked out of the equation. Objector is therefore still of the opinion land should be allocated for residential development in Long Sutton.

##### Council's Response:

*IC10 amends Policy HS5 to allow for development on undeveloped land in the Area Centres. The policy promotes the development of brownfield sites followed by undeveloped land through a sequential approach. The Council is of the view that the revised wording is appropriate and does not preclude development on greenfield sites, where appropriate.*

#### IC11 – Changes to Affordable Housing section.

##### **Development Land Planning (Southfield Business Park) (587)**

Objector suggests that insistence upon on-site affordable housing provision may jeopardise units coming forward overall. Developers should be given opportunity to develop affordable housing off-site where this may assist scheme coming forward.

##### Council's Response:

*This matter was discussed at hearing sessions and in the councils written submissions. The Council is of the view that no further amendments are necessary.*

#### IC14 - Changes to Sites for Gypsies and Travellers section.

**See Appendix A.**

IC21 - Change to Caravan Sites section.

**Roythornes (Heron Cottage) (515)**

The objector suggests the change to paragraph 7.35 is inconsistent with and more restrictive than the limitation determined by the inspector on a recent appeal decision. The Council should give considerable weight to that decision.

Council's Response:

*This matter was discussed at the hearing. The Council is of the view that the revised wording is appropriate.*

IC33 - Allocation for Urban Extension. New notation required

**SM & D Johnson**

Object to proposals for an urban extension at Holbeach. Objectors feel the site is inappropriate as there would not be adequate access to the site, privacy would be lost and their property would be devalued.

Council's Response:

*The Council has provided written representations on the issue of the Moulton Whaplode bypass. Mr & Mrs Johnson's response is not a direct objection to the Inquiry change itself, but to the allocation of land adjacent to A151/A17 generally. The Council has provided justification for this site throughout the Inquiry process. We do not believe there is anything additional to be added on these issues.*

IC35 - De-allocation of Major Housing Proposal to Open Space. New allocations for Major Housing Proposal. Sutton Bridge

**Mr and Mrs Lorenze, Mrs M Bowley and others, Mrs V Fisher, Mr D Iddenden, Mrs F Minns**

Summary of Objections:

There were a number of objections and comments received regarding this Inquiry Change. These related to safety issues concerning access from and onto Chestnut Terrace, that parking is currently a major issue and that the road is not wide enough to take anymore traffic. It was felt that road improvements were necessary and these should be met by the developer. Future development would also increase the stress on existing water and

sewerage infrastructure. It was also questioned whether the access to the Withington Street site was the only one available.

Council's Response:

*The Council acknowledges that there are highway issues that would need to be resolved for these sites before development could commence. However, we are of the view that these could be overcome through a partnership approach between the relevant parties.*

IC15 - Changes to New Employment Areas section.

IC36 - Designation of employment land including part to be kept under review.

**Litchfield Planning (Mr R Gallagher) (700)**

The objector appreciates the changes proposed and the ongoing commitment to develop the Wingland employment allocation. However, objector is of the opinion these changes do not fully reflect the outcome of the hearing session, concerning highway, sewerage and power supply issues. The objector is also seeking the removal of their site from the area identified on the proposals map to be kept under review.

Council's Response:

*The Council acknowledges the further concerns raised by the objector. However, we remain of the view that the approach we have taken regarding development at Wingland is suitable. We believe it appropriate to continue to keep the site under review.*

IC69 – Changes to Affordable Housing section.

**Development Land Planning (Southfield Business Park) (587)**

Objector suggests that insistence upon on-site affordable housing provision may jeopardise units coming forward overall. Developers should be given opportunity to develop affordable housing off-site where this may assist scheme coming forward.

Council's Response:

*This matter was discussed at hearing sessions and in the council's written submissions. The Council is of the view that no further amendments are necessary.*

1C77 – Change to Inset No. 4 Donington to include additional land within the Defined Settlement Limit, Major Employment Area and Major Employment Proposal.

**Mr Hird**

Objecting to the inclusion of additional land to the employment allocation at Donington. Suggests this would lead to further industrial expansion close to the proximity of residential housing together with the potential for noise pollution during night-time as well as daylight hours.

Council's Response:

*The site is located on the western side of the A52 and is distanced from the existing residential areas by this road. The impact of any specific proposals can be looked at the pre-application stage. The larger site also provides greater opportunity for site layout/design options and if necessary mitigation measures to be incorporated with any proposal.*

IC99 – Changes to Distribution of Development Section.

**NFU (500)**

Object and suggest that IC means that farm diversification schemes won't be able to meet criteria 5. Suggest criteria 5 should be amended to read 'ensure that development, where possible, is served by a choice of transport modes....'.

Council's Response:

*Policy SG2 as rewritten provides the criteria against which proposals will be judged. It is not intended to be used to automatically refuse proposals permission where a choice of transport modes including public transport is/will be not available. The policy includes the phrase 'having regard to'.*