

Your Ref: CLLP
Our Ref: SJS/sjs/L BAR 088

6th March 2017

Mr Richard Kay
Central Lincolnshire Joint Planning Unit
C/o North Kesteven District Council
5th Floor, City Hall
Beaumont Fee
LINCOLN
LN1 1DF

Dear Richard,

Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Proposed Modifications

This representation is made on behalf of Tom Barton Farms Ltd. in response to the publication of the Schedule of Proposed Post-Submission Main Modifications to The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. The six week consultation period for representations to be made expires at 5pm on Monday 6th March.

The comments below are confined to the proposed modifications and we consider them particularly relevant to the scale, character and location of future development in Lea. This is pertinent given the live appeal¹ for significant residential development between Lea and Knaith Park. The Plan needs to provide for criteria to allow for the growth objectives for Gainsborough to be realised whilst protecting the identity and character of Lea.

In this regard, the retention of the lack of settlement limits in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan is welcomed as confirmed by paragraph 3.2.5 as modified by MM/1. It is noted that this paragraph clearly provides a basis for the monitoring of the “no settlement limits” approach. We acknowledge this caveat and the reasoning for it, but would suggest that the “appropriate locations” criteria set out in the modified policy LP2² provide the degree of control necessary for development management purposes.

We welcome the proposed modifications³ acknowledgment of the fact that some Medium Villages, including Lea, are the subject of residential allocations. We support the explanation for Lea’s allocation in the proposed modification to paragraph 3.4.7 advising that Lea (as well as Morton) were considered for allocations to help meet Gainsborough’s growth needs as they are physically connected to the town’s urban area. Proposed Modification MM/70 recognises that one such allocation has been made.

¹ PINS ref 3147441

² Proposed Main Modification MM/2

³ Ibid

PROPERTY | BUSINESS | PLANNING | ENERGY

Ian H Walter BSc (Hons) CEnv FRICS FAAV +
Timothy J Atkinson BSc (Hons) MRICS FAAV +
Ellen J Allwood BSc (Hons) LL.M FRICS FAAV +
John R Elliott BSc (Hons) MRICS ACI Arb MNAVA +
Simon L Smith MNAEA MARLA +
Stephen J Catney BA (Hons) +

James R Mulhall BA MNAEA MNAVA *
Isabel K McDougall BSc (Hons) MRICS FAAV *
Ben W Kendall BSc (Hons) *
Simon J Sharp BA (Hons) BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI *
Andrew J France BSc (Hons) MRICS *
David T Wright BSc (Hons) MI Agr M MBIAC ^

JHWalter LLP | 1 Mint Lane | Lincoln LN1 1UD
DX 11056 Lincoln 1
E info@jhwalter.co.uk
T 01522 526526
F 01522 512720
www.jhwalter.co.uk

2 of 2

Your Ref: CLLP

Our Ref: SJS/sjs/L BAR 088

We note that modification MM/6 proposes that paragraph 3.4.7 also be amended to advise that the single allocation in Lea counts towards the 15% level of growth set out in policy LP4. We also note that proposed modification MM/3 advises that the Objectively Assessed Need of 36,960 dwellings over the plan period “should not be seen as a ceiling, but rather the level of growth which is both needed and anticipated to take place in the plan period.” This is the first time that the Plan’s proposed text includes acknowledgement that the OAN should not be seen as a ceiling and this overdue inclusion is supported.

In the context of proposed modifications MM/1, MM/3 and MM/6 we suggest that the plan provides scope for further development in Lea in the event of the allocation not coming forward, the Council not delivering against its OAN and/or when growth is required for Gainsborough (most likely to be when the development of the Gainsborough allocations does not occur as per the trajectories). However, as per the proposed modifications to policy LP2, we suggest that such development should only be within appropriate locations as defined in the Plan. The criteria to ascertain whether a site is an appropriate location emphasises the need to retain the core shape and form of the settlement. This is supported and we suggest that the allocation on Willingham Road and our client’s land on the western side of the A156 accord with the criteria rather than the appeal site between Lea and Knaith Park.

Finally, with regards to proposed modification MM/52 and the amending of the Key Diagram for Gainsborough, we question whether the highlighting of Morton and Lea in a different colour and annotating these villages as the “indicative built up area of Lea and Morton” rather than “urban area” or “indicative built up area” is necessary given the development management controls provided for in the modified policy LP2. Indeed, the role of Lea and Morton as part of the growth strategy is recognised in the evidence base to the Plan, specifically the Gainsborough Strategy Area Study (2015) and this Study, as explicitly acknowledged by proposed modification MM/46’s revision to paragraph 8.2.3, notes that the existing built-up areas of the town includes Lea and Morton.

We hope that this representation is taken into full consideration prior to the consideration for the final Plan for adoption. I also would be grateful if you could confirm safe receipt of this letter within the prescribed consultation period timescales?

I look forward to hearing from you. Please be advised that all correspondence in response to this representation should be sent to JHWalter LLP.

Yours sincerely



Simon J Sharp BA (Hons) BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI
Associate

For and on behalf of JHWalter LLP

