
Central Lincolnshire Local Plan: Matters, Issues and Questions Consultation: Matter 3 – Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development

On behalf of Beal Developments

November 2022

**Central Lincolnshire Local Plan:
Matter, Issues and Questions Consultation:
Matter 3 – Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development**

On behalf of Beal Developments Ltd

Project Ref:	33148/A5/P6/GP/SO	33148/A5/P6/GP/SO
Status:	Draft	Final
Issue/Rev:	01	02
Date:	November 2022	November 2022
Prepared by:	Gareth Pritchard	Gareth Pritchard
Checked by:	Gareth Wilson	Gareth Wilson
Authorised by:	Gareth Wilson	Gareth Wilson

Barton Willmore, now Stantec
St Andrews House
St Andrews Road
Cambridge
CB4 1WB

Tel: 01223 345 555

Ref: 33148/A5/P6/GP/SO
File Ref: 33148.P6.CLLPM3.GP
Date: November 2022

COPYRIGHT

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Barton Willmore, now Stantec.

All our stationery is produced using recycled or FSC paper and vegetable oil based inks.

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Matters, Issues and Questions Response
- 3.0 Summary and Conclusions

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQ) consultation response is made on behalf of Beal Developments Ltd (hereafter 'Beal') regarding Matter 3 for the Examination of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.
- 1.2 Beal has several land interests across Central Lincolnshire. Sites include at Welton, Dunholme and Scotter, all defined as 'large villages' in the emerging plan. These representations seek to set out why Beal feel that greater flexibility for housing delivery is required within the large villages.

2.0 MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS RESPONSE

Issue 5: Housing Development in or Adjacent to Villages – S4

Q1: What is the justification for the size limits in Policy S4 for schemes within the developed footprint of villages?

- 2.1 We do not believe that there is a justification for the size limits for schemes within the developed footprint of villages. We believe that the policy artificially constrains development, particularly in settlements which have proven to be sustainable, such as the large villages.
- 2.2 We are supportive of the text that requires developments to enhance or preserve character and appearance, not harm the character and appearance of the wider countryside; and be consistent with other policies in the development plan. However, the extent of housing should be for the decision-maker at the time to weigh up as part of the planning process.
- 2.3 Furthermore, this artificial constraint may result in the loss of affordable housing, open space and other infrastructure. We suggest that the size limit is removed from the policy wording.

Q2: Is the restriction of residential development to schemes of no more than 10 dwellings justified and appropriate in medium and large villages?

- 2.4 We do not believe so based on the above. Large villages have proven to be sustainable locations for development. It should be for the decision maker to determine whether the scale of proposed growth is acceptable on a case-by-case basis, and to consider proposals against the other policies in the development plan.

Q3: What is the justification for allowing some residential development adjacent to the Lincoln Urban Area, Main Towns and Market Towns, but not villages, especially Large Villages which benefit from a good range of services?

- 2.5 We assume this decision has largely been made based on the sustainability of each settlement, and their perceived capacity to absorb growth from an infrastructure and character perspective. Albeit, having reviewed the Sustainability Appraisal Preferred Policies and Options Document (June 21, STA004d) this is unclear.

- 2.6 However, large villages have been identified as those which provide housing, employment, retail and key services and facilities. As such, they are likely to be capable of absorbing appropriate levels of growth adjacent to their settlement boundaries. Though, we note this would be site specific and each application judged on its own merits.
- 2.7 We suggest that large villages could be added to Policy S3 as a solution.

Q4: What is the justification for additional requirements for exception sites under Policy S4?

- 2.8 We believe that the wording could just be shortened to advise that the other policies in the development plan would need to be applied.

3.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 3.1 These representations have been prepared on behalf of Beal Developments Ltd in regard to Matter 3 – Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development. Specifically, we have concerns that the policy wording of S4 is overly prescriptive within the large villages, and that there should be greater flexibility.
- 3.2 Larger villages have shown to be sustainable locations for development of appropriate levels of growth. We believe it should be for the decision-maker to determine what may be acceptable on a case-by-case basis, rather than arbitrary restrictions which may result in inappropriate forms of development ie: inefficient use of land.
- 3.3 Instead, it may be more appropriate for large villages to be added to policy S3.

bartonwillmore.co.uk

TOWN PLANNING
MASTERPLANNING & URBAN DESIGN
ARCHITECTURE
LANDSCAPE PLANNING & DESIGN
SUSTAINABLE VALUE
INFRASTRUCTURE &
ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING
HERITAGE
GRAPHIC COMMUNICATION
COMMUNICATIONS & ENGAGEMENT
DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS

This product is printed
on stock and in a process
that conforms to the PEFC
standards for sustainably
managed forests.