

East Lindsey Core Strategy 2016 – 2031 Examination

Stage 2 – Settlement Proposals DPD

Lincolnshire County Council Written Statement

Matter 4 – Individual Settlement Proposals

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

Questions

Burgh Le Marsh (Large Village)

3.

- **Is the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site consistent with policy SP12 of the Core strategy in respect of safe access to the nearest settlement?**

A G&T Transit Site is included on the map next to the Bypass. However, there is no additional information provided as to its suitability in planning terms similar to the information provided for other allocated sites in pp 25 – 27. Consequently the site is included without justification.

The proposed development is 1 km away from Burgh Le Marsh and is contrary to proposed Policy SP 12 which states that sites should:

- Demonstrate that there is safe access to the nearest town, or large settlements amenities by means of pedestrians and vehicles being segregated or be accessible by public transport

The LCC Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer (GTLO) has confirmed that the site does not provide safe access to Burgh Le Marsh's amenities by either a segregated footpath from the highway or accessible public transport. While buses may travel along the A158 there is no designated bus stop close to the proposed site. Occupiers of the site would have to cross a busy main road with limited routes to Burgh Le Marsh.

- **Has sufficient account been taken of the effect on the surrounding countryside?**

The site has natural screening by way of mature hawthorn hedging to all its boundaries ranging from heights of between 2.5 metres and 3 metres in height.

■ Is the site deliverable having regard to the conditions imposed upon the extant planning permission?

LCC is not aware of any existing planning permission on this site. Permission has been refused twice by ELDC and is now subject to appeal.

■ Have the legal requirements concerning publicity and public consultation been met in respect of the proposal to allocate this site in the plan?

The process by which the Burgh site has come to be "allocated" can be criticised insofar as there was no public consultation concerning the proposal in advance of the consideration of the matter by the Planning Policy Committee on 13 October 2017, and the allocation appears to have been proposed without there having been any (documented) consideration of the respective planning merits of the site, and thus any consideration of whether the Burgh site provided "the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives".