

Your ref: H23-0848-19
Our ref: 1365 1 LMS EC

19 March 2020

32 High Street, Helpringham,
Sleaford, Lincolnshire NG34 0RA
Tel: 01529 421646
Email: admin@rdc-landplan.co.uk
Web: www.rdc-landplan.co.uk

Submitted via email only

Polly Harris-Gorf
Principal Planning Officer
South Holland District Council
Council Offices
Priory Road
Spalding
PE11 2XE

Dear Ms Harris-Gorf

**MRS M A COMPTON
H23-0848-19 FULL PLANNING APPLICATION
PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL GYPSY/TRAVELLER SITE
BLEU RAYE FARM, MILLGATE, WHAPLODE, SPALDING, PE12 6RY**

Following consideration and deferment of the above application at the 12th February Planning Committee, we provide the following in response to the matters raised by the committee.

1. The location of the pitches and relocation of the caravans in order to assess impact on neighbouring residents.

The development comprises of four pitches as prescribed in your local plan and each pitch contains the elements required for each family. The touring caravans, the mobile homes and brick-built day rooms are all single storey. There is no room within the red line to relocate the pitches and we question the logic of relocating single storey development within the red line. The result of the suggested relocation exercise is the same pieces of development within the same area which will have no greater or lesser impact on whichever local residents the committee is concerned about.

There is no good planning reason for what is being required and we are not therefore prepared to put our client to further unnecessary expense.

2. The relocation of the day rooms in order to reduce the impact on neighbouring residents.

We would reiterate the points made above in relation to the other single storey elements on the site.






town planning



landscape architecture



architecture

 @RobertDoughtyConsultancy
 @RDC_Ltd
 robert-doughty-consultancy-limited

Robert Doughty Consultancy Limited
Registered in England No. 4084500
VAT Reg No. 364 7780 17

19 March 2020

Polly Harris-Gorf
Principal Planning Officer

3. A detailed landscaping scheme to be provided to demonstrate how this development would be assimilated into the area.

We have provided a detailed planting scheme and have enclosed a copy here. We would reiterate the point that the site is already well screened from all significant public vantage points and this single storey development will therefore be very well assimilated into the existing landscape. The existing screening is also under the control of our client. We would draw members attention to the site off the A16 at Spalding and the site off the A151 at Holbeach, neither of which have hardly any landscaping around them.

4. Details of the management strategy for the site going forward.

We are not sure what a management strategy is designed to manage. The occupation of the site will be limited by virtue of proposed planning conditions 3 (number of families), 4 (restricted occupation to gypsy or traveller), condition 5 (no touring caravan or day room used for permanent residential occupation), 6 (restriction of caravans and mobile homes per pitch), 7 (construction management), 8 (external illumination), 9 (refuse collection) 11 (implementation of the landscaping scheme), 12 (access road construction), 13 (removal of permitted development rights), 14 (external materials) and 15 (no walls or fences other than those proposed). These conditions comprehensively ensure the management of the site.

5. Submission of an ecology survey.

We attach the survey here, you will note that there is the requirement to erect a Barn Owl box which our client is happy to do.

6. Revisit the provisions for commercial vehicles and reconsider the 3.5 tonne limit condition in order to preclude commercial activities on site.

The requirement to include space for the parking of commercial vehicles on each plot was at the suggestion of the planning officer. The need to park such vehicles within the site is commonplace on such sites. This does not mean commercial activities will take place on site.



town planning



landscape architecture



architecture

19 March 2020

Polly Harris-Gorf
Principal Planning Officer

7. The percentage comparison of the application site and the allocation in the SELLP.

We attach a plan here showing the comparison between the application site boundary and the land allocated in the local plan. The boundaries numbered 2, 3 and 4 are not fixed by physical features on the ground. Boundary 1 is characterised by tree planting, 5 is the site frontage and boundary 6 is the southern boundary characterised by an existing line of conifer trees in our client's ownership. There is a 19.5% difference in areas, however, the application site boundary allows for the same development as prescribed in the local plan allocation and crucially, a more spacious layout which ensures the retention of as many trees on site as possible.

Should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely



Lewis Smith MRTPI

Enclosures: Proposed Planting Plan 1365-1_PL_PP01
Area Comparison 1365-1_PL_SP02
Preliminary Ecological Appraisal CGC Ecology



town planning



landscape architecture



architecture