

1.0 Introduction

1.1 On adoption of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) the local planning authority are required to make available a statement¹ setting out:

- A summary of the main issues raised in the representations on the draft SPD
- How these main issues have been addressed in the SPD which it is intended to adopt

2.0 Consultation on Draft Greyfriars and Wharf Place SPD

2.1 The draft Greyfriars and Wharf Place SPDs were published on the 26th August 2011 for six weeks public consultation. During this time the draft SPDs, Consultation Statement and other supporting documents were made available for inspection during normal office hours at the District Council's main offices in Grantham and on the website at www.southkesteven.gov.uk. The documents were also available in the Grantham local library.

2.2 A copy of the SPD documents were sent to those stakeholders who, it was considered, had an interest in the subject matter. All local residents, landowners and businesses within the areas proposed to be covered by the SPDs were notified directly by letter of the consultation, as were those in the immediate vicinity of the two sites.

2.3 Notice of the consultation and the availability of the consultation documents was given by way of a statutory notice published in the local press and the issuing of a press release.

3.0 Main Issues Raised

3.1 At the end of the consultation period representations on the draft SPDs had been received from 13 individuals, landowners and businesses and other organisations. Some of the responses were general comments common to both SPDs whilst others were more specific in respect of a particular aspect of one of the SPDs.

3.2 A summary of the main issues raised and how these were addressed in revising the SPDs for adoption are set out in Appendix 1 to this Statement.

3.3 The Council's Cabinet considered all the representations received at their meeting on the 9th January 2012, when it was resolved that the SPDs should be adopted subject to changes proposed to address issues raised in several of the representations.

¹ Regulation 18 4(b) Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended)

APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF MAIN ISSUES RAISED AND RESPONSE

Respondent Name	Reference Number	Section	Representation Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Changes
BOTH DEVELOPMENT BRIEFS					
Environment Agency			Support proposals	Support noted.	No changes required.
Anglian Water			There should be no new surface water connections to the foul or combined system. Recommend the opportunity for surface water separation. In accordance with PPS25, the proposals should secure sustainable surface water disposal applying the Flood Risk Management Hierarchy to ensure that SUDS are considered as the preferred option for surface water disposal.	Chapter 6 of both briefs require SUDS. Detailed guidance on this matter is set out in PPS25, there is no need to repeat it.	No changes required.
English Heritage			No recognition of the archaeological potential of each site.	Text added to briefs that draws attention to the archaeological potential of both sites	In Historic Character section on page 13 and Historic Assets section on page 34 add reference to archaeological potential.
			Greater attention should be given to the setting of CA's. Development outside of the CA boundary (but which forms part of the setting of the CA) needs to protect and enhance the character of the CA	The briefs cover this specific point/principle very clearly already.	No changes required.
			Change requirement for a PPS5 statement to 'Heritage Statement'	Documents amended to account for this	Amend reference in Planning Application Requirements section on page 49
			Make reference to the Grantham CA appraisal and show how it has influenced the proposals	Documents have been amended to include greater reference to the Grantham Conservation Area, and to require due regard to be had to this in the preparation of planning application proposals	In Historic Character section on page 13 and Planning Policy chapter add reference to Grantham Conservation Area Appraisal
CPRE			Expressed support	-	Support noted.

Respondent Name	Reference Number	Section	Representation Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Changes
Ancer Spa (on behalf of Buckminster Estates and Grantham Estates)			Very supportive of the general principles. Noted that it is a practical working document that incorporates a appropriate flexibility. However a number of detailed points raised.	-	Support noted.
Local resident (no.1)			Supports the proposals	-	Support noted.
			Pedestrian movement around the town centre needs to be improved	The brief supports this. Development should complement the Grantham Movement Study proposals.	No changes required.
			Must ensure adequate car parking in the town centre	Both of the planning briefs require car parking to be provided. Detailed proposals should complement the Grantham Movement Study.	No changes required.
Local Resident (no.4)			Remove reference to recession (as technically the UK has not been in recession for 18 months)	Agree text should be amended to reflect this.	Amend text in Development Viability section on page 48
			More detailed delivery strategy needed. How will Growth Point and GAF funds be used. Identify other funding sources to support development. Alternative delivery vehicles	The delivery strategy sets a framework for a landowner/developer-led strategy to be taken forward (with appropriate support from the Council). The brief must incorporate appropriate flexibility and it would be inappropriate/unecessary to include more detailed requirements at this stage	No changes required.
			SPDs should be supported by initial high-level appraisals		No changes required.
Grantham Civic Society			Supports the proposals but concerned about viability	The brief recognises the viability issues associated with development	No changes required.

Respondent Name	Reference Number	Section	Representation Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Changes
BNP Paribas (on behalf of royal Mail Estates)			Committed to retaining an operation in Grantham town centre however would consider relocating to make way for the proposed development if a suitable alternative location could be identified both from a cost and operational point of view.	Noted.	No changes required.
-	-	-	-	Update text to refer to latest stage of Area Action Plan preparation.	In Policy section update reference to Grantham Area Action Plan Submission version
WHARF PLACE DEVELOPMENT BRIEF					
English Heritage			Support the principle of redevelopment	-	Support noted.
			The historic context section should make reference to the Maltings and the Baptist church as being heritage buildings	These buildings are already referred to but additional references have been introduced	In Historic Character section on page 13 add reference to Maltings
			Landmark building on PO site should not be a tall building	None. While we recognise the heritage sensitivities with a taller building on this land, in urban design terms it is suitable. Detailed proposals (at the planning application stage) will need to justify scale/form having regard to these conflicting considerations. It is appropriate for the brief to remain flexible at this stage to enable the best possible solution to be realised in due course. This is linked to Policy WP 1 in GAAP which emphasises that building should be high design.	No changes required.
			Regrettable that the SPD is not ambitious is proposing the removal of the shopping centre and re-provision of the existing street network.	Evidence suggests that this would not have a reasonable prospect of being delivered in the current plan period.	No changes required.

Respondent Name	Reference Number	Section	Representation Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Changes
			Church has the potential to form a key part of the public square.	The plans allow for this exact scenario.	No changes required.
			Ensure compatible with the Grantham Townscape Character Appraisal	The key principles associated with the framework plans are broadly consistent with the illustrative plans included within the TCA.	No changes required.
Grantham Baptist Church			Surprised to see that the church is identified as a 'heritage asset', as it is an old not particularly attractive building. Supports the demolition and redevelopment of the church	We recognise this comment (and note that the building is not listed), nonetheless the Grantham TCA identifies the building as making a positive contribution to the town centre. Accordingly, the brief supports its retention.	No changes required.
Grantham Civic Society			The pedestrian environment on Wharf Road needs to be improved	The brief supports this.	No changes required.
Local resident (no.1)			Public realm improvements required along Wharf Road	The brief supports this.	No changes required.
			Concerned about impact on the vitality of the High Street	The proposed development may shift the retail focus of the town centre, however it should allow the centre (as a whole) to function more effectively, efficiently, and competitively by driving a more effective retail circuit and allowing for new forms of retail which should compensate for any shift in the retail focus.	No changes required.
GREYFRIARS DEVELOPMENT BRIEF					
English Heritage			Support the principle of redevelopment	-	Support noted.

Respondent Name	Reference Number	Section	Representation Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Changes
			The document does not make reference to non-designated heritage assets that make a positive contribution to the CA. The Townscape Character Appraisal makes reference to a number of positive contribution buildings in Figure 8.1.07, but these are not referred to in the SPD	Yes it does. It recognises that the non-listed buildings along Westgate make a positive contribution to the CA, and any removals should be dealt with very sensitively.	No changes required.
			The term 'comprehensive development' is too strong - perhaps temper with 'whilst preserving and enhancing the historic environment'	This site requires a comprehensive development solution (to overcome the risk of piecemeal development), and the brief makes it very clear that the existing historic buildings fronting Westgate are to be retained.	No changes required.
			Concerned about providing an access point at the site of 91-92 Westgate - this is identified in the Townscape Appraisal as having a positive contribution to the CA. Reference to a new route at this point should be removed. However, an 'arcade' style 'punch through' here would be acceptable.	This is exactly what is proposed in the brief.	No changes required.
			Welcomes the requirement for development to respond to the pattern of burgage plots etc and the suggestions of how buildings and spaces can achieve this. However, the diagrams provide little detail of the required building form and layout, suggesting large blocks rather than fine grain buildings.	The supporting text sets out possible solutions that could be taken on board at the planning application stage (preparation of scheme proposals)	No changes required.
			Need to ensure consistency between the TCA and the brief in respect to the site	The framework plans are very similar in principle to the proposals set out on page 78 of the TCA.	No changes required.
			Lost opportunity to extend the extent of the SPD to cover a larger area	Not a relevant comment. The extent of the SPD area has been set for some time. Too late to extend this.	No changes required.

Respondent Name	Reference Number	Section	Representation Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Changes
Ancer Spa (on behalf of Buckminster Estates and Grantham Estates)			The aspiration to retain the character of burgage plots contradicts with the recognition that the site should accommodate larger format development and improve pedestrian connectivity into the site. Suggests that the brief should either dilute the burgage plot referecne or provide worked up example of how this can be achieved.	The brief needs to stike an appropriate balance between heritage/conservation considerations and development reality. It is important that the referecne to burgage plots remains. Potential solutions are provided in the text - at the detailed design stage applicants should seek to achieve these objectives as best as possible.	No changes required.
			There should be pedestrian links between St Augustins Retail Park and the site - this should be a firmer requirement in the brief.	Briefs amended as per comment	Amend Urban Structure (page 27) and Access and Movement plan (page 45) to include link with St Augustin Retail Park
			The urban design plan on page 37 shows 7 new pedestrian links into the site. This should be a less specific requirement as subject to land acquisition etc.	These links are existing. The briefs support the retention and enhancement of these as far as it practicable (noting that some are under private ownership - although publicly accesible)	No changes required.
			The brief should acknowledge that residential uses could make-up a reasonable portion of the western part of the site	The framework plans and text support residential development on the western part of the site - some minor text changes have been introduced to make this more clear.	In Land Use Objective table on page 30 amend text to clarify residential and office/community/cultural uses are acceptable on western part of site

Respondent Name	Reference Number	Section	Representation Summary	Officer Response	Proposed Changes
			Undercroft/decked car parking is expensive. Some flexibility in car parking format should be introduced.	Significant areas of surface car parking is unlikely to be acceptable in townscape terms (although a small amount could be appropriate subject to appropriate design). The intention of the brief is to establish an ambitious development framework where undercroft/basement parking is preferred - alternative solutions should be justified at the planning application stage	No changes required.
			SKDC must take a lead in land assembly, to include the establishment of a Landowners Working Group	The delivery section makes clear that the Council is willing to use its powers to assist in land assembly.	In Land Assembly section on page 48 amend text to clarify role of Council
Local resident (no.1)			Lanes/alleys require enhancement	The brief supports this.	No changes required.
Local resident (no.2)			Adequate road and level pavement access to the sheltered housing units on Grey Friars should be maintained during the construction and operation phase of the development	This matter is too detailed to be a specific requirement for the planning brief. Nonetheless the brief does not prevent this being achieved and is a matter for consideration at the planning applications stage	No changes required.
Local resident (no.3)			The Greyfriars site should be used for employment uses not retail.	The Council has to balance development needs for different uses with land availability. The emerging LDF sets out plans to accommodate significant employment development on other sites (including Station Approach) - this site is considered most appropriate for retail (and other town centre uses) on account of its proximity to the primary shopping area.	No changes required.
Grantham Labour Club			The Greyfriars site should be used for employment uses not retail.		