Summary:
We recognise that the SA/SEA cannot be a completely comprehensive reflection on the full range of environmental receptors in the district, however the baseline section of the SA/SEA relating to biodiversity is extremely limited. No mention is made of protected species or non-statutory sites ('Wildlife Sites') which make up, in area terms, the vast majority of the district's remaining biodiversity-rich sites. This section doesn't actually say much about the environment of the district. We would argue that section 5 is correct in so far as it goes in relation to biodiversity and better reflects the direction taken in RSS8 than the policy in the main document because it identifies explicitly the need to enhance biodiversity.

Sustainability Appraisal - We will concentrate our comments upon those preferred options against which we have registered objections above.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments will be taken on board as the SA/SEA is updated for submission. In particular, the absense of reference to protected species and wildlife sites must be addressed.

Summary:
We consider that this revised Core Strategy and SA/SEA consultation is a significant improvement on that submitted to us in 2006. It has maintained the clarity and accessibility that we noted in our previous response. It has also built on the solid baseline of evidence that was compiled for the previous consultation. We consider that the majority of the issues that we consider are significant for SKDC have been identified. The policies put forward are also

Officers' Recommendation:
Support welcomed. Contact will be made with Environment Agency to resolve outstanding concerns.
largely appropriate to address those issues. Accordingly we consider that should the areas of concern that we have identified elsewhere be resolved, the Core Strategy document will be an appropriate overarching strategy to enable sustainable development in the District. We offer our full assistance to the LPA in resolving the issues that we have identified below and would encourage them to make contact as early as possible.

Con ID: 26179
Full Name: Mr Neil Pike
Organisation: English Nature
Comment ID: 2628
Title: 
Number: 
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
Habitats Regulation Assessment: Natural England has been involved in the production of the Habitats Regulation assessment for the core strategy of this LDF. Natural England concurs with the and is satisfied that there is unlikely to be a significant effect on the two Natura 2000 sites. Recommend minor changes in wording within the Assessment: 1) document to be entitled Habitat Regulations Assessment. 2) On page 2, recognise the activities listed here are not necessarily exhaustive, but represent the only likely activities which the plan could expect to influence. 3) A section on page 3 is missing - between stages 3 & 4 is a test of over-riding public interest which should be included.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted and the document will be amended as appropriate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26480</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Mr A Hoyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**

Bus services are generally too irregular and expensive to tempt people not to use their cars. Even if buses were heavily subsidized, ie free, people would still prefer the convenience of door to door car travel. SKDC must not ignore the great number of car owning council tax payers and ensure that all our towns have adequate car parks.

**Officers' Recommendation:**

Comments noted, however, national planning policy is to provide development which allows alternatives to the private car.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26173</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Mrs Alice de la Rue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Planning Officer Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**

General
Having considered the above proposed policies, it appears that there should be a separate policy that broadly covers the factors that are considered when assessing new development, such as impact on existing land-uses, highway safety, design etc. These may already be contained in saved local plan policies, so cross-references to those should be made wherever appropriate to avoid unnecessary repetition. Baseline Data On page 25 of this document there is reference to GP practices. It may be helpful to record the number of dentist practices in the area as there are known shortages in some parts of the region.

**Officers' Recommendation:**

Disagree. A separate policy is not required as these issues are covered in National and Regional policy. Baseline: when the baseline data is revised dentists can be considered.
Summary:
Sustainable Appraisal Page 7 should refer to the South Kesteven Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment. This highlighted some issues in terms of improvements needed to sites as well as a need for new pitches. Improvements to sites are important in the context of providing 'decent' accommodation for all. Page 63 should refer to storage and maintenance of equipment in the first paragraph. Under social consideration on page 63, reference should be made to the contribution of sites to the health, well-being and educational needs of Travelling Showpeople.

Officers' Recommendation:
This list will be updated as part of preparing SA/SEA for submission, and can be amended to include "maintenance".

Summary:
Objections to the housing provision for Grantham and to the identification of specific sites for sustainable urban extensions to Grantham. I consider the Preferred Options Core Strategy unsound and should be withdrawn.

Officers' Recommendation:
Disagree. RSS will establish level of housing development required for district to 2026. Core strategy has been prepared in accordance with figures of draft and will not be finalised until RSS figures approved (expected Sept 2008). National advice is that key strategic allocations should be identified in Core Strategy, hence SUEs for Grantham are identified.
Summary:
The sequential approach has been deliberately omitted from PPS3 as a way of speeding up the delivery of and release of land for housing. PPS3 still prioritises the use of previously developed land over greenfield, however this aspiration should be expressed in terms of the priority being given to previously developed sites, and should not be expressed using the terminology "sequential approach, as that approach has a very precise and specific meaning, which is no longer appropriate. The HBF believes the Local Planning Authority should adopt a more flexible approach to the distribution of housing developments within the District. Housing provision should be increased in the rural district to ensure local workforce to support expanding local businesses.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. References to sequential approach in policies will be removed and policies pointed in line with all new government guidance. The Council's preferred option for residential development includes development in the larger villages in order to maintain their viability.

Con ID: 26062
Full Name: Miss H Mawson
Organisation: The Home Builders Federation
Comment ID: 2174
Title: Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007
Number: Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
The HBF would also like the Core Strategy to recognise that the Federation, in conjunction with CABE, have produced the "Building for Life" guide. This guide is intended to assist housebuilders, housing associations, architects and planners achieve good quality design in housing.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Mr Anthony Jowett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>F H Gilman &amp; Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Supports the general thrust of all the objections and representations made by the Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce in its letters to you dated 7 August 2006 and 14 June 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26106</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Mrs J Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Preferred Options paper is premature and therefore unsound. Because the RSS has not been completed. Hope that the submission draft will not be published before the RSS has been finalised. We also would like to add that there are also significant inconsistencies through the paperwork, for example no specific sites identified and yet urban extension sites have been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>Comments noted. The LDS has been updated, and allows time to consider the outcome of the Panel Report. The RSS is expected to be approved in September 2008. The submission of the Core Strategy is now programmed for Oct/Nov. Good practice suggests that major changes such as the location of urban extension sites should be identified within the Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26560</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>J &amp; T Orrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>C/o Brown &amp; Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Preferred Options paper is premature and therefore unsound. Because the RSS has not been completed. Hope that the submission draft will not be published before the RSS has been finalised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>The LDS has been updated, and allows time to consider the outcome of the Panel Report. The RSS is expected to be approved in September 2008. The submission of the Core Strategy is now programmed for Oct/Nov.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary: Client suggests 3 areas of land in and around Market Deeping for employment and mixed use development.


---

Summary: Publication of CSPO premature: Final RSS not expected until September 2008 and Growth Point initiative not yet endorsed. Identification of Urban Extension Sites does not accord with the Vision and Objectives of the Core Strategy: require major infrastructure, will inhibit supply and will not deliver development at the rates required by PPS3 and Growth Point because of ownership and remediation issues. Growth in town centre required to broaden employment base. Proposal for Spitalgate Level/Somerby Hill as Urban Extension based on solely on desire for southern bypass. No certainty that bypass could be funded by Urban Extension. Proposal amounts to uncontrolled, prominent and intrusive urban sprawl into open countryside. Suggest that allocation of site between Belton Lane and Manthorpe Estate in addition to Poplar Farm and Spitalgate Level as Urban Extension (suggests slightly smaller site than PO4c). Smaller Urban Extension could be brought forward early in LDF, ensuring continuity of supply while more challenging Poplar Farm and Spitalgate Level come on stream. HMA and district housing allocations in

Officers' Recommendation: The LDS has been updated, and allows time to consider the outcome of the Panel Report. The RSS is expected to be approved in September 2008. The submission of the Core Strategy is now programmed for Oct/Nov. Selection of preferred options was political decision, and forms part of Grantham. However, further consideration should be given to the potential of this "alternative" SUE.
RSS will be regarded as minimum targets, rather than ceilings, PPS3 seeks flexible and continuous supply, Growth Point sets challenging target and current development plan has effectively choked off supply in first five years of LDF. Implication of above is that LDF needs delivery trajectory above average rates required by RSS in next 10 years if RSS is to be met.

Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer Planning & Conservation Lincolnshire County Council

Summary:
It is acknowledged that this review of core options has been undertaken to comply with Government guidance and assist with aligning the Local Development Framework with the Regional Plan and Lincolnshire Structure Plan. South Kesteven District Council (SKDC) may also have to review the core strategy following the Examinations in Public (EIP) into the draft regional plan and any proposed changes that are agreed by the Secretary of State.

Officers' Recommendation:
Noted.

Con ID: 1859
Full Name: Mrs M.T.D Cooke
Organisation: parish clerk Castle Bytham Parish Council

Summary:
The Parish Council felt they were not sufficiently informed to make comments and therefore will go along with the Preferred Option. The Councillors found the document difficult to get through, with unclear aims and objectives.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.
**Con ID:** 26299  
**Full Name:** Mr John Plumb  
**Organisation:** Stamford Town Partnership

**Comment ID:** 1814  
**Title:** Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007  
**Number:**  
**Nature Of Response** Observations

---

**Summary:**
Some of the issues you are consulting on do not affect Stamford and without specific proposals are fairly meaningless. The next stage of being site specific and then an Action Plan will need considerable vision to preserve the character of the town and to underpin its economic viability long term.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The Core Strategy provides the spatial policy framework for development and change in the whole district.

---

**Con ID:** 26292  
**Full Name:** Councillor T Holmes  
**Organisation:**

**Comment ID:** 1832  
**Title:** Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007  
**Number:**  
**Nature Of Response** Observations

---

**Summary:**
Sustainability Appraisal: The appraisal seems to be reactive rather than proactive. I see only carrots but no sticks. The suggestion that adjustments will be made over time, is a simple admission of defeat. ‘Developers will win whatever we do’. Strong measures to ensure that the identified strategy is adhered to is more expensive in the short term but will bring serious real cost savings over time and make this authority a more credible force in the community. Unlike the rest of the Core Strategy document, it goes off into 'techno-speak' unintelligible to all but experts. Is this the way to obtain effective consultation and feedback?

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comments noted. An Appraisal is, by definition, reactive. Support for the Core Strategy Preferred Options is welcomed.
**Con ID:** 26304  
**Full Name:** Mr J M Mettham  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 2695  
**Title:** Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007  
**Number:**  
**Nature Of Response** Observations

**Summary:**  
Village people are penalized by policies of car restraint. SKDC should make more use of public transport and not rely on cars. People already travel long distances to access health services. Have the effects of more housing development been considered in relation to Grantham Hospital and NHS dental? Suggest a public forum is considered before the final options are published.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
SKDC cannot directly increase public transport provision, but does work together with LCC to encourage an appropriate level of service. Sustainable patterns of development should ensure that new development is located so that it provides occupants with the choice to use other modes of transport than the car. Further consultation will be held before submission/adoPTION.

---

**Con ID:** 26107  
**Full Name:** Mr & Mrs T Shaw  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 2503  
**Title:** Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007  
**Number:**  
**Nature Of Response** Observations

**Summary:**  
Preferred Options paper is premature and therefore unsound. Because the RSS has not been completed. Hope that the submission draft will not be published before the RSS has been finalised.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments noted. The LDS has been updated, and allows time to consider the outcome of the Panel Report. The RSS is expected to be approved in September 2008. The submission of the Core Strategy is now programmed for Oct/Nov.

---

**Con ID:** 26108  
**Full Name:** Messrs Brint, MCcallion  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 2466  
**Title:** Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007  
**Number:**  
**Nature Of Response** Observations

**Summary:**  
Preferred Options paper is premature and therefore unsound. Because the RSS has not been completed. Hope that the submission draft will not be published before the RSS has been finalised. In addition there are inconsistencies within the document - particularly relating to the identification of sites in Grantham. These should not be considered prior to the RSS.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments noted. The LDS has been updated, and allows time to consider the outcome of the Panel Report. The RSS is expected to be approved in September 2008. The submission of the Core Strategy is now programmed for Oct/Nov. Identification of major urban extensions should be included within the Core Strategy rather than the site allocations document.
Summary:
I agree with the Council's preferred options, but wonder how committed the Council is to actually put any plans into action. The Council seems inconsistent in the requirements for affordable new housing.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. If the Core Strategy is approved, this will be the Council's policy document, and should be used to deliver both public and private development to 2026. Where appropriate the errors noted will be rectified.

Summary:
Notes with extreme disappointment that the background evidence assembled by the Council (paras 1.12 and 1.13) does not include any information on the biodiversity of the District. This omission was pointed out in our submission to the earlier draft of the Core Strategy and we have corresponded with the Council on this subject. South Kesteven District is rich in biodiversity, with some 27 SSSIs, 10 LWT nature reserves, 21 Protected Road Verges, 12 RIGS and 236 SNCIs. There is a need for, at least, complete surveys of previously identified SNCIs and their assessment by the Local Wildlife Sites Panel to determine whether they meet Local Wildlife Site criteria. The need for up-to-date surveys by 2010 is now enshrined in the Lincolnshire Local Area Agreement. The Trust would welcome discussion on the means to take this forward. Policy for conservation and enhancement of biodiversity. It is widely recognised that Lincolnshire is impoverished in terms of biodiversity (Lincolnshire BAP; East Midlands Regional Biodiversity Strategy; Draft Regional Plan etc). The draft Regional Plan proposes a major step-change increase in the

Officers' Recommendation:
Disagree. Wildlife covered by many national and regional policies to protect species and habitat. Not appropriate to reiterate these policies. PO10 encompasses conservation and biodiversity. Lincolnshire BAP should be added to the list of background papers.
region's biodiversity. Within South Kesteven District lie parts of the Rutland and South West Lincolnshire Limestone Biodiversity Conservation Area and The Fens Biodiversity Enhancement Area. Object to the draft Core Strategy on the basis that it omits a Preferred Option for conservation and enhancement of biodiversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26210</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Dr R A Fuller</td>
<td>The revised Core Strategy Preferred Options is considerably modified from that issued in 2006 for consultation and in many instances is more generalised and less specific. This has made the Strategy less definitive in areas such as: Design, Protecting Neighbouring Amenity Through Design, Development in Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Pollution Control. This is to the detriment of the overall document and actually avoids a number of the comments we felt were viable in respect of the earlier proposals.</td>
<td>Many of these issues are covered by regulations and national policy. LDF documents should not reiterate national or regional policy. The Core Strategy should provide the spatial planning framework for all development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Bourne Civic Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response:</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26218</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Mr P Lely</td>
<td>Preferred Options paper is premature and therefore unsound. Because the RSS has not been completed. Hope that the submission draft will not be published before the RSS has been finalised.</td>
<td>The LDS has been updated, and allows time to consider the outcome of the Panel Report. The RSS is expected to be approved in September 2008. The submission of the Core Strategy is now programmed for Oct/Nov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response:</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Con ID: 26347
Full Name: Mrs N Jacobs
Organisation: Town Clerk Bourne Town Council
Comment ID: 2067
Title: Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007
Number: Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Bourne Town Council would welcome to receive details of proposed revision dates.

Officers' Recommendation:
All parish and town councils within this district are automatically notified of any consultation and of the issue of any planning documents.

Con ID: 26480
Full Name: Mr A Hoyle
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 2264
Title: Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007
Number: Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
It would be nice to think that the areas, particularly in Grantham, scheduled for the housing development, were something other than vast housing estates with 'executive' homes. I accept that people only buy houses that they like and that developers need to make money, but it ought to be possible to have some imaginative thinking to create something other than a 'mirror image' of developments that you see on the outskirts of every town.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Efforts will be made to ensure that the two Urban Extensions for Grantham are designed and laid out in a manner which adds to the local character of Grantham and the surrounding countryside. This will, hopefully, be achieved via an SPD for each SUE.

Con ID: 26484
Full Name: Trustees for the Belvoi
Organisation: Smiths Gore
Comment ID: 2406
Title: Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007
Number: Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
We have noted that the terms relating to the different categories of settlement that are set out in the spatial strategy do not seem to be used exclusively and consistently throughout the document, especially in those policies relating to housing matters. For example, some new categories seem to be mentioned eg rural/urban areas, rural villages, other rural villages, other sustainable settlements etc. If these terms are to be used, we are of the opinion that they should be clearly defined, possibly in the spatial

Officers' Recommendation:
The urban area of the District comprises the four main towns: Grantham, Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings. Appendix A defines and lists Local Service Centres and Larger Villages. Other settlements are contained within the term "other rural villages". It is considered that the most sustainable settlements are the towns, followed by the Local Service Centres and Larger Villages. The other rural villages have few facilities and are, therefore, considered to be less sustainable than other settlements.
strategy, so as to improve the clarity of the document. The settlements included in these categories could perhaps be listed in an appendix.

**Con ID:** 26190  
**Full Name:** Julie Banks  
**Organisation:** Clerk to the Trustees Deeping St James United Charities

**Summary:**
The Trustees of these Charities are not averse to development on the Charities' lands and would wish this willingness to have its lands included in the employment land and affordable housing allocations noted.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
SHLAA pro forma issued. This is a matter for the Site Allocations DPD, not the Core Strategy.

---

**Con ID:** 26217  
**Full Name:** CPRE  
**Organisation:** c/o Community Council of Lincs

**Summary:**
Overall, CPRE (Lincolnshire branch) welcomes the approach set out in the Core Strategy and we have therefore indicated our support for the Preferred Options (with the exception of the policy proposed for Renewable Energy). Whilst supporting Policy PO10 (Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District), this does appear as something of a 'catch all' policy in that it enhances a wide and diverse range of factors that, in our view, would be better disaggregated and given a more selective focus on particular topics such as conservation; recreation; biodiversity etc. We would welcome some refinement on these line therefore. On a detailed point, we query (see para.1.29) what is "the correct balance between urban and rural
systems”? This needs to be elaborated or it is incapable of providing guidance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26125</th>
<th>Full Name: Mr Graham Foster</th>
<th>Organisation: Senior Planning Officer - Lincolnshire and Rutland Area Team Government Office For The East Midlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>Soundness test vi): coherent and consistent. Soundness test vii): evidence base is robust and credible. Soundness test viii): clear mechanisms. Weakness stems from the lack of the identification of key issues early on in the document which may have logically followed the spatial portrait. The means of implementation should be set out within the plan period and with a high level of commitment from partners. Provision for delivery of the policies is required and the role of the delivery bodies should be clearly set out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong> Document will be amended in light of the comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26189</th>
<th>Full Name: Mrs S Roberts</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>New housing needs to be built over time and positioned where there are existing facilities or additional facilities provided. Few local amenities means people have to travel. The 'green' areas of South Kesteven need to be retained and protected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong> Comments noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Comment ID:** 2009  
**Title:** Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007  
**Number:** Observations

**Comment ID:** 1850  
**Title:** Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007  
**Number:** Observations
**Con ID:** 26179  
**Full Name:** Mr Neil Pike  
**Organisation:** English Nature  
**Comment ID:** 1981  
**Title:** Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007

**Nature Of Response**  Observations

**Summary:**
Natural England recognises that, between PO11, PO12 and PO13, there exists the basis for a general climate change policy. Whilst Natural England does not object to these options per se, we would wish to ensure that policies relating to wind farms are cross-reference to policies relating to landscape and biodiversity protection and enhancement in the final document.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comments noted. Renewable energy policy is not specific to windfarms. All policies should be read in conjunction with each other. There should be no need for cross reference.

---

**Con ID:** 26170  
**Full Name:** Mr J Plumb  
**Organisation:** Stamford Civic Society  
**Comment ID:** 1959  
**Title:** Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007

**Nature Of Response**  Observations

**Summary:**
It is not the job of organisations or individuals to assess whether the comment is in line with National or Regional guidance - in our view that is the responsibility of Council Officers. Many of the questions raised are impossible to comment on as there are no details of policy, merely a desire to comply with a national policy. With a few exceptions the document is addressed not to communities but to Whitehall. The Society would support some limited growth on brownfield sites, though we have expressed reservations for Stamford as to the definition of such sites. In our view it is not existing gardens in the Conservations Areas, neither does it involve property demolition merely to provide more units on a site. We support a retail strategy to ensure the viability of town centre retail. Thirdly, we agree there needs to be a complete reassessment of sites for economic development. In our view the latter is linked to something not referred to in your document, namely transport and road issues. Whilst we appreciate this is the remit of the Highways Authority, there is no way that the next stage of site allocations and an Action Plan can be

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comments noted.
prepared without a planning policy in respect or Relief/Bypass roads.

**Summary:**
Erection of a Margaret Thatcher Memorial Statue at the entry of the town with a visitor centre would increase tourism and benefit local businesses.

**Officer's Recommendation:**
Not a matter for the core Strategy. Comment will be forwarded to the Economic Development Team.

---

**Con ID:** 26285  
**Full Name:** Mr L J Blunt  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 1835  
**Title:** Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007  
**Number:**  
**Nature Of Response** Observations

**Summary:**
The core strategy does not address tourism directly nor does it address the relation in the economic development section. We consider that the core strategy should address tourism in some form particularly as one of the priorities identified by consultation in the 'prosperous community' section of the South Kesteven Community strategy is a focus on tourism development. We welcome the inclusion of the Grantham Canal Corridor into the centre of Grantham on both the key diagram and the built and natural environment diagrams.

**Officer's Recommendation:**
Comments noted. Tourism should be included within the Economic Development Section.
**Summary:**
The main concerns are around the levels of proposed affordable housing and amount of scope for extra retail development in Bourne which we believe will inhibit future growth in the town.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Noted.

---

**Summary:**
Due to the high level of growth associated with this region, a water cycle study is key to understanding the constraints to development on a regional and site-specific basis.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Water-cycle study for Grantham is currently being undertaken.

---

**Summary:**
In order to consult all interested members of the community please continue to provide hard copies of documents and forms.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comments noted.
Summary:
Representation supporting the allocation of land for employment at Gonerby Moor. Previously identified as proposed allocation E1(o) and E15.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support for Gonerby Moor as employment land noted. However, this is a matter for the Site Specific Allocations DPD, and not the Core Strategy.

Summary:
Natural England believes that the core strategy document is acceptable in so far as it goes. However, we believe that it does not, at present go far enough in seeking to optimise the biodiversity gain that the forward planning system should seek to deliver.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. Consideration to be given to increasing biodiversity gain.

Summary:
The Preferred Options Core Strategy does not comply with a recently approved Local Development Scheme

Officers' Recommendation:
The timetable for the Core Strategy has been amended to allow time to consider the panel report and consultation into changes arising. The new LDS has been approved by GOEM and is available on the website.
Summary:
Overall, the commitment to achieving sustainable development and a reduction of the need to travel is welcome and it is considered that these objectives underpin the current preferred options strategy. The need to avoid unnecessary additional stress being placed upon the strategic road network is embodied, although I should emphasise that inevitable impacts on the trunk road network will need to be carefully assessed as the Core Strategy is further developed.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.

Summary:
I agree with the Council's preferred options, and in particular with your Preferred Option 3b. I believe that the priority in allocating residental building consents should go to projects where planning gain can deliver significant benefits for the community as a whole.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.

Summary:
It is requested that the Trust's comments previously submitted re protection zone around Belton House on 7th August 2006 are taken forward other than where specific changes are noted below in this letter.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Trusts' previous comments were considered in this revised Preferred Options document. It is not considered appropriate to include such policies within the Core Strategy.
Con ID: 26045  
Full Name: Mr Egerton Gilman  
Organisation: Chairman, Environment & Traffic Working Group Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce  
Consideration:
Summary:
Chamber does not accept the validity of designating Grantham as a Sub-Regional Centre: this will result in Grantham's problems being exacerbated and be to the detriment of Stamford.

Officers' Recommendation:
The designation of Grantham as a Sub-Regional Centre is a Regional (RSS) designation. The LDF must be in conformity with the RSS.

Comment ID: 1929  
Title: Introduction  
Number: 1  
Nature Of Response: Observations

Con ID: 26160  
Full Name: Cecil  
Organisation: c/o Strutt and Parker  
Consideration:
Summary:
Specified reference should be made to the purpose of including the Key Diagram and its significance in the context of the document.

Officers' Recommendation:
Key diagram is a requirement of PPS12, Annex A and paragraph 2.13.
Summary:
The Retail Needs Study needs to be updated to bring its projections to 2026, in line with the LDF timeframe.

Officers' Recommendation:

Con ID: 26101
Full Name: Mr J Parmiter
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 979
Title: paragraph
Number: 1.1
Nature Of Response  Observations

Con ID: 26271
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
DLP Planning Ltd
Comment ID: 911
Title: paragraph
Number: 1.1
Nature Of Response  Support

Con ID: 26475
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
Stamford Property Company
Comment ID: 2080
Title: paragraph
Number: 1.1
Nature Of Response  Support

Summary:
Support plan period to 2026

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.

Summary:
We express support for the adoption of a plan period to 2026 as set out in paragraph 1.1. This will enable the Council to meet the newly expressed requirements of PPS3 (paragraph 53) to provide for housing requirements for at least 15 year period from the point of adoption; and to take into account the merging review of RSS8 which is currently being rolled forward to 2026.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.
Summary:
Clearer explanation of changes made previously following discussions with GOEM and how previous comments were taken on board is needed.

Officers' Recommendation:
Core Strategy is not the place for such discussion - see previous Cabinet report for reasons why changes were made.

Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells
Comment ID: 997
Title: paragraph
Number: 1.7
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
Support paragraph 1.7 and the explicit expression of intent to align the LDF with the emerging RSS for the East Midlands.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted

Con ID: 26475
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner Stamford Property Company
Comment ID: 2081
Title: paragraph
Number: 1.7
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
There should be a clear explanation as to the changes to be made following discussions with the Government Office and also as to how and where the responses to the previous Preferred Options Core Strategy were taken on board. This is required to allow respondents to understand the changes made since the previous version as this will of course influence responses.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.
Summary:
The Submission Draft Core strategy should at the very least await the outcome of the Secretary of State’s consideration of the Panel Report, i.e. the publication of proposed changes.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. The Panel Report was published December 2007. The outcomes of this and proposed changes will influence the submission version.

Summary:
The preparation of the Submission Draft Core Strategy should at the very least await the outcome of the Secretary of States consideration of the Panel Report, i.e. the publication of proposed changes.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Reference to ongoing work with LCC be made on introduction and in relation to Grantham Growth. LTP to be added to list of background papers.

Summary:
A reference at Para 1.12/1.13 to the Local Transport Plan in the introduction CSPO (and the ongoing work with the County to develop a Transport Strategy for Grantham) would help to demonstrate a joined-up approach between land-use planning and transport.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Reference to ongoing work with LCC be made on introduction and in relation to Grantham Growth. LTP to be added to list of background papers.
Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer Planning & Conservation Lincolnshire County Council

Summary:
Para 1.13 highlights research papers and could also include the Lincolnshire Biodiversity Action Plan.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Lincolnshire BAP to be added to list of background papers.

Comment ID: 2640
Title: paragraph
Number: 1.13
Nature Of Response: Object

Con ID: 26469
Full Name: Ms Alison Christie
Organisation: Strategic Partnership Officer Lincolnshire County Council

Summary:
1.13 – Local Transport Plan (LTP) is now missing from the list of background research papers
3.2.7 – Reducing dependence on the private car also offers health benefits. What type of modern technology will reduce the need to travel? This needs to be clearer

Officers' Recommendation:
LTP to be added to list of background papers.

Comment ID: 2025
Title: paragraph
Number: 1.13
Nature Of Response: Observations
Summary:
We support the expressed intent in paragraph 1.20 that in order to maintain a close relationship between homes, employment and community facilities within South Kesteven, urban areas will be the focus for new development and redevelopment.

Officers' Recommendation:
support noted

Summary:
Support urban area focus for new and re-development.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted

Summary:
Support recognition of Grantham as a sub-regional centre and as a growth point.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted
Summary:
Focussing new development within the urban areas is supported. Role of Grantham as SRC should be to support new housing and employment. Development of Grantham and its position as a 'growth point' is supported, greatest danger to Grantham is population gain and unequal delivery of employment land. The A1 town entrances should be developed for B1 and B8 development.

Officers' Recommendation:
Concerns about the amount of employment land in comparison to the delivery of housing are noted. The hierarchy included in Preferred option 8a seeks to provide the largest employment land use allocation for the Grantham area, up to 90ha initially and a further 70ha (reserved) if required. No change required.

Comment ID: 1700
Number: 1.20
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
Support recognition of Grantham as a sub-regional centre and as a growth point.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.

Comment ID: 1000
Number: 1.24
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
The document fails to recognise either the status and role of Stamford as a Main Town as established in RSS, or the expectation that such towns should have "appropriate amounts of development land"

Officers' Recommendation:
Although the RSS differentiates between Stamford and Bourne, as "Main Towns" and Deepings, as a "Small Town", for practical purposes within SKDC there is nothing to be served by having an extra tier, consisting of one settlement.

Comment ID: 915
Number: 1.25
Nature Of Response: Object
Miss Ellie Smith
Assistant Planner
Stamford Property Company

Summary:
Does not reflect the status and role envisaged in the RSS for Stamford. RSS clearly differentiates between the 'Main Towns' including Stamford and Bourne; and the 'Small Towns' which includes The Deepings.

Officers' Recommendation:
Although the RSS differentiates between Stamford and Bourne, as "Main Towns" and Deepings, as a "Small Town", for practical purposes within SKDC there is nothing to be served by having an extra tier, consisting of one settlement.

Mr J Parmiter
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Stamford needs to grow, to fulfil its role within the sub-region and to support its local catchment area. This needs to be reflected in the commentary.

Officers' Recommendation:
Stamford is not identified as a growth area, and is subject to considerable constraints to growth (eg historic character, landscape and topography). Difficulties relating to district, county and regional boundaries all constrain growth of Stamford. Modest incremental growth to meet own needs as set out in RSS Panel Report.

Mr D Bainbridge
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
An amount of new employment is supported in the towns of Deepings and Bourne, However the infrastructure and character of the towns are unlikely to be able to cope with the amount of development required to ensure the towns become self-supporting and sustainable.

Officers' Recommendation:
Noted. No evidence from service providers to suggest the modest levels of new development proposed by Core Strategy will be a problem for existing infrastructure.
Summary: The last sentence of this paragraph should be amended to include reference to Stamford, to redress the outward migration to Peterborough.

Officers' Recommendation: Agree. The paragraph will be amended to include reference to Stamford.

Summary: we welcome the acknowledgement of the need to develop a strategy to reduce commuting into Peterborough by restricting housing development in the south western part of the district.

Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted.

Summary: Support principle of sustainable service villages. Core Strategy has no policies to protect local services, despite the Council's obvious knowledge about the number of individual shops and other services being lost from such villages over time.

Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted. It is difficult to "protect" local shops via planning restraint, as they are dependant upon market forces. However, consideration should be given to the inclusion of a policy to promote and encourage development/retention of local services and employment in rural areas.
Con ID: 26276
Full Name: Mr Clive Henderson
Organisation: Chairman Long Bennington Parish Council

Comment ID: 944
Title: paragraph
Number: 1.29
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary:
More joined-up consideration on Town and Village Planning.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.

Con ID: 26205
Full Name: Dr D Burston
Organisation: Framptons

Comment ID: 2285
Title: paragraph
Number: 1.30
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
Residential option 3 tabulates provision for LSC & larger villages, plus 'other rural villages'. Introduction para's 1.24-1.31 should make the distinction between larger villages, all other villages and the countryside. LSC essential facilities should include local employment availability. Castle Bytham should be an LSC as it has employment opportunities.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comment noted. A further sentence should be incorporated within LSC paragraph to mention larger villages. The LSC essential facilities were identified by the range of facilities and services offered within the village. LSCs are defined as having 8 of the 9 essential facilities, Castle Bytham according to the Parish Council (2006) has 6.

Con ID: 74056
Full Name: Mr Michael King

Comment ID: 2649
Title: paragraph
Number: 1.30
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
The Council should be more proactive to ensure existing services, in LSCs and larger villages, are protected and improved. One of the arguments for the new planning system was that it should be more proactive. The main problem in the villages is that housing land values are attractive as a capital gain to the owners of village shops and facilities. The Planning Authority cannot force shops to open or stay open, but it can prevent change of use of existing premises, but only if it has a strong

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. 'There will also be a presumption against change of use away from retail and other facilities in the case of existing village facilities' to be added to paragraph. Consider strengthening PO8 to prevent loss of existing rural employment and in PO9 to protect rural services.
policy in the Core Strategy. This matter cannot be left to ad hoc development control. I propose that at Para 1.30 the sentence 'There will also be a presumption against change of use away from retail and other facilities in the case of existing village facilities' is added at the end.

**Con ID:** 26261  
**Full Name:** Mr Tudor Townsend  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 889  
**Title:** paragraph  
**Number:** 1.30  
**Nature Of Response** Support with conditions

**Summary:**  
Support for the identification of a need for growth within identified Local Service Centres, however growth should be controlled through allocation of appropriate housing development sites within these Centres.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Agree. PO1(a) seeks to do this. Clarification of this preference should be made in new policy PO1(a). The allocation of appropriate housing development sites will be dealt with in the site specific allocations document.

**Con ID:** 26276  
**Full Name:** Mr Clive Henderson  
**Organisation:** Chairman Long Bennington Parish Council  
**Comment ID:** 945  
**Title:** paragraph  
**Number:** 1.30  
**Nature Of Response** Support with conditions

**Summary:**  
Better indication of growth allowable in Local Service Centres required.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments noted. PO1(a) seeks to do this. Clarification of this preference should be made in new policy PO1(a). The allocation of appropriate housing development sites will be dealt with in the site specific allocations document.
**Summary:**
Para 1.31 should acknowledge that any sustainable development allowed in these settlements (and part funded through Section 106 Agreements) should achieve a more reasonable degree of sustainability. The proposed Vision and Objectives relating to the natural environment are supported.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Agree. Include "or helps to achieve a better degree of sustainability" after ". . . or local need requirement or is appropriate to the rural location."

---

**Summary:**
Small-scale infill within village of Sedgebrook should be allowed.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Sedgebrook is not an LSC or a larger village. It would, therefore, fall within the 3rd tier of policy PO1(a) where only affordable or agricultural housing or conversions are considered appropriate.

---

**Summary:**
The Key Diagram should be changed to show the A1 Corridor Opportunity Area extending beyond the A1 to the west in the vicinity of Harlaxton Wharf.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The A1 acts as a boundary to the expansion of Grantham. Land to the west of the A1 should, therefore, not be included.
Summary:
The Key Diagram should identify Grantham as a Sub-Regional Centre in accordance with the emerging RSS. The A1 Corridor Opportunity Area is not developed through one of the Strategic Objectives and nor is it translated as a Policy. It is recommended that the opportunity area is enlarged to encompass land to the west and east of the A1 and the intentions behind the area fully explained. The specific sites for Possible Urban Extensions should be removed from the Key Diagram because it is not appropriate to identify specific sites in the Core Strategy. Replace with broad locations for delivering housing and other strategic development needs (as per para. 2.10 PPS12). On this basis the land to the west of Grantham adjoining the west side of the A1 should be included as a broad location for development. An Ordnance Survey plan of the site is enclosed, reference B.7904.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. The key diagram will be amended to identify Grantham as a Sub-regional centre and the A1 corridor opportunity area needs to be mentioned in the document, but as the A1 acts as a boundary to the expansion of Grantham. Land to the west of the A1 should therefore not be included. The possible urban extension sites should remain on the key diagram, to denote areas of significant change, in line with PPS12 Appendix A.

Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells
Comment ID: 996
Title: paragraph
Number: 1.32
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
KEY DIAGRAM AND PARAGRAPH 1.32 The purpose of the key diagram is to provide a visual indication of the spatial objectives of the strategy including the broad strategy for delivering housing and other strategic development needs. This should include general locations for strategic urban extensions or alternatively directions of growth, as well as major transport developments. In addition to the indication of broad directions of growth, the Key Diagram should also identify: • Granthams New Growth Point status and its role as a Sub-Regional Centre, as well as the role of Stamford, Bourne and The Deepings as Main and Small

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Consider 2 key diagrams - one for district and an inset for Grantham denoting its strategic role as a Growth Point, and allowing key elements of the Growth Strategy to be depicted.
Towns; • the retail hierarchy with Grantham as a principal retail area and the role of the smaller towns of Stamford, Bourne and The Deepings as indicated in the Boroughs Retail Capacity Study and in accordance with the Draft RSS8 (paragraph. 3.2.14, Eastern Sub-area)

Summary:
KEY DIAGRAM AND PARAGRAPH 1.32 The purpose of the key diagram is to provide a visual indication of the spatial objectives of the strategy including the broad strategy for delivering housing and other strategic development needs. This should include general locations for strategic urban extensions or alternatively directions of growth, as well as major transport developments. In addition to the indication of broad directions of growth, the Key Diagram should also identify: • Granthams New Growth Point status and its role as a Sub-Regional Centre, as well as the role of Stamford, Bourne and The Deepings as Main and Small Towns; • the retail hierarchy with Grantham as a principal retail area and the role of the smaller towns of Stamford, Bourne and The Deepings as indicated in the Boroughs Retail Capacity Study and in accordance with the Draft RSS8 (paragraph. 3.2.14, Eastern Sub-area)

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Consider 2 key diagrams - one for district and an inset for Grantham denoting its strategic role as a Growth Point, and allowing key elements of the Growth Strategy to be depicted.
Summary:
The Key Diagrams both show Significant Areas of Historic Parkland. Use of point locations of Wildlife Sites could under-represent their extent. If SKDC intend to engage more in the current review of non-statutory wildlife sites then that would assist with the LDF being more enhanced.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Wildlife Sites are shown on the built and natural environment map as points. To show them in a form other than points would lead to a very cluttered diagram. These are intended to be, as their name suggests, indicative diagrams and not detailed map representations.

Comment ID: 1892
Title: paragraph
Number: 1.32
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary:
Map should also include Scheduled Ancient Monuments as a constraint.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Scheduled Ancient Monument sites will be included on the Built and Natural Environment Diagram.

Comment ID: 958
Title: paragraph
Number: 1.33
Nature Of Response  Observations
Summary:
Many of the principles of the old Local Plan are so out of date and so out of tune with national guidance that it is unsound to continue them.

Officers' Recommendation:
Only appropriate and relevant policies have been saved in accordance with paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

---

Summary:
Migration path necessary for transition from Local Plan to LDF

Officers' Recommendation:
This information is contained within the LDS.

---

Summary:
Suggested Additional Objective The Chamber's concerns relating to the Sustainable Integrated Transport Preferred Option (see below), particularly in relation to the need for more explicit reference to the commitment within LTP2 to undertake feasibility work in relation to Stamford by-Pass/Relief Road, point to the need for an explicit objective relating to Stamford traffic relief.

Officers' Recommendation:
Disagree. An additional objective is not required: PO2 states that the objectives of LTP will be met. There is no such specific objective for other parts of the district for whom LTP2 comments are made.
**Con ID:** 26112  
**Full Name:** Alison Homes  
**Organisation:** Director Smith  
**Stuart Reynolds**  
**Comment ID:** 1964  
**Title:** Vision and Objectives  
**Number:** 2  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**
It is considered that the vision should include reference to recognition of increased growth in the district and it is proposed that it should be reworded to state: “to create a place where people really matter by providing for and managing growth and new development by maintaining and improving ….. to create a network of sustainable communities…..” (Emboldened text indicates requested changes). It is considered that this would better reflect the spatial nature of the strategy which emphasises local distinctiveness with a focus upon delivery as set out in government guidance ‘Local Development Frameworks – A Companion Guide’.

**Officers’ Recommendation:**
The Vision statement will need to be changed following amendments to the Corporate Plan, and in line with the review of the Sustainable Community Plan. Consideration of these words will be given when changing the Vision. Also create a more local vision referencing specific parts of the district, ie a Grantham, Stamford, Bourne, Deepings and villages vision.

---

**Con ID:** 26230  
**Full Name:** Alison and Stamford H  
**Organisation:** Director Smith  
**Stuart Reynolds**  
**Comment ID:** 1996  
**Title:** Vision and Objectives  
**Number:** 2  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**
The vision should include reference to recognition of increased growth in the district and it is proposed that it should be reworded to state: “to create a place where people really matter by providing for and managing growth and new development by maintaining and improving ….. to create a network of sustainable…..”. It is considered that this would better reflect the spatial nature of the strategy which emphasises local distinctiveness with a focus upon delivery as set out in government guidance ‘Local Development Frameworks – A Companion Guide’.

**Officers’ Recommendation:**
The Vision statement will need to be changed following amendments to the Corporate Plan, and in line with the review of the Sustainable Community Plan. Consideration of these words will be given when changing the Vision. Also create a more local vision referencing specific parts of the district, ie a Grantham, Stamford, Bourne, Deepings and villages vision.
Summary:
A specific objective should be established that seeks to increase the number and distribution of sustainable settlements (or Local Service Centres) through appropriate enabling development.

Officer's Recommendation:
Enabling development is not appropriate in small villages, which would require a very large amount of new development to "enable"the provision and retention of many local services. PO1 allows for the development of local services and facilities in all settlements, if these can be provided without enabling development.

Summary:
South Kesteven is considered "a great place to live and work", not because of, or in spite of, diversity of people but because of the beauty of the area - particularly the limestone, its particular flora and fauna and the material and styles of the local architecture and the relatively small proportion of modern developments which spoil this character. Not possible to maintain rural or "small town"character while packing in thousands of extra houses and their attendant services.

Officer's Recommendation:
Comments noted. Government's "growth"agenda and the need to ensure a decent home for all means that additional housing development must be accommodated. The challenge for SKDC is to ensure they are accommodated in the most sustainable manner, and that the development does not detract from the attractive nature of the countryside.

Summary:
In terms of achieving the vision, HBF considers that the first bullet point should be amended to read creating the right balance of jobs, housing and infrastructure whilst meeting identified housing needs and demands.

Officer's Recommendation:
The Vision Statement is to be changed following amendments to the Corporate Plan. It is important that a "balance"is achieved between jobs, housing and infrastructure. This is an important element of town planning in Britain. Vision will be amended again; further consideration given to objectives of PPS1.
Full Name: Mr Graham Foster
Organisation: Senior Planning Officer - Lincolnshire and Rutland Area Team Government Office For The East Midlands

Comment ID: 2006
Title: Vision and Objectives
Number: 2
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
The Vision includes a clear reference to the vision in the Community Plan and the Councils Corporate Plan. Notwithstanding, this the Vision could be less general and more locally distinct.

Officers' Recommendation:
It is important that a "balance"is achieved between jobs, housing and infrastructure. This is an important element of town planning in Britain. Vision will be amended again; further consideration given to objectives of PPS1.

Con ID: 26221
Full Name: Mr Alan Hubbard
Organisation: Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust

Comment ID: 2125
Title: Vision and Objectives
Number: 2
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
Previous comments from the National Trust have not been taken on board, 'balancing' has been retained in the third bullet point. The inconsistency with the integrated approach to sustainable development as set out in PPS1 remains a weakness.

Officers' Recommendation:
It is important that a "balance"is achieved between jobs, housing and infrastructure. This is an important element of town planning in Britain. Vision will be amended again; further consideration given to objectives of PPS1.
Summary:
We are supportive of bullets 3 & 4 of the Council's. The impact of climate change and risk of flooding together with the impact of increased development on the environment is a vital part of achieving these objectives. We consider that the identification and appropriate management of such impacts is correctly identified as part of the overarching aims of the Core Strategy. However, suggest that more emphasis could be placed on the capacity for development to make a positive impact on both the built and natural environment as well as addressing the negative effects of development.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Consider changes made in policy PO10, 11 & 14 to encourage positive impact of development upon built and natural environment.

Summary:
The Councils Vision is welcomed. However, it should ensure that the towns and villages proposed to be maintained and improved include all of those across the District including those smaller settlements.

Officers' Recommendation:
It is important that a "balance" is achieved between jobs, housing and infrastructure. This is an important element of town planning in Britain. Vision will be amended again; further consideration given to objectives of PPS1.

Summary:
The Objectors generally support and endorse the Vision and subordinate Spatial Objectives.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26276</th>
<th>Full Name: Mr Clive Henderson</th>
<th>Organisation: Chairman Long Bennington Parish Council</th>
<th><strong>Summary:</strong> The strategy should acknowledge the community views in Parish Plans and not already adopted and should specify how early consideration/adoption of these plans will be addressed.</th>
<th><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong> PO1(a) makes reference to the role of Parish Plans and VDSs. This policy will allow the council to consider adopting Village Design Statements when the Core Strategy is in place and adopted. Until then they can be accepted as Position Statements, to be used to encourage appropriate development within the village. Reference can be made within introduction to Parish Plans and their role in developing communities - however, this is much more a matter to be considered within the Sustainable Community Strategy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: 953</td>
<td>Title: Vision and Objectives</td>
<td>Number: 2</td>
<td>Nature Of Response Support with conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26271</th>
<th>Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith</th>
<th>Organisation: Assistant Planner DLP Planning Ltd</th>
<th><strong>Summary:</strong> Support for the stated Vision. However, we have particular concerns at the manner in which the spatial objectives that have been derived from the vision are framed.</th>
<th><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong> Support noted. The concerns raised have been addressed elsewhere in this document.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: 916</td>
<td>Title: Vision and Objectives</td>
<td>Number: 2</td>
<td>Nature Of Response Support with conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary:
We express support for the stated 'Vision'. However, we have particular concerns at the manner in which the spatial objectives that have been derived from the vision are framed. The Planning Officer’ Society, in its document 'Policies for Spatial Plans' (2005) notes that: ‘the spatial objectives are derived from the identified issues and the spatial vision. They illustrate, in a meaningful way, how the strategy contributes to the outcomes of the spatial vision. Whilst the objectives should be clear, focused and concise, they should not be overly narrow or mechanistic’ The document goes on to set out examples of matters for spatial objectives and in a similar vein advocates the adoption of SMART principles to the drafting of text generally. Consequently, we are concerned that the spatial objectives do not explicitly express a commitment to ensuring the provision of housing land to meet RSS8 requirements to 2026; that aspects of the objectives are in fact specific targets, but which themselves are poorly defined or not clearly measurable; and that the objectives make multiple references to other aspects of the statutory development plan, seemingly without differentiating between their relative roles or status.

Officers’ Recommendation:
Support noted. The concerns raised have been addressed elsewhere in this document.
**Comment ID:** 959  
**Full Name:** Jenny Young  
**Organisation:** Planning Archaeologist Heritage Trust for Lincolnshire

**Summary:**  
I fully support the vision. However, I feel that the third and fourth bullet points should also include the words either 'cultural heritage' or 'historic' alongside 'natural and built environment'.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Agree. Include "cultural" within the vision. Note that the Vision Statement is to be changed following amendments to the Corporate Plan.

---

**Comment ID:** 26261  
**Full Name:** Mr Tudor Townsend  
**Organisation:**

**Summary:**  
Appropriate housing development should be encouraged in Local Service Centres to support local services and to sustain rural communities.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Support noted.

---

**Comment ID:** 26204  
**Full Name:** Rose Freeman  
**Organisation:** Planning Assistant The Theatres Trust

**Summary:**  
In spite of the statement in your Community Strategy that Lifelong learning and cultural activity is at the heart of economic regeneration and social inclusion there are no policies in this document to support Objectives 1 and 10. Your Cultural Strategy also states on page 9 that one of the South Kesteven corporate objectives is to provide its people with opportunities for a healthy and fulfilled lifestyle through recreation and culture. There are no policies to cover the

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Issues and Options (Sep 2005) responses indicated support for provision of recreational/cultural facilities. Identification of land where this type of facility may be located will be the subject of a separate Site Allocation document.
development of any recreational, sporting, leisure or cultural activities for the health and well-being of your community. We particularly wish to be sure that your policies are robust enough to include specific guidance on protecting and encouraging existing theatre provision, especially for The Stamford Arts Centre and The Guildhall in Grantham and we are concerned at the lack of references to cultural activities and the performing arts in general. Cultural activity brings economic benefits by providing employment and generating revenue. It attracts people and businesses, inward investment, job creation and supports the visitor economy. Creative industries are the UKs fastest growth sector, generating significant revenue and employing hundreds and thousands of people. Activities at museums, libraries and archives generate substantial income and investment and support the tourism and employment economy. The Government is increasingly seeing the benefits of using cultural activities as a method of achieving strategic agendas. Cultural activity can drive regeneration and make people proud of their communities and of themselves. Taking part in sporting activities, walking in the countryside or cycling all lead to healthier lifestyles. A visit to the cinema, the museum or the library can stimulate the imagination and promote mental well-being and aid lifelong learning. Widening cultural opportunities can improve community safety - for example by diverting attention away from acts of crime. The wide range of cultural activities offers something for everyone and the many free and inclusive opportunities go toward tackling issues of social exclusion. We urge you to include a policy to protect and promote leisure and cultural activities.
Summary:
The aim of Objective 1 is positively received. Concern that if the Council's spatial strategy is not sufficiently flexible, then windfall brownfield site opportunities within the smaller rural villages will be missed. The Council's commitment to a quality of life for existing or future generations must embrace those existing local rural communities in the District's smaller villages.

Officers' Recommendation:
The small villages are not sustainable, therefore development needs to be restricted, and "windfall brownfield sites" should be missed!

Con ID: 26300  
Full Name: Messrs E A Sheardown  
Organisation: Sheardown & Co. Ltd  
Comment ID: 2560  
Number: Objectives 1  
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
We consider that an integral part of ensuring 'development does not compromise the quality of life for future or existing generations' is locating development in areas at a low risk of flooding. We therefore support the inclusion of this as a specific objective for the Core Strategy.

Officers' Recommendation:
This is covered by Objective 13.

Con ID: 26229  
Full Name: Mr Jacob Newby  
Organisation: Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency  
Comment ID: 2672  
Number: Objectives 1  
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
Objective 1 should be facilitated through the settlement hierarchy.

Officers' Recommendation:
Settlement hierarchy is set out in PO1 to ensure that this objective is met.

Con ID: 26261  
Full Name: Mr Tudor Townsend  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 891  
Number: Objectives 1  
Nature Of Response: Support
| Con ID: 26204 | Summary: | Officers' Recommendation: |
| Full Name: Rose Freeman | support objective | support noted. |
| Organisation: Planning Assistant The Theatres Trust |

| Comment ID: 2160 |
| Title: |
| Number: Objectives 1 |
| Nature Of Response | Support |

| Con ID: 26112 | Summary: |
| Full Name: Alison Homes | It is considered that this objective does not reflect the roles and the needs of the towns concerned as the corollary to the location of 70% of the housing requirement in the towns is that there will be 30% in the villages; a completely unsustainable proportion. The representation relating to PO3b proposes that a greater emphasis should be placed upon the districts towns, including Bourne and The Deepings. |
| Organisation: Director Smith Stuart Reynolds |
| Comment ID: 1965 |
| Title: |
| Number: Objectives 2 |
| Nature Of Response | Object |

| Con ID: 26525 | Summary: |
| Full Name: Somerby Hill Estates C/O Mike Sibthorpe | Wording unclear. Does not prescribe the types of development that are proposed to be encompassed within the 70% target, or, how they will be measured. 70% target figure is inappropriate and will not meet the stated objective of achieving a sustainable pattern of development. Target should only relate to housing development and should be increased to 80% with majority (i.e. 70%) concentrated on Grantham. |
| Organisation: |
| Comment ID: 2422 |
| Title: |
| Number: Objectives 2 |
| Nature Of Response | Object |

| Officers' Recommendation: |
| 70% target refers to ALL development. Include word "all" to clarify. No evidence provided to demonstrate why 70% rather than 80%. |
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Con ID: 26524
Full Name: Messers Bealby
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 2416
Title: 
Number: Objectives 2
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
Wording unclear. Does not prescribe the types of development that are proposed to be encompassed within the 70% target, or, how they will be measured. 70% target figure is inappropriate and will not meet the stated objective of achieving a sustainable pattern of development. Target should only relate to housing development and should be increased to 80% with majority (ie 70%) concentrated on Grantham.

Officers' Recommendation:
70% target refers to ALL development. Include word "all"to clarify. No evidence provided to demonstrate why 70% rather than 80%.

Con ID: 26106
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 2524
Title: 
Number: Objectives 2
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
It is inappropriate to legislate for the split at this stage on prematurity grounds given the emerging RSS.

Officers' Recommendation:
Final RSS is not expected until September 2008 it is considered unfeasible to postpone the production of the Submission version of the Core Strategy until this time.

Con ID: 26230
Full Name: Alison and Stamford H
Organisation: Director Smith
                       Stuart Reynolds
Comment ID: 1997
Title: 
Number: Objectives 2
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
It is considered that this objective does not reflect the roles of the towns concerned, in particular the role of Grantham as a sub-regional centre and New Growth Point. The representation relating to PO3b proposes that a greater emphasis should be placed upon the districts towns.

Officers' Recommendation:
Objective 6 addresses Grantham's role as a Sub-Regional Centre. Reference to Growth Point status needs to be added throughout the document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Nature Of Response</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26172</td>
<td>Mr J Coleman</td>
<td>William Davis Ltd</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Objectives 2</td>
<td>Objective 2 reference to 70% of new development being in Grantham, Stamford, Bourne and Deepings. Suggest this is increased to at least 80%.</td>
<td>70% target refers to ALL development. Include word &quot;all&quot;to clarify. No evidence provided to demonstrate why 70% rather than 80%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26231</td>
<td>Mr D Bainbridge</td>
<td>Senior Planning Associate Bidwells</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Objectives 2</td>
<td>The 70% threshold is arbitrary and unnecessary. The objective is therefore bluntly worded and should be changed to define the hierarchy where Grantham is the Sub Regional Centre followed by the three market towns.</td>
<td>The Objective 2 70% threshold enables the majority of development to be in the towns but also allow some in the villages to ensure they remain sustainable. This is considered to be an appropriate and sustainable split.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26263</td>
<td>Mr Tim Slater</td>
<td>Consultant Planner Persimmon Homes Ltd</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Objectives 2</td>
<td>Too much housing development proposed within the rural areas and villages which are not sustainable locations.</td>
<td>The villages where development is suggested are those which have been designated as Local Service Centres or Larger Villages. These settlements have several essential or desirable facilities/services and have been assessed as being sustainable. RSS Panel Report and following Proposed Modifications will be used to help determine any changes to the split of housing requirement across the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Mr P Lely</td>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td>It is premature to split housing figures prior to RSS.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The timetable for the Core Strategy has been amended to allow time to consider the panel report and consultation into changes arising. Final RSS is not however expected until September 2008. Production of the Submission version of the Core Strategy has been postponed until October.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Objectives 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>J &amp; T Orrey</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>C/o Brown &amp; Co</td>
<td>We think it is inappropriate to legislate for the split at this stage on prematurity grounds given the emerging RSS.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The timetable for the Core Strategy is being amended to allow time to consider the panel report and consultation into changes arising. Final RSS is not however expected until September 2008 and it is considered unfeasible to postpone the production of the Submission version of the Core Strategy until this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Objectives 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Mr H Thornton</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Genepi Property</td>
<td>Objective is ambiguous and does not prescribe what type of development is encompassed in the target. Target should be 80% not 70% and should relate to housing only.</td>
<td>70% target refers to ALL development. Include word &quot;all&quot;to clarify. No evidence provided to demonstrate why 70% rather than 80%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Objectives 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con ID: 26160</td>
<td>Full Name: Cecil</td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature Of Response</strong></td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Objective 2 should be re-worded to achieve greater clarity.</td>
<td>It is considered that the objective is clear and will contribute towards a sustainable pattern of development. Add &quot;all&quot; between &quot;of&quot; and &quot;new development&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26221</th>
<th>Full Name: Mr Alan Hubbard</th>
<th><strong>Summary:</strong></th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature Of Response</strong></td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Concerned about the change from 80% down to 70% in respect of new development in the main centres. The Trust considers that an 80% target should be set.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The 70% figure is considered to be more realistic and reflect the rural nature of the authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26108</th>
<th>Full Name: Messrs Brint, McCallion</th>
<th><strong>Summary:</strong></th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature Of Response</strong></td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>We think it is inappropriate to legislate for the split at this stage on prematurity grounds given the emerging RSS.</td>
<td>Comments noted. The timetable for the Core Strategy has been amended to allow time to consider the panel report and consultation into changes arising. Final RSS is not however expected until September 2008. Production of the Submission version of the Core Strategy has been postponed until October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con ID</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2504</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs T Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>We think it is inappropriate to legislate for the split at this stage on prematurity grounds given the emerging RSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>David Wilson Homes North Midland</td>
<td>Wording unclear. Does not prescribe the types of development that are proposed to be encompassed within the 70% target, or, how they will be measured. 70% target figure is inappropriate and will not meet the stated objective of achieving a sustainable pattern of development. Target should only relate to housing development and should be increased to 80% with majority (i.e. 70%) concentrated on Grantham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Mr Egerton Gilman</td>
<td>Chairman, Environment &amp; Traffic Working Group Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce</td>
<td>Proportion of new development to be directed towards the four towns in the District has reduced from 80% to 70% since 2006. Objects to this change and considers that in the interests of sustainable development the original figure of 80% should be maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number: Objectives 2
Nature Of Response: Observations

**Con ID:** 26231  
**Full Name:** Mr D Bainbridge  
**Organisation:** Senior Planning  
**Associate Bidwells**  
**Comment ID:** 1004  
**Title:**  
**Number:** Objectives 3  
**Nature Of Response:** Object

**Summary:**
Should acknowledge the 60% requirement is a national target. Density thresholds should be replaced by the objective of achieving on average 30 dwellings per hectare net across the district. The setting of density thresholds should be considered in the Site Allocations DPD where the location type and geographical spread of the option sites for development are known.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comment noted. Amend objective 3, using suggested wording, in line with PPS3. Density target should remain to maximise the amount of development on brownfield land, but wording can be clarified. Currently delivering 60% on brownfield sites - further consideration of this figure will be possible when SHLAA sites have been considered.

**Con ID:** 26112  
**Full Name:** Alison Homes  
**Organisation:** Director Smith  
**Stuart Reynolds**  
**Comment ID:** 1966  
**Title:**  
**Number:** Objectives 3  
**Nature Of Response:** Object

**Summary:**
This objective assumes all brownfield sites are suitable for development. PPS3 clearly states there is no presumption that previously developed land is necessarily suitable for housing or that the whole curtilage should be developed. Suggest that objective should be reworded to state “...maximising the amount of development on suitable previously developed sites and in locations which reduce the need to travel. Past performance indicates that only 50% new housing on brownfield sites is likely to be achieved. Examination of Urban Capacity Study and figures in PO3b indicate 57% might be achievable (if all development takes place on brownfield land). Density reference does not comply with PPS3 para 46, which requires a more flexible approach. Not clear how figures have been derived and wording in unclear and confusing. Suggest amendment to “...on brownfield sites. New housing should be built at

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comment noted. Amend objective 3, using suggested wording, in line with PPS3. Density target should remain to maximise the amount of development on brownfield land, but wording can be clarified. Currently delivering 60% on brownfield sites - further consideration of this figure will be possible when SHLAA sites have been considered.
This objective assumes all brownfield sites are suitable for development. PPS3 clearly states there is no presumption that previously developed land is necessarily suitable for housing or that the whole curtilage should be developed. Suggest that objective should be reworded to state “...maximising the amount of development on suitable previously developed sites and in locations which reduce the need to travel. Past performance indicates that only 50% new housing on brownfield sites is likely to be achieved. Examination of Urban Capacity Study and figures in PO3b indicate 57% might be achievable (if all development takes place on brownfield land). Density reference does not comply with PPS3 para 46, which requires a more flexible approach. Not clear how figures have been derived and wording in unclear and confusing. Suggest amendment to “...on brownfield sites. New housing should be built at an average density of 32 dwellings per hectare with higher densities being permitted in areas with good sustainable transport and easy access to a range of services subject to other environmental considerations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Nature Of Response</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26268</td>
<td>Mr Stephen Bickford-S</td>
<td>c/o JB Planning Associates</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td></td>
<td>60% of new housing to be built on brownfield sites is overly prescriptive, particularly given that the Site Allocations DPD has yet to be prepared. Suggested revised wording given.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Amend objective 3, using suggested wording, in line with PPS3. Density target should remain to maximise the amount of development on brownfield land, but wording can be clarified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26107</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs T Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>2506</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td></td>
<td>60% may not be achievable and we contend the figure is inappropriate because of the sequential approach. Until all the detailed surveys have been obtained, deliver-ability issues are assessed, it is impossible to predict what is a reasonable figure to expect by way of brownfield sites.</td>
<td>60% is the national target. The urban capacity study has assessed potential deliverability of brownfield sites within the urban areas. It is considered that 60% is a realistic figure for the delivery of development on brownfield sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26045</td>
<td>Mr Egerton Gilman</td>
<td>Chairman, Environment &amp; Traffic Working Group Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Chamber believes that the figure of 60% housing development on brownfield sites is too low, and that the target should be increased.</td>
<td>60% is the national target. The urban capacity study has assessed potential deliverability of brownfield sites within the urban areas. It is considered that 60% is a realistic figure for the delivery of development on brownfield sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary:**
The objective should be amended as high-density housing is more suited to some urban sites and the requirement for at least 20% of new housing development to be built to a density of 50 + dph should be confined to brownfield development sites only.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comment noted.

---

**Summary:**
Relationship to heading unclear. Brownfield land is not necessarily more accessible or sustainable to develop than greenfield land.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Agree. Place Objective 3 under the Sustainable Settlements heading.

---

**Summary:**
60% may not be achievable and we contend the figure is inappropriate because of the sequential approach. Until all the detailed surveys have been obtained, deliverability issues are assessed, it is impossible to predict what is a reasonable figure to expect by way of brownfield sites.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
60% is the national target. The urban capacity study has assessed potential deliverability of brownfield sites within the urban areas. It is considered that 60% is a realistic figure for the delivery of development on brownfield sites.
Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, MCcallion
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2468
Title:
Number: Objectives 3
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
60% may not be achievable and we contend the figure is inappropriate because of the sequential approach. Until all the detailed surveys have been obtained, deliverability issues are assessed, it is impossible to predict what is a reasonable figure to expect by way of brownfield sites.

Officers' Recommendation:
60% is the national target. The urban capacity study has assessed potential deliverability of brownfield sites within the urban areas. It is considered that 60% is a realistic figure for the delivery of development on brownfield sites.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2481
Title:
Number: Objectives 3
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
60% may not be achievable and we contend the figure is inappropriate because of the sequential approach. Until all the detailed surveys have been obtained, deliverability issues are assessed, it is impossible to predict what is a reasonable figure to expect by way of brownfield sites.

Officers' Recommendation:
60% is the national target. The urban capacity study has assessed potential deliverability of brownfield sites within the urban areas. It is considered that 60% is a realistic figure for the delivery of development on brownfield sites.

Con ID: 26300
Full Name: Messrs E A Sheardown
Organisation: Sheardown & Co. Ltd
Comment ID: 2563
Title:
Number: Objectives 3
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Objective 3 should be amended, 'up to' 60% of new housing.. should replaced by 'at least' as a more appropriate target to reflect the brownfield priority. It is not considered appropriate that percentages should be attributed to different 'dwellings-per-hectare' ratios. To commit to 20% of new housing developments to be built at a higher density of 50 dwellings to the hectare at such an early stage is considered premature.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree with the 'at least' amendment to Objective 3. Latter point noted, however, the 20% target for new housing development built at a density of 50dph is in the interests of sustainability and should be retained.
Summary:
Delivery of Grantham's growth aspirations could be compromised by a strict adherence to the 60% brownfield completions figure. To resolve this either adopt a lower overall requirement or adopt a specific lower requirement for Grantham, which reflects the growth aspirations for the town, acknowledging that that growth demands a high greenfield requirement. or adopt a trajectory based target that acknowledges the increased reliance upon greenfield sites over the duration of the plan period. A new objective should be included setting out measures that the Council will use to ensure growth is achieved in Grantham, and how it will deal with non-delivery of brownfield sites.

Officers' Recommendation:
60% is the national target. The urban capacity study has assessed potential deliverability of brownfield sites within the urban areas. It is considered that 60% is a realistic figure for the delivery of development on brownfield sites.

Summary:
Delivery of Grantham's growth aspirations could be compromised by a strict adherence to the 60% brownfield completions figure. To resolve this either adopt a lower overall requirement or adopt a specific lower requirement for Grantham, which reflects the growth aspirations for the town, acknowledging that that growth demands a high greenfield requirement. or adopt a trajectory based target that acknowledges the increased reliance upon greenfield sites over the duration of the plan period. A new objective should be included setting out measures that the Council will use to ensure growth is achieved in Grantham, and how it will deal with non-delivery of brownfield sites.

Officers' Recommendation:
60% is the national target. The urban capacity study has assessed potential deliverability of brownfield sites within the urban areas. It is considered that 60% is a realistic figure for the delivery of development on brownfield sites.
| Con ID: 26560 | Full Name: J & T Orrey | Organisation: C/o Brown & Co |
| Comment ID: 2451 | Title: | Nature Of Response Observations |
| **Summary:** | 60% may not be achievable and we contend the figure is inappropriate because of the sequential approach. Until all the detailed surveys have been obtained, deliverability issues are assessed, it is impossible to predict what is a reasonable figure to expect by way of brownfield sites. | **Officers' Recommendation:** |
| | | 60% is the national target. The urban capacity study has assessed potential deliverability of brownfield sites within the urban areas. It is considered that 60% is a realistic figure for the delivery of development on brownfield sites. |

| Con ID: 26301 | Full Name: Wilson | Organisation: David Wilson Homes North Midland |
| Comment ID: 1860 | Title: | Nature Of Response Observations |
| **Summary:** | Delivery of Grantham's growth aspirations could be compromised by a strict adherence to the 60% brownfield completions figure. To resolve this either adopt a lower overall requirement or adopt a specific lower requirement for Grantham, which reflects the growth aspirations for the town, acknowledging that that growth demands a high greenfield requirement. or adopt a trajectory based target that acknowledges the increased reliance upon greenfield sites over the duration of the plan period. A new objective should be included setting out measures that the Council will use to ensure growth is achieved in Grantham, and how it will deal with non-delivery of brownfield sites. | **Officers' Recommendation:** |
| | | 60% is the national target. The urban capacity study has assessed potential deliverability of brownfield sites within the urban areas. It is considered that 60% is a realistic figure for the delivery of development on brownfield sites. |
Con ID: 26318
Full Name: Mr Cyril Day
Organisation: Highways Agency
Comment ID: 2141
Title:
Number: Objectives 3
Nature Of Response Support with conditions

Summary:
Welcomes overall thrust of the vision and the related objectives. Suggest amendment to Objective 3 to reflect PPS3 guidance that AT LEAST 60 percent of new development be located on previously developed land.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.

Con ID: 26045
Full Name: Mr Egerton Gilman
Organisation: Chairman, Environment & Traffic Working Group Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce
Comment ID: 2661
Title:
Number: Objectives 4
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
It is noted that the previously stated figure of 80% of new development being within 30 minutes of main services set out in the June 2006 Consultation has been reduced to 70% in this instance. There is no justification for this reduction.

Officers' Recommendation:
This objective relates to the Spatial Strategy. The threshold provides a measurable target which the Council considers is deliverable. The final sentence states the 30 minutes is by public transport.

Con ID: 26268
Full Name: Mr Stephen Bickford-S
Organisation: c/o JB Planning Associates
Comment ID: 942
Title:
Number: Objectives 4
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
Objective 4 is overly prescriptive. It is not clear as to how this objective will be achieved, particularly given that the Site Allocations DPD has yet to be prepared and sites identified for new development. Suggested alternative words provided.

Officers' Recommendation:
This objective relates to the Spatial Strategy. The threshold provides a measurable target which the Council considers is deliverable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26231</th>
<th>Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge</th>
<th>Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells</th>
<th>Summary: The 70% threshold is arbitrary and unnecessary. There is no justification for the threshold or for the 30 minutes duration which is not adequately explained. Reference to the threshold should be omitted.</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation: This objective relates to the Spatial Strategy. The threshold provides a measurable target which the Council considers is deliverable. The final sentence states the 30 minutes is by public transport.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Con ID: 26172</td>
<td>Full Name: Mr J Coleman</td>
<td>Organisation: William Davis Ltd</td>
<td>Summary: Objective 4: suggest 80% new development located within 30 mins of main services.</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation: comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con ID: 26280</td>
<td>Full Name: Mr Henry Clark</td>
<td>Organisation: Chairman Peakirk Parish Council</td>
<td>Summary: Cross border commuting must be considered - especially to and from Peterborough.</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation: Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary:
The Council's expectations that at least 70% of new development will be located within 30 minutes of main services by public transport implies a need for ~ 30% of new development to be located in lesser sustainable locations in order to meet the District's needs. This is considered to be a realistic approach and reflects the District's essentially rural geographical base and character. The Council must make sure that the spatial strategy reflects and facilitates such an approach.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.

Summary:
Not see benefit in the reference to location "within 30 minutes of main services". Suggest delete.

Officers' Recommendation:
This objective relates to the Spatial Strategy. The threshold provides a measurable target which the Council considers is deliverable. The final sentence states the 30 minutes is by public transport.

Summary:
Object to restriction on building houses in Stamford.

Officers' Recommendation:
House building is addressed elsewhere in this document, not at Objective 5.
Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells
Comment ID: 1006
Title: 
Number: Objectives 5
Nature Of Response Support with conditions

Summary:
Support time frame for Core Strategy. all reference to the Structure Plan should be deleted.

Officers' Recommendation:
Reference to the Structure plan is required until certainty is provided that the RSS will be adopted before this Core Strategy.

Con ID: 26160
Full Name: Cecil
Organisation: c/o Strutt and Parker
Comment ID: 1939
Title: 
Number: Objectives 6
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
The wording of Objective 6 needs to be qualified, that strengthening the role of Grantham as a sub regional centre is not achieved at the detriment of Bourne, The Deepings and Stamford.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments and concerns noted. There is no intention to strengthen Grantham at the expense of Bourne, The Deepings and Stamford.
Con ID: 26045
Full Name: Mr Egerton Gilman
Organisation: Chairman, Environment & Traffic Working Group Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce
Comment ID: 2663
Title:
Number: Objectives 6
Nature Of Response: Observations
Summary:
The wording of this Objective remains unchanged from the previous June 2006 version of the document and the Chamber's objections to this, as set out in its letter of 7 August 2006 remain: Extent of promotion and strengthening role of Grantham is excess and unreasonable. It will be at the expense of development in Stamford. Gwash Valley Business Park, Welland Quarter and Stamford 250 high density housing project can assist with funding of Eastern Relief Road. Suggest modification of Objective 6 to restrict Grantham's expansion into open countryside, in favour of better use of existing space in all SKDC urban areas, and timely advancement of strategic projects such as the Eastern Relief Road in Stamford.
Officers' Recommendation: comments noted.

Con ID: 26276
Full Name: Mr Clive Henderson
Organisation: Chairman Long Bennington Parish Council
Comment ID: 948
Title:
Number: Objectives 6
Nature Of Response: Observations
Summary:
More consultation on links (transport in particular) to 'hub' towns needed.
Officers' Recommendation: These comments appear to relate to the Grantham Transport Study conducted by Lincolnshire County Council.
**Con ID:** 26160  
**Full Name:** Cecil  
**Organisation:** c/o Strutt and Parker  
**Comment ID:** 1942  
**Nature Of Response**  
**Number:** Objectives 6  
**Summary:**  
The wording of Objective 6 needs to be qualified, that strengthening the role of Grantham as a sub regional centre is not achieved at the detriment of Bourne, The Deepings and Stamford.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments and concerns noted. There is no intention to strengthen Grantham at the expense of Bourne, The Deepings and Stamford.

---

**Con ID:** 26231  
**Full Name:** Mr D Bainbridge  
**Organisation:** Senior Planning Associate Bidwells  
**Comment ID:** 1007  
**Nature Of Response**  
**Number:** Objectives 6  
**Summary:**  
The identification of Grantham as the Sub-Regional Centre is supported but emphasis should be given to the objective of delivering one or more sustainable urban extensions to the town. Again reference to the Structure Plan should be omitted.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Support noted. Reference to the Structure plan is required until certainty is provided that the RSS will be adopted before this Core Strategy.

---

**Con ID:** 26172  
**Full Name:** Mr J Coleman  
**Organisation:** William Davis Ltd  
**Comment ID:** 2698  
**Nature Of Response**  
**Number:** Objectives 7  
**Summary:**  
Objective 7: suggest 30% affordable.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Evidence of recent Housing Needs surveys and SHMA suggest higher than 30% required.
Summary:
50% is inappropriate and is not in accordance with the merging RSS. The 50% figure should be changed to reflect what is finally adopted in the RSS. Density across a site may vary but can deliver at 30/ha average.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. The RSS policy is a minimum against which this council has made representations. No change to the Council's approach.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2482
Title:
Number: Objectives 7
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
It is considered that in the absence of an HMA it is inappropriate to indicate a precise figure in this objective. The objective should be reworded to exclude the reference to 50% and refer instead to “... a mix and range of housing types which are affordable and suitable for a variety of needs”; a point expanded upon in the representation to PO6a.

Officers' Recommendation:
The objective can be amended when the results of the HMA are available (expected Spring 2008).

Con ID: 26112
Full Name: Alison Homes
Organisation: Director Smith Stuart Reynolds
Comment ID: 1967
Title:
Number: Objectives 7
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
50% is inappropriate and is not in accordance with the merging RSS. The 50% figure should be changed to reflect what is finally adopted in the RSS. Density across a site may vary but can deliver at 30/ha average.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. The RSS policy is a minimum against which this council has made representations. No change to the Council's approach.

Con ID: 26106
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2526
Title:
Number: Objectives 7
Nature Of Response: Object
Con ID: 26230
Full Name: Alison and Stamford H
Organisation: Director Smith
Stuart Reynolds
Comment ID: 1999
Title:
Number: Objectives 7
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
It is considered that in the absence of an HMA it is inappropriate to indicate a precise figure in this objective. The objective should be reworded to exclude the reference to 50% and refer instead to “… a mix and range of housing types which are affordable and suitable for a variety of needs”; a point expanded upon in the representation to PO5a.

Officers' Recommendation:
The objective can be amended when the results of the HMA are available (expected Spring 2008).

Con ID: 26160
Full Name: Cecil
Organisation: c/o Strutt and Parker
Comment ID: 1940
Title:
Number: Objectives 7
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
Object to the upper limit of 50% affordable housing provision. This is in excess of the 33% target set out in RRS 8. The wording of Objective 7 should be is altered to reflect these comments and reduce the upper limit for affordable housing to 33%.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. The RSS policy is a minimum against which this council has made representations. No change to the Council's approach.

Con ID: 26101
Full Name: Mr J Parmiter
Organisation:
Comment ID: 982
Title:
Number: Objectives 7
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
Trying to achieve 50% affordable housing is likely to have a negative effect on the supply of housing land.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. The RSS policy is a minimum against which this council has made representations. No change to the Council's approach.
Summary:
It is considered that seeking up to 50% affordable is excessively high and will have a significant impact on site viability and housing land supply.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. The RSS policy is a minimum against which this council has made representations. No change to the Council's approach.

Summary:
The 50% figure will stifle development in areas of lower values and can be mistakenly viewed as a target that must achieved rather than a ceiling.

Officers' Recommendation:
The 50% figure should remain, it reflects the latest Housing Needs Survey (2006).

Summary:
50% is inappropriate and is not in accordance with the merging RSS. The 50% figure should be changed to reflect what is finally adopted in the RSS. Density across a site may vary but can deliver at 30/ha average.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. The RSS policy is a minimum against which this council has made representations. No change to the Council's approach.
Summary: 50% is inappropriate and is not in accordance with the merging RSS. The 50% figure should be changed to reflect what is finally adopted in the RSS. Density across a site may vary but can deliver at 30/ha average.

Officers' Recommendation: The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. The RSS policy is a minimum against which this council has made representations. No change to the Council's approach.

Con ID: 26107
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2507
Title:
Number: Objectives 7
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary: 50% is inappropriate and is not in accordance with the merging RSS. The 50% figure should be changed to reflect what is finally adopted in the RSS. Density across a site may vary but can deliver at 30/ha average.

Officers' Recommendation: The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. The RSS policy is a minimum against which this council has made representations. No change to the Council's approach.

Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, MCcallion
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2469
Title:
Number: Objectives 7
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary: A commitment towards the need for up to 50% affordable and local-need housing is considered too high. In meeting the District's needs and applying an appropriate ratio the most up to date information, for the application site ward, must be considered.

Officers' Recommendation: The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing is sought on development sites, this will effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing. No change to the Council's approach.

Con ID: 26300
Full Name: Messrs E A Sheardown
Organisation: Sheardown & Co. Ltd
Comment ID: 2565
Title:
Number: Objectives 7
Nature Of Response: Observations
Con ID: 26045
Full Name: Mr Egerton Gilman
Organisation: Chairman, Environment & Traffic Working Group Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce

Comment ID: 2664
Number: Objectives 7
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
The wording of this Objective remains unchanged from the previous June 2006 version of the document and the Chamber's objections to this, as set out in its letter of 7 August 2006 remain:
• Shortage of houses for first time buyers in Stamford.
• Housing Needs Study shows: under-occupied houses are large and over-occupied houses are small.
• Big shortage of quality small homes in Stamford.
• Artificial restriction of housing growth in SKDC by National and Regional policies responsible for local shortages and high prices of homes.
• Affordable Homes Policy is farcical: need stated to be 643 compared to build rate of 460pa.
• Market forces should be considered when setting housing targets.
• Higher build rate should be set and the Affordable Homes policy abandoned.

Officers' Recommendation:
The 50% figure should remain, it reflects the latest Housing Needs Survey (2006).

Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells

Comment ID: 1009
Number: Objectives 8
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
The objective must make it clear that Grantham is the priority for the bulk of new development and that the remaining towns will benefit from employment-led regeneration and growth commensurate with the eventual agreed housing provision.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. Grantham's role as a Sub-Regional Centre is made clear in Objective 6. No change to the Council's approach.
Summary:
The wording of this Objective remains unchanged from the previous June 2006 version of the document and the Chamber's objections to this, as set out in its letter of 7 August 2006 remain: • unemployment in SKDC is low. • unemployment in Stamford is even lower. • as a consequence, demand for employment land in Stamford will remain low. • exceptions + relocation of existing businesses and new businesses providing high value employment presently being met by residents in Peterborough.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted

---

Summary:
Not thought that SKDC can arrange for "appropriate supply of premises". Suggest reference be deleted. Relevant parts of Economic and Community Strategy should be part of Core Strategy documents.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Remove "premises".

---

Summary:
Objective fails to recognise the strategic importance of the Roseland Business Park for employment purposes, and the contribution the sites currently makes in employment terms. (collectively the site employs 600 - 700 people. Objective 8 should be redrafted to support appropriate employment development in existing established locations outside urban areas.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Reference should be made here to protecting and supporting existing employment uses in established locations, both within and outside urban areas, especially where these are in sustainable and accessible locations.
Con ID: 26560
Full Name: J & T Orrey
Organisation: C/o Brown & Co
Comment ID: 2453
Title:
Number: Objectives 8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
The word 'specific' on the second line should be removed, as market requirements cannot be predicated at this stage. General zoning of land for employment is more appropriate. Also the final sentence starting, 'In accordance with the objectives..' is probably inappropriate, as it may apply forever.

Officers' Recommendation:
General employment allocations have always been made in the past, however there is concern that such allocation have not always delivered new employment development. In addition some employment uses have specific location requirements, which can be met, by certain sites. It makes sense for such uses to be recognised and directed to specific sites. The final sentence provides the necessary signposting to the relevant strategy document.

Con ID: 26106
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2527
Title:
Number: Objectives 8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
The word 'specific' on the second line should be removed, as market requirements cannot be predicated at this stage. General zoning of land for employment is more appropriate. Also the final sentence starting, 'In accordance with the objectives..' is probably inappropriate, as it may apply forever.

Officers' Recommendation:
General employment allocations have always been made in the past, however there is concern that such allocation have not always delivered new employment development. In addition some employment uses have specific location requirements, which can be met, by certain sites. It makes sense for such uses to be recognised and directed to specific sites. The final sentence provides the necessary signposting to the relevant strategy document.

Con ID: 26107
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2508
Title:
Number: Objectives 8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
The word 'specific' on the second line should be removed, as market requirements cannot be predicated at this stage. General zoning of land for employment is more appropriate. Also the final sentence starting, 'In accordance with the objectives..' is probably inappropriate, as it may apply forever.

Officers' Recommendation:
General employment allocations have always been made in the past, however there is concern that such allocation have not always delivered new employment development. In addition some employment uses have specific location requirements, which can be met, by certain sites. It makes sense for such uses to be recognised and directed to specific sites. The final sentence provides the necessary signposting to the relevant strategy document.
Summary:
The word 'specific' on the second line should be removed, as market requirements cannot be predicated at this stage. General zoning of land for employment is more appropriate. Also the final sentence starting, 'In accordance with the objectives..' is probably inappropriate, as it may apply forever.

Officers' Recommendation:
General employment allocations have always been made in the past, however there is concern that such allocations have not always delivered new employment development. In addition some employment uses have specific location requirements, which can be met by certain sites. It makes sense for such uses to be recognised and directed to specific sites. The final sentence provides the necessary signposting to the relevant strategy document.

Summary:
The word 'specific' on the second line should be removed, as market requirements cannot be predicated at this stage. General zoning of land for employment is more appropriate. Also the final sentence starting, 'In accordance with the objectives..' is probably inappropriate, as it may apply forever.

Officers' Recommendation:
General employment allocations have always been made in the past, however there is concern that such allocation have not always delivered new employment development. In addition some employment uses have specific locational requirements which can be met by certain sites. It makes sense for such uses to be recognised and directed to specific sites. The final sentence provides the necessary signposting to the relevant strategy document.
Con ID: 26045
Full Name: Mr Egerton Gilman
Organisation: Chairman, Environment & Traffic Working Group Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce

Comment ID: 2666
Title:
Number: Objectives 9
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
The wording of this Objective remains unchanged from the previous June 2006 version of the document and the Chamber's objections to this, as set out in its letter of 7 August 2006 remain:• fails to differentiate between location of new retail and of housing and employment. • street-facing retail space could beneficially exist with housing and employment uses in Stamford. • fails to include for rear delivery access to retail premises which would reduce conflict between pedestrians and delivery vehicles.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted

Con ID: 26230
Full Name: Alison and Stamford H
Organisation: Director Smith Stuart Reynolds

Comment ID: 2000
Title:
Number: Objectives 9
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
Objective does not reflect regional priorities for town centres and retail development in emerging RSS8 (particularly paragraph 3.2.14) which states that one of the priorities for support is Grantham and also highlights the complementary roles of Grantham and Newark. In this context it is noted that the Retail Study undertaken by the Council provides for considerable expansion of the town centre (by approximately 20,000 square metres). Development of this scale would support Grantham as a focus for new growth.

Officers' Recommendation:
Disagree. Principle retailing areas of the District includes Grantham. Sub-Regional role of Grantham is addressed in Objective 6. All objectives should be read together, however, some refernce in Objective to retail hierarchy would be helpful.
Con ID: 26100  
Full Name: Mr N Gough  
Organisation: Bigwood Associates  
Comment ID: 2439  
Number: Objectives 9  
Nature Of Response: Observations  

Summary: Relevant parts of Economic and Community Strategy should be part of Core Strategy documents.  
Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted, they are..  

Con ID: 26108  
Full Name: Messrs Brint, MCcallion  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 2471  
Number: Objectives 9  
Nature Of Response: Observations  

Summary: Reference to the most recent retail capacity study may not be relevant throughout the lifetime of the Core Strategy.  
Officers' Recommendation: Noted, however, this sentence provides the necessary signposting to the relevant strategy document.  

Con ID: 26107  
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 2512  
Number: Objectives 9  
Nature Of Response: Observations  

Summary: Reference to being in accordance with Retail Capacity Study should be deleted as may never happen.  
Officers' Recommendation: This reference is made to signpost readers to the relevant background evidence which has been used to justify the objective.
Summary:
Reference to the Retail capacity study should be deleted as this will become outdated, and may be inappropriate towards the end of the plan period.

Officers' Recommendation:
This reference is made to signpost readers to the relevant background evidence which has been used to justify the objective. Such reference is necessary and is clearly referenced to the "most recent".

Summary:
Reference to Economic and Community Development Strategy will become outdated and should be withdrawn.

 Officers' Recommendation:
The final sentence provides the necessary signposting to the relevant strategy document which has led to this objective.

Summary:
Reference to Retail Capacity Study may not be relevant throughout lifetime of plan.

 Officers' Recommendation:
This reference is made to signpost readers to the relevant background evidence which has been used to justify the objective. Such reference is necessary and is clearly referenced to the "most recent".
Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells

Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary:
Objective is supported. The Principal Retail Areas need to be defined to avoid conflict with national retail strategy and emphasis on town centre first.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Define centres ref PO8 and PO9.

Con ID: 26101
Full Name: Mr J Parmiter
Organisation: 

Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary:
The findings and recommendations of the Retail Needs Study (not Capacity study, as mentioned here - suggest this incorrect reference is rectified) are mis-represented in the Core Strategy. See later objections. The objective must also to ensure that identified needs can be met by the new plan.

Officers' Recommendation:
Reference corrected to Retail Needs Study.

Con ID: 26230
Full Name: Alison and Stamford H
Organisation: Director Smith Stuart Reynolds

Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
Does not reflect Circular 05/05 guidance that requirement for contributions to be necessary, relevant and reasonable. It is appropriate to include information on matters to be covered by planning obligations. Reference should also be made to on- or off-site infrastructure which is of a strategic nature. Whilst Stamford Homes and Allison Homes are willing to consider the provision of, or contributions to, infrastructure and community benefits which are necessary in conjunction with development, it is not the role of the developer to make good existing

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Reword objective: "To ensure that relevant community and other infrastructure costs arising from new development are met through the provision of on- and off-site contributions."
Summary:
The wording of this Objective remains unchanged from the previous June 2006 version of the document and the Chamber's objections to this, as set out in its letter of 7 August 2006 remain. This objective lacks a sentence to indicate that when two developments of equal planning merit come forward but only one is necessary or desirable, then only the development which contributes most to community benefit should be permitted.

Officers' Recommendation:
Disagree. Developer contributions or planning obligations are governed by ODPM Circular 05/2005. Contributions from developers must be relevant, directly related to the proposal, make the development acceptable, fairly related in scale and reasonable. They must never be used as a betterment levy. Most importantly, the over-riding principle is that "The use of planning obligations must be governed by the fundamental principle that planning permission may not be bought or sold. It is therefore not legitimate for unacceptable development to be permitted because of benefits or inducements offered by a developer which are not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms."

Summary:
This objective does not reflect the guidance contained in Circular 05/05: Planning Obligations and its requirement for contributions to be necessary, relevant and reasonable. Although it is appropriate that Local Development Documents should include information on matters to be covered by planning obligations, the Strategy should include reference to on or off-site infrastructure which is of a strategic nature. Whilst Allison Homes is willing to consider the provision of, or contributions to, infrastructure and community benefits which are necessary in conjunction with development, it is not the role of the developer to make good existing deficiencies in provision. It is requested that the objective be reworded to

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Reword Objective "To ensure that relevant community and other infrastructure costs arising from new development are met through the provision of on- and off-site contributions. Infrastructure such as facilities for leisure, open space, green infrastructure, health, education, affordable housing, transport and the arts could be funded by this means."
state: "to ensure that relevant community and other infrastructure costs arising from new development are met through the provision of on and off site contributions.

Con ID: 26179
Full Name: Mr Neil Pike
Organisation: English Nature
Comment ID: 2627
Title:
Number: Objectives 10
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
We recognise that this objective could include green infrastructure (reference is made to open space), however we would wish to see explicit reference made to it, particularly as Green Infrastructure provision will need to be a central tenet of any growth point bid associated with Grantham.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Reference can be made to Green Infrastructure to aid clarity, and ensure strategic objectives are set out.

Con ID: 26263
Full Name: Mr Tim Slater
Organisation: Consultant Planner Persimmon Homes Ltd
Comment ID: 906
Title:
Number: Objectives 10
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
S106 requirements need to be considered in relation to Circular 05/05.

Officers' Recommendation:
Reword Objective "To ensure that relevant community and other infrastructure costs arising from new development are met through the provision of on- and off-site contributions. Infrastructure such as facilities for leisure, open space, green infrastructure, health, education, affordable housing, transport and the arts could be funded by this means."
Con ID: 26231  
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge  
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells  
Comment ID: 1011  
Number: Objectives 10  
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary:  
The areas for development contributions are long-established however reference should be made to the policy tests and also that the issue of viability will be considered.

Officers' Recommendation:  
To ensure that relevant community and other infrastructure costs arising from new development are met through the provision of on- and off-site contributions. Infrastructure such as facilities for leisure, open space, green infrastructure, health, education, affordable housing, transport and the arts could be funded by this means.

Con ID: 26100  
Full Name: Mr N Gough  
Organisation: Bigwood Associates  
Comment ID: 2438  
Number: Objectives 10  
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary:  
List of community benefits is not all encompassing. Suggest that "including" be replaced by "such as". Suggest that "reasonable" be inserted after "through the" in line 1.

Officers' Recommendation:  
Reword Objective "To ensure that relevant community and other infrastructure costs arising from new development are met through the provision of on- and off-site contributions. Infrastructure such as facilities for leisure, open space, green infrastructure, health, education, affordable housing, transport and the arts could be funded by this means." Wording of objective is intended to demonstrate that those facilities listed can be included in the term "community infrastructure". They are not intended to be examples of facilities for which contributions may be sought. They do not preclude the possibility of contributions being sought for other facilities. Planning guidance clearly states that contributions must be "... reasonably related ... to the proposed development, ... [and] ... reasonable in all other respects" [circular 05/05]. It is not, therefore, necessary to insert "reasonable" in the objective.
Con ID: 26160  
Full Name: Cecil  
Organisation: c/o Strutt and Parker  
Comment ID: 1941  
Number: Objectives 10  
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary: The affordable housing aspirations will directly impact upon the on and off site contributions available to achieve this objective. Concerns that objectives 7, 10 and the proposed planning gain supplement will have a detrimental affect on the supply of suitable housing land coming forward to the market.

Officers' Recommendation: Comment noted.

Con ID: 26296  
Full Name: Mr N Sandford  
Organisation: Woodland Trust  
Comment ID: 2635  
Number: Objectives 10  
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary: Objective 10 states that you will ensure that the community benefits from access to facilities for leisure, open space etc. We would like you to extend this approach to include a right of access to green space and in particular to woodland. The UK is one of the least wooded countries in Europe with only 11.6 percent woodland cover. Trees and forests are crucial to life on our planet. There is growing awareness of the linkage between healthy communities and the quality of the environment. The Woodland Trust has researched and developed a Woodland Access standard for local authorities to aim for, endorsed by English Nature. This recommends: - that no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size - that there should also be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round-trip) of people's homes.

Officers' Recommendation: Reference to Green Infrastructure will be included here. However, this is not intended to be an exhaustive list.
Con ID: 26045  
Full Name: Mr Egerton Gilman  
Organisation: Chairman, Environment & Traffic Working Group Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce  

Comment ID: 2668  
Title:  
Number: Objectives 11  
Nature Of Response: Object  

Summary:  
The wording of this Objective remains unchanged from the previous June 2006 version of the document and the Chamber's objections to this, as set out in its letter of 7 August 2006 remain: Replace "promoting" by "ensuring. Delete "and to ensure adequate mitigation where appropriate" (line 3). Given character and status of Stamford, include "In particular, development likely to negatively affect the landscape setting and character of the town of Stamford will be resisted."

Officers' Recommendation:  
noted

Comment ID: 26179  
Full Name: Mr Neil Pike  
Organisation: English Nature  

Comment ID: 2625  
Title:  
Number: Objectives 11  
Nature Of Response: Observations  

Summary:  
The wording here speaks of protecting the environment from significant harm - significant is a subjective term and difficult to measure. The aim here should be to protect it from harm. We recognise this may not always be possible, however this is what mitigation and compensation should seek to do.

Officers' Recommendation:  
Agree. Remove "significant".
Con ID: 26229
Full Name: Mr Jacob Newby
Organisation: Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency

Summary: Concerns about the use of the term 'significant harm' which may be interpreted as justifying harm where it is not considered 'significant' but where it may be avoidable.

Officers' Recommendation: Agree. Remove "significant".

Comment ID: 2673
Title: Objectives 11
Nature Of Response Observations

Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells

Summary: Objective is supported, but reference should be made to the relevant environmental and technical evidence base and that further detail will be provided in DPDs and SPDs.

Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted. Policy 3.10 refers to the relevant environmental and technical evidence base, no change to objective.

Comment ID: 1012
Title: Objectives 11
Nature Of Response Support with conditions

Con ID: 26229
Full Name: Mr Jacob Newby
Organisation: Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency

Summary: The need to acknowledge the safe remediation of contaminated land should be noted, as this may be a significant issue for the district. This could be incorporated into objective 12.

Officers' Recommendation: Reword objective: "To protect and promote the enhancement, sensitive use and management of the district's natural, historic and cultural assets and the built environment through good design that respects important local characteristics. Where harm to the built or natural environment is unavoidable, any impacts will be appropriately mitigated to ensure the development's safe use and occupancy."

Comment ID: 2674
Title: Objectives 12
Nature Of Response Observations
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local characteristics. Where harm to the built or natural environment is unavoidable, any impacts will be appropriately mitigated to ensure the developments safe use and occupancy.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26179</th>
<th>Full Name: Mr Neil Pike</th>
<th>Organisation: English Nature</th>
<th>Summary: This objective identifies the need to enhance the environment, and we welcome this.</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation: Support welcomed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: 2626</td>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Number: Objectives 12</td>
<td>Nature Of Response Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26231</th>
<th>Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge</th>
<th>Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells</th>
<th>Summary: Objective is supported, but reference should be made to the relevant environmental and technical evidence base and that further detail will be provided in DPDs and SPDs.</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted. Policy 3.10 refers to the relevant environmental and technical evidence base, no change to objective.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: 1013</td>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Number: Objectives 12</td>
<td>Nature Of Response Support with conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Con ID:** 26229  
**Full Name:** Mr Jacob Newby  
**Organisation:** Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency  
**Comment ID:** 2675  
**Number:** Objectives 13  
**Nature Of Response** Observations

**Summary:**  
Suggested wording of objective changed to reflect the importance of the challenge to climate change: 'To plan for and reduce the impacts to and from development on the effects and causes of climate change; including ensuring that new development is not exposed unnecessarily to the risk of flooding or increases the risk of flooding elsewhere.'  

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Reword Objective: "To plan for and reduce the impacts to and from development on the effects and causes of climate change; including ensuring that new development is not exposed unnecessarily to the risk of flooding or increases the risk of flooding elsewhere."

---

**Con ID:** 26231  
**Full Name:** Mr D Bainbridge  
**Organisation:** Senior Planning Associate Bidwells  
**Comment ID:** 1014  
**Number:** Objectives 13  
**Nature Of Response** Support with conditions

**Summary:**  
Objective is supported, but reference should be made to the relevant environmental and technical evidence base and that further detail will be provided in DPDs and SPDs.  

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments noted. Policy 3.11 refers to the relevant environmental and technical evidence base, no change to objective.

---

**Con ID:** 26300  
**Full Name:** Messrs E A Sheardown  
**Organisation:** Sheardown & Co. Ltd  
**Comment ID:** 2566  
**Number:** Objectives 14  
**Nature Of Response** Observations

**Summary:**  
Objective 14 is supported. The Council's commitment towards directing development to previously developed sites must be anticipated in the framing of the eventual spatial strategy and fully explored through the forthcoming Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD.  

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Support noted.
Summary:
The inclusion of a policy aimed at reducing the impacts of development on water resources and water quality would contribute to meeting Objective 14: specifically the 'prudent use of finite resources'. Without this we consider that the Core Strategy may not be compliant with Conformity Test (iv). Suggest that as policies 12 and 13 both deal solely with the generation of renewable energy that these may be combined into a single policy.

Officers' Recommendation:
Reducing the impact on water resources is covered by RSS Policy 26. Disagree: should remain separate to avoid confusion.

Summary:
Objective is supported, but reference should be made to the relevant environmental and technical evidence base and that further detail will be provided in DPDs and SPDs.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. SFRA/Climate change SEA/SA docs.

Summary:
We support the objective but wish to clarify that water resources are to be considered as finite resources. Whilst they may be replenished over time the importance of their availability to communities cannot be over-estimated. One of the predicted impacts of climate change is greater uncertainty regarding the availability of water resources. This matter was raised as an issue during the application for Growth Point statues. The subsequent requirement for a
Water Cycle Study bears out the significance of the matter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26469</th>
<th>Summary: 2.2.1 States that all new development should be located in a sustainable way, however it should also reference promoting Travel Plans through the development process to ensure that people actually get to the development in a sustainable way.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name: Ms Alison Christie</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation: Strategic Partnership Officer Lincolnshire County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: 2020</th>
<th>Summary: Clarification is needed as to how the Council will ensure &quot;all new development is located in a sustainable way&quot; and what this means.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title: paragraph</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation: Suggest amend to read &quot;by ensuring that all new development occurs in sustainable locations.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number: 2.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response: Observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26303</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name: Mr Ian Lings</td>
<td>Clarification is needed as to how the Council will ensure &quot;all new development is located in a sustainable way&quot; and what this means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation: Principal Policy Officer Planning &amp; Conservation Lincolnshire County Council</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation: Suggest amend to read &quot;by ensuring that all new development occurs in sustainable locations.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: 1888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: paragraph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number: 2.2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response: Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary:
It is considered that the definition of a sustainable community should be reworded to better reflect the more balanced definition given in Sustainable Communities – Building for the Future so that site criteria for selection can be identified, broadly as in line with Policy 2 in emerging Draft RSS8. The methodology by which strategic site selection has been made should be placed in this context. There is concern that no background document has been published which explains the approach used in site selection.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.
Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer
Planning & Conservation Lincolnshire County Council

**Summary:**
Draft Spatial Strategy (Para 3.1.3) highlights the role of Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings identified in the Draft Regional Plan under Eastern Sub-Area Priorities. However, it should be acknowledged that Stamford and Bourne are 'Main Towns' and Deepings is a 'Small Town'; as this approach is also taken in the adopted Lincolnshire Structure Plan (Table 4.1) and Draft Regional Plan (Para 2.5.6 and 2.5.7 and Policy 6) which seek to provide a settlement hierarchy. The Draft Regional Plan does not contradict the Structure Plan guidance on the balance of provision between the three towns and Grantham.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Although it is acknowledged that the RSS designates Stamford and Bourne as Main Towns and Deepings as a Small Town, all of these require appropriate amounts of development to maintain viability and to meet local needs. The amounts of development proposed reflect the particular local needs which have been identified, and are shown in PO1.

Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer
Planning & Conservation Lincolnshire County Council

**Summary:**
The CSPO takes into account the role of Peterborough given its proximity to South Kesteven (Para 1.16). This is consistent with the Policy 4 and 6 in the draft East Midlands Regional Plan which seeks to concentrate sustainable development in urban areas and taking into account the sustainable influence of this major urban area. Regional Plan policy 6 also says "promote sustainable patterns of development in those parts of the Sub-area bordering major urban areas in other regions, in particular Peterborough" and this point is repeated in the justification for the District housing figure (Housing Policy Justification Paper, para 2.3.8).

**Officers' Recommendation:**
It is considered that the Core Strategy conforms to the intention of the RSS in the distribution of housing development.
Con ID: 26475  
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith  
Organisation: Assistant Planner  
Stamford Property Company  
Comment ID: 2086  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.1.2  
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
We object to paragraph 3.1.2 in a similar vein to our comments in paragraph 2.4 above. Stamford has a role to play as a location for development that should also be explicitly recognised and differentiated from not only Grantham, but also The Deepings.

Officers' Recommendation:
Although the RSS differentiates between Stamford and Bourne, as "Main Towns" and Deepings, as a "Small Town", for practical purposes within SKDC there is nothing to be served by having an extra tier, consisting of one settlement.

Con ID: 26271  
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith  
Organisation: Assistant Planner  
DLP Planning Ltd  
Comment ID: 917  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.1.2  
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
Stamford has a role to play as a location for development that should also be explicitly recognised and differentiated from not only Grantham, but also The Deepings.

Officers' Recommendation:
This paragraph states that development will be concentrated in urban areas. This includes Stamford. Grantham is mentioned because it has been designated as a sub-regional centre.

Con ID: 26475  
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith  
Organisation: Assistant Planner  
Stamford Property Company  
Comment ID: 2087  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.1.3  
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
We object to paragraph 3.1.3. The text fails to acknowledge the differentiation that is clearly apparent in the emerging RSS as it relates to Stamford which by implications, cannot be treated in policy terms on a par with The Deepings.

Officers' Recommendation:
The RSS differentiates between Stamford and Bourne, as "Main Towns" and Deepings, as a "Small Town" and reference will be made in this paragraph to RSS categories. However, for practical purposes within SKDC there is nothing to be served by having an extra tier, consisting of one settlement.
**Summary:**
Object text fails to acknowledge the differentiation that is clearly apparent in the emerging RSS as it relates to Stamford which by implication, cannot be treated in policy terms on a par with The Deepings.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The RSS differentiates between Stamford and Bourne, as "Main Towns" and Deepings, as a "Small Town", and this should be set out in the text. However, for practical purposes within SKDC there is nothing to be served by having an extra tier, consisting of one settlement within the Spatial Strategy.

---

**Summary:**
The RSS also emphasises the need to make sure there is development in larger villages to enable their needs to be provided. Billingborough is one such village.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Agree, ensure reference is made to this element of the RSS.

---

**Summary:**
Again, note the emphasis on the fact that the emerging RSS suggests there should be development within the Deepings to help maintain viability and to meet local needs.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Noted
Con ID: 26218  
Full Name: Mr P Lely  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 2505  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.1.3  
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary: Emphasise that the emerging RSS suggests there should be development in the Deepings to help maintain vitality and viability.

Officers' Recommendation: Noted

Con ID: 26101  
Full Name: Mr J Parmiter  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 984  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.1.3  
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary: Stamford is a sustainable location that needs more development.

Officers' Recommendation: Noted. However, Stamford is also heavily constrained by physical and geographical features/characteristics.

Con ID: 26230  
Full Name: Alison and Stamford H  
Organisation: Director Smith Stuart Reynolds  
Comment ID: 2003  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.1.3  
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary: The principal of balanced growth is supported in accordance with the general guidelines contained in Draft RSS8. However, it is considered that there should be a general policy of rural restraint which enables limited development within the larger villages to support their role as local service centres.

Officers' Recommendation: This is the intention of PO1a. The level of development provided in the rural villages in the Council's Preferred Option (PO3b) is limited, to meet local need. It is considered that the level of development in the LSCs and Larger Villages will enable those settlements to fulfil their role.
Summary:
Paragraph 3.1.3 Support and ObjectThe principal of balanced growth is supported in accordance with the general guidelines contained in Draft RSS8. However, it is considered that there should be a general policy of rural restraint which enables limited development within the larger villages to support their role as local service centres.

Officers' Recommendation:
This is the intention of PO1a. The level of development provided in the rural villages in the Council's Preferred Option (PO3b) is limited, to meet local need. It is considered that the level of development in the LSCs and Larger Villages will enable those settlements to fulfil their role.

Summary:
Local issues para 3.1.4 is welcomed. Nevertheless, it is not clear how this objective will be met through the spatial strategy currently promoted.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Spatial Strategy promotes planning development in villages which have all or most local services and resists development in those which don't. The number of village services will be monitored and appropriate amendments to Larger village/LSC lists considered.

Summary:
The text about some of the villages being able to accommodate some new development is supported.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.
Summary:
Support the majority of new development should be focused on Grantham in view of its Growth point status. Agree with the principle of PO1a but feel should add to the sequential listing a new category for Local Service Centres and Larger Villages to allow for small appropriate extension sites.

Officers' Recommendation:
Policy Option has been written to ensure that suitable sites on the edges of villages will be thoroughly assessed and allocated through the LDF process, and will not be acceptable as infill sites. This will ensure that extensions to villages are properly planned and in appropriate proportion to the existing form of the village. No change to the policy approach.

Summary:
Object, sequence fails to reflect different roles of town as in RSS. Stamford should be acknowledged as a location for development. Needs definition of "underused green field site"and to make clear that the sequence does not place a moratorium on greenfield development.

Officers' Recommendation:
Although the RSS differentiates between Stamford and Bourne, as "Main Towns" and Deepings, as a "Small Town", for practical purposes within SKDC there is nothing to be served by having an extra tier, consisting of one settlement. Policy will be clarified.

Summary:
Sequence restricts the opportunity to develop what would otherwise be suitable sites in satellite villages will be lost. It will also increase the pressure being put on those settlements identified as Local Service Centres and large villages. By limiting the areas that can be developed the Council will create too many restrictions on developable sites and land prices will rise accordingly which inevitably reflects in the end sale price of any house.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. Government guidelines dictate that development must be located in the most sustainable locations. Those settlements which have a good range of facilities and services have been designated as Local Service Centres and Larger Villages. The services within villages are reviewed regularly.
Summary:
We object to PO1a the preferred Spatial Strategy for the following reasons:* It fails to adequately reflect the different roles that are expected of the towns of Stamford, Bourne and The Deepings as expressed in the emerging RSS; * Stamford should clearly be acknowledged as a settlement at which development will be provided in order to maintain viability, promote regeneration and allow growth;* The POCS does not provide any definition of an 'underused green field site.' The development plan document should keep to the well understood concepts of 'brown field' and 'green field'.* The POCS should explain that it is not intended that the 'preferred sequence' is a moratorium on any greenfield development in the District or at any particular settlement until such times as it can be demonstrated that all brownfield development opportunities have been pursued. In order to develop an appropriate range of housing to meet demand for both affordable and market housing, opportunities on both greenfield and brownfield sites may need to be pursued in tandem.

Officers' Recommendation:
Although the RSS differentiates between Stamford and Bourne, as "Main Towns" and Deepings, as a "Small Town", for practical purposes within SKDC there is nothing to be served by having an extra tier, consisting of one settlement.

Summary:
No more development of the town until a by-pass is built. The developments proposed will grid lock the roads.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comment noted. All new development proposals should show how the impact of travelling to and from has been considered, and should demonstrate that measures have been made to minimise that impact. One of the priorities for Grantham growth is the delivery of a southern relief road.
Con ID: 26172  
Full Name: Mr J Coleman  
Organisation: William Davis Ltd  
Comment ID: 1576  
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY  
Number: Preferred Option PO1a  
Nature Of Response: Object

**Summary:**
Development within LSCs and larger villages is contrary to emerging Regional Plan. Suggest development below "market towns" tier be restricted to "meeting local needs" as per polices 5 and 6 of draft RP. Prescribed sequence contrary to PPS3.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The Inspector's report on the RSS recommends deleting policy 5, and incorporating some of it in policy 4. Policy 4 will now refer to development in "other settlements" (ie those below the "market town" tier). Development should occur in these settlements in accordance with their needs as long as it is sustainable.

---

Con ID: 26263  
Full Name: Mr Tim Slater  
Organisation: Consultant Planner Persimmon Homes Ltd  
Comment ID: 907  
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY  
Number: Preferred Option PO1a  
Nature Of Response: Object

**Summary:**
Sequential approach to housing site allocation superseded with PPS3.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
PPS3 acknowledges that not all brownfield land is suitable for development and that alternatives, including greenfield extensions, may need to be considered. The wording of the Spatial Strategy and sequence will be updated accordingly.

---

Con ID: 26286  
Full Name: Mr N Hydes  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 1584  
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY  
Number: Preferred Option PO1a  
Nature Of Response: Object

**Summary:**
Clarification of "Appropriate" town extension site is needed. Underused underdeveloped sites are often important and prevent rural becoming urban.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The proposed sequence should protect the districts natural assets. It focuses development initially on brownfield sites. Town extension sites are considered in more detail in Policy Option 4.
Summary:
Term for developing underused greenfield sites lacks precision. Text required to define or explain. Opportunity Areas should be included in recognition of their strategic importance. The Preferred option sequence should include opportunity areas in item one of the search. eg: "1. Brownfield sites and identified opportunity areas within the built up part towns".

Officers' Recommendation:
Glossary to be provided. At this stage the Council has not identified specific Opportunity Areas. Such areas will be identified in the Site Specific Allocations DPD.

Summary:
Allowing general development on 'Under used undeveloped sites' is likely to have an adverse effect on the character of most villages including 'Local Service Centres'.

Officers' Recommendation:
Disagree. The sequence would allow for an appropriate small extension within an LSC or larger villages. It takes account of the needs of the rural community as development may be beneficial enabling services to be retained or improved.

Summary:
Above-trend growth for Grantham needs a more comprehensive approach, delivering brownfield sites and greenfield sites in tandem. The sequential approach is unrealistic and will not, if strictly applied achieve the delivery of housing targets for the town. Suggest following wording: "The majority of new development shall be focussed in Grantham to support and strengthen its role as a sub-regional centre. New development proposals shall be considered on sustainable and deliverable brownfield sites and appropriate greenfield sites (including urban extensions) sufficient to ensure the achievement of growth targets". The term underused

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree, suggested wording to be included, and "underused" to be removed.
Summary:
The LSCs and larger villages are now at full capacity. If further expansion is allowed there is a danger of them becoming suburbs of the market towns with insufficient 'greenspace' around them.

Officers' Recommendation:
Some LSCs do appear to have reached capacity. Some LSCs and larger villages, however, can still accommodate development. Close liaison with Parish Councils and Parish Plans (where prepared) will be a vital element in identifying sites for allocation within the Site Allocation document.

Summary:
Do not support any of the options, however, PO1a is the best. Regarding the 4 towns, I believe that town extension sites such as say, expanding towards Barrowby, are a bad idea, large scale development on the edge of towns swallow up the countryside and this amalgamates villages into the town. In the local service centres, I believe development should however, be encouraged as village extension sites to allow the village to evolve organically, especially affordable housing.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. Unfortunately, if Grantham is to grow and fulfil its potential as a sub-regional centre, urban extensions will need to be developed. Care will be taken to ensure that this development does not amalgamate the town with surrounding villages.
Summary:
The above trend growth anticipated and proposed for Grantham (including the additional growth element) would suggest a more comprehensive approach is required, which places an equal emphasis upon the delivery of both brownfield sites and greenfield sites in tandem. Evidence from the AMR suggests that brownfield sites alone will not remotely approach the target annual completion levels required for Grantham growth. In these circumstances, it is considered that the sequential approach adopted in PO1, in relation to Grantham is unrealistic and will not, if strictly applied achieve the delivery of housing targets for the town. Suggest following wording: "The majority of new development shall be focussed in Grantham to support and strengthen its role as a sub-regional centre. New development proposals shall be considered on sustainable and deliverable brownfield sites and appropriate greenfield sites (including urban extensions) sufficient to ensure the achievement of growth targets". The term underused undeveloped land needs clarification.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Amend text accordingly.

Summary:
Whilst the general principle of directing a large proportion of new development towards these larger and arguably more sustainable locations is understood, this should not prevent or discourage development at sub-Local Service Centre village level. PPS3 at Paragraph 38 lends support to those larger villages that fall below sub-LSC level, which could, with an appropriate scale of development and infrastructure achieve comparable levels of sustainability to LSCs. A more appropriate response in this instance

Officers' Recommendation:
The LDF is the vehicle to pursue such strategic expansions of villages. However, in light of the Regional Plan and National Policy objectives, the Spatial Strategy for South Kesteven is to concentrate growth in those locations which already have a range of services and facilities, and those larger villages which just fall short of LSC but which could accommodate some modest new development in accordance with PPS3. However, Tallington does not fit into this category. Further investigation is required to assess the level of
would be to make specific provisions relating to each settlement category in the option, and adopt a different policy approach for the aspiring LSC's which would allow for some greenfield dedevelopment. Tallington should be included as a larger village which is suitable for expansion. Alternatively, the issues surrounding Tallington and the desire to eliminate the level crossing could be deemed sufficiently exceptional to justify a separate and distinct policy approach.

**Con ID:** 26231  
**Full Name:** Mr D Bainbridge  
**Organisation:** Senior Planning Associate Bidwells  
**Comment ID:** 1016  
**Title:** SPATIAL STRATEGY  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO1a  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**  
This policy option does not comply with Strategic Objective 6 relating to urban extension for Grantham. In relation to the villages and countryside sequence must be changed to accord with PPS7 on priority for conversion for employment use.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Disagree. Objective and Spatial Strategy do conform; at least one urban extension is necessary if Grantham is to grow and fulfil its sub-regional centre role. Further clarification of this is to be given in PO1. PO1a is also in line with PPS7 para. 17: Re-use for economic development purposes will usually be preferable, but residential conversions may be more appropriate in some locations, and for some types of building. It should be noted that PO1 relates to all types of development, not just residential!

**Con ID:** 26558  
**Full Name:** Mr G Fearn  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 2433  
**Title:** SPATIAL STRATEGY  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO1a  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**  
The sequential methodology set out within the strategy is inappropriate and requires further refinements and clarification. Use of the terms "allocated sites" and "underused undeveloped sites" should be defined and clarified. There is no inherent logic in preferring underused undeveloped sites over appropriate greenfield sites within Local Service Centres.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Agree. Sequential approach is no longer part of PPS3 and policy will be clarified.
Summary:
The sequential methodology set out within the strategy is inappropriate and requires further refinements and clarification. Use of the terms "allocated sites" and "underused undeveloped sites" should be defined and clarified. There is no inherent logic in preferring underused undeveloped sites over appropriate greenfield sites within Local Service Centres.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Sequential approach is no longer part of PPS3 and policy will be clarified.

Summary:
Above-trend growth for Grantham needs a more comprehensive approach, delivering brownfield sites and greenfield sites in tandem. The sequential approach is unrealistic and will not, if strictly applied achieve the delivery of housing targets for the town. Suggest following wording: "The majority of new development shall be focussed in Grantham to support and strengthen its role as a sub-regional centre. New development proposals shall be considered on sustainable and deliverable brownfield sites and appropriate greenfield sites (including urban extensions) sufficient to ensure the achievement of growth targets". The term underused undeveloped land needs clarification.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree, suggested wording to be included, and "underused" to be removed.
Summary:
The Chamber objects to the primacy afforded to Grantham as a Sub-Regional centre (see above under comments on section 1). The re-drafted version of this Preferred Option emphasises the primacy of Grantham, which is a change from the earlier draft. In other respects, in terms of the sequential approach adopted, this remains essentially the same as the June 2006 document, and the Chamber’s objections as set out in its letter of 7 August 2006 remain: Sequential approach does not conform to Policy 1 of RPG8. Preferred Option offends the sustainability criteria. Stamford should be designated as a “Special Town” because of its landscape, architecture and historic character.

Officers’ Recommendation:
The designation of Grantham as a Sub-Regional Centre is a Regional (RSS) designation.

Summary:
Object to wording which implies that a negative impact on biodiversity is acceptable: this is not sustainable development. In no circumstance should there be a net loss of biodiversity. Proposes insertion of ‘appropriate’ to read ‘Appropriate brownfield sites within the built up part of the town’. Would also like to raise the issue of planning the ‘Green Infrastructure’ of the urban environment so that accessible natural greenspace is available to residents.

Officers’ Recommendation:
Comments noted. In all cases, care must be taken to ensure that any impact on biodiversity is minimised. Other policies within the Core Strategy address the issue of biodiversity, and Green Infrastructure is to be added to Objective 10.
Summary:
We think a new category should be added to the sequential listing for local service centres, larger and smaller villages. There will be situations where small extension sites would be appropriate. These should not be prohibited where there may not be sites which fit within categories 1 to 3.

Officers' Recommendation:
Disagree. The sequence would allow for an appropriate small extension within a LSC or larger village. Small villages are not sustainable and, therefore, will not be suitable for extension sites.

Summary:
We are concerned about the terms "underused greenfield" and "underused undeveloped"sites, which could be seen as an invitation to neglect and even degrade land in order to obtain development value. It is felt that these terms should be deleted from the sequence.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Glossary of terms will be included. However, this policy will be reworded in the light of National and Regional policies and representations received.

Summary:
It is considered that the spatial strategy does not adequately reflect requirements to provide for employment development, or to provide a range of employment sites, and the sequential criteria outlined in the strategy are inappropriate for employment development. Certain employment uses are unsuitable for location in built up areas. Spatial strategy should have full regard to locational requirements of all types of employment activity.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments are noted and accepted. The spatial strategy should be applicable for all types of development. The options should be amended to make allowances for different types of development which by their nature will be located away from built-up areas.
Summary:
Broadly similar to sequential approach set out in previous PO1. Previous comments (that sequence is broadly satisfactory but housing and employment developments should be linked so that development is not unbalanced, resulting in unwanted traffic generating scenarios such as dormitory towns) have not been addressed, and, therefore stand. It is considered that the Authority’s preferred option, by allowing the needs of the local, and rural communities to be met locally, could assist in reducing the need to travel. However, focusing development in the main towns should also enable a range of facilities to be accessed by sustainable modes. It is therefore not clear which option is likely to increase vehicle trips overall and it would be helpful if this could be examined further.

Officers’ Recommendation:
PO2 addresses the issues of accessibility by means other than by private car and this policy applies to all locations.

Summary:
Concern about term ‘underused greenfield site.’ This concern is heightened in PO1a by the change that now seeks to allow development in Local Service Centres and larger villages. Concerns about the practicality of the policy and the interpretation of LSCs regarding distinct but linked settlements.

Officers’ Recommendation:
Concerns are noted, the policy aims to retain or improve the range of services within the LSCs and larger villages. The spatial strategy aims to ensure existing settlement patterns and through good design new development should complement the existing built form. Policy will be clarified.
Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation: Nature Of Response

Summary: A new category should be added to the sequential listing for local service centres, larger and smaller villages. There will be situations where small extension sites would be appropriate.

Officers' Recommendation: Disagree. The sequence would allow for an appropriate small extension within a LSC or larger village. Small villages are not sustainable and therefore will not be suitable for extension sites.

Con ID: 26107
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw
Organisation: Nature Of Response

Summary: We think a new category should be added to the sequential listing for local service centres, larger and smaller villages. There will be situations where small extension sites would be appropriate. These should not be prohibited where there may not be sites which fit within categories 1 to 3.

Officers' Recommendation: Disagree. The sequence would allow for an appropriate small extension within a LSC or larger village. Small villagers are not sustainable and, therefore, will not be suitable for extension sites.

Con ID: 26299
Full Name: Mr John Plumb
Organisation: Stamford Town Partnership

Summary: Stamford is an important conservation town with two parts of the town so designated. The definition of brownfield is therefore vital to the future ambiance of the town. Current practice and policy in a context of great shortage of developable building land means gardens built on, leading to over density of developments and consequent car parking problems. Stamford in our view is a special case in this respect in SKDC.

Officers' Recommendation: Definition of brownfield sites in PPS3 includes gardens. "Brownfield sites within the built up part of the town" can be amended by the addition of "[but which do not compromise the nature and character of the town]".
Summary:
Underused Greenfield sites – this is not defined and does not accord with national definitions. It is not clear whether this 2nd tier location is within the built up part of the town.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Glossary of terms will be included. However, this policy will be reworded in the light of National and Regional policies and representations received.

Comment ID: 2011
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY
Number: Preferred Option PO1a
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
My Client supports the preferred option P01a. The recognition that the major growth envisaged by Grantham’s Growth Point Status will require the allocation of a significant area of ‘greenfield land’ outside but close to the current urban boundary of Grantham is considered realistic and is welcomed. Sustainable and deliverable town extension sites are available to the north west and the south of the town.

Officers' Recommendation:
support noted.

Comment ID: 2030
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY
Number: Preferred Option PO1a
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
The Council’s preferred option of Policy 1a is supported.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26108</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Messrs Brint, MCcallion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>SPATIAL STRATEGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** Agree that the majority of new development should be focussed on Grantham.

**Officers' Recommendation:** Support noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Anna Bave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Property Consultant First City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>SPATIAL STRATEGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** It is appropriate to allow additional development within the Local Service Centres in order to maintain vitality and viability.

**Officers' Recommendation:** Support noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26132</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Planning Policy Peterbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Peterborough City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>SPATIAL STRATEGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** We would support the proposals to concentrate the majority of new development in Grantham, as the largest and therefore most sustainable settlement in South Kesteven.

**Officers' Recommendation:** Support noted.
Con ID: 26166  
Full Name: Mr A Evans  
Organisation: Kimberley Developments Ltd  
Comment ID: 2179  
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY  
Number: Preferred Option PO1a  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary:  
Reference to the Sequential Approach is too general as it does not distinguish varying types of development. There is no reference to development that is not appropriately located within the urban area or on previously developed land, eg some modern B1/B2/B8 is incompatible with historical urban layout and is suited to out-of-centre location. Suggest insertint "(with exceptions for certain types of employment development)" after first "1" in policy.

Officers' Recommendation:  
Comments noted.

Con ID: 26195  
Full Name: Mr M Brebner  
Organisation: Greatford Parish Council  
Comment ID: 2305  
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY  
Number: Preferred Option PO1a  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary:  
The broadening of the areas considered for development is welcomed.

Officers' Recommendation:  
Support noted.

Con ID: 26205  
Full Name: Dr D Burston  
Organisation: Framptons  
Comment ID: 2283  
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY  
Number: Preferred Option PO1a  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary:  
The search sequences for local services centres and large villages should provide as the second category 'brownfield sites within and adjoining the built-up part of settlements which are not protected.'

Officers' Recommendation:  
Disagree with the addition. The sequence considers brownfield sites within the built-up parts of the settlement, this allows for an appropriate small extension within a LSC or larger village.
Con ID: 26334  
Full Name: Town Clerk Market Dee  
Organisation: Clerk Market Deeping Town Council  
Comment ID: 2345  
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY  
Number: Preferred Option PO1a  
Nature Of Response  Support

Summary: Sites for affordable housing should not be restricted. Maximum availability is a priority and should be accessible for all.

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted. Proposals for affordable housing will be considered wherever there is an identified need. However, all development, whether for affordable or market housing, must be of an appropriate scale, location and design.

Con ID: 26379  
Full Name: Mr M Brebner  
Organisation: Clerk Tallington Parish Council  
Comment ID: 2319  
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY  
Number: Preferred Option PO1a  
Nature Of Response  Support

Summary: The broadening of the areas considered for development is welcomed.

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted.

Con ID: 26605  
Full Name: HPC Homes, Namulas  
Organisation: c/oAnthony Aspbury Associates  
Comment ID: 2562  
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY  
Number: Preferred Option PO1a  
Nature Of Response  Support

Summary: Generally support the preference for PO1a, subject to modification in respect of the sequential test. Sustainable urban extensions and underused greenfield sites not already protected may need to have priority over constrained brownfield sites in order to deliver continuous, flexible housing supply. PO1a too inflexible: no mechanism to override identified sequence to meet other legitimate spatial objectives. Suggest retain number categories of land in each settlement tier but removal of...
"sequence". Suggest removal of penultimate paragraph because it is unduly onerous, impracticable and will constrain development.

Con ID: 26484
Full Name: Trustees for the Belvoi Organisation: Smiths Gore
Comment ID: 2397
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY
Number: Preferred Option PO1a
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
Support "Larger Village" settlement category. Support inclusion with LSCs in policy. However, suggest they are merged, as policy does not separate the 2 categories. Question use and practicality of the sequence for the 'consideration of new development proposals'. No provision in PPS3 for "search sequence" when considering applications. Therefore, sequence should apply only when 'allocating' sites in LDF. Question why sequence differs between towns and LSCs. To maintain consistency "larger villages"should be in bold type.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. The sequence approach has been chosen as it is felt that this constitutes the most efficient use of development land. Although not specifying a sequence for development, PPS3 places great emphasis on locating development on brownfield land. Policy will be clarified.

Con ID: 26165
Full Name: Macdonald Buchanan T Organisation:
Comment ID: 2106
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY
Number: Preferred Option PO1a
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
Support the recognition of the role development can play in supporting the three market towns and in particular The Deepings.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.
Con ID: 26261  
Full Name: Mr Tudor Townsend  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 892  
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY  
Number: Preferred Option PO1a  
Nature Of Response Support  

Summary:  
We support the application of the urban settlement hierarchy to direct development to appropriate areas of the District. It is important to create provision for development of allocated sites within Local Service Centres to sustain local services.

Officers' Recommendation:  
Noted.

Con ID: 26210  
Full Name: Dr R A Fuller  
Organisation: Bourne Civic Society  
Comment ID: 2331  
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY  
Number: Preferred Option PO1a  
Nature Of Response Support  

Summary:  
If development is concentrated on Grantham, why does Bourne have a disproportionate percentage of new housing and Stamford the main proportion of new retail space?

Officers' Recommendation:  
This document is about the future development of the district. The housing and retail units referred to for Bourne include the large development already committed at Elsea Park. The Retail Study demonstrated a shortfall of retail space in both Grantham and Stamford. However, that shortfall in Grantham has now been largely met by recent development. Despite this, Grantham will see majority of new housing and employment development which in itself will raise the profile of town centre.

Con ID: 26203  
Full Name: Mr C Townson  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 1836  
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY  
Number: Preferred Option PO1a  
Nature Of Response Support  

Summary:  
But only acceptable if a Parish Design Statement can be agreed that meets the needs of the community. Other Councils show greater flexibility on sustainable definition see further comments 1.

Officers' Recommendation:  
Reference to Parish plans and Village Design Statements is included within PO1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Nature Of Response</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26179</td>
<td>Mr Neil Pike</td>
<td>English Nature</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>SPATIAL STRATEGY</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO1a</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Natural England supports Preferred Option PO1a as it is consistent with national and regional policy relating to spatial strategy and the sequential approach to development.</td>
<td>support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26151</td>
<td>Mr Ivan Fuller</td>
<td>Bourne Town Centre Management Partnership</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>SPATIAL STRATEGY</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO1a</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Should Bourne Woods not be a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) or is it covered by some other legislation?</td>
<td>SACs are areas which have been given special protection under the European Unions Habitats Directive. There are two SACs within South Kesteven district: Baston Fen and Grimsthorpe. UK SACs have been identified, following criteria set out in the Habitats Directive, by English Nature. Bourne Wood has been designated as a Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) and is protected as a local wildlife site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26142</td>
<td>Miss H Edwards</td>
<td>British Waterways</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>SPATIAL STRATEGY</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO1a</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Supportive of the aim of strengthening Grantham as a sub-regional centre and the achievement of this aim will be assisted by the restoration of the Grantham Canal, including a new canal basin area. If achieved, the latter will play a key role in delivering sustainable growth and a step change in the urban offer. Route of Grantham canal crosses both urban and rural areas and it is therefore necessary to ensure that appropriate facilities are provided along the network. PPS7 recognises that 'tourism and leisure activities are vital to many rural</td>
<td>Comments noted. Core Strategy as currently written does not cover tourism specifically. There may be scope to add tourism into &quot;employment and economic development&quot;policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We consider that the spatial strategy should reflect PPS7 in relation to 'tourism and leisure development' by providing a specific exception in relation to development in the other villages and countryside for appropriate tourism and leisure activities.

**Summary:**
Clarification is sought on whether there is a preference for allocated sites and brownfield sites in the local service centres and larger villages ahead of greenfield sites in market towns.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The policy will be reworded. However, any sequence applies to that category only. It is not reasonable to expect development in LSCs to be allowed only after development in towns is finished.

**Con ID:** 26230
**Full Name:** Alison and Stamford H
**Organisation:** Director Smith Stuart Reynolds
**Comment ID:** 1976
**Title:** SPATIAL STRATEGY
**Number:** Preferred Option PO1a
**Nature Of Response** Support with conditions

**Summary:**
Accept focus of new development is on Grantham. Welcome inclusion of Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings within the second part of the development sequence. This will enable development to be provided, commensurate with the role of these three market towns, including on appropriate town extension sites: essential if these towns are to be able to develop as sustainable settlements providing the homes, jobs and services which their residents should be able to reasonably expect. Sequence for allocation of sites within LSCs and Larger Villages does not accord with regional and national guidance. In particular, greater priority given to greenfield sites than brownfield sites. Sequence should be the same as for towns. Concerns about infill and higher density in rural

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Support for development sequence is welcomed. There should be no presumption that only greenfield sites will be allocated for development in LSCs and Larger Villages. Brownfield as well as greenfield sites will be considered, and where available brownfield sites will be considered in advance of greenfield sites. The objective of this sequence is to ensure planned development, rather than windfall development.
settlements is not sufficient justification to contravene national and regional planning policy. Suggest that policy is amended by deletion of the first priority in the sequence proposed in respect of LSCs and Larger Villages so that brownfield sites and underused undeveloped sites within built up areas are prioritised ahead of greenfield allocations when identifying sites for development in these locations.

| Con ID: 26229 | Full Name: Mr Jacob Newby | Organisations: Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency | Summary: PPS25 sequential test may mean that town extensions or greenfield sites are preferable to urban brownfield sites. The sequence for development might be superseded by the national policy for sites within the floodplain: this should be acknowledged. Support redevelopment of brownfield sites: contamination could be remedied. Assume reference to allocated sites in LSCs and larger villages relates to existing Local Plan. These should not be automatically re-allocated in the LDF. | Officers' Recommendation: LDF policies should not reproduce national planning guidance. The allocations in the adopted Local Plan will not be automatically re-allocated. They will be superseded by those in the Site Allocations and Policies DPD when this is adopted. In the interim period, however, Local Plan allocations remain. |
| Comment ID: 2677 | Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY | Number: Preferred Option PO1a | Nature Of Response Support with conditions |

| Con ID: 26101 | Full Name: Mr J Parmiter | Organisation: | Summary: The objective must be to go further than merely "maintain and support". They need to grow. | Officers' Recommendation: "Maintain and support" reflects the RSS requirements for these settlements. There is no "growth"agenda for these settlements. |
| Comment ID: 985 | Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY | Number: Preferred Option PO1a | Nature Of Response Support with conditions |
Con ID: 26278
Full Name: Mr David Balfe
Organisation: Managing Director T Balfe Construction Ltd
Comment ID: 2281
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY
Number: Preferred Option PO1a
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary:
Sequential test no longer required [PPS3].
Suggest amendments: Accordingly, the third paragraph/sentence in PO1a should be deleted, as should the phrase "in accordance with the following sequence" after "...allowed in accordance with..." in the fifth paragraph, and the omitted phrase should be replaced merely with the word "on". In the list of three categories of sites permissible in 'Local Service Centres' and larger villages, in number 3, the words "...and on the edge of..." should be inserted between "...within..." and "...the built-up parts of settlements...", with the general qualification for all three categories of sites being added as follows: "Providing sites and the development proposed on them are not (separately or cumulatively) of a scale which conflicts with the distributional strategy of the LDF and/or harms the character and appearance of the village concerned". In the final category of villages (i.e. other than the LSCs and 'larger villages'), two additional categories of permissible development should be included as follows: "g. Small-scale infill or rounding off, amounting to no more than three dwellings, of a size and character appropriate to the village." "h. Housing to accommodate agricultural forestry and other key workers who need to live in that particular village or in the countryside generally."

Officers' Recommendation:
Noted. PO1 will be amended to encompass some of these and other suggestions, together with changes arising nationally, regionally and locally.
**Con ID:** 26279  
**Full Name:** Mr Richard Edwards  
**Organisation:** Director of Planning Larkfleet Group

**Comment ID:** 973  
**Title:** SPATIAL STRATEGY  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO1a  
**Nature Of Response** Support with conditions

**Summary:**
Our primary concern with the proposed search sequence is the accuracy of the identified brownfield sites as shown in the 2005 Urban Capacity Study. It is essential that any identified brownfield sites are truly deliverable during the plan period. The Council should scrutinise those brownfield sites already identified to ensure that the sites are available, suitable and that there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered on them. Alternative wording is suggested. The Council should identify suitable sites within these sustainable settlements to be included in any subsequent site allocations Development Plan Document.

**Officer's Recommendation:**
Comments noted. The remaining Urban Capacity Sites will be reassessed as part of the current SHLAA work, which considers availability. Site allocations will be the subject of a "Site Specific Allocations and Policies"DPD, to be issued for public consultation at a later date.

---

**Con ID:** 26292  
**Full Name:** Councillor T Holmes  
**Organisation:**

**Comment ID:** 1681  
**Title:** SPATIAL STRATEGY  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO1a  
**Nature Of Response** Support with conditions

**Summary:**
Encourage and directly support Design Statements for all settlements, large or small. This would strengthen the Core Strategy as a whole and ensure that attempts to circumvent it can be resisted more effectively. Where the need for additional infrastructure is identified, its location and availability should be consulted upon (if not already part of the design statement) and Service Providers positively encouraged or incentivised by use of section 106 receipts, to create community sustainability.

**Officer's Recommendation:**
Noted. However, it must be clarified that the District Council will not prepare Village/Town Design Statements These must arise out of a proper Parish Plan approach, and be an outcome firmly rooted in local consensus.
Con ID: 26300
Full Name: Messrs E A Sheardown
Organisation: Sheardown & Co. Ltd
Comment ID: 2553
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY
Number: Preferred Option PO1a
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary:
General agreement with PO1a. However, concerns that the District's rural villages (not LSCs or larger villages) will be affected by the constraints of the proposed spatial strategy (criteria a-f). Amend to incorporate additional criterion to a-f list 'brownfield sites within the built up part of settlements [but which do not compromise the nature and character of the village]'. Would the addition of a minimum number of services to a smaller settlement automatically gain larger village status.

Officers' Recommendation:
Disagree with the amendment, the small villages are not sustainable, therefore development needs to be restricted. The number of village services will be monitored and appropriate amendments to Larger village/LSC lists considered.

Con ID: 26111
Full Name: Mr W Barton
Organisation: Kennedy Leigh Charitable Trust
Comment ID: 2048
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY
Number: Preferred Option PO1a
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary:
This policy is too restrictive on development within rural villages and fails to take into account the need to provide sustainable development that will support existing services particularly within rural villages. It is proposed therefore that an additional bullet point be added to allow for sustainable infill development within the built framework of settlements. The suggested wording for such an additional point is as follows: "sustainable infill development within the built fabric of settlements to a maximum of 10 dwellings."

Officers' Recommendation:
Disagree. The sequence would allow for an appropriate small extension within a LSC or larger village. Small villagers are not sustainable and, therefore, will not be suitable for extension sites.
**Con ID:** 26100  
**Full Name:** Mr N Gough  
**Organisation:** Bigwood Associates  
**Nature Of Response** Support with conditions

**Summary:**  
PO1a generally preferred over alternatives. However, suggest reference in sequential test to locations “that are not identified and protected”... is unnecessary. Suggest sequential test should apply only to types of site: brownfield, underused greenfield and town extension sites. Suggest delete wording after "sites" in point 2 of policy.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Support for option noted. Wording of policy provides flexibility to override identified sequence to meet other legitimate spatial objectives. However, policy will be amended.

---

**Con ID:** 26112  
**Full Name:** Alison Homes  
**Organisation:** Director Smith  
**Nature Of Response** Support with conditions

**Summary:**  
Accept focus of new development is on Grantham. Welcome inclusion of Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings within the second part of the development sequence. This will enable development to be provided, commensurate with the role of these three market towns, including on appropriate town extension sites: essential if these towns are to be able to develop as sustainable settlements providing the homes, jobs and services which their residents should be able to reasonably expect. Sequence for allocation of sites within LSCs and Larger Villages does not accord with regional and national guidance. In particular, greater priority given to greenfield sites than brownfield sites. Sequence should be the same as for towns. Concerns about infill and higher density in rural settlements is not sufficient justification to contravene national and regional planning policy. Suggest that policy is amended by deletion of the first priority in the sequence proposed in respect of LSCs and Larger Villages so that brownfield sites and underused undeveloped sites within built up areas are prioritised ahead of greenfield allocations when

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Support for development sequence is welcomed. There should be no presumption that only greenfield sites will be allocated for development in LSCs and Larger Villages. Brownfield as well as greenfield sites will be considered, and where available brownfield sites will be considered in advance of greenfield sites. The objective of this sequence is to ensure planned development, rather than windfall development.
identifying sites for development in these locations.

Con ID: 26125
Full Name: Mr Graham Foster
Organisation: Senior Planning Officer - Lincolnshire and Rutland Area Team Government Office For The East Midlands

Summary: Would this option also meet objective 1?

Officers' Recommendation: Yes, add objective to the list.

Comment ID: 2012
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.1.10
Nature Of Response: Observations

Con ID: 26261
Full Name: Mr Tudor Townsend
Organisation: 

Comment ID: 893
Title: SPATIAL STRATEGY
Number: Alternative Option PO1b
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary: This policy does not make use of the settlement hierarchy which is based on comprehensive research. By only directing development through Grantham and the 3 Market Towns, much needed development in Local Service Centres is more difficult to deliver. Development within Local Service Centres is necessary to contribute to the vitality and viability of rural communities.

Officers' Recommendation: Agree. This option is not the Council's preferred option.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26082</th>
<th>Full Name: Mr Tim Bladon</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Claims [para 3.1.16] that not allowing development in rural settlements could have a negative impact on local economy and rural diversification, not borne out by experience of development in Rippingale. Residents of recent developments do not integrate with community, send children to local school or work in village. The result has been the closure of the village school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26293</th>
<th>Full Name: Mrs M. A. S. Bates</th>
<th>Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Do not support any, but PO1b least objectionable. The word 'appropriate' has no definition here, so items in which it appears have no clear meaning. PO1b does not include 'local service centres' and so appear to provide the villages, so described a little more protection - specifically against development of 'Brownfield sites... and 'underused greenfield sites...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26288</th>
<th>Full Name: Mrs J M Cutting</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Allowing general development on 'Under used undeveloped sites' is likely to have an adverse affect on the character of most villages including 'Local Service Centres'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>PO1b was not selected as not allowing development in rural areas may lead to a decline in LSC and larger villages which fulfil many of the daily requirements for wide areas of rural populations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary:
The LSCs and larger villages are now at full capacity. If further expansion is allowed there is a danger of them becoming suburbs of the market towns with insufficient 'greenspace' around them.

Officers' Recommendation:
Some LSCs do appear to have reached capacity. Some LSCs and larger villages, however, can still accommodate development. Close liaison with Parish Councils and Parish Plans (where prepared) will be a vital element in identifying sites for allocation within the Site Allocation document.

Summary:
Option PO1b is the preference as this option emphasises the need to focus growth on the towns. The allocations to the towns should be higher as this is a more sustainable form of development.

Officers' Recommendation:
Noted.

Summary:
Does this option meet objective 1?

Officers' Recommendation:
Not really, as it only provides for development in 4 towns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26273</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>The development of brownfield sites can have a very positive impact on biodiversity, and can provide opportunity to create new open space, or implement management plans.</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Crown Estate Commiss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>c/o Carter Jonas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>3.1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con ID:</td>
<td>26306</td>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>The concentration in urban areas may minimise the need to travel by car but will not &quot;reduce&quot;it (Page 16).</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Mr J.A Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>clerk Marston Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>3.1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support with conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con ID:</td>
<td>26137</td>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>The proposed A1 Corridor Opportunity Area specifically at Colsterworth is likely to impact on the road network within Leicestershire. A Transport Assessment for development should address these issues and put forward mitigation proposals. The Planning Authority should liaise with Leicestershire County Council in respect of appropriate mitigation measures.</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation: Comment noted. Where appropriate the Council will liaise with neighbouring authorities to ensure impacts from the development are minimised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Ms Sophie Davies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Planning Assistant Leicestershire County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Sustainable Integrated Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary:**
A reference to the health benefits brought about by increased walking and cycling would again demonstrate joined-up thinking across the various agendas.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Para 3.2.4 highlights the need for increased provision of cycle routes. However, reference will be made to the wider health benefits of cycling and walking.

---

**Con ID:** 26303  
**Full Name:** Mr Ian Lings  
**Organisation:** Principal Policy Officer  
Planning & Conservation Lincolnshire County Council

**Comment ID:** 1889  
**Title:** Sustainable Integrated Transport  
**Number:** 3.2  
**Nature Of Response** Observations

---

**Con ID:** 26062  
**Full Name:** Miss H Mawson  
**Organisation:** The Home Builders Federation

**Comment ID:** 2175  
**Title:** Sustainable Integrated Transport  
**Number:** 3.2  
**Nature Of Response** Observations

**Summary:**
Travelling per se should not be viewed as being a negative activity. Travelling by either by foot or bicycle, for example, can be beneficial in terms of being active and healthy. Furthermore, public transport either travelling by bus, train or tram can also have community and well-being benefits. Suggest such sentences as referred to above should be rephrased to “reduce the need to travel by car.”

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Agree. Make changes where appropriate.
Con ID: 26469
Full Name: Ms Alison Christie
Organisation: Strategic Partnership Officer, Lincolnshire County Council

Summary:
Needs to include reference to Transport Statements along with Travel Plans & Transport Assessments

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree, include reference.

Comment ID: 2021
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.2.1
Nature Of Response: Observations

Con ID: 26102
Full Name: Mr P R Tame
Organisation: National Farmers Union

Summary:
The text about the dependency of people living in rural areas on the motor car is supported.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.

Comment ID: 2119
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.2.3
Nature Of Response: Support

Con ID: 26523
Full Name: Mr M Thurlby
Organisation: 

Summary:
The policy should be re-drafted to more accurately reflect the provisions of paragraph 38 of PPS3: by supporting the creation of communities of sufficient size and mix to justify the development of, and sustain community facilities, infrastructure and services.

Officers' Recommendation:
PO2 refers to sustainable transport. PO1 refers to the spatial strategy for development. This provides development in the larger villages which could sustain additional community facilities and infrastructure.

Comment ID: 2413
Title: SUSTAINABLE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT
Number: Preferred Option PO2
Nature Of Response: Object
Summary:
Policy highlights the need to reduce travel by private car, yet the emphasis to promote development in rural locations bows to the fact that the use of a car is unavoidable. Development in villages without public transport become dormitories in order to achieve the objectives of government and local housing policies. There is no realisation of the local effect of development (which is not sustained by public transport or employment within the community) and the damage, rather than the perceived benefit, it causes to that community.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. In a rural/semi rural district such as South Kesteven, without strong public transport links, it would be unrealistic not to accept that private transport use is unavoidable. However, greater priority should be given to promoting development in villages served by regular public transport.

Summary:
Whilst preferred Option 2, incorporates references to Sustainable Transport issues, and outlines that it has reflected the priorities and objectives of the Local Transport Plan, it is considered that the submission Core Strategy should be underpinned by a more robust transport strategy. This should identify improvements and key schemes, and be illustrated on the Key Diagram where appropriate. This will ensure that the Core Strategy acts as an investment framework, and addresses a key issue that could impact upon adjoining areas.

Officers' Recommendation:
Noted. Further consideration should be given to incorporating key elements of LTP2 strategy into the Core Strategy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26299</th>
<th>Full Name: Mr John Plumb</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Stamford Town Partnership</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Lack of mention of transport/roads. The long term transport plan for Stamford will surely determine any future brownfield development for housing, economic development. Too often in the past land has been allocated and been undevelopable because of access. Without a clear policy on this we do not see how SKDC can be site specific in the next stage of the LDF.</td>
<td>Observations noted. Consideration will be given the inclusion of specific strategic elements of the LTP within the Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26295</th>
<th>Full Name: Mr D J Holmes</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Chairman Old Somerby Parish Council</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>High speed broadband internet access within the district is scant outside the main urban areas - BT does not apparently see the need to provide the exchanges necessary for rural settlements to benefit from broadband. Its potential impact on the need to travel to work is enormous. Reference to ICT should specifically include the partnered rollout of broadband infrastructure, eg, that planning obligations will include an element for this purpose.</td>
<td>Agree. Reference will be included to the scant provision of broadband in rural areas, and the need to promote availability more widely in those areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26106</th>
<th>Full Name: Mrs J Shaw</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Reference should also be made to any subsequent replacement or amendment of the 2nd Local Transport Plan. It is possible that policies may change through the duration of the plan period.</td>
<td>Agree, include reference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary:
Reference should be made to the LTP and any subsequent plans produced to replace or amend it. As this document may change during the timeframe of the Core Strategy.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree.

Summary:
Policy reads as a hybrid of criteria and generic development control policy and lacks a local distinctiveness of the District.

Officers' Recommendation:
The strategic elements of the LTP will be included within the policy. The rural character of the district, and the travel needs and patterns of its residents will also be considered.
Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:  
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary:
Make reference to the second LTP and any subsequent plans produced to replace or amend this document.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree.

Con ID: 26229
Full Name: Mr Jacob Newby
Organisation: Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency  
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary:
If Objective 13 is expanded to include climate change as a broader subject, this option will contribute to meeting that objective. We also consider that this option contributes to Objective 14.

Officers' Recommendation:
Noted. Objectives 13 & 14 added.

Con ID: 26100
Full Name: Mr N Gough
Organisation: Bigwood Associates  
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary:
Support. Suggest reference be made in the supporting text to any appropriate, relevant policy/objectives. Copy should be in appendix for ease of reference.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted. Comments noted. Document states which spatial objectives are met by each Preferred Option. All the policies should be taken into consideration for any proposal.
Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells

Summary:
It should be made explicit that one or more sustainable urban extension to Grantham will be most likely to provide the scale and type of development to deliver sustainable integrated transport.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. Council will encourage the creation of a sustainable modern transport network across South Kesteven. Policy 4 considers the requirements of urban extension sites.

Con ID: 26045
Full Name: Mr Egerton Gilman
Organisation: Chairman, Environment & Traffic Working Group Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce

Summary:
Whilst the Option acknowledges that the Council shall ensure the 'objectives of the LTP2 are met', the Chamber believes the express commitments within the LTP2 document in relation to the Stamford By-Pass/Relief Road warrant specific mention and emphasis.

Officers' Recommendation:
Consideration will be given the inclusion of specific strategic elements of the LTP within the Core Strategy.
Con ID: 26289  
**Full Name:** Mrs P J Kirby  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 1645  
**Title:** SUSTAINABLE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO2  
**Nature Of Response** Support

**Summary:**  
Please ensure that sufficient plans are in place for cycle ways in towns - the most dangerous areas for cyclists.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Whilst the County Council are responsible for the provision of cycle paths on the public highway, the District Council can ensure that such routes are planned for as part of development. This is an important aspect in the planning of the urban extensions for Grantham, and, as such, should be referenced.

Con ID: 26379  
**Full Name:** Mr M Brebner  
**Organisation:** Clerk Tallington Parish Council  
**Comment ID:** 2320  
**Title:** SUSTAINABLE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO2  
**Nature Of Response** Support

**Summary:**  
Adequate parking in towns is important for the 'unavoidable' journeys by private cars from villages without transport links.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comment noted.

Con ID: 26271  
**Full Name:** Miss Ellie Smith  
**Organisation:** Assistant Planner  
DLP Planning Ltd  
**Comment ID:** 920  
**Title:** SUSTAINABLE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO2  
**Nature Of Response** Support

**Summary:**  
Support first and second bullet points

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Support noted.
Summary:
The policy should be focused on public transport provision to a much greater extent. The demography of the district indicates that, whilst initially many households are able to use their own vehicle, as the residents get older they must rely on public transport (if available) or remain isolated and become potentially a serious cost to the community at large.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. However, it should be stressed that the provision of public transport is not part of this Council’s remit. The Council’s can only support and/or encourage the creation of public transport schemes. Transport in Grantham forms part of the wider Grantham Growth Point work, and proposals for integrating transport are included. These comments will be forwarded to the Growth Point Team.

Summary:
Grantham By-pass is main priority.

Officers' Recommendation:
This issue is largely within the remit of the County Council as the highway authority. However, the Core Strategy/LDF can pick up such strategic issues, and this is one which should be considered.

Summary:
There is little that is integrated about public transport in Grantham - no bus service to and from the railway station for instance. What buses go near or to the Meres Centre?

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. However, it should be stressed that the provision of public transport is not part of this Council’s remit. The Council’s can only support and/or encourage the creation of public transport schemes. Transport in Grantham forms part of the wider Grantham Growth Point work, and proposals for integrating transport are included. These comments will be forwarded to the Growth Point Team.
Summary:
But would like to see more positive planning to encourage ICT to help more people work at home.

Officers' Recommendation:
Reference will be included to the scant provision of broadband in rural areas, and the need to promote availability more widely in those areas.

Comment ID: 1707  
Number: Preferred Option PO2  
Title: SUSTAINABLE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT  
Nature Of Response: Support

---

Summary:
we support a policy requiring travel plans and improving public transport within the SKDC area as these measures may help reduce car-borne commuting into Peterborough.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.

Comment ID: 2167  
Number: Preferred Option PO2  
Title: SUSTAINABLE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT  
Nature Of Response: Support

---

Summary:
Suggest an example be given within 2nd bullet point to fully demonstrate policy's compliance with government guidance. Suggest insertion of "(for example the provision of local service centre and convenience retail facilities within proximity to areas of new housing developments)."after 2nd bullet point.

Officers' Recommendation:
Disagree. No example included for any other bullet points.

Comment ID: 2180  
Number: Preferred Option PO2  
Title: SUSTAINABLE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT  
Nature Of Response: Support
Con ID: 26195
Full Name: Mr M Brebner
Organisation: Greatford Parish Council
Comment ID: 2306
Title: SUSTAINABLE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT
Number: Preferred Option PO2
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
Adequate parking in towns is important for the 'unavoidable' journeys by private cars from villages without transport links.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comment noted.

Con ID: 26210
Full Name: Dr R A Fuller
Organisation: Bourne Civic Society
Comment ID: 2332
Title: SUSTAINABLE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT
Number: Preferred Option PO2
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
A significant effort should be made to promote and develop more extensive bus facilities in the rural areas and in particular the Bourne area and surrounding villages.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. Agree with the need for this. However, the Core Strategy and Planning has a limited role in bus provision. This is a matter which can be addressed through the Sustainable Community Plan.

Con ID: 26334
Full Name: Town Clerk Market Dee
Organisation: Clerk Market Deeping Town Council
Comment ID: 2346
Title: SUSTAINABLE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT
Number: Preferred Option PO2
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
Public transport system should not focus solely within it's own county. Should be developed across adjoining counties.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. The development of cross-boundary transport schemes should be considered as part of the development of the Sustainable Community Plan.
Con ID: 26475  
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith  
Organisation: Assistant Planner  
Stamford Property Company  

Summary: We support the first and second bullet points of PO2 Sustainable Integrated Transport.  

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted.

Con ID: 26484  
Full Name: Trustees for the Belvoi  
Organisation: Smiths Gore  

Summary: We support the general aims of the policy.  

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted.

Con ID: 26203  
Full Name: Mr C Townson  
Organisation:  

Summary: If sustainable housing/affordable is to be developed outside of the main towns, public transport must seriously be enforced, not passive acceptance that the car is the only alternative.  

Officers' Recommendation: Provision of public transport is largely outside the remit of the District Council. In a largely rural district such as South Kesteven, with few public transport links between settlements, it is unrealistic not to acknowledge that the private car is the only means of transport for many residents. However, development should be promoted in locations which are already serviced by public transport, or where the provision of new routes is
Con ID: 26151  
**Full Name:** Mr Ivan Fuller  
**Organisation:** Bourne Town Centre Management Partnership  
**Summary:**  
Better bus provision between the towns should be aimed for? E.g., there is no connection between Bourne/The Deepings and Grantham

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments noted. Agree with the need for this. However, the Core Strategy and Planning has a limited role in bus provision. This is a matter which can be addressed through the Sustainable Community Plan.

---

Con ID: 26318  
**Full Name:** Mr Cyril Day  
**Organisation:** Highways Agency  
**Summary:**  
The preferred option is the only option put forward and is almost identical to the previous PO2, which we supported, especially the elements relating to Sustainable Transport, Promotion of Alternative Modes, Travel Plans and Encouraging Use of Information & Communication Technology. New reference is made to developments that are necessary in rural areas, with recognition that such developments "may only be accessible by the motor car. The previous reference to "minimising environmental impacts of new development through the requirement for mitigation measures" has been deleted. However, neither of these changes is considered to warrant a change in opinion on this policy by the Highways Agency – the creation of a sustainable, modern transport network is supported by the Highways Agency.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Support noted.
Summary:
The key principles of the Preferred Option are enshrined in current national and regional planning guidance on sustainability and integrated transport and are therefore supported. However, it is considered that priorities for transport should be identified in the Core Strategy, particularly for inward investment (new road infrastructure, priorities for sustainable transport investment, etc) as well as key corridors, location of transport interchanges etc. In this context it is not considered acceptable to exclude the consideration of these issues on the basis that they are within the remit of the County Council as to do so would contravene government guidance as set out in paragraph 2.10 of PPS12 which states inter alia that “The core strategy should set out the long term spatial vision for the authority’s area........It should seek to implement the spatial and transport policies of the regional spatial strategy.... (My emphasis).

Requested Approach
It is therefore requested that the Spatial Strategy stipulates the priorities for transport.

Officers' Recommendation:
There is scope for the Council to set out its long term objectives for transport, even if they are not in the LTP. However, we cannot identify lines on maps without a formal proposal, otherwise it will blight land. Consideration will be given to including key strategic transport schemes from the LTP within the Core Strategy.
conditions interchanges etc. In this context it is not considered acceptable to exclude the consideration of these issues on the basis that they are within the remit of the County Council as to do so would contravene government guidance as set out in paragraph 2.10 of PPS12 which states inter alia that “The core strategy should set out the long term spatial vision for the authority’s area........It should seek to implement the spatial and transport policies of the regional spatial strategy..... (My emphasis).

.Requested Approach: It is therefore requested that the Spatial Strategy stipulates the priorities for transport.

**Con ID:** 26470  
**Full Name:** Mr Roger Stafford  
**Organisation:** Manager  
Buckminster Estate  
**Comment ID:** 2031  
**Title:** SUSTAINABLE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO2  
**Nature Of Response**  Support with conditions  

**Summary:**  
My Client supports the only option presented i.e. P02 this is with the proviso that major relief roads such as the proposed Grantham Southern Bypass can be accommodated within the terms of the Preferred Option. This is on the basis that a relief road, as well as serving new development, is a vital component in the strategy of relieving town centre congestion which can facilitate improvement to sustainable means of transport i.e. bus, cycling and walking.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Support noted.
Summary:
This policy seems at odds with the Council's preferred suggested approach of placing 30% of new development in villages and rural areas, which are less accessible by public transport and therefore more reliant on the private car.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.

Summary:
Concentration of development in Bourne does not reduce the need for travel by car, 50% commute to work in Peterborough or London.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comment noted. Whilst planning development in sustainable locations provides people with transport choices, the Council cannot force people to live and work in the same place or to travel by public transport only.

Summary:
1.13 – Local Transport Plan (LTP) is now missing from the list of background research papers
3.2.7 – Reducing dependence on the private car also offers health benefits. What type of modern technology will reduce the need to travel? This needs to be clearer.

Officers' Recommendation:
LTP will be added to the list of background papers.
Summary:
Object to the high level of housing development proposed in rural areas, which require especially high levels of new provision in the "LSC & Large Villages", in Options PO3a, b and c, and which has not been justified in the context of the sequential approach and policies of urban concentration. The Adopted Structure Plan and Option PO3e concentrate 79.3% of provision in urban areas. In Option PO3a it is only 70% and 72.2% in Preferred Option PO3b. This is reflected in Objective 2 which sets a minimum of 70%. A more appropriate figure would be around 80%: this could then be reflected in Objective 4. Both Options PO3a and PO3b concentrate new provision entirely in Grantham and the large villages. Option PO3c would exacerbate current unsustainable patterns of development. It does illustrate that provision in large villages in the first two options is almost 1000 higher than if simply continuing current trends. Option PO3d might be the only acceptable Option in terms of rural growth, but it also redistributes growth from Grantham to Stamford and the Deepings, which would have negative effects on regeneration and growth in Peterborough, conservation in Stamford and in terms of flood risk in the Deepings. Whilst Option PO3e would obviously best match the Structure Plan spatial strategy, it would fall substantially short of the draft Regional Plan provision and is also contrary to Grantham's New Growth Point Status. We would welcome discussion of these issues between the County Council and SKDC in the context of the Regional Plan process. It is not our role to put forward precise sub-District figures, but as a starting point a suggested better split would

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council's objective is to concentrate 70% of growth in the urban areas, with the remaining 30% in the LSCs and Larger Villages. This should help to maintain their viability and sustainability. This amount of development is proposed in the Council's preferred option. The amount of development proposed by LCC for the LSCs and Larger Villages would not allow for any growth in those settlements. (2700 dwellings, divided between 22 settlements, over 20 years equates to 6 dwellings per year in each settlement.)
be: Grantham: between 6500 (Structure Plan %) and 7560 (SKDC Preferred Option) LSC & Large Villages; around 2700 (Option PO3d) Other Rural Villages: around 630 (SKDC Preferred Option) Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings: 4860 to 5920 (concentrated entirely in Stamford and the Deepings because of the amount of development already committed in Bourne).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26277</td>
<td>Jenny Young</td>
<td>Planning Archaeologist Heritage Trust for Lincolnshire</td>
<td>Residential development can have impact on archeological reamins.</td>
<td>Comments noted. Lincs Heritage is consulted when applications for development are made which may affect a Scheduled site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2301</td>
<td>Barbara Robinson</td>
<td>Clerk to the Parish Council Fulbeck Parish Council</td>
<td>Limited infil development should be permitted in villages which do not have LSC status. The few sites available would not result in the over-provision of homes and will negate the impression that they are being allowed to &quot;die&quot;.</td>
<td>The Council's preferred option envisages some development in other rural locations. This may include some infil development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary:**

It is clear that part of the RSS requirement for the District is in the form of sites that already have housing consent but it is not clear what the status is of those which have been added in as a result of the 'Urban Capacity Study'. If this study carries no statutory weight then these additional sites should be separated out in the Core Strategy and not given the same weight as those which already have planning consent or a development plan allocation. (This point is less important than those which follow).

**Officers' Recommendation:**

Agree. Remove Urban Capacity sites from calculations.

---

**Summary:**

Concerned with small-scale well designed domestic housing in the villages of this area. Doubling size of Irnham saved village, added over 20 houses to SKDC housing stock. Another 10 could be built without causing the slightest damage.

**Officers' Recommendation:**

Comments noted. Irnham is not among the villages identified as a Local Service Centre or Larger Village. It is not envisaged that large amounts of development will take place in this location.

---

**Summary:**

We object to paragraph 3.3.1. Whilst the Lincolnshire Structure plan 2006 is clearly a part of the extant development plan, the professed intent of the Council to align the emerging Core strategy/LDF with RSS8 suggests that this should be the basis on which the level of residential development planned for in the Core Strategy should be derived. This in fact is what is then proposed in PO3b. Little purpose therefore seems to be served by the reference to the Structure Plan housing provision.

**Officers' Recommendation:**

Until such time as the RSS is adopted, the Lincolnshire Structure Plan housing requirements are those to which the District Council must adhere.
Summary:
Identifying the housing requirements of the Lincolnshire Structure Plan as a minimum does not reflect the plan period nor the requirements of the emerging RSS8 for 15,750 (630 dwellings pa). To do this even to 2021 would require an annual build rate of only 460 dwellings per annum, severely affecting the ability to deliver housing growth and then requiring a large increase in growth during the final part of the plan period. Such an approach would be contrary to the emphasis on the early delivery of new homes in the designated New Growth Points, such as Grantham. PPS3 paragraph 53 suggests that local planning authorities should have regard to the level of housing provision proposed in the relevant emerging spatial strategy and the Councils preferred option, PO3b, overall growth allocation of 15,750 is supported, though the district wide distribution is disputed.

Officers' Recommendation:
This Council will ensure that the housing requirements set out in the RSS are met. It is anticipated that the final version of the RSS will be available in September 2008.
paragraph 53 suggests that local planning authorities should have regard to the level of housing provision proposed in the relevant emerging spatial strategy and the Councils preferred option, PO3b, overall growth allocation of 15,750 is supported, though the district wide distribution is disputed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26271</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Miss Ellie Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Assistant Planner DLP Planning Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
Little purpose therefore seems to be served by the reference to the Structure Plan housing provision.

Officers' Recommendation:
Until such time as the RSS is adopted, the Lincolnshire Structure Plan housing requirements are those to which the District Council must adhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26560</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>J &amp; T Orrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>C/o Brown &amp; Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:
Core Strategy should not be prepared in advance of the RSS being adopted.

Officers' Recommendation:
The timetable for the Core Strategy is being amended to allow time to consider the panel report and consultation into changes arising. Final RSS is not however expected until September 2008 and it is considered unfeasible to postpone the production of the Submission version of the Core Strategy until this time.
Summary: Core Strategy should not be prepared in advance of the RSS being adopted.

Officers' Recommendation: The timetable for the Core Strategy is being amended to allow time to consider the panel report and consultation into changes arising. Final RSS is not however expected until September 2008 and it is considered unfeasible to postpone the production of the Submission version of the Core Strategy until this time.
**Con ID:** 26106
**Full Name:** Mrs J Shaw
**Organisation:**
**Comment ID:** 2530
**Title:** paragraph
**Number:** 3.3.1
**Nature Of Response** Observations

**Summary:**
Core Strategy should not be prepared in advance of the RSS being adopted.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The timetable for the Core Strategy is being amended to allow time to consider the panel report and consultation into changes arising. Final RSS is not however expected until September 2008 and it is considered unfeasible to postpone the production of the Submission version of the Core Strategy until this time.

---

**Con ID:** 26475
**Full Name:** Miss Ellie Smith
**Organisation:** Assistant Planner
Stamford Property Company
**Comment ID:** 2091
**Title:** paragraph
**Number:** 3.3.3
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**
We also object to paragraph 3.3.3. The Council has acknowledged in its own responses to the Submission Draft of RSS8 that circumstances have changed since RSS8 was drafted, in particular the publication of 2003 trend based population projections. We have made representations to RSS8 addressing this particular issue and demonstrating that an annual completion rate of 740 dwellings in South Kesteven would be appropriate, notwithstanding Grantham's designation as a 'New Growth Point'.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Panel Report has now been published. The conclusions of the Panel are that, despite higher household trend, the housing requirement for the Peterborough HMA, within which South Kesteven sits, have been reduced. No district wide split of the HMA figure has been provided. However, we do not anticipate a figure higher than 630 pa.

---

**Con ID:** 26271
**Full Name:** Miss Ellie Smith
**Organisation:** Assistant Planner
DLP Planning Ltd
**Comment ID:** 922
**Title:** paragraph
**Number:** 3.3.3
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**
Object. Things have moved on since Draft RSS published can now demonstrate an annual completion rate of 740 dwellings in South Kesteven would be more appropriate, notwithstanding Grantham’s designation as a New Growth Point.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
noted
Summary:
Growth point partnership states it is necessary for SKDC to, "deliver increased levels of sustainable growth over the next decade".

Officer's Recommendation:
Noted.

Summary:
Concerns about the accuracy of para. 3.3.3. (2nd sentence)* New Growth Point status is provisional (as stated in the next sentence)* It could be taken to imply that the Regional Plan has allocated 20% more housing to Grantham: in fact it is this Core Strategy that sets the level of provision, on a basis which we feel misinterprets the 20%.* New Growth Points are not just to meet local needs. It is suggested that if this sentence is deleted the remaining text on New Growth Points then reads correctly.

Officer's Recommendation:
Agree. Delete "in order to address local needs".

Summary:
Separate identification of specific regional growth allocation for New Growth Point required.

Officer's Recommendation:
Growth Point allocation of "additional ... 20%" identified in previous paragraph (3.3.3).
Con ID: 26271
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
DLP Planning Ltd

Summary: Object to the way the residual requirement is calculated.

Officers' Recommendation: Calculation is outlined in the Five Year Land Supply background paper.

Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells

Summary: Unrealistic to assume that all consented sites will deliver dwellings, particularly in relation to new shorter consent periods. Also the 1800 urban capacity sites figure must be revised as it is now out of date. Should be tested under the new Housing Land Availability Assessments (PPS3). This process is should be completed before the submission version Core Strategy.

Officers' Recommendation: A SHLAA is currently being undertaken and will provide background evidence for the Housing figures.

Con ID: 26475
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
Stamford Property Company

Summary: Object to the way the residual requirement is calculated.

Officers' Recommendation: Calculation is outlined in the Five Year Land Supply background paper.
Con ID: 26107
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 2516
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.5
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary: We support the view that the option includes too higher requirement for Stamford.

Officers' Recommendation: noted.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 2518
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.5
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary: The figure does not allow for additional 20% for Grantham Growth. Is no guarantee that the Urban Capacity sites will all be delivered.

Officers' Recommendation: Will ensure consistency of figures. It should be noted that the figures included in the submission draft will be up-to-date.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 2491
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.5
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary: Support this view about Stamford.

Officers' Recommendation: Noted
Con ID: 26303  
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings  
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer  
Planning&Conservation on Lincolnshire County Council  
Comment ID: 1867  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.3.5  
Nature Of Response: Observations  

Summary:  
Regarding the supply figures in para 3.3.5 the Dec. 2005 Urban Capacity Study figure submitted in tables for the Regional EiP is 1440, which is based on the 1800 total assuming 80% deliverability. On the other hand the Regional EiP supply figures include a windfall allowance of 1020 (51 p.a 2006-2026). This key part of the evidence base needs to be consistent between the LDF and the Regional Plan.  

Officers' Recommendation:  
Agree. Will ensure consistency of figures. It should be noted that the figures included in the submission draft will be up-to-date.

Con ID: 26106  
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 2533  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.3.5  
Nature Of Response: Observations  

Summary:  
Support the view that the option includes too higher requirement for Stamford.  

Officers' Recommendation:  
Comments noted.

Con ID: 26300  
Full Name: Messrs E A Sheardown  
Organisation: Sheardown & Co. Ltd  
Comment ID: 2555  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.3.5  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary:  
Some sites identified in the Urban Capacity Study will not be delivered within the Plan period; how the overall numbers are arrived at needs to be flexible to ensure delivery of the housing target up to 2026. The Council's Annual Monitoring Report will prove essential in achieving this.  

Officers' Recommendation:  
Comments noted. The Council will regularly monitor development rates across the district. The monitoring results will be published each December through the AMR, which contains housing trajectories to ensure a five and ten year housing land supply is available.
Con ID: 26560
Full Name: J & T Orrey
Organisation: C/o Brown & Co

Summary:
We support the view that the option includes too higher requirement for Stamford.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.

Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, McCallion
Organisation:

Summary:
Agree that this option is too high for Stamford.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.

Con ID: 26271
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
DLP Planning Ltd

Summary:
the possibility of a greenfield urban extension in Stamford should be explicitly acknowledged.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council has no proposed Urban Extension for Stamford. Specific development sites will be considered in the Site Allocations DPD. In the context of Grantham, the Urban Extensions are strategic allocations, essential to the delivery of the Growth Point initiative and, therefore, essential to the spatial strategy.
**Summary:**
We also object to paragraph 3.3.6 in the light of the above critique of the housing land position, the prospect of a greenfield urban extension at Stamford, albeit on a smaller scale than at Grantham, should be explicitly acknowledged.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The Council has no proposed Urban Extension for Stamford. Specific development sites will be considered in the Site Allocations DPD. In the context of Grantham, the Urban Extensions are strategic allocations, essential to the delivery of the Growth Point initiative and, therefore, essential to the spatial strategy.

---

**Summary:**
It needs to be made clear that Grantham already has significant traffic congestion problems in the peak and that simply locating development in areas where there is existing services and facilities is insufficient. Walking, cycling and passenger transport will need to be significantly improved to be an attractive and reliable alternative to the private car.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
A travel impact assessment will be required for all large development proposals.

---

**Summary:**
The Core Strategy will need to be amended taking into consideration the outcome of a Housing Land Availability Assessment and then the Site Allocations DPD will need to identify specific sites to comply with the PPS3 requirements.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comment noted a SHLAA is currently being undertaken to address this.
Summary:
As indicated before, this is inappropriate and will not satisfy government requirements to accommodate growth for the RSS and growth point status of Grantham.

Officers' Recommendation:
comments noted.

Con ID: 26560
Full Name: J & T Orrey
Organisation: C/o Brown & Co
Comment ID: 2461
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.7
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
As indicated before, this is inappropriate and will not satisfy government requirements to accommodate growth for the RSS and growth point status of Grantham.

Officers' Recommendation:
comment noted

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 2493
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.7
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
As indicated before, this is inappropriate and will not satisfy government requirements to accommodate growth for the RSS and growth point status of Grantham.

Officers' Recommendation:
comments noted.

Con ID: 26107
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 2519
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.7
Nature Of Response Observations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26271</th>
<th><strong>Summary:</strong></th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith</td>
<td>The implicit assertion that it is more sustainable to develop brownfield sites in preference to greenfield sites does not bear scrutiny.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation: Assistant Planner DLP Planning Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: 925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number: 3.3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response Object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26475</th>
<th><strong>Summary:</strong></th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith</td>
<td>We object to paragraph 3.3.8, the implicit assertion that it is more sustainable to develop brownfield sites in preference to greenfield sites does not bear scrutiny. There is a failure to appreciate the realities of the housing market in terms of supply and demand. A supply of housing to meet needs will inevitably be constrained if such restrictions are imposed, e.g. the often unique costs associated with remediation of brownfield sites may well hamper the ability to provide much needed affordable housing. The submission draft must acknowledge that greenfield site release alongside the development of brownfield sites will prove necessary to maximise the widest supply of house type and tenure, as well as optimum delivery rates.</td>
<td>The preference for development on urban brownfield land before greenfield land does not, in fact, preclude development on greenfield land if no suitable brownfield land is available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation: Assistant Planner Stamford Property Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: 2094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title: paragraph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number: 3.3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response Object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary:
It may be appropriate to mention that developments may be in locations that will be serviced by new as well as existing services and facilities. An integrated development plan for the larger schemes will be appropriate.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree, make reference within this paragraph.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 2489
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.8
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary:
It may be appropriate to mention that developments may be in locations that will be serviced by new as well as existing services and facilities.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree, include reference in text.

Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, MCcallion
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 2473
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.8
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary:
Suggest site to rear of 45, 51 and 53 Barrowby Road, Grantham for allocation.

Officers' Recommendation:
Requests for sites to be considered for inclusion in the Site Specific Allocations DPD will be taken at a later date.

Con ID: 26278
Full Name: Mr David Balfe
Organisation: Managing Director T Balfe Construction Ltd
Comment ID: 994
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.8
Nature Of Response  Observations
Con ID: 26106
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2531
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.8
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary:
It may be appropriate to mention that developments may be in locations that will be serviced by new as well as existing services and facilities. An integrated development plan for the larger schemes will be appropriate.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree, make such reference in text.

Con ID: 26107
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2513
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.8
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary:
It may be appropriate to mention that developments may be in locations that will be serviced by new as well as existing services and facilities. An integrated development plan for the larger schemes will be appropriate.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree, make reference within this paragraph.

Con ID: 26560
Full Name: J & T Orrey
Organisation: C/o Brown & Co
Comment ID: 2457
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.8
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary:
It may be appropriate to mention that developments may be in locations that will be serviced by new as well as existing services and facilities. An integrated development plan for the larger schemes will be appropriate.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Make reference within this paragraph.
**Summary:**
The over-reliance on Grantham is not sound, the strategy should support development at Stamford as well.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Locating the majority of development in Grantham does not preclude locating some development elsewhere, including Stamford.

---

**Summary:**
All PO3 options are premature and inappropriate as based upon RSS allocations which have yet to be confirmed.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The timetable for the Core Strategy is being amended to allow time to consider the panel report and consultation into changes arising. Final RSS is not however expected until September 2008 and it is considered unfeasible to postpone the production of the Core Strategy until this time.

---

**Summary:**
Alternative options for PO3a, PO3b, PO3c PO3d and PO3e are premature and inappropriate at this stage. They are based on expected RSS allocations which have yet to be confirmed.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The timetable for the Core Strategy is being amended to allow time to consider the panel report and consultation into changes arising. Final RSS is not however expected until September 2008 and it is considered unfeasible to postpone the production of the Submission version of the Core Strategy until this time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26106</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Mrs J Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>3.3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
Alternative options PO3a - are premature and inappropriate as based on expected RSS allocation which have yet to be confirmed and may yet be increased. Option PO3b is in line with expectations, but the total number and split cannot be finalised. Welcome a fair proportion of housing in the LSC and larger villages, such as Billingborough.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The timetable for the Core Strategy is being amended to allow time to consider the panel report and consultation into changes arising. Final RSS is not however expected until September 2008 and it is considered unfeasible to postpone the production of the Submission version of the Core Strategy until this time. Option PO3b is also the Council's preferred option, however the figures for the settlements may need to be reconsidered in light of possible RSS changes.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26203</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Mr C Townson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Alternative Option PO3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
We prefer PO3d. Growth in LSCs is sensible with flexibility for other smaller villages to grow to meet their needs. Development in LSCs should only be agreed when the infrastructure can support further development.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comments noted.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26151</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Mr Ivan Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Bourne Town Centre Management Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Alternative Option PO3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
We are in favour of alternative option PO3c as plans for new retail/residential/public realm to complement existing town centre will need further residential support to attract premium retailers.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comments noted.
**Con ID:** 26101  
**Full Name:** Mr J Parmiter  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 987  
**Title:** RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
**Number:** Alternative Option PO3a  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:** A greater proportion of growth should be directed to Stamford.

**Officers' Recommendation:** Disagree. Road and boundary constraints are such that it is not considered feasible to allocate land for large developments in Stamford.

---

**Con ID:** 26218  
**Full Name:** Mr P Lely  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 2539  
**Title:** RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
**Number:** Alternative Option PO3a  
**Nature Of Response** Observations

**Summary:** Option does not cater for the additional RSS allocation to reflect Grantham's growth point status.

**Officers' Recommendation:** PO3b, the Preferred Option, includes allowance for Growth Point.

---

**Con ID:** 26261  
**Full Name:** Mr Tudor Townsend  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 894  
**Title:** RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
**Number:** Alternative Option PO3a  
**Nature Of Response** Support

**Summary:** We support the distribution of residential development based on the current RSS housing figures. We specifically support the level of provision for Local Service Centres and Large Villages.

**Officers' Recommendation:** Support noted.
Summary: which concentrates growth in Grantham and at the same time help to reduce commuting to Peterborough (para 3.3.13) would be our preferred option. But as this option was formulated before Grantham was granted the growth point status, we consider that option 3b would be acceptable, as below.

Officers’ Recommendation: Option 3b is this Council’s preferred option.

Con ID: 26132
Full Name: Planning Policy Peterbo
Organisation: Peterborough City Council
Comment ID: 2168
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Alternative Option PO3a
Nature Of Response Support

Con ID: 26292
Full Name: Councillor T Holmes
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 1684
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Alternative Option PO3a
Nature Of Response Support

Summary: There is a need to match housing density and height to the area in which it is to be placed. Very little of South Kesteven, with the possible exception of Grantham and the parts of Stamford where it is in keeping, should be subjected to high density, high rise developments which are out of character with the townscape in general. New development must be strictly confined to Grantham if it is to justify already placed infrastructure improvements.

Officers’ Recommendation: Comments noted. Development must be related, both in scale and appearance, to the area in which it is located. Developments should be assessed against the criteria in Preferred Policy Option 10.

Con ID: 26190
Full Name: Julie Banks
Organisation: Clerk to the Trustees Deeping St James United Charities
Comment ID: 1747
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Summary: Some sites identified in the Urban Capacity Study may be less suitable than some greenfield sites. There is an urgent need for more affordable housing

Officers’ Recommendation: Noted.
**Nature Of Response** Support with conditions

**Con ID:** 26101  
**Full Name:** Mr J Parmiter  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 988  
**Title:** paragraph  
**Number:** 3.3.12  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**
To direct a disproportionate amount of growth to Grantham may harm the roles of the other main towns, especially Stamford.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Grantham will be allocated most growth to reflect its sub-regional and New Growth Point status. There is no intention to develop Grantham at the expense of development in Stamford.

**Con ID:** 26160  
**Full Name:** Cecil  
**Organisation:** c/o Strutt and Parker  
**Comment ID:** 1943  
**Title:** paragraph  
**Number:** 3.3.13  
**Nature Of Response** Observations

**Summary:**
The second sentence is inaccurate. There is land on the western side of Stamford, which does not suffer from boundary or road constraints and is able to absorb large residential development.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comment noted. However, it is considered that a large residential development in Stamford could have a negative impact on the historic nature of the town and its setting within the landscape.
Con ID: 26095  
**Full Name:** Barbara Robinson  
**Organisation:** Clerk to the Parish Council Fulbeck Parish Council  
**Comment ID:** 2302  
**Title:** paragraph  
**Number:** 3.3.14  
**Nature Of Response** Observations  

**Summary:**  
Justification for the Council’s preferred option, paragraph 3.3.14 says that if growth is not allowed in Local Service Centre villages they will cease to be viable. This must be true of other villages equally or even more so.

**Officers’ Recommendation:**  
Comments noted.

---

Con ID: 26276  
**Full Name:** Mr Clive Henderson  
**Organisation:** Chairman Long Bennington Parish Council  
**Comment ID:** 962  
**Title:** paragraph  
**Number:** 3.3.16  
**Nature Of Response** Observations  

**Summary:**  
Percentage breakdown needed on exact numbers for LSCs. Also need a date from when the figures are applicable.

**Officers’ Recommendation:**  
Background paper containing the data is available on the SKDC website.

---

Con ID: 26279  
**Full Name:** Mr Richard Edwards  
**Organisation:** Director of Planning Larkfleet Group  
**Comment ID:** 974  
**Title:** RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO3b  
**Nature Of Response** Object  

**Summary:**  
Preferred option does not allow for additional growth in any of the 3 southern towns which is contrary to the bold text of the policy. We consider that a more equitable spread of growth across the four urban area of the district should be considered to help to ensure that the long term viability and vitality of the towns is maintained and enhanced. In particular both Bourne and the Deepings are capable of accommodating significant additional.
development without detrimentally affecting the character, nature or sustainability of the settlements.

**Summary:**
Option PO3b should be rejected, it will exacerbate the current affordable housing and local needs housing issues within the Stamford, Bourne, and The Deepings. Option PO3d (with alterations) is preferred as a more balanced approach to the distribution of housing across the region between the four urban centres.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comments noted. The amended Option 3d however, is not considered to reflect current local circumstances and needs. The other villages need some housing to meet identified local need.

**Con ID:** 26160  
**Full Name:** Cecil  
**Organisation:** c/o Strutt and Parker  
**Comment ID:** 1944  
**Title:** RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO3b  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Con ID:** 26289  
**Full Name:** Mrs P J Kirby  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 1646  
**Title:** RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO3b  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**
All options meet Spatial objections 1,2,3,4,5& 7. The Lincolnshire Structure plan should not be ignored.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The Council as a minimum will ensure that the district meets the current housing requirements set out in the Structure Plan. However the SP will soon be replaced by a new Regional Plan and it is necessary for the Core Strategy to be in conformity with the Regional Plan when approved.
Con ID: 26298
Full Name: Mr J.J.S. Brown
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 1800
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO3b
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
None of them however PO3a is the best. Again, regarding the local service centre, I believe more development should be allowed. At present levels 10,000 affordable homes are required each year to meet existing rural needs on a national level. Villages should be able to expand outside the village curtilage.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. The Preferred Option includes an amount of housing in the larger villages in order to help maintain their viability.

Con ID: 26301
Full Name: Wilson
Organisation: David Wilson Homes North Midland
Comment ID: 2408
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO3b
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
Figures are difficult to comprehend because of a lack of supporting justification for the figures incorporated within the document. Fundamentally, the figures set out in the document differ markedly from the figures contained within the documentation presented to the Council’s Cabinet in December 2006. Alternative options do not present a valid range of alternatives to test growth scenarios. The PO makes allowance for 20% additional growth for Grantham. This actually represents the minimum amount of additional growth to quality as a Growth Point. A higher rate of Growth (ie 30%) could be justified. Whilst the high level of growth for LSCs and larger villages is a less sustainable approach for which there is no planning or sustainability justification. The level of provision within urban areas should be significantly increased, and the village provision proportionally decreased and the additional growth for Grantham should be increased to 30%.

Officers' Recommendation:
Background papers available on the Council’s website.
**Summary:**
Housing allocations do not reflect the Council’s sustainability objectives or prevailing planning policy, particularly as significant amount of housing is identified for rural villages.

**Officers’ Recommendation:**
Development in rural villages is to meet identified local need and to help maintain viability. Most of the villages identified as Local Service Centres and Larger Villages have public transport connections.

---

**Summary:**
Object

**Officers’ Recommendation:**
noted.

---

**Summary:**
Neither the Preferred Option nor any of the Alternative Options strike the right balance for the distribution of development across the district during the Plan period for the following reasons: • Grantham should be the focus of development to consolidate its role as a Sub Regional Centre and so its ability to operate as a New Growth Point is not restricted. • A large proportion of housing numbers have been allocated to urban capacity sites, in particular

**Officers’ Recommendation:**
The policy will need to be revised in the light of the Panel Report into the RSS. However, it is considered that sufficient housing should be allocated to the LSCs and Larger Villages to maintain their vitality and viability. It is considered that the Preferred Option, by allocating app 25% of residential development within those 22 settlements, goes some way to ensuring this aim.
brownfield sites. The ability to deliver these, particularly early within the plan timescale, is questionable. There will be a requirement to prove sites are deliverable and that the requisite land supply can be achieved; a scenario which it is considered the Council will have difficulty in achieving without the early release of greenfield land alongside the delivery of brownfield sites, both in Grantham and the other sustainable urban areas.

**Requested Approach**

The residual housing requirement be re-examined so that policy for Residential Development provides for the total amount of housing stipulated in the approved version of the RSS for the District as a whole, with the greatest proportion allocated to Grantham, lesser amounts to the secondary towns and only minimal amounts, enabling local needs to be met, in the Local Service Centres and larger villages. It is proposed that the Preferred Option should be amended as follows:

- **District Total (RSS 15,730 - residual 5,347)**
- **Grantham (RSS 6,600 - residual 3,143)**
- **Stamford (RSS 2,000 - residual 736)**
- **Bourne (RSS 3,500 - residual 557)**
- **Deepings (RSS 1,000 - residual 503)**
- **LSC + LV (RSS 2,000 - residual 366)**
- **Other Rural Villages (RSS 650 - residual 48)**

In considering how this requirement should be met, the Council is advised that there is probably greater capacity at Elsea Park than previously assumed. An uplift in the density of some of the later phases would make more efficient use of this committed site. Elsewhere, it is considered that there is considerable scope for a mixed use urban extension at The Deepings as described in the representations which were submitted to the Housing and Economic DPD in August 2006.
Summary:
The proposed 'distribution' of development does not reflect the relative status of the settlements as portrayed in the emerging RSS8. It is our view that Stamford's role as envisaged in the emerging RSS8 must be reflected in the distribution of development. Whilst the need for housing development in rural settlements is acknowledged, it is clear in PPS3 that no allowance can be placed on windfall development except where the LPA is unable to identify sites for development. Unless the LPA can identify sites in the LSCs, large village and other rural settlements to reflect the housing distribution in PO3b, then it must identify land for development at the principal urban areas. There are commitments for some 900 units in Stamford. PO3b implies there is to be no further allocation of land at the town through the LDF process. This equates to 45 units pa (av) for the remainder of the plan period: average completion rates over the period 31/03/01-30/09/05 = 73 units pa. Despite its status in the emerging RSS, which is a clear reflection of the role played by the Town and such matters an acknowledged and substantive requirement for affordable housing, the strategy promulgated through PO3b will simply serve to further constraint housing supply. There is capacity at Stamford for additional housing, beyond that proposed by the Council, as a small scale urban extension to the east of the town. This is well connected by public transport with no overriding environmental or technical constraints to preclude this as an area for search. It may provide an opportunity to secure in part an eastern relief road for the Town. This should be reflected in the submission draft of the CS through an appropriate apportionment of development at Stamford to at least meet a

Officers' Recommendation:
Although the RSS differentiates between Stamford and Bourne, as "Main Towns" and Deepings, as a "Small Town", for practical purposes within SKDC there is nothing to be served by having an extra tier, consisting of one settlement.
level of housing completions as has been experienced in the recent past; and an acknowledgement that a small scale greenfield urban extension to the east of the town is considered necessary to properly reflect the Town's role and identified needs, e.g. affordable housing. This would entail an additional level of provision at Stamford of at least 1500 dwellings, which would serve to place the town on a par with Bourne. This would seem appropriate given the roles expected of these settlements in the emerging RSS8 and will enable some inroads to be made with regard to such matters as affordable housing.

Con ID: 26272
Full Name: W McCallin
Organisation: Clerk Westborough and Dry Doddington Parish council

Summary: This approach will result in mothballing of small villages

Officers' Recommendation: noted.

Comment ID: 952
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO3b
Nature Of Response Object
Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer Planning & Conservation on Lincolnshire County Council

Summary:
The key issue is that we object to Preferred Option PO3b (and Para. 3.3.17), and none of the Alternative Options would fully address our concerns, for reasons set out below. The Preferred Option reflects your Draft Regional Plan EiP submissions in which you argue for a small increase in the overall housing provision to 680 p.a. in order to increase housing provision in Grantham by 20% compared to Option PO3a. New Growth Point criteria, however, do not require a 20% increase above any current policy proposal, either in the Regional Plan or this LDF but against the policy context in 2003. The Grantham bid was justified on the basis of a 20% increase on the Structure Plan provision in Draft Regional Plan Policy 14, at District level in the absence of a Grantham figure (630 p.a. is a 37% increase). Now that Grantham figures are being proposed through the LDF, comparing Option PO3a for Grantham (252 p.a.) with the Adopted Structure plan (190 p.a.) already gives a 33% increase, more than enough for Growth Point status. We have no objection in principle to even higher growth in Grantham, but this does not require an increase in the District total. Grantham already has 41.3% of that in the Adopted Structure Plan and Option PO3a is a slight reduction on this to 40%. The Preferred Option total for Grantham would be 48% of an unchanged District figure. Incidentally in none of the Options does Grantham provide the majority of development as stated in paras, 3.3.9, 3.3.6 and elsewhere, nor is such a requirement in RSS or the Structure Plan.

Officers’ Recommendation:
As the RSS will replace the Structure Plan on its adoption, and the Core Strategy is expected to be adopted after the RSS, it is necessary that the housing provision is in conformity with the RSS rather than the Structure Plan. The housing figures have been prepared on the basis of likely RSS allocation, and the distribution is in line with the hierarchy suggested in that document.
Con ID: 26045
Full Name: Mr Egerton Gilman
Organisation: Chairman, Environment & Traffic Working Group Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce

Summary:
Grantham's planning driven expansion to fulfil its Sub-Regional Centre role will be to the detriment of the natural development of Stamford. Degree of promotion and strengthening role of Grantham is excessive and unreasonable. Expansion of Grantham into open countryside does not comply with sequential or sustainability criteria, which is unacceptable.

Officers' Recommendation:
Grantham will be allocated most growth to reflect its sub-regional and New Growth Point status. There is no intention to develop Grantham at the expense of development in Stamford.

Con ID: 26285
Full Name: Mr L J Blunt
Organisation:

Summary:
Further development only after road/and by-pass have been built.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comment noted. All new development proposals should show how the impact of travelling to and from has been considered, and should demonstrate that measures have been made to minimise that impact.
Mrs C Curtis  
Organisation: Friends of Bourne Wood  
Summary: Housing in Bourne should be restricted, too many people living in Elsea Park commute to Peterborough and London. House prices are unaffordable for young people.  
Officers' Recommendation: It is considered that Option 3b concurs with the comments.

Mr D Bainbridge  
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells  
Summary: Grantham allocation of 6300 dwellings is inadequate. There is no justification for this figure and therefore it is considered not to be sufficiently robust. Object to the residual balance for Grantham which is likely to be higher if consented sites and urban capacity sites are discounted. LSC figure is exceptionally high and cannot be justified.  
Officers' Recommendation: Disagree. The 'Residential development background paper' justifies the housing figures. The figures were divided to reflect the needs and capacity of each settlement. In order to support and strengthen the role of Grantham as a sub-regional centre, as required by the RSS, all options locate the majority of development in Grantham. The LSCs figure is 30% of the RSS to maintain their vitality and sustainability. This level of development will also contribute to the provision of affordable local need housing, a key issue as identified in the Councils Housing Needs Survey.

Mr J Parmiter  
Organisation:  
Summary: Too little growth is directed towards Stamford.  
Officers' Recommendation: Boundary and road constraints are such that it is not feasible to allocate land for large developments. Development could have a negative impact on the historic nature of the town and its setting within the landscape.
Con ID: 26100
Full Name: Mr N Gough
Organisation: Bigwood Associates
Comment ID: 1740
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO3b
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
Excluding development in Stamford, Bourne and Deepings and allowing development in LSCs and larger villages is not sustainable. Suggest that development should be concentrated on towns and village development only to support and not expand settlements.

Officers' Recommendation:
Objection noted.

Con ID: 26557
Full Name: Acrabuild Ltd
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2428
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO3b
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
Residential development proposals in the Core Strategy document are difficult to comprehend because of a lack of supporting justification for the figures incorporated. Fundamentally, the figures set out in the document differ markedly from the figures contained within the documentation presented to the Council's Cabinet in December 2006. The range of alternative options do not give a valid range of options and do not test a range of growth scenarios. The figures for the LSCs and larger villages are not disaggregated between the two settlement categories. It is considered that the primary focus of new development outside the urban areas should be within the identified LSCs, including Rippingale. A realistic split of 80% / 20% in favour of Local Service Centres is suggested.

Officers' Recommendation:
Background papers available on the Council's website.
Summary:
Would prefer an approach that is consistent with Draft RSS8. Do not support the preferred option PO3b as it proposes 1260 more dwellings in South Kesteven than provided for in the Draft East Midlands Regional Plan (RSS8). This could be a concern for Rutland if the housing provision for the rest of the Housing Market Area were to be reduced to compensate for over-provision in South Kesteven.

Officers' Recommendation:
The policy will need to be revised in the light of the Panel Report into the RSS. The extra housing proposed for Grantham is as a result of its New Growth Point status.

Summary:
The housing growth figure for Grantham in PO3b, requires an A52 bypass. The strategy document should state that the housing growth figures would only be acceptable if funding for a by-pass is provided.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comment noted.

Summary:
Agree with distribution of development and spread across the towns. However, as PO1a largely excludes residential development outside the four towns, LSCs and larger villages, no residential development should be distributed in the "Other Rural Villages". There appears to be no hierarchy of these "Other Rural Villages". This approach could result in unsustainable villages being allocated residential development. Suggest removing the 'Other Rural Villages'
category, and distributing those housing figures amongst other categories.

Summary: Residential development proposals are difficult to comprehend because of a lack of supporting justification for the figures included. Fundamentally, the figures set out differ markedly from the figures contained within the documentation presented to the Council's Cabinet in December 2006. Alternative Option presented for consideration do not represent a valid range of alternative options that test a range of growth scenarios. They are presented as mathematical interpretations of the housing requirement, rather than articulating a cogent strategy for the distribution of development to meet the Objectives of the Plan. The option for LSC and larger villages should be disaggregated and to apply a higher proportion to the larger villages to enhance their sustainability. In particular Tallington, where there is a clear justification to enhance local infrastructure, may warrant a specific approach.

Officers' Recommendation: The policy will need to be revised in the light of the Panel Report into the RSS.

Comment ID: 2414
Full Name: Mr M Thurlby
Organisation:

Con ID: 26523
Full Name: Messers Bealby
Organisation:

Summary: Figures are difficult to comprehend because of a lack of supporting justification for the figures incorporated within the document. Fundamentally, the figures set out in the document differ markedly from the figures contained within the documentation presented to the Council's Cabinet in December 2006. Alternative options do not present a valid range of alternatives to test growth scenarios. The PO makes allowance for 20% additional growth for

Officers' Recommendation: The policy will need to be revised in the light of the Panel Report into the RSS.
Grantham. This actually represents the minimum amount of additional growth to qualify as a Growth Point. A higher rate of Growth (ie 30%) could be justified. Whilst the high level of growth for LSCs and larger villages is a less sustainable approach for which there is no planning or sustainability justification. The level of provision within urban areas should be significantly increased, and the village provision proportionally decreased and the additional growth for Grantham should be increased to 30%.

Summary:
Figures are difficult to comprehend because of a lack of supporting justification for the figures incorporated within the document. Fundamentally, the figures set out in the document differ markedly from the figures contained within the documentation presented to the Council’s Cabinet in December 2006. Alternative options do not present a valid range of alternatives to test growth scenarios. The PO makes allowance for 20% additional growth for Grantham. This actually represents the minimum amount of additional growth to qualify as a Growth Point. A higher rate of Growth (ie 30%) could be justified. Whilst the high level of growth for LSCs and larger villages is a less sustainable approach for which there is no planning or sustainability justification. The level of provision within urban areas should be significantly increased, and the village provision proportionally decreased and the additional growth for Grantham should be increased to 30%.

Officers’ Recommendation:
Background papers available on the Council’s website.
Summary:
The preferred option for housing supply is unclear and inadequate. The provision is insufficient to provide for both need and demand within the District. The additional amount for New Growth also falls short of the requirement to meet need and demand. In terms of distribution, the HBF consider that housing should be provided in both urban and rural areas.

Officers' Recommendation:
The policy will need to be revised in the light of the Panel Report into the RSS.

Summary:
Residential development proposals in the Core Strategy document are difficult to comprehend because of a lack of supporting justification for the figures incorporated. Fundamentally, the figures set out in the document differ markedly from the figures contained within the documentation presented to the Council's Cabinet in December 2006. The range of alternative options do not give a valid range of options and do not test a range of growth scenarios. The figures for the LSCs and larger villages are not disaggregated between the two settlement categories. It is considered that the primary focus of new development outside the urban areas should be within the identified LSCs, including Long Bennington. A realistic split of 80% / 20% in favour of Local Service Centres is suggested.

Officers' Recommendation:
Background papers available on the Council's website.
Summary:
The residential development proposals articulated in the Core Strategy document are difficult to comprehend because of a lack of supporting justification for the figures incorporated within the document. Fundamentally, the figures set out in the document differ markedly from the figures contained within the documentation presented to the Council's Cabinet in December 2006. The proposed residual provision of some 2489 dwelling within villages over the balance of the plan period = annual average of exceeding 100 dwellings per annum. This will result in failure to meet the sustainability objectives of the plan. There is no valid planning or sustainability justification for such a high village based level of provision. Appropriate urban development (including the redevelopment Opportunity Areas) represent the most appropriate response. Increased provision can be made in urban areas without adverse environmental effects. It is considered that in tandem with a review of Objective 1, the level of provision within urban areas should be significantly increased, and the village provision proportionally decreased. The provision should be equitably spread across the four urban areas in the district, and not skewed towards Grantham (for which an additional growth element is already proposed).

Officers' Recommendation:
Background papers available on the Council's website.
Summary:
The concentration of housing in local service centres and large villages is contrary to Options 1 and 2 of the Core Strategy. The allocations should be redistributed to the three market towns of Stamford, Bourne and The Deepings.

Officers' Recommendation:
Allocations have been made to the LSCs and Larger Villages to help to maintain their viability and to meet local need. A "no development" policy would stifle these settlements.

Summary:
It is obviously the intent of the LDF to reduce car journeys wherever possible, but it would appear to be contradictory if the LDF is promoting residential growth in Bourne in order to arrest the drift of households towards Peterborough. Peterborough is a main centre of employment for residents of Bourne and Market Deeping and it would seem to be beneficial, both economically and environmentally, to encourage residential development to be much closer to Peterborough. The May, 2007 SA/SEA relevant to this version of the LDF makes no recommendation for housing growth to be located in Bourne in order to stop the southward drift towards Peterborough.

Officers' Recommendation:
noted
Con ID: 26149  
**Full Name:** Miss E C Biott  
**Organisation:** Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust  
**Comment ID:** 2287  
**Title:** RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO3b  
**Nature Of Response** Observations  

**Summary:**  
LWT has strong concerns over availability of water resources for the number of households proposed. The Catchment Abstraction Management Plans drawn up by the Environment Agency show current over-abstraction and this issue is being debated in the context of the Regional Spatial Strategy. LWT would wish to be satisfied that the environmental capacity of the District is not being exceeded.  

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments noted. Environmental issues will be considered during the process of site allocation.

---

Con ID: 26165  
**Full Name:** Macdonald Buchanan T  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 2131  
**Title:** RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO3b  
**Nature Of Response** Observations  

**Summary:**  
Preferred option PO3b takes insufficient account of the role of Stamford, Bourne and The Deepings within the District. It is proposed that although the majority of development is likely to be focused within Grantham, there needs to be greater parity between the remaining three towns of Stamford, Bourne and The Deepings in order to acknowledge their roles as key centres within the district. It is considered that the level of development proposed for the Local Service Centres and Larger Villages is too great. When combining with the other villages the figure for Local Service Centres and villages equates to 30% of the total Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) provision, comparable to the whole allocation within the three market towns. The Deepings accounts for only 3.5% for the overall RSS figure which is disproportionate to the role of the town as a service provider in the district. It is proposed that The Deepings should accommodate approximately 10% of the RSS housing allocation: 1571 dwellings within Market Deeping. It is both right and proper that completions and existing commitments, as well as urban capacity, be considered when

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
The policy will need to be revised in the light of the Panel Report into the RSS.
determining the residual dwellings that need to be provided by the LDF. In this case the Council suggests 159 completions between 2001-2006, and 242 dwellings remain as commitments through extant planning permissions. These figures vary from the most up to date AMR, but it is accepted that the six month interim period between the production of the Urban Capacity Study and the current consultation document could account for the discrepancy. The urban capacity figure of 102 dwellings within Market Deeping cannot, however, be accepted. Sites DE10, DE17, DE18 and DE19 should be removed from the UCS, which would then leave a further 102 dwellings to be provided within The Deepings. This, coupled with 10% of the RSS figure and the intention to allocate 23 hectares of employment land within The Deepings, would suggest that a small scale urban extension ought to be possible in order to continue to balance the housing and employment land within the town. [site proposed].

**Summary:**
Questions interpretation of local need and inclusion of Thurlby as LSC.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comments noted. As stated (3.1.4) The capacity of services within some of the LSCs and larger villages has been met, this may be the case with Thurlby. However, for others new development may help to retain or improve the range of services within them.
Summary:
Housing growth concentrated in Grantham, with significant levels of additional housing allowed for in Local Service Centres and large villages, is purportedly to maintain the viability of these centres, with new development limited to existing built-up areas. In order to be sustainable, these developments would have to be in proximity to existing transport networks. It is recommended that the release of development sites is limited until such time that the accessibility and overall transport impact of the proposed development sites has been investigated and a package of measures identified to minimise adverse transport impacts and encourage non-car modes. PO3b is the only one of the five options put forward that takes into account the NGP designation, and is supported as being consistent with the established NGP partnership. However modelling work will be required to ensure that the location of the Growth Point development is sustainable and that additional, undue stress is not placed on the strategic road network. The alternative proposed development options are based upon following existing trends (PO3c), providing a development focus on the south of the district to address migration to the Peterborough area (PO3d), and development patterns based upon the Lincolnshire Structure Plan (PO3e), all of which may encourage less sustainable forms of development.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.
Summary:
Proposed allocation for LSC + Larger Villages in PO3b doesn't reflect paragraph 3.3.14. The Trust question if in practical terms sites for this allocation of dwellings actually exists within built up areas of the settlements. This position is in great contrast to that set out for Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings. The proposed level of allocation is in quite stark contrast with table 4 in the Urban Capacity Study. The Trust is not aware of any housing capacity work that demonstrates that the additional housing allocations for the LSC + Large Villages category can be accommodated on land that is underused and within settlement boundaries. The Trust is unclear that it is demonstrated that 15740 units can be accommodated within the District without adverse impacts upon the landscape and historical environment. Reasons for PO3e providing an insufficient level of rural development are not provided.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. The PO3b allocation does not propose the allocation to be divided equally between the LSCs and larger villages. The figures within the UCS are based on the Structure Plan allocations, these will be superseded by the RSS figures, therefore the core strategy needs to reflect the RSS allocation for the District.

Con ID: 26221
Full Name: Mr Alan Hubbard
Organisation: Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust

Con ID: 26560
Full Name: J & T Orrey
Organisation: C/o Brown & Co

Summary:
Core Strategy should not be prepared in advance of the RSS being adopted.

Officers' Recommendation:
The timetable for the Core Strategy is being amended to allow time to consider the panel report and consultation into changes arising. Final RSS is not however expected until September 2008 and it is considered unfeasible to postpone the production of the Submission version of the Core Strategy until this time. Housing allocations may need to be revised in the light of the Panel Report (publication expected December 2007).
Summary:
Support locating majority of development in Grantham. However, strongly oppose the high level of development proposed for so-called 'large service centres' and large villages. Do not believe that the rural character of the district, the structure of the communities and the economics of infrastructure can support this high level: the so-called 'large service centres' are themselves only villages. If intention for Grantham to become a growth point is to be taken seriously, this should mean more than the 1290 dwellings allocated. Rather than increase the district total in excess of RSS figure, we propose that allocation to Grantham be increased and that to LSCs and larger villages be reduced. Option 3b gives each of the 22 LSCs and larger villages an average of 111 dwellings, which would destroy the character of many of them, and could not be accommodated on brownfield land. The allocation for LSCs and Larger Villages should not exceed that in Option 3d (and should be much lower).

Officers' Recommendation:
LSCs are Local (not Large) Service Centres. This is to recognize their role in supplying the daily needs of the community. The Core Strategy sets out the approach to development until 2026. Given that timespan, it is not considered that an average of 111 dwellings in each of the LSCs and Larger Villages until 2026 is excessive. It is considered that development is needed in these settlements to ensure that they continue to be able to support the community.

Summary:
Alternative options for PO3a, PO3b, PO3c, PO3d and PO3e are premature and inappropriate at this stage as based on expected RSS allocations which have yet to be confirmed. It is quite conceivable that as a result of the EIP and the panel report, figures may be increased.

Officers' Recommendation:
Final RSS is not however expected until September 2008 and it is considered unfeasible to postpone the production of the Submission version of the Core Strategy until this time. The policy will need to be revised in the light of the Panel Report into the RSS.
Summary:
The Preferred Option PO3b acknowledges the best way to obtain significant contribution to highway improvements and is inline with the growth point status of Grantham.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.

Comment ID: 1891
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO3b
Nature Of Response Support

---

Summary:
I agree with the Council's preferred options, and in particular with your Preferred Option 3b. I believe that the priority in allocating residential building consents should go to projects where planning gain can deliver significant benefits for the community as a whole.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.

Comment ID: 2590
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO3b
Nature Of Response Support
Summary: We would not support the alternative option which proposes a lower level of housing provision in the local service centres.

Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted.

Summary: We support the recognition for the need to provide residential development in rural villages to ensure their long term viability.

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted.

Summary: due to its new growth point status and previous overprovision of housing in the south of the district, we would support a policy concentrating the majority of new housing in Grantham.

Officers' Recommendation: Support for preferred option noted.
Con ID: 26470  
Full Name: Mr Roger Stafford  
Organisation: Manager  
Buckminster Estate  
Comment ID: 2032  
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
Number: Preferred Option PO3b  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary:  
Support Preferred Option. Grantham is a sustainable location capable of accommodating a substantial amount of housing over and above that set out in the Core Strategy for Grantham. Plus, additional housing will be required to meet the range of developer contributions to projects such as the Grantham Southern Bypass, general community infrastructure and affordable housing. (Opinion supported by SKDC/Fordham Research report into the viability of the Grantham Southern By pass July 2006)Notes inclusion of Wordsworth Holdings site as residential development opportunity in Urban Capacity Study (2005). This site is unlikely to come forward until at least 2020 because it is in viable commercial use creating local employment for the first part of the plan period. A residential allocation is however welcomed for the site in the medium/long tem.

Officers' Recommendation:  
Support noted.

Con ID: 26481  
Full Name: Mr K Boon  
Organisation: Anglian Water  
Comment ID: 2274  
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
Number: Preferred Option PO3b  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary:  
In terms of wastewater treatment works, there is limited capacity at Bourne; AW are currently in negotiation with the EA on increasing consented flow. There is limited flow capacity at both Marston (serving Grantham) and Deeping which may be a constraint to development. There are no short-term constraints in terms of water supply although Aswarby treatment works (serves Grantham in conjunction with Salterford works) has limited capacity.

Officers' Recommendation:  
support noted.
| Con ID: 26231 | **Summary:** | Support additional development in Grantham | **Officers' Recommendation:** | Support noted. |
| Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge |  |  |  |  |
| Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells |  |  |  |  |
| Comment ID: 1021 |  |  |  |  |
| Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT |  |  |  |  |
| Number: Preferred Option PO3b |  |  |  |  |
| Nature Of Response: Support |  |  |  |  |

| Con ID: 26605 | **Summary:** | Support Preferred Option PO3b (including the additional 'Growth Point' provision proposed in Grantham. Text of policy should contain clear commitment to the delivery of RSS requirement. Table showing scale and distribution of development should be transferred to supporting text. Figures are likely to require amendment when RSS is approved, and based upon progress of RSS EIP this will be upwards. | **Officers' Recommendation:** | Support noted. It is felt that presenting the housing figures in tabular format lends clarity to the policy. The policy will need to be revised in the light of the Panel Report into the RSS. |
| Full Name: HPC Homes, Namulas |  |  |  |  |
| Organisation: c/o Anthony Aspbury Associates |  |  |  |  |
| Comment ID: 2568 |  |  |  |  |
| Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT |  |  |  |  |
| Number: Preferred Option PO3b |  |  |  |  |
| Nature Of Response: Support |  |  |  |  |

| Con ID: 26210 | **Summary:** | Housing provision in Bourne, including unimplemented planning permissions, is already excessive and out of balance with infrastructure and community facilities. This is contrary to sustainable community requirements. Policies under other options should be adjusted to help balance this effect. | **Officers' Recommendation:** | Preferred Option addresses concerns for housing development in Bourne. |
| Full Name: Dr R A Fuller |  |  |  |  |
| Organisation: Bourne Civic Society |  |  |  |  |
| Comment ID: 2333 |  |  |  |  |
| Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT |  |  |  |  |
| Number: Preferred Option PO3b |  |  |  |  |
| Nature Of Response: Support |  |  |  |  |
Con ID: 26166
Full Name: Mr A Evans
Organisation: Kimberley Developments Ltd
Comment ID: 2181
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO3b
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
Policy option is entirely consistent with relevant government guidance and regional spatial strategy.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.

Con ID: 26261
Full Name: Mr Tudor Townsend
Organisation: Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Comment ID: 895
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO3b

Summary:
New Growth Point development in Grantham should not be at the expense of development in LSCs or large villages.

Officers' Recommendation:
Development in Grantham will not be at the expense of development elsewhere.

Con ID: 26300
Full Name: Messrs E A Sheardown
Organisation: Sheardown & Co. Ltd
Comment ID: 2556
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO3b
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary:
Agree the distribution across the District in alternative option PO3b is the most appropriate. Tolerance needs to be incorporated to allow for existing planning consents and/or Urban Capacity Study sites not being delivered. Suggest brownfield windfall allowance is included into housing figure table, these sites should take priority over greenfield sites. Residual Rural village figure is low and will result in stagnation of local communities. Councils approach in PO3c and PO3d to other rural

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. It is considered that Brownfield windfall allowance does not need to be included in the housing figure table. PPS3 para 59 "Allowances for windfalls should not be included in the first 10 years of land supply unless Local Planning Authorities can provide robust evidence of genuine local circumstances that prevent specific sites being identified". Disagree with residential policy addition as the small villages are not sustainable, therefore development needs to be restricted.
villages 'within all these rural locations, development including infill will be limited to the built-up areas of the settlements', is appropriate and should be incorporated into the final residential development policy.

Con ID: 26334
Full Name: Town Clerk Market Dee
Organisation: Clerk Market Deeping Town Council
Comment ID: 2347
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO3b
Nature Of Response Support with conditions

Summary:
Any further developments in Deeping should be restricted 'affordable housing' and 'social housing' - to encourage & enable local children to start on the property ladder without being forced to migrate to Peterborough.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support welcomed. Comments noted.

Con ID: 26230
Full Name: Alison and Stamford H
Organisation: Director Smith Stuart Reynolds
Comment ID: 1979
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO3b
Nature Of Response Support with conditions

Summary:
Neither the Preferred Option nor any of the Alternative Options strike the right balance for the distribution of development across the district during the Plan period for the following reasons: • Grantham should be the focus of development to consolidate its role as a Sub Regional Centre and so its ability to operate as a New Growth Point is not restricted. • A large proportion of housing numbers have been allocated to urban capacity sites, in particular brownfield sites. The ability to deliver these, particularly early within the plan timescale, is questionable. • There will be a requirement to prove sites are deliverable and that the requisite land supply can be achieved; a scenario which it is considered the Council will have difficulty in

Officers' Recommendation:
The policy will need to be revised in the light of the Panel Report into the RSS. However, it is considered that sufficient housing should be allocated to the LSCs and Larger Villages to maintain their vitality and viability. It is considered that the Preferred Option, by allocating app 25% of residential development within those 22 settlements, goes some way to ensuring this aim.
achieving without the early release of greenfield land alongside the delivery of brownfield sites, both in Grantham and the other sustainable urban areas.

**Requested Approach**
The residual housing requirement be re-examined so that policy for Residential Development provides for the total amount of housing stipulated in the approved version of the RSS for the District as a whole, with the greatest proportion allocated to Grantham, lesser amounts to the secondary towns and only minimal amounts, enabling local needs to be met, in the Local Service Centres and larger villages. It is proposed that the Preferred Option should be amended as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>RSS (Houses)</th>
<th>Residual (Houses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Total</td>
<td>15,730</td>
<td>5,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantham</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>3,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourne</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deepings</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSC + LV</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Rural Villages</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
Close attention should be given to the water infrastructure for the LSC/Large Villages that are likely to receive the bulk of new development. They must be able to accommodate the increased levels of development without increasing the risks of pollution to controlled waters or placing an unacceptable burden on water resources.
Summary:
Preferred Option PO3b (including the supplementary 'Growth Point' provision proposed for Grantham) is supported with qualifications by the Objectors. The text of the Policy itself should contain a clear commitment to the delivery of the RSS requirement along the lines: "At least 15,750 new houses will be built in the District between 2001 and 2026 at an annual average rate of 630 houses. At least 7,600 new dwellings will be built at the Grantham Growth Point between 2001 and 2016." Tabulation and presentation of figures is confusing and open to restrictive interpretation. The figures are most likely to require amendment when the RSS is approved. Moreover, in the Objectors view, based on the progress of the RSS EIP to date, this amendment will be upwards.

Officers' Recommendation:
The policy will need to be revised in the light of the Panel Report into the RSS.

Summary:
support approach for Grantham

Officers' Recommendation:
support noted.
Mr P Lely  
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions  
Summary: Option PO3b is the most acceptable option as it recognises the Growth status of Grantham. But the figure for LSCs and larger villages is too high.  
Officers' Recommendation: This is also the Council's preferred option. The policy will need to be revised in the light of the Panel Report into the RSS.

Mr J Coleman  
Organisation: William Davis Ltd  
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions  
Summary: Support as far as it acknowledges Growth Point and Sub-regional status of Grantham. However, too much housing development in LSCs and larger villages (contrary to RSS policies 5 & 6). Suggest housing growth should be directed to Grantham and Stamford.  
Officers' Recommendation: The Inspector's report on the RSS recommends deleting policy 5, and incorporating some of it in policy 4. Policy 4 will now refer to development in "other settlements" (ie those below the "market town" tier). Development should occur in these settlements in accordance with their needs as long as it is sustainable. Directing too much growth to Grantham and Stamford and away from the LSCs and Larger Villages could result in the viability of these settlements being diminished.

Mr Tudor Townsend  
Nature Of Response: Object  
Summary: This option does not provide sufficient housing numbers to meet the needs of Local Service Centres and Large Villages within South Kesteven.  
Officers' Recommendation: Noted. This is not the Council's preferred option.
Con ID: 26218  
**Full Name:** Mr P Lely  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 2543  
**Title:** RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
**Number:** Alternative Option PO3c  
**Nature Of Response** Object  

**Summary:**  
Option does not allow for the growth point status of Grantham, and is over allocation in Bourne where a substantial amount of land has already been allocated.  

**Officers' Recommendation:** Noted. This is not the Council's preferred option.

---

Con ID: 26272  
**Full Name:** W McCallin  
**Organisation:** Clerk Westborough and Dry Doddington Parish council  
**Comment ID:** 951  
**Title:** RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
**Number:** Alternative Option PO3c  
**Nature Of Response** Support  

**Summary:**  
This option will help prevent the mothballing until 2026 of smaller villages.  

**Officers' Recommendation:** noted.

---

Con ID: 26100  
**Full Name:** Mr N Gough  
**Organisation:** Bigwood Associates  
**Comment ID:** 1741  
**Title:** RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
**Number:** Alternative Option PO3c  
**Nature Of Response** Support  

**Summary:**  
Support, although allocation for LSCs and larger villages too high.  

**Officers' Recommendation:** Comments noted.
Con ID: 26095
Full Name: Barbara Robinson
Organisation: Clerk to the Parish Council Fulbeck Parish Council

Summary:
If growth is not allowed in Local Service Centre villages they will cease to be viable. This must be true of other villages equally or even more so. urge the District Council to reconsider its position and adopt an option which allows infill development in villages other than LSCs.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support for this option noted.

Comment ID: 2303
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Alternative Option PO3c
Nature Of Response Support

Con ID: 26151
Full Name: Mr Ivan Fuller
Organisation: Bourne Town Centre Management Partnership

Summary:
We are in favour of alternative option PO3c as plans for new retail/residential/public realm to complement existing town centre will need further residential support to attract premium retailers.

Officers' Recommendation:
Noted.

Comment ID: 2613
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Alternative Option PO3c
Nature Of Response Support
Summary: This option does not provide sufficient housing numbers to meet the needs of Local Service Centres and Large Villages within South Kesteven.

Officers' Recommendation: Noted. This is not the Council's Preferred Option.

Comment ID: 897
Number: Alternative Option PO3d
Nature Of Response: Object

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation: 

Summary: Option PO3d is not appropriate.

Officers' Recommendation: Agree. Not the Preferred Option.

Comment ID: 2544
Number: Alternative Option PO3d
Nature Of Response: Object

Con ID: 26132
Full Name: Planning Policy Peterbo
Organisation: Peterborough City Council

Summary: We would question the assumption that this option would ‘arrest the drift of household to Peterborough’ (para 3.3.25). Proximity of Deepings to Peterborough and lack of employment and higher level services will inevitably result in increased commuting Peterborough for these facilities. Also it will divert growth from Peterborough to the more pleasant rural settings of the Deepings.

Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted.

Comment ID: 2170
Number: Alternative Option PO3d
Nature Of Response: Observations
Summary:
We prefer PO3d. Growth in LSCs is sensible with flexibility for other smaller villages to grow to meet their needs. Development in LSCs should only be agreed when the infrastructure can support further development.

Officers' Recommendation:
comments noted.

Summary:
If growth is not allowed in Local Service Centre villages they will cease to be viable. This must be true of other villages equally or even more so. urge the District Council to reconsider its position and adopt an option which allows infill development in villages other than LSCs.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support for this option is noted.

Summary:
Support PO3d as preferred option, but to include Grantham's Growth Point Allocation, and reallocate 186 houses from Other Rural Villages to Stamford, Bourne and Deepings. Believe amended PO3d satisfies PO1a requirements.

Officers' Recommendation:
Housing figures will be revised in the light of the RSS Panel Report.
Summary:
This should not be put as an alternative. It is highly inappropriate in that the LDF must take into consideration RSS need and should not be based on structure plan provisions to 2021.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council has not selected this as the preferred option as the Structure Plan figures will be superseded by the emerging RSS.

Comment ID: 2545
Number: Alternative Option PO3e
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
This option does not provide sufficient housing numbers to meet the needs of Local Service Centres and Large Villages within South Kesteven.

Officers' Recommendation:
Noted. This is not the Council's preferred option.

Comment ID: 899
Number: Alternative Option PO3e
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
Housing in the area should be restricted as South Kesteven is becoming a base for people to live while working in London.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.

Comment ID: 1608
Number: Alternative Option PO3e
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
Nature Of Response Observations
Summary: All options meet Spatial objections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 7. The Lincolnshire Structure plan should not be ignored.

Officers' Recommendation: The Council as a minimum will ensure that the district meets the current housing requirements set out in the Structure Plan, however this will soon be replaced by a new Regional Plan and it is necessary for the Core Strategy to be in conformity with the Regional Plan when approved.

Con ID: 26289  
Full Name: Mrs P J Kirby  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 1647  
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
Number: Alternative Option PO3e  
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary: Further development only after road/and by-pass have been built.

Officers' Recommendation: The Council has not selected this as the preferred option as the Structure Plan figures will be superseded by the emerging RSS. All new development proposals should show how the impact of travelling to and from has been considered, and should demonstrate that measures have been made to minimise that impact.

Con ID: 26285  
Full Name: Mr L J Blunt  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 1564  
Title: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
Number: Alternative Option PO3e  
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary: Option PO4 should state that it does require the allocation for Greenfield extensions rather than one Greenfield extension. As more than one site may be necessary.

Officers' Recommendation: Agree.

Con ID: 26218  
Full Name: Mr P Lely  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 2546  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.3.34  
Nature Of Response: Observations
Con ID: 26108  
Full Name: Messrs Brint, McCallion  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 2495  
Number: 3.3.36  
Nature Of Response: Observations  
Summary: Not all parts of the Deepings are within the area of potential flood risk. Option 3d should be refined to allow for additional growth in Deepings.  
Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted.

Con ID: 26560  
Full Name: J & T Orrey  
Organisation: C/o Brown & Co  
Comment ID: 2460  
Number: 3.3.36  
Nature Of Response: Observations  
Summary: There are areas within the Deepings that are not within the flood plain and our site is one of these. There are areas which are outside of the potential flood risk area. A refinement of this option to provide for additional growth in the Deepings would be possible if the requirement for Stamford is reduced.  
Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted.

Con ID: 26107  
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 2517  
Number: 3.3.36  
Nature Of Response: Observations  
Summary: There are areas within the Deepings that are not within the flood plain and our site is one of these. There are areas which are outside of the potential flood risk area. A refinement of this option to provide for additional growth in the Deepings would be possible if the requirement for Stamford is reduced.  
Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted.
Con ID: 26160
Full Name: Cecil
Organisation: c/o Strutt and Parker
Comment ID: 1946
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.36
Nature Of Response: Observations
Summary:
Disagree with bullet points for Option 3b: 2, 4 and 5 in paragraph 3.3.36.
Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. However, it is considered that it is not feasible to allocate for large developments in Stamford due to the boundary and road constraints. Point 5, the final sentence, highlights the concerns in relation to objective 1: 'although this may have a detrimental impact upon urban regeneration in Peterborough.' Agree that bullet point 4 needs clarifying, it relates to the 'other rural villages.'

Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer Planning & Conservation Lincolnshire County Council
Comment ID: 1866
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.37
Nature Of Response: Observations
Summary:
Although the Structure Plan will be superseded by Regional Plan in terms of total provision, it is still the Adopted strategic framework, the principles of which still carry considerable weight in terms of spatial strategy and other general policy aims. We would therefore query 3.3.37 (bullet point 2) which states that a Structure Plan option "does not reflect the spatial strategy". It is the spatial strategy of this LDF that needs to reflect the Adopted Structure Plan and Policy 6 of the Draft Regional Plan.
Officers' Recommendation:
The Core Strategy is not expected to be adopted until after the RSS has been adopted.

Con ID: 26102
Full Name: Mr P R Tame
Organisation: National Farmers Union
Comment ID: 2120
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.38
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions
Summary:
The Council's preference for option 3b is understood; but before development is commenced all of the infrastructure required by new housing should be put in place.
Officers' Recommendation:
Comment noted. The submitted planning application should justify how the site is to be accessed and serviced and indicate the likely impact of the development on the local transport infrastructure. These impacts will be assessed as part of the planning application consultation process through statutory consultees. If permission is granted specific conditions can be imposed as part of the permission.
Summary:
The first sentence contradicts the results of previous consultations, as stated in paragraph 3.3.11.

Officers' Recommendation:
Disagree. The SA evidences the reasons why Option 3d does not reflect current local circumstances and needs.

Summary:
We object to Section 3.4 of the POCS. In the light of our representations above, we consider that the submission draft of the CS must address the potential for a small scale urban extension at Stamford, to the east of the town.

Officers' Recommendation:

Summary:
It is entirely inappropriate to identify specific sites for development within a Core Strategy. Therefore, the Urban Extensions part of the Core Strategy does not comply with PPS12 and it is unsound to the point of requiring withdrawal of the document. To address this problem the Council must withdraw the identification of the specific sites and instead identify broad locations. As such, the land to the west of

Officers' Recommendation:
The possible urban extension sites should remain in the Core Strategy to denote areas of significant change, in line with PPS12 appendix A. The A1 acts as a boundary to the expansion of Grantham. Land to the west of the A1 should therefore not be included. A SHLAA is currently being undertaken.
Grantham to the west side of the A1 should be considered as a broad location for strategic development which can deliver one of the strategic urban extensions to Grantham required to meet housing, employment and other provision. Such work is also dependant upon the outcomes of a Housing Land Availability Assessment.

**Con ID:** 26303  
**Full Name:** Mr Ian Lings  
**Organisation:** Principal Policy Officer Planning & Conservation Lincolnshire County Council

**Summary:**  
We have no comments on the description or choice of sites, but note that text elsewhere refers to at least one urban extension. Two are identified, but possibly only one may be needed if the Preferred Option “additional 20% discussed above is not applied. This could be important in view of the potential constraints identified.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Noted.

---

**Con ID:** 26295  
**Full Name:** Mr D J Holmes  
**Organisation:** Chairman Old Somerby Parish Council

**Summary:**  
Information is too vague: cannot make a proper assessment without knowing the extent, boundaries of, access to the areas under consideration (and other associated information). Notwithstanding suggestions below, accordingly reserve right to make alternative proposals when such boundary, access information is put forward; areas seem to be exaggerated (catering for 50% more than the residual allocation (5347)); Omit land between Spitalgate Level and Somerby Hill: this seems to rely on extent on alignment of southern by-pass

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments noted.

---

**Comment ID:** 1869  
**Number:** 3.4  
**Comment ID:** 1757  
**Number:** 3.4.1  
**Nature Of Response**  Observations
road, feasibility and route of which are yet to be met. Re-include Belton Lane + Manthorpe Estate option. Additionally consider Wyville Road area.

Summary:
Very strongly support the submission from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust - especially referring to risk of flooding and presence of SNCI & archaeological remains.

Officers' Recommendation:
Environment issues will be considered before site allocation.

Con ID: 26293  
Full Name: Mrs M. A. S. Bates  
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust  
Comment ID: 1708  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.4.1  
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Urban Extension sites may yield archaeological remains. In such cases the opportunities to use these for education and tourism should be recognised.

Officers' Recommendation:
noted.

Con ID: 26277  
Full Name: Jenny Young  
Organisation: Planning Archaeologist Heritage Trust for Lincolnshire  
Comment ID: 965  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.4.3  
Nature Of Response Observations

Con ID: 26293  
Full Name: Mrs M. A. S. Bates  
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust  
Comment ID: 1708  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.4.1  
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Very strongly support the submission from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust - especially referring to risk of flooding and presence of SNCI & archaeological remains.

Officers' Recommendation:
Environment issues will be considered before site allocation.

Con ID: 26293  
Full Name: Mrs M. A. S. Bates  
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust  
Comment ID: 1708  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.4.1  
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Urban Extension sites may yield archaeological remains. In such cases the opportunities to use these for education and tourism should be recognised.

Officers' Recommendation:
noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26230</th>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Alison and Stamford H</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Director Smith Stuart Reynolds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>3.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>self-containment is not something new development should aspire to and in any event this statement conflicts with the 3rd and 6th bullets about integration. &quot;Selfsufficiency&quot; would be a better word.</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>comments noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26218</th>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Mr P Lely</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2547</td>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>3.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support with conditions</td>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Emphasis of para 3.4.3 should be changed and the penultimate bullet point changed to read; &quot;Ensure that development secures good quality public transport links, improving the quality and frequency of public transport links where possible.&quot;</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>Disagree, the current wording specifically requires an urban extension to utilise and improve existing public transport networks, rather than allow development in a location which would require a whole new network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26108</th>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Messrs Brint, MCcallion</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2499</td>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>3.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support with conditions</td>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Generally support the objectives for urban extension to Grantham. Penultimate bullet point should be changed to read &quot;Ensure that development secures good quality transport links, improving the quality and frequency of public transport links where possible&quot;.</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>Disagree, the current wording specifically requires an urban extension to utilise and improve existing public transport networks, rather than allow development in a location which would require a whole new network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Full Name: Miss E C Biott
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Comment ID: 2289
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.3
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary:
Could not support implication of second bullet point: that loss of important land/features could be permissible if mitigation strategies can not be successfully implemented. In the case of some legally protected species, development is not permissible unless it can be proven to be in the national interest and there is no alternative option. Recommend specific reference to development of Green Infrastructure as part of the design process. Supports the inclusion of an objective to enhance the local environment through the creation of wildlife corridors and refuges and through careful consideration of the landscape.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. Environmental issues will be considered during site allocation.

Con ID: 26125
Full Name: Mr Graham Foster
Organisation: Senior Planning Officer - Lincolnshire and Rutland Area Team Government Office For The East Midlands
Comment ID: 2014
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.4
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
2nd sentence: the sequential approach to locating housing development was omitted from PPS 3. PPS 3 at paragraph 36 refers to creating mixed and sustainable communities by developing housing in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities and good access to jobs and to create mixed use developments etc.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. PPS3 retains focus on brownfield development: paras 40-44 includes national target of 60%, LPAs to prioritise brownfield land etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Nature Of Response</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26230</td>
<td>Alison and Stamford H</td>
<td>Director Smith Stuart Reynolds</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
<td>3.4.4</td>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The search sequence appears to have been taken from PPG3 which has now been replaced by PPS3 which adopts a rather different approach to site selection as set out in paragraph 38. It is considered that Site PO4a complies with these criteria and in particular would facilitate the creation of a community of sufficient size and mix to justify the development of and sustain community facilities, infrastructure and services.</td>
<td>Suggest reword 3.4.4. to read: &quot;Government policy states that future housing needs should be met in the most sustainable way possible.&quot; Delete 2nd sentence. 3.4.5. to be amended in light of RSS panel report which recommends deletion of Policy 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26268</td>
<td>Mr Stephen Bickford-S</td>
<td>c/o JB Planning Associates</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
<td>3.4.4</td>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PPG3 has been superseded by PPS3 whilst this continues to give priority to urban brownfield sites over urban extensions it no longer includes the search sequence of the old PPG. Suggest paragraph is amended.</td>
<td>Suggest reword 3.4.4. to read: 'Government policy states that future housing needs should be met in the most sustainable way possible.' Delete 2nd sentence. 3.4.5. to be amended in light of RSS panel report which recommends deletion of Policy 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26218</td>
<td>Mr P Lely</td>
<td></td>
<td>2548</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
<td>3.4.7</td>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Figure should be 1800 not 1080 as in 3.3.5.</td>
<td>Agree. Correct as necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary:
The figure of 1,080 not be 1,800 as indicated in 3.3.5. Also concerned that not all these sites will be delivered.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Correct as necessary.

Con ID: 26106
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 2534
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.7
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary:
Figure of 1080 in this paragraph should be 1800 as indicated in paragraph 3.3.5.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree, correct as necessary.

Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, MCcallion
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 2500
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.7
Nature Of Response  Observations

Summary:
This and the sections which follow through, including the preferred and alternative options PO4a, PO4b and PO4c should be removed. They are site-specific issues that should not be provided for as part of a Core strategy document. the Core Strategy document should be looking to identify is the factors which will be taken into consideration, the core issues and how this interrelates with existing facilities, proposed infrastructure and generally need.

Officers' Recommendation:
Advice from both GOEM, the DCLG, and the Planning Inspectorate, imply that major development issues such as urban extensions to meet the demands of such things as growth points should be addressed via the Core Strategy as these issues have a major impact upon the wider spatial strategy which the Core Strategy seeks to address. It is felt entirely appropriate to include the urban extensions within the Core Strategy, a move which appears to have been supported by the Government Office.
Summary:
This section should be removed as it relates to site specific issues which should not be in the Core Strategy. Consultation on these issues should be in the DPD where alternatives can be invited, before a preferred approach evolved.

Officer's Recommendation:
Emerging national advice and Good Practice suggests that proposals for major change should be included within the Core Strategy. This includes Urban Extensions. Alternative options were identified in both the Issues and Options Paper and the first Preferred Options stages of the Core Strategy and Housing and Economic DPD. Full consideration was given to the alternatives prior to the selection of the Council's preferred options as published in May. This consideration included the SEA/SA of alternatives.

Summary:
The Core Strategy provides no evidence to suggest that the urban extension sites identified have been the subject of rigorous appraisal against recognised criteria. It is considered that the proposed southerly urban extension does not represent a deliverable site in the short term. The ultimate viability of the proposal is not proven. The site has not been the subject of any form of Environmental Assessment and the

Officer's Recommendation:
Emerging national advice and Good Practice suggests that proposals for major change should be included within the Core Strategy. This includes Urban Extensions. Alternative options were identified in both the Issues and Options Paper and the first Preferred Options stages of the Core Strategy and Housing and Economic DPD. Full consideration was given to the alternatives prior to the selection of the Council's preferred options as published in May. This consideration included the SEA/SA of alternatives.
Council has presented no satisfactory evidence to demonstrate the deliverability of this site within the Plan period. Conversely the Barrowby Road urban extension site has demonstrated all of these factors and indeed has previously been allocated. It is the only candidate site that can ensure these challenging growth targets are met. Phasing provisions of the Core Strategy should reflect the ability of this site to deliver high levels of growth on the short term.

Con ID: 26286  
Full Name: Mr N Hydes  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 1590  
Title: POPLAR FARM  
Number: Preferred Option PO4a  
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:  
Grantham already suffers from traffic gridlock. Adding 2900 new dwellings will only exacerbate this.

Officers' Recommendation:  
The Council will require the preparation of Transport Assessments for all developments that are likely to have significant transport implications, to determine the measures required on the surrounding highway network to ensure adequate access.

Con ID: 26231  
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge  
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells  
Comment ID: 1023  
Title: POPLAR FARM  
Number: Preferred Option PO4a  
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:  
It is entirely inappropriate to identify specific sites for development within a Core Strategy. Therefore, the Urban Extensions part of the Core Strategy does not comply with PPS12 and it is unsound to the point of requiring withdrawal of the document. To address this problem the Council must withdraw the identification of the specific sites and instead identify broad locations. As such, the land to the west of Grantham to the west side of the A1 should be considered as a broad location for strategic development which can deliver one of the strategic urban extensions to Grantham required to meet housing, employment and other
provision. Such work is also dependent upon the outcomes of a Housing Land Availability Assessment.

Summary:
The Core Strategy provides no evidence to suggest that the urban extension sites identified have been the subject of rigorous appraisal against recognised criteria. It is considered that the proposed southerly urban extension does not represent a deliverable site in the short term. The ultimate viability of the proposal is not proven. The site has not been the subject of any form of Environmental Assessment and the Council has presented no satisfactory evidence to demonstrate the deliverability of this site within the Plan period. Conversely the Barrowby Road urban extension site has demonstrated all of these factors and indeed has previously been allocated. It is the only candidate site that can ensure these challenging growth targets are met. Phasing provisions of the Core Strategy should reflect the ability of this site to deliver high levels of growth on the short term.

Officers' Recommendation:

Summary:
Both of these sites are located in Grantham and are primarily in the control of a single landowner. Such a strategy appears to be unduly weighted towards one urban location and does not offer any form of contingency in the event of either or both sites being delivered. There are identified infrastructure issues with both sites which may prevent delivery. We are concerned that the Council has not extended the search sequence beyond Grantham and not

Officers' Recommendation:

Grantham's New Growth Point and Sub-regional Centre status requires Urban Extension development. The selection of Spitalgate Level and Poplar Farm as Preferred Options was a political decision by Cabinet.
considered sites in other sustainable urban locations capable of accommodating the growth required over the plan period particularly where such sites could deliver community and infrastructure benefits as part of the development of the land.

**Con ID:** 26605  
**Full Name:** HPC Homes, Namulas  
**Organisation:** c/o Anthony Aspbury Associates  
**Comment ID:** 2571  
**Title:** POPLAR FARM  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO4a  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**  
Not support Preferred Options PO4a and PO4b in isolation. Propose PO4c be added, with assumed capacity of 1000 dwellings, and assumed capacity of PO4a and PO4b be reduced by 500 each.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments noted. Grantham's New Growth Point and Sub-regional Centre status required Urban Extension development in the town. The selection of Spitalgate Level and Poplar Farm as Preferred Options was a political decision by Cabinet.

**Con ID:** 26301  
**Full Name:** Wilson  
**Organisation:** David Wilson Homes North Midland  
**Comment ID:** 2409  
**Title:** POPLAR FARM  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO4a  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**  
The Core Strategy provides no evidence to suggest that the urban extension sites identified have been the subject of rigorous appraisal against recognised criteria. It is considered that the proposed southerly urban extension does not represent a deliverable site in the short term. The ultimate viability of the proposal is not proven. The site has not been the subject of any form of Environmental Assessment and the Council has presented no satisfactory evidence to demonstrate the deliverability of this site within the Plan period. Conversely the Barrowby Road urban extension site has demonstrated all of these factors and indeed has previously been allocated. It is the only candidate site that can ensure these challenging growth targets are met. Phasing provisions of the Core Strategy
should reflect the ability of this site to deliver high levels of growth on the short term.

**Con ID:** 26149  
**Full Name:** Miss E C Biott  
**Organisation:** Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust  
**Comment ID:** 2288  
**Title:** POPLAR FARM  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO4a  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**  
Urban Extension sites have not been identified in the context of a robust and credible biodiversity evidence base: SNCI information is out of date. No comprehensive assessment of biodiversity of proposed areas made. Without detailed information LWT is not in a position to comment on the options and does not believe it to be appropriate for any decisions to be made without adequate information.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments noted. Environmental issues will be considered before any housing allocations are made.

---

**Con ID:** 26285  
**Full Name:** Mr L J Blunt  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 1566  
**Title:** POPLAR FARM  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO4a  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**  
Some Grantham areas are being ruined by over development. No further greenfield sites should be used.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments noted. However, Grantham is seen by the RSS and Lincolnshire Structure Plan as the location for the majority of development within the district. It is accepted that Grantham will need at least one Greenfield urban extension to meet the strategic housing requirement for the town.

---

**Con ID:** 26559  
**Full Name:** Mr H Thornton  
**Organisation:** Genepi Property  
**Comment ID:** 2446  
**Title:** POPLAR FARM  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO4a  
**Nature Of Response** Observations

**Summary:**  
It is considered that there should be an additional preferred option relating to the identification of Opportunity Areas, including the Stamford Welland Quarter. Such areas warrant particular and specific consideration in a comparable manner to the urban extension sites considered under Preferred Option PO4.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Inclusion of Urban Extension sites is a strategic requirement in the delivery of housing because of Grantham's Growth Point status.
Summary:
Commitment towards locating at least 70% of new development within 30 minutes of main services – this has been lowered from 80%. It is not clear how this will be checked. If they want to improve the accessibility to jobs, houses, and services then this objective should include an accessibility appraisal of all new developments, including the promotion of Travel Plans.

Officers' Recommendation:
All planning applications should include a design and access statement.

Summary:
Whilst the general principle of the urban extension for Grantham is recognised, modelling of the impacts of the developments at both locations is required before the Highways Agency can take a firm stance on such allocations. In general it is recommended that for each site there is:
• Investigation of transport impacts of spatial scenarios including major urban extensions using local transport models;
• The testing of strategic transport interventions to support spatial scenarios, including policies and measures aimed at influencing travel behaviour and mode choice, and development of a preferred spatial strategy for the sub area;
• Investigation of the delivery mechanisms for transport improvements, including the role of developers and resource availability through the Regional Funding Allocation process, Local Transport Plans, Highways Agency programmes, other agencies and developers;
• Investigation of interdependencies between development and infrastructure provision and identification of key

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. Design and Access statements will be required with applications for development.
phasing requirements and;• Sound infrastructure planning founded on a comprehensive Implementation Plan and monitoring framework including the indicators that will be monitored to assess progress towards the achievement of targets and to inform review mechanisms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26218</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Mr P Lely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>POPLAR FARM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**

We support the preferred option PO4a as this encompasses the area in which our land falls to the south of the Nottingham/Grantham rail line.

**Officers' Recommendation:**

Support noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26481</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Mr K Boon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>2275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>POPLAR FARM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**

Marston treatment works is to the north of Grantham. AW initial preference would thus be for the two sites to the north thus avoiding having to increase sewer flows through the town where there are some sewer capacity issues.

**Officers' Recommendation:**

comments noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26284</th>
<th>Full Name: on behalf of Jenkinson</th>
<th>Organisation: Chartered Surveyors Escritt Barrell Golding</th>
<th>Summary: The Inquiry has been held in abeyance as a result of former uncertainty over housing requirements and recent delays in the RSS and LDF process. However, the owners are committed to delivery. Previous assessment work has demonstrated that there are no significant environmental constraints to developing this site which cannot be mitigated. This work will be updated to inform the Inquiry and any future planning applications.</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation: Commitment to development noted. However, the application for planning permission has now been withdrawn.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: 2385</td>
<td>Title: POPLAR FARM</td>
<td>Number: Preferred Option PO4a</td>
<td>Nature Of Response Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26298</th>
<th>Full Name: Mr J.J.S. Brown</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Summary: As long as no development approaches the eastern side of the A1 it is a good idea. Option PO4c is ridiculous as it will add to congestion on the A607 as also the already congested Manthorpe Road and the new bottle necks that build up around the Kings School and Premier Court areas in Grantham. It is also to close to the Belton House Estate, which is a vital parkland amenity for the residents of Grantham.</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation: Support noted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: 1801</td>
<td>Title: POPLAR FARM</td>
<td>Number: Preferred Option PO4a</td>
<td>Nature Of Response Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26203</th>
<th>Full Name: Mr C Townson</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Summary: Major developments must be supported with a realistic road support system, proper retail and full hospital facilities. The Developers should seriously contribute. 1k per house is not unrealistic, parking in Grantham must be developed to take the increase - park &amp; ride schemes etc. seriously considered.</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: 1853</td>
<td>Title: POPLAR FARM</td>
<td>Number: Preferred Option PO4a</td>
<td>Nature Of Response Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary:
Poplar Farm is most appropriate location for urban extention. Consider that Sitalgate Level/Somerby Hill site should be phased for development after Poplar Farm and that Belton Lane/Manthorpe estate is least sustainable location.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.

Con ID: 26230
Full Name: Alison and Stamford H
Organisation: Director Smith Stuart Reynolds
Comment ID: 1982
Title: POPLAR FARM
Number: Preferred Option PO4a
Nature Of Response  Support

Summary:
Comparative study, including identifying environmental constraints and preparing development concept, undertaken for each site. Findings described and shown on the drawings submitted with representations. It is considered that the Poplar Farm site (Site A) is the most suitable site to provide an Urban Extension to Grantham. Its identification as one of the two Preferred Options is therefore welcomed. The other two options (B and C) will have a detrimental impact on the environment and will not be able to provide the requisite number of dwellings for the reasons set out above. It is therefore considered that they are unsuitable for identification as urban extensions.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support welcomed.
**Summary:**
The Spitalgate Level/Somerby Hill site looks very unsuitable for development on the face of it. Popular Farm will need to be supplied with necessary community facilities for such a large development. A community school could provide these. Is there provision for the relocating of school places out of central Grantham to these near areas? What are the effects on local GP/medical/hospital services to all these developments given that GP lists are full and the hospital is changing its role as a local general hospital.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comments noted.

---

**Summary:**
Supports principal of urban extension sites (UES) outside of the built-up area of Grantham. Agrees with principle of two major site allocations (north west and south of Grantham) with the proviso that the description and scale of the two preferred UES i.e. Poplar Farm (P04a) and Land between Spitalgate Level and Somerby Hill (P04b), as presented in the Core Strategy, is revised. Poplar Farm is considered too large (133 ha) and its proposed allocation of 2,900 new dwellings (some 1000-1,200 more than proposed in the current Poplar Farm planning application) unnecessary and indeed likely to be problematic in relation to my Client’s support for the delivery of the Grantham Southern Bypass. The Poplar Farm UES should be limited to the land encompassed by S02/0154 and the small-holding at the Maltings on the north side of the site – some 70 hectares. The surplus housing should be added to the other UES at Spitalgate Level and Somerby Hill (P04b).

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Support noted.
**Comment ID:** 2681  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO4b  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**  
Do not consider site 4b to satisfy the sequential test in PPS25. We suggest that SKDC contact us at the earliest opportunity to discuss the requirements for the proposed site to satisfy the Exception Test. Given the scale and nature of the development this may need to include the provision of flood alleviation measures that will be of benefit to the community.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
The sites will be further evaluated before a final decision is made upon which sites to promote as Urban Extensions.

---

**Comment ID:** 1987  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO4b  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**  
Comparative study, including identifying environmental constraints and preparing development concept, undertaken for each site. Findings described and shown on the drawings submitted with representations. It is considered that the Poplar Farm site (Site A) is the most suitable site to provide an Urban Extension to Grantham. Its identification as one of the two Preferred Options is therefore welcomed. The other two options (B and C) will have a detrimental impact on the environment and will not be able to provide the requisite number of dwellings for the reasons set out above. It is therefore considered that they are unsuitable for identification as urban extensions.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Objection noted. The sites will be further evaluated before a final decision is made upon which sites to promote as Urban Extensions.
**Summary:**
It is contrary to PPS12 to identify specific sites for development within a Core Strategy. It may be that the Council considers these sites to fall within a broad location for development but the current identification prejudges the outcome of the Site Allocations DPD and is unsound. Similarly the Key diagram which shows three sites is unsound.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Disagree. It is considered that the urban extensions are broad locations for growth and should be identified in the Core Strategy (PPS12).

---

**Summary:**
Some Grantham areas are being ruined by over development. No further greenfield sites should be used.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comments noted. However, Grantham is seen by the RSS and Lincolnshire Structure Plan as the location for the majority of development within the district. It is accepted that Grantham will need at least one Greenfield urban extension to meet the strategic housing requirement for the town.

---

**Summary:**
Spitalgate Level/Somerby Hill inappropriate because of impact on landscape and ecology of R Witham Valley/flood risk. Doubt about viability due to technical constraints and infrastructure requirements. Consider Belton Lane/Manthorpe estate more sustainable and deliverable. Suggest Preferred Option promotes flexibility for further small scale urban extension sites: to deliver mixed communities in line with PPS3.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Full assessments of the viability and suitability of the site (including examination of constraints) will be required before any housing allocation is made.
Con ID: 26286
Full Name: Mr N Hydes
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2619
Title: LAND BETWEEN SPITALGATE LEVEL AND SOMERBY HILL
Number: Preferred Option PO4b
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
Grantham already suffers from traffic gridlock. Adding 2900 new dwellings will only exacerbate this.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council will require the preparation of Transport Assessments for all developments that are likely to have significant transport implications, to determine the measures required on the surrounding highway network to ensure adequate access.

Con ID: 26295
Full Name: Mr D J Holmes
Organisation: Chairman Old Somerby Parish Council
Comment ID: 2699
Title: LAND BETWEEN SPITALGATE LEVEL AND SOMERBY HILL
Number: Preferred Option PO4b
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
Information is too vague: cannot make a proper assessment without knowing the extent, boundaries of, access to the areas under consideration (and other associated information). Notwithstanding suggestions below, accordingly reserve right to make alternative proposals when such boundary, access information is put forward; areas seem to be exaggerated (catering for 50% more than the residual allocation (5347)); Omit land between Spitalgate Level and Somerby Hill: this seems to rely on extent on alignment of southern by-pass road, feasibility and route of which are yet to be met. Re-include Belton Lane + Manthorpe Estate option. Additionally consider Wyville Road area.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.
**Summary:**
Not support Preferred Options PO4a and PO4b in isolation. Propose PO4c be added, with assumed capacity of 1000 dwellings, and assumed capacity of PO4a and PO4b be reduced by 500 each.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Grantham’s New Growth Point and Sub-regional Centre status required Urban Extension development in the town. The selection of Spitalgate Level and Poplar Farm as Preferred Options was a political decision by Cabinet.

**Summary:**
Natural England objects to Preferred Option PO4b as we believe that, at present there is insufficient information to determine the impacts upon biodiversity - not only on the SNCI identified, but on the river Witham, which is of high biodiversity value, including supporting a population of white-clawed crayfish of national importance. We do not believe that sufficient background work has been undertaken to establish the impact of such an allocation on a receptor as sensitive as the Witham. We cannot therefore concur with the information contained in section 3.4.13 as it is not clear what evaluation the council has undertaken to assess the impact of the selection of this option upon the receptor sites identified.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Further evaluation of any site will be undertaken before allocations are made.
Con ID: 26238
Full Name: Rev Canon Chris Andre
Organisation: St Wulfram's Church, Grantham

Summary:
The Spitalgate Level/Somerby Hill site looks very unsuitable for development on the face of it.

Officers' Recommendation:
Noted.

Comment ID: 2646
Title: LAND BETWEEN SPITALGATE LEVEL AND SOMERBY HILL
Number: Preferred Option PO4b
Nature Of Response Object

Con ID: 26179
Full Name: Mr Neil Pike
Organisation: English Nature
Comment ID: 1991
Title: LAND BETWEEN SPITALGATE LEVEL AND SOMERBY HILL
Number: Preferred Option PO4b
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Overall conclusion identifies that all biodiversity issues can be mitigated against, yet no mention is made of the impact upon the biodiversity value of the river Witham, nor detailed information provided as to how the impact upon the SNCI can be mitigated against. Natural England would wish to see more detailed thinking on this option before it can be satisfied that the conclusions drawn here are accurate.

Officers' Recommendation:
Full assessments of the viability and suitability of the site (including examination of constraints) will be required before any housing allocation is made.
Summary:
There appears to be a miscalculation of the capacity of this site in Preferred Option PO4b. We would anticipate that the site area would net down to about 50 – 55 hectares of developable housing land which at an average density of 30 dph would achieve a site capacity of 1,500 to 1,650 dwellings;

Officers' Recommendation:
Full assessments of the viability and suitability of the site (including examination of constraints) will be required before any housing allocation is made.

Summary:
Major developments must be supported with a realistic road support system, proper retail and full hospital facilities. The Developers should seriously contribute. 1k per house is not unrealistic, parking in Grantham must be developed to take the increase - park & ride schemes etc. seriously considered.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.
Summary:
If the land between Spitalgate Level and Somerby Hill (your Preferred Option 4b) can be developed in such a way as to provide funding for the construction of the East-West bypass to the south of Grantham then I believe that the resulting benefits to the community as a whole, and to the future development of Grantham, would be so great to warrant your using any number up to the total allocation of residential building consents available for Grantham for this sole purpose.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support and comments noted.
Summary:
Supports principal of urban extension sites (UES) outside of the built-up area of Grantham. Agrees with principle of two major site allocations (north west and south of Grantham) with the proviso that the description and scale of the two preferred UES i.e. Poplar Farm (P04a) and Land between Spitalgate Level and Somerby Hill (P04b), as presented in the Core Strategy, is revised.

Officer's Recommendation:
Support noted.

Summary:
It is entirely inappropriate to identify specific sites for development within a Core Strategy. Therefore, the Urban Extensions part of the Core Strategy does not comply with PPS12 and it is unsound to the point of requiring withdrawal of the document. To address this problem the Council must withdraw the identification of the specific sites and instead identify broad locations. As such, the land to the west of Grantham to the west side of the A1 should be considered as a broad location for strategic development which can deliver one of the strategic urban extensions to Grantham required to meet housing, employment and other provision. Such work is also dependent upon the outcomes of a Housing Land Availability Assessment.

Officer's Recommendation:
Disagree. It is considered that the urban extensions are broad locations for growth and should be identified in the Core Strategy (PPS12). The Council is currently undertaking a joint SHLAA, this will be used to feed into the Sites Specific Allocations and Policies document.
Summary:
Comparative study, including identifying environmental constraints and preparing development concept, undertaken for each site. Findings described and shown on the drawings submitted with representations. It is considered that the Poplar Farm site (Site A) is the most suitable site to provide an Urban Extension to Grantham. Its identification as one of the two Preferred Options is therefore welcomed. The other two options (B and C) will have a detrimental impact on the environment and will not be able to provide the requisite number of dwellings for the reasons set out above. It is therefore considered that they are unsuitable for identification as urban extensions.

Officers' Recommendation:
Objection noted.

Summary:
It is agreed that this option should not be pursued. The analysis of this site has failed to adequately identify how sensitive it is to development. The SA comments at 3.4.15 are imprecise as to what the surrounding sensitive landscapes. The failure to specifically identify the Registered Historic Park and Garden (Grade 1) at Belton, and its wider setting, is perplexing.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support for not pursuing this option is noted. The landscape sensitivity was taken from the Landscape Character Assessment.
Con ID: 26172
Full Name: Mr J Coleman
Organisation: William Davis Ltd
Comment ID: 2643
Title: BETWEEN BELTON LANE AND MANTHORPE ESTATE
Number: Alternative Option PO4c
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
Spitalgate Level/Somerby Hill inappropriate because of impact on landscape and ecology of R Witham Valley/flood risk. Doubt about viability due to technical constraints and infrastructure requirements. Consider Belton Lane/Manthorpe estate more sustainable and deliverable. Suggest Preferred Option promotes flexibility for further small scale urban extension sites: to deliver mixed communities in line with PPS3.

Officers' Recommendation:
Full assessments of the viability and suitability of the site (including examination of constraints) will be required before any housing allocation is made.

Con ID: 26605
Full Name: HPC Homes, Namulas
Organisation: c/o Anthony Aspbury Associates
Comment ID: 2580
Title: BETWEEN BELTON LANE AND MANTHORPE ESTATE
Number: Alternative Option PO4c
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
Not support Preferred Options PO4a and PO4b in isolation. Propose PO4c be added, with assumed capacity of 1000 dwellings, and assumed capacity of PO4a and PO4b be reduced by 500 each.

Officers' Recommendation:
The selection of Spitalgate Level and Poplar Farm as Preferred Options was a political decision by Cabinet.

Con ID: 26295
Full Name: Mr D J Holmes
Organisation: Chairman Old Somerby Parish Council
Comment ID: 2700
Title: BETWEEN BELTON LANE AND MANTHORPE ESTATE
Number: Alternative Option PO4c
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
Information is too vague: cannot make a proper assessment without knowing the extent, boundaries of, access to the areas under consideration (and other associated information). Notwithstanding suggestions below, accordingly reserve right to make alternative proposals when such boundary, access information is put forward; areas seem to be exaggerated (catering for 50% more than the residual allocation (5347)); Omit land between Spitalgate Level and Somerby Hill: this seems to rely on extent on alignment of southern by-pass

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.
road, feasibility and route of which are yet to be met. Re-include Belton Lane + Manthorpe Estate option. Additionally consider Wyville Road area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26062</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Miss H Mawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>The Home Builders Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
The requirement must be related directly to local need and not to an arbitrary aspiration applied to the whole of the District. The high percentage requirement for affordable housing is unachievable. This unrealistic requirement may constrain the delivery of housing further and therefore exacerbate issues of affordability. Need to increase market housing price to cover affordable housing provision costs will widen affordability gap. Tenures should be determined on a site-by-site basis. The Core Strategy bears little reference to viability, which is a prime concern when undertaking a development.

**Officers' Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26108</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Messrs Brint, MCcallion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
Rate for affordable housing in the district should be no higher than that in the emerging Regional plan.

**Officers' Recommendation:**

The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. The RSS policy is a minimum against which this council has made representations. No change to the Council's approach.
Con ID: 26332
Full Name: Mr John Shead
Organisation: Clerk Hough on the Hill Parish Council
Comment ID: 2187
Title: Affordable Housing
Number: 3.5
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
Suggest remove affordable house requirement from non-sustainable hamlets and villages, and also discourage any further house building in those areas. The shortfall should be met by concentrating new builds in a few suitable Larger Villages where moderate increases in population would encourage and warrant improvements to infrastructure and amenities with the view to bringing them up to Local Service Centre status. Need for affordable housing for the farming community could be satisfied by a more relaxed approach to planning consents on farming estates.

Officers' Recommendation:
Disagree. Affordable Housing provision in rural villages/hamlets is intended to satisfy a proven local need.

Con ID: 26160
Full Name: Cecil
Organisation: c/o Strutt and Parker
Comment ID: 1948
Title: Affordable Housing
Number: 3.5
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
The definition of Affordable Housing as stated within the document is not supported; the definition differs significantly from PPS3. Details of the Council’s Housing Partnership Agreement are not provided or mentioned in the Background evidence.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. It is considered that the main emphasis of the PPS3 definition is contained within the Core Strategy definition, tailored to South Kesteven’s local needs. Details of the CHPA need to be mentioned.

Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells
Comment ID: 1026
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.3
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
The Housing Market Assessment has not been fully tested and therefore the tenure split for affordable housing should take into consideration local needs and circumstances.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. Tenure split is derived from the latest Housing Needs Survey (2006)
Con ID: 26107  
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 2520  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.5.3  
Nature Of Response: Observations  

Summary:  
We feel strongly that the rates to be set in SKDC over the plan period should be in line with the emerging regional plan and no higher.  

Officers' Recommendation:  
The Fordhams Housing Need survey has been prepared following National guidance and good practice. Fordhams are a nationally renowned specialist in this area of research and no evidence is provided to justify these comments. In the absence of evidence to the contrary the council should base its policy on the recommendations of the Fordhams study. Rural Exceptions sites would be permissible under the preferred option - however this should be clarified within the final policy.

Con ID: 26218  
Full Name: Mr P Lely  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 2496  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.5.3  
Nature Of Response: Observations  

Summary:  
We feel strongly that the rates to be set in SKDC over the plan period should be in line with the emerging regional plan and no higher  

Officers' Recommendation:  
The RSS figures for affordable housing are a minimum. SKDC has challenged these figures through the EIP. The evidence provided by the Regional Assembly to arrive at this figure is not as thorough and detailed as the evidence gained by Fordhams, from for example household surveys.

Con ID: 26106  
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 2536  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.5.3  
Nature Of Response: Observations  

Summary:  
The rates to be set in SKDC for affordable housing over the plan period should be in line with the emerging regional plan and no higher.  

Officers' Recommendation:  
Disagree. The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. The RSS policy is a minimum against which this council has made representations. No change to the Council's approach.
Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer Planning & Conservation Lincolnshire County Council

Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
The Housing Needs Survey is being fed into the wider Housing Market Assessment for the Peterborough HMA, also being conducted by Fordhams. Although the different timescales are recognised the results of this should not be pre-judged.

Officers' Recommendation:
This document uses the latest available information. As, and when, further information is available it will be incorporated into the policy-making process.

Con ID: 26271
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner DLP Planning Ltd

Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
Object Any deviation from the definition of affordable housing in Annex B of PPS3 must be appropriately justified by the Council.

Officers' Recommendation:
Miss Ellie Smith  
Assistant Planner  
Stamford Property Company  

Summary:
We object to paragraph 3.5.6 and the definition of affordable housing that has been provided. Any deviation from the definition of affordable housing in Annex B of PPS3 must be appropriately justified by the Council.

Mr Ian Lings  
Principal Policy Officer  
Planning & Conservation Lincolnshire County Council  

Summary:
Definition of Affordable Housing needs to be checked for consistency with PPS3. "Low cost market housing" is now excluded from the PS3 definition, under which intermediate housing includes housing sold below market prices. Also in Objective 7 what is "local-need housing"? This does not fit with either the definition in para. 3.5.6, the PPS3 definition, or the Council’s powers.

Officers’ Recommendation:
Annex B of PPS3 defines what can and cannot be considered as Affordable Housing for planning purposes. It does, indeed, specifically exclude "low cost market housing". However, the definition at para 3.5.6 of the Preferred Options document, does not mention "low cost market housing". It refers to "low cost home ownership". Annex B of PPS3 states that Intermediate affordable housing includes "... low cost homes for sale ..." Therefore, the definition is correct. "Local-need housing" relates to those sites, referred to as "exception sites", in small rural villages where there is an identified proven need for local families to be housed. The sites will always be small, possibly as few as one dwelling, and will only be for families with a local connection to the village. These sites are always 100% affordable housing.
Con ID: 26106
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2537
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.8
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
The percentage of affordable should be reduced substantially. Other ways should be investigate to meet the shortfall. Fordhams paper is questionable. Everybody will say that there needs to be more affordable houses and the quality of this data is questionable. A better balance of supply will lower land costs making housing more affordable. Policy should also cater for Rural Exceptions sites.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Fordhams Housing Need survey has been prepared following National guidance and good practice. Fordhams are a nationally renowned specialist in this area of research and no evidence is provided to justify these comments. In the absence of evidence to the contrary the council should base its policy on the recommendations of the Fordhams study. Rural Exceptions sites would be permissible under the preferred option - however this should be clarified within the final policy.

Con ID: 26560
Full Name: J & T Orrey
Organisation: C/o Brown & Co
Comment ID: 2463
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
The percentage of affordable should be reduced substantially. Other ways should be investigate to meet the shortfall. Fordhams paper is questionable. Everybody will say that there needs to be more affordable houses and the quality of this data is questionable. A better balance of supply will lower land costs making housing more affordable. Policy should also cater for Rural Exceptions sites.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Fordhams Housing Need survey has been prepared following National guidance and good practice. Fordhams are a nationally renowned specialist in this area of research and no evidence is provided to justify these comments. In the absence of evidence to the contrary the council should base its policy on the recommendations of the Fordhams study. Rural Exceptions sites would be permissible under the preferred option - however this should be clarified within the final policy.

Con ID: 26107
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2521
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
The percentage of affordable should be reduced substantially. Other ways should be investigate to meet the shortfall. Fordhams paper is questionable. Everybody will say that there needs to be more affordable houses and the quality of this data is questionable. A better balance of supply will lower land costs making housing more affordable. Policy should also cater for Rural Exceptions sites.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Fordhams Housing Need survey has been prepared following National guidance and good practice. Fordhams are a nationally renowned specialist in this area of research and no evidence is provided to justify these comments. In the absence of evidence to the contrary the council should base its policy on the recommendations of the Fordhams study. Rural Exceptions sites would be permissible under the preferred option -
Summary:
The percentage of affordable should be reduced substantially. Other ways should be investigate to meet the shortfall. Fordhams paper is questionable. Everybody will say that there needs to be more affordable houses and the quality of this data is questionable. A better balance of supply will lower land costs making housing more affordable. Policy should also cater for Rural Exceptions sites.

Officers’ Recommendation:
The Fordhams Housing Need survey has been prepared following National guidance and good practice. Fordhams are a nationally renowned specialist in this area of research and no evidence is provided to justify these comments. In the absence of evidence to the contrary the council should base its policy on the recommendations of the Fordhams study. Rural Exceptions sites would be permissible under the preferred option - however this should be clarified within the final policy.

Summary:
The percentage of affordable should be reduced substantially. The data on which the Council’s policies are formulated must be questioned. We feel the Fordham Research Paper 2006 is questionable. A better balance between supply and demand will inevitably result in lower land costs which will mean that all houses should, in theory, be more affordable.

Officers’ Recommendation:
Disagree. No evidence to contradict the Fordhams report has been provided. Fordhams are a recognised and renowned expert in this field. The study demonstrates through more than one evidential source this level of need. To actually meet this level of need ALL new housing required for the district on an annual basis would need to be affordable. The recommended policy percentage of 50% is seen as an appropriate compromise which will effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing.
Summary:
Affordable housing requirements should reflect any abnormal housing costs associated with enabling the development (e.g., a bridge and link road).

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.

Summary:
We strongly object to PO5a. It is acknowledged that there is clearly a significant and demonstrable requirement for the provision of affordable housing. However, the approach that is promulgated in the PCS is flawed for a number of reasons. Firstly, the policy should not require the provision of a certain level of affordable housing from all sites. The 'requirement' should be expressed as a plan-wide target (PPS3 paragraph 29) that is a matter for negotiation with developers; and which is reflective of site circumstances and suitability. Secondly, a target of 50% will serve to considerably reduce the availability of market housing that will come forward over the plan period to 2026. In our view this will only add to the problems of affordability that are being experienced in this area, which is quite contrary to the stated commitment of the Government to improving the affordability and supply of housing in all communities (PPS3 paragraph 3).
**Summary:**
The preferred option for this policy is unsound in that it does not accord with the Regional Spatial Strategy. We consider that a requirement to provide 50% of all units on development sites as affordable is unsustainable and will in effect stifle land supply. An example of the costs for developing a greenfield site are provided and further deductions would also need to be made for S106 requirements and any abnormal development costs. Previously developed sites present additional financial problems most notably associated with the clean up costs that are usually required to bring the sites up to an acceptable level. The cumulative effect of these additional costs and the proposed 50% affordable housing requirement means that the existing use value will exceed the value of the land for residential purposes.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The RSS figures for affordable housing are a minimum. SKDC has challenged these figures through the EIP. The evidence provided by the Regional Assembly to arrive at this figure is not as thorough and detailed as the evidence gained by Fordhams, from for example household surveys.

---

**Summary:**
The requirement for 50% affordable is considered to place a serious burden on site viability resulting in land supply shortages when landowners are not willing to bring their land forward for development given the impact on reduced land values. Further, given the preferred option to concentrate the majority of new housing at Grantham, such a high percentage of affordable will result in a significant imbalance of affordable provision in the town. The 50% target is also inconsistent with the proportion of affordable homes sought in RSS8 which is 35%.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing is sought on development sites, this will effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing. No change to the Council's approach.
Summary:
Concern is expressed as to the apparent lack of a necessary evidence base as specified in PPS 3. Specifically in relation to affordable housing, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Urban threshold is supported, and the need for a lower threshold in villages is accepted, however think that 2+ is too restrictive and could be counterproductive. PPS 3 suggest Local Authorities could include a series of site-size thresholds over the plan area. In this case such an approach would seem appropriate and set the best context to achieve the affordable housing target for the district. Target of 50% is very different from the RSS target of 35%. A more tailored approach which sets an overall plan wide target, as recommended in PPS3 and a series of site thresholds across the plan area derived from the evidence base detailed in PPS3 would seem a more appropriate way forward. And the policy must allow flexibility to take account of site viability. Support inclusion of rural exceptions policy.

Officers' Recommendation:
RSS figure is a minimum requirement. Housing Needs Survey specifies 50% affordable housing requirement.

Summary:
By placing a requirement for affordable housing for developments of 2 or more dwellings in rural areas, residential development will no longer be viable. This would result in a lower level of provision than identified in the Housing Needs Survey, which will have a negative impact on the vitality of communities. The requirement should be changed to reflect the levels set for urban areas.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing is sought on development sites, this will effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing. No change to the Council's approach.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Nature Of Response</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr M Brebner</td>
<td>Greatford Parish Council</td>
<td>26195</td>
<td>PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO5a</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Requiring a development as small as 2 plus dwellings in a rural area to include 50% affordable housing is excessive.</td>
<td>The Council’s Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. No change to the Council’s approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr R A Fuller</td>
<td>Bourne Civic Society</td>
<td>26210</td>
<td>PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO5a</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>We are not in sympathy with the present policies for the provision of affordable housing as an imposed percentage of privately provided housing stock and that the targets are neither desirable nor achieveable.</td>
<td>The Council’s Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing is sought on development sites, this will effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing. No change to the Council’s approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Parmiter</td>
<td></td>
<td>26101</td>
<td>PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO5a</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The target of 50% will have the effect of reducing the amount of land being brought forward for development. The figure should be 35-40%.</td>
<td>The Council’s Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing is sought on development sites, this will effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing. No change to the Council’s approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary:**
The proposed affordable housing provision of 50% of all market housing is far too high. Affordable housing contribution should be negotiated on a site by site basis and directly linked to housing needs of the relevant ward. It is not entirely clear how the provision for rural development will be calculated. A contribution towards an affordable housing pot may be more appropriate in some circumstances. The minimum threshold set at 15 and above dwellings is an appropriate threshold for all new urban developments. However, there is concern that a threshold of two dwellings, only in rural areas may affect the viability of a proposal.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing is sought on development sites, this will effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing. No change to the Council's approach.

---

**Summary:**
It appears that the preferred option PO5a would provide about 160 affordable units per year, representing about 25% of the total provision per year. This falls short of the 35% target for the Housing Market Area in the Draft East Midlands Regional Plan (RSS8). This could be a concern for Rutland if the affordable housing requirement in the rest of the Housing Market Area were to be increased to make up the shortfall in South Kesteven. The Policy should be reviewed in the light of the Housing Market Assessment that is currently under way and any subsequent changes to the requirement in RSS8.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The Fordhams Housing Need survey has been prepared following National guidance and good practice. Fordhams are a nationally renowned specialist in this area of research and no evidence is provided to justify these comments. In the absence of evidence to the contrary the council should base its policy on the recommendations of the Fordhams study. Rural Exceptions sites would be permissible under the preferred option - however this should be clarified within the final policy.
**Con ID:** 26165  
**Full Name:** Macdonald Buchanan T  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 2109  
**Title:** PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO5a  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**
Where affordable units are provided an average ration of 40% affordable and 60% market housing should replace the 50% affordable and 50% market housing in the interests of delivery.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comments noted.

---

**Con ID:** 26484  
**Full Name:** Trustees for the Belvoi  
**Organisation:** Smiths Gore  
**Comment ID:** 2400  
**Title:** PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO5a  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**
The rural threshold of 2+ dwelling is far too low. There are significant practical problems in the delivery of affordable housing on this basis and we question whether RSL have endorsed this approach. Unit costs are higher on sites of this size, and resources are not cost-effectively spent. A level of 50% is unjustifiably high and is akin to that set out in the London Spatial Development Strategy. Affordability issues in SK are not on a par with London. Level of 50% will act as a significant disincentive to investment, and could have a distinct effect on the delivery of all housing requirements. Specific affordable housing allocations do not work: landowners will not make land available as there is no point in them doing so. We have direct experience of recent Local Plan Inquiries where such policies have been dismissed by Inspector as unworkable, except where land is already owned by sympathetic parties. Suggest policy be amended to include a higher site size threshold in the rural areas, comparable to urban areas, and a lower overall target. Alternatively, suggest using North Norfolk District Council model.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing is sought on development sites, this will effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing. No change to the Council's approach.
Summary:
50% is unreasonable and unrealistic level which cannot be sustained. Will impact upon the ability to deliver housing growth.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing is sought on development sites, this will effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing. No change to the Council's approach.
Con ID: 26557
Full Name: Acrabuild Ltd
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2431
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
50% represents an unreasonable and unrealistic level of provision which cannot reasonably be sustained. Delivery of such a high level of affordable housing will compromise the viability of development sites, and more importantly will dissuade land-owners from disposing of sites at what will be regarded as deflated values. This will compromise the ability to deliver housing growth.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing is sought on development sites, this will effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing. No change to the Council's approach.

Con ID: 26558
Full Name: Mr G Fearn
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2430
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
50% represents an unreasonable and unrealistic level of provision which cannot reasonably be sustained. Delivery of such a high level of affordable housing will compromise the viability of development sites, and more importantly will dissuade land-owners from disposing of sites at what will be regarded as deflated values. This will compromise the ability to deliver housing growth.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing is sought on development sites, this will effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing. No change to the Council's approach.

Con ID: 26559
Full Name: Mr H Thornton
Organisation: Genepi Property
Comment ID: 2450
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
PO is an unreasonable and unrealistic level of provision which cannot reasonably be sustained. Will compromise the viability of development sites, disuading landowners from selling land at a deflated value. Thus compromising ability to deliver housing growth.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. No change to the Council’s approach.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26379</th>
<th>Full Name: Mr M Brebner</th>
<th>Organisation: Clerk Tallington Parish Council</th>
<th><strong>Summary:</strong> Requiring a development as small as 2 plus dwellings in rural areas to include 50% affordable housing is excessive.</th>
<th><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong> The Council’s Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. No change to the Council’s approach.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Con ID: 26292</td>
<td>Full Name: Councillor T Holmes</td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> There should be a requirement for all developments new or outlined, prior to granting full permissions, that the provision of affordable housing be to the figures indicated irrespective of what part of the district it is.</td>
<td><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong> noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con ID: 26231</td>
<td>Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge</td>
<td>Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells</td>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong> Objective 7 seeks “up to 50% new housing development to be affordable whereas policy requires an average of 50%. It is unrealistic to expect 50% of rural development sites comprising 2+ dwellings to provide affordable housing on site.</td>
<td><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong> The Council’s Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. The RSS policy is a minimum against which this council has made representations. No change to the Council’s approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Coleman</td>
<td>William Davis Ltd</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Housing Needs Assessment inadequate as robust evidence base over extended period to 2026. PPS3 advises Strategic Housing Market Assessment required. Concerned that 50% target is excessive, particularly where no public funding is available. Suggest target is reduced to 30% and reference made to Council having regard to availability of public funding and viability of sites to more adequately reflect PPS3.</td>
<td>Comments noted. SHMA report is due during early 2008 and its contents will be taken into consideration when preparing policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr N Hydes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>People on low incomes should live in urban areas so their travel to work costs are lower.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>50% affordable dwellings provision is excessive and unjustifiable. Housing Needs Survey requirement of 643 pa (against total RSS housing requirement of 630 pa) is unrealistic. Housing Needs Survey has not be subject to robust stakeholder engagement. PPS3 proposes HMAs are most appropriate mechanism for establishing need for both affordable and market housing. Suggest that the HMA be subject to full and effective consultation with private sector and other interests both during its formulation and prior to its adoption and that only once the</td>
<td>The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing is sought on development sites, this will effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing. No change to the Council's approach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
need for both affordable and market housing has been taken into account throughout the district that a target, or preferably targets, are proposed for further consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26203</td>
<td>Mr C Townson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Threshold for service centres should be between 5 - 10 houses - allows for a quality development (builder can make a profit) while pricing the affordable unit at a affordable price.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26230</td>
<td>Alison and Stamford H</td>
<td>Director Smith Stuart Reynolds</td>
<td>50% affordable housing requirement is excessive and unjustified. Housing Needs Survey requirement of 643pa is totally unrealistic: total housing requirement is 630pa. HMA, as proposed in PPS3, required. Suggest that HMA is subject to full and effective consultation with private sector and other interests both during its formulation and prior to its adoption, and that only once the need for both affordable and market housing has been taken into account throughout the district that a target, or preferably targets, are proposed for further consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officers' Recommendation:**
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing is sought on development sites, this will effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing. No change to the Council's approach.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
HMA is being prepared. The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing is sought on development sites, this will effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing. No change to the Council's approach.
Summary:
We consider the overall provision should be reduced from 50% as we are concerned that this could discourage new development. The threshold for rural developments should also be increased.

Officers' Recommendation:

Con ID: 26301
Full Name: Wilson
Organisation: David Wilson Homes North Midland
Comment ID: 2410
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
50% is unreasonable and unrealistic level that cannot be sustained. Will impact upon the ability to deliver housing growth.

Officers' Recommendation:

The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing is sought on development sites, this will effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing. No change to the Council's approach.

Con ID: 26305
Full Name: Mr D Gibbons
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 1908
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
The threshold of 2+ dwellings for rural development is too low and would result in every 2nd new dwelling having to be affordable housing. This will make the development of small sites uneconomic. Suggest threshold of 6+ dwellings 10.5 ha will achieve objective of providing more affordable homes in rural areas.

Officers' Recommendation:

Noted.
Con ID: 26082
Full Name: Mr Tim Bladon
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 2600
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response Object
Summary:
Feel that "+2" dwellings leads to confusion, and that proper and specific expression is necessary to show either "two dwellings and above" or "above two dwellings". The same applies to the "15+". Also seeks clarification as to the Council's intention if the number of dwellings amounted to an odd number, would the number of affordable dwellings be rounded up or down?

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Policy needs clarification. Consider 2+ is amended to "two and above".

Con ID: 26111
Full Name: Mr W Barton
Organisation: Kennedy Leigh Charitable Trust
Comment ID: 2050
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response Object
Summary:
We propose that the proportion should be reduced to 40% affordable housing.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Fordhams Housing Need survey has been prepared following National guidance and good practice. Fordhams are a nationally renowned specialist in this area of research and no evidence is provided to justify these comments. In the absence of evidence to the contrary the council should base its policy on the recommendations of the Fordhams study. Rural Exceptions sites would be permissible under the preferred option - however this should be clarified within the final policy.

Con ID: 26299
Full Name: Mr John Plumb
Organisation: Stamford Town Partnership
Comment ID: 1811
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response Observations
Summary:
For Stamford we would wish to strongly emphasise the importance of affordable housing, there is an increasingly urgent problem of its availability to retain young people in our town.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.
Full Name: Mrs M. A. S. Bates
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Comment ID: 1710
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
Agree with the general principle of proportion of 'affordable' in new developments. Would want to see much more emphasis on the use of local styles and material, limits to the number of houses on new AH estates and attention to wildlife conservation and biodiversity within and immediately around estates to provide access for householders to wildlife areas.

Officer's Recommendation:
Comments noted.

Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer Planning & Conservation Lincolnshire County Council
Comment ID: 1878
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
Preferred Option PO5a: The 50% target and the 60%/40% social intermediate split within it are inconsistent with draft Regional Plan Policy 15. It is, however, more important that they are consistent with SKDC's evaluation of the results of the HMA, as also set out in Policy 15.

Officer's Recommendation:
Noted.
Summary:

Last sentence: this ought to be clarified as PPS 3 provides for rural exceptions sites to be allocated for affordable housing in small rural communities (the definition of small rural settlements is set out in the footnote on page 11 of PPS 3)

Officers' Recommendation:

Comments noted.

Summary:

Rural exception sites will still be subject to the requirements of PPS25 in respect to the application of the Sequential and Exception Tests, although it is acknowledged that the scope to consider reasonably available alternative sites will be restricted to the location where the rural housing need has been identified. We request that when sites in Flood Zones 2 or 3 come forward for consideration the Environment Agency be consulted with a FRA to ensure that the development can be safe from flooding.

Officers' Recommendation:

All applications for residential development will be considered in the light of the requirements of PPS25.
Con ID: 26160
Full Name: Cecil
Organisation: c/o Strutt and Parker
Comment ID: 1949
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Object to the upper limit of 50% affordable housing provision, it will limit the supply of land suitable for housing development coming to the market and undermine deliverability of the Plan. PO5a should be amended to 20+ dw to emphasise meeting affordable housing needs through exception sites. Disagree with rural threshold, it contradicts Objective 4. Split between shared ownership and low cost home ownership needs to be more flexible. Policy needs to be re-worded and a stronger emphasis placed on delivery through Exception Sites.

Officers' Recommendation:
To actually meet the level of need identified in the Councils Housing Needs Survey (2006) all new housing required for the district on an annual basis would need to be affordable. The recommended policy percentage of 50% is seen as an appropriate compromise to effectively deliver an appropriate mix and balance of housing. Increasing the threshold to 20+ would result in fewer new development sites being required to provide affordable housing which would decrease the number of overall number of affordable units delivered and increase the level of need. The Policy 5a thresholds and percentage splits reflect recommendations of the Housing Needs Survey. Policy states the Council will investigate and identify specific sites or areas of search to allocate exception sites, no further emphasis required. No change to the Council's approach.

Con ID: 26142
Full Name: Miss H Edwards
Organisation: British Waterways
Comment ID: 1926
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Within the context of delivering the objective of growth in Grantham and having regarding to the necessary balance to be achieved in delivering the wider economic objectives of area based regeneration projects within the town, any affordable threshold should reflect Paragraph 29 of PPS3, which states that the target amount of affordable housing to be provided should reflect: "an assessment of the likely economic viability of land for housing within the area, taking account of risks to delivery and drawing on informed assessments of the likely levels of finance available for affordable housing, including public subsidy and the level of developer contribution that can reasonably be secured".

Officers' Recommendation:
Within the context of delivering the objective of growth in Grantham and having regarding to the necessary balance to be achieved in delivering the wider economic objectives of area based regeneration projects within the town, any affordable threshold should reflect Paragraph 29 of PPS3, which states that the target amount of affordable housing to be provided should reflect: "an assessment of the likely economic viability of land for housing within the area, taking account of risks to delivery and drawing on informed assessments of the likely levels of finance available for affordable housing, including public subsidy and the level of developer contribution that can reasonably be secured".
Summary:
Whilst the wording of this Option has been revised, the headline issues remain the same, notably in terms of thresholds and percentages. As such the Chamber's objections as expressed within its 7 August 2006 submissions remain.

Officers' Recommendation:
noted.

---

Summary:
Ratio of 50% affordable / 50% market housing is too high, and will threaten delivery of all housing sites. Propose substantial reduction, or deletion of relevent sentence. Provision of affordable housing to be decided on site-by-site basis.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. The RSS policy is a minimum against which this council has made representations. No change to the Council's approach.
Con ID: 26318  
Full Name: Mr Cyril Day  
Organisation: Highways Agency  
Comment ID: 2151  
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING  
Number: Preferred Option PO5a  
Nature Of Response: Observations  
Summary:  
Our previous comments cautioned that, as affordable housing was to be the only type of new housing development that would be allowed in rural areas, extreme care should be taken to ensure that pockets of deprivation are not created in otherwise affluent areas, where poorer residents may not have access to cars. This advice still stands, given the continued aim of placing affordable housing on policy exceptionsites, some in rural locations.  
Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted.

Con ID: 26100  
Full Name: Mr N Gough  
Organisation: Bigwood Associates  
Comment ID: 2442  
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING  
Number: Preferred Option PO5a  
Nature Of Response: Support  
Summary:  
General support for policy. However, organizations other than RSLs provide Affordable Housing and the policy should reflect this. Suggest adding "other appropriate agencies" after "RSLs" in first line of last paragraph. It is unreasonable not to include Bourne as one of towns identified in last paragraph, because Bourne has identified Affordable Housing need.  
Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted.

Con ID: 26334  
Full Name: Town Clerk Market Dee  
Organisation: Clerk Market Deeping Town Council  
Comment ID: 2348  
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING  
Number: Preferred Option PO5a  
Nature Of Response: Support  
Summary:  
Concerned that this will encourage developers to restrict each planning application to 15 dwellings to avoid having to provide affordable housing will lead to lots of 'piecemeal' developments.  
Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted.
Con ID: 26289
Full Name: Mrs P J Kirby
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 1648
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response Support

Summary:
My only comment is that I would like to know what "an appropriate number"will mean in reality. It would be clearer if set guidelines were adhered to.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comment noted. ? make policy clearer.

Con ID: 26221
Full Name: Mr Alan Hubbard
Organisation: Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust
Comment ID: 2130
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response Support

Summary:
The National Trust supports the revised preferred option.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.

Con ID: 26298
Full Name: Mr J.J.S. Brown
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 1802
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response Support

Summary:
There is a greater need in rural areas than in the towns. Many people find they cannot afford to live in the place they grew up or work, ie, farm workers, they can only afford to live in larger towns, more greenfield sites in the local service centres should be used. An example of this is the Manor Court Development in Sudbrook, the 3 affordable houses sold within the first week, the homes at £300,000 remain

Officers' Recommendation:
Noted.
Con ID: 26290
Full Name: Mrs Sheila Kostyrka
Organisation: Deeping St James Parish Council
Comment ID: 1663
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary:
Greenfield 'exception' sites should be used very sparingly.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.

Con ID: 26470
Full Name: Mr Roger Stafford
Organisation: Manager
Buckminster Estate
Comment ID: 2034
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Number: Preferred Option PO5a
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary:
Supports initiative BUT concerned that the bar may have been set too high with regard to the economics of the delivery. PO5a is too prescriptive and definitive in relation to percentages. Affordable housing is typically part of an overall development and does not produce open market land values. Requirement is effectively a substantial cost to the development. With many projects there are other planning gain requirements in addition to affordable housing. Viability of schemes should not be undermined by excessive planning gain requirements, otherwise there is a risk that development will not happen. LPA may need flexibility to lower affordable housing requirements in return of planning gain package which delivers, say, infrastructure of a higher priority, at the same time. In the case of the two Urban Extension sites we are advised that a Grantham Southern Bypass is the current major priority for the Town. To this end Preferred

Officers' Recommendation:
Option P05a should include the caveat that levels of affordable housing on the two UES should be set at levels which balance the need to direct substantial capital receipts to the proposed Grantham Bypass with the need to deliver affordable housing. Post Bypass construction it may well be that the wording of PO5a as set out in the Core Strategy be applied for the remaining period up to 2026.

Con ID: 26166  
Full Name:  Mr A Evans  
Organisation:  Kimberley Developments Ltd  
Comment ID: 2183  
Title: PROVIDING FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING  
Number: Preferred Option PO5a  
Nature Of Response  Support with conditions

Summary: Concerns that 50% affordable housing cannot always be viably achieved. Policy could be detrimental to Council's overall targets. Need, therefore, to incorporate reference within the draft Policy to include the impact of viability of the provision of affordable housing. Examining viability issues ensures that a consistent provision of affordable housing is made. Support Option 5f, or amendment to Option 5a to allow for reduced provision where necessary.

Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted.

Con ID: 26379  
Full Name:  Mr M Brebner  
Organisation: Clerk Tallington Parish Council  
Comment ID: 2594  
Title:  
Number: Alternative Option PO5c  
Nature Of Response  Support

Summary: Requiring a development as small as 2 plus dwellings in a rural area to include 50% affordable housing is excessive.

Officers' Recommendation: This option is contrary to the recommendations in the Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) and would result in fewer affordable units being delivered where there is currently a high level of need relative to supply. No change to the Council's approach.
Con ID: 26195
Full Name: Mr M Brebner
Organisation: Greatford Parish Council
Comment ID: 2309
Title: 
Number: Alternative Option PO5c
Nature Of Response Support

Summary:
Requiring a development as small as 2 plus dwellings in a rural area to include 50% affordable housing is excessive.

Officers' Recommendation:
This option is contrary to the recommendations in the Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) and would result in fewer affordable units being delivered where there is currently a high level of need relative to supply. No change to the Council's approach.

Con ID: 26261
Full Name: Mr Tudor Townsend
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 902
Title: 
Number: Alternative Option PO5c
Nature Of Response Support

Summary:
The affordable housing threshold for development within rural areas should be increased to the same level as urban areas. The level of threshold will prevent development coming forward in rural areas as it will be unviable for developers.

Officers' Recommendation:
This option is contrary to the recommendations in the Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) and would result in fewer affordable units being delivered where there is currently a high level of need relative to supply. No change to the Council's approach.

Con ID: 26305
Full Name: Mr D Gibbons
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 2642
Title: 
Number: Alternative Option PO5c
Nature Of Response Support

Summary:
The threshold of 2+ dwellings for rural development is too low and would result in every 2nd new dwelling having to be affordable housing. This will make the development of small sites uneconomic. Suggest threshold of 6+ dwellings 10.5 ha will achieve objective of providing more affordable homes in rural areas.

Officers' Recommendation:
This option is contrary to the recommendations in the Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) and would result in fewer affordable units being delivered where there is currently a high level of need relative to supply. No change to the Council's approach.
Support is expressed for the alternative option of 40% affordable housing providing that an assessment of viability is incorporated into the policy.

Summary:

Support noted.

Officers' Recommendation:
Summary:
The Council's preferred option for affordable housing should be in line with the figure which is finally adopted as part of the RSS review and not one of the options PO5a to PO5g.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. The RSS EIP Panel report on this issue should be considered when finalising this policy, however officers are confident that the evidence and recommendations of the Housing Needs Survey 2006 should be the basis for the Council's policy on this matter.

Summary:
Preferred Option should be in line with RSS review figures.

Officers' Recommendation:
The RSS figures for affordable housing are a minimum. SKDC has challenged these figures through the EIP. The evidence provided by the Regional Assembly to arrive at this figure is not as thorough and detailed as the evidence gained by Fordhams, from for example household surveys.

Summary:
Affordable housing figure should be in line with that which is finally adopted in the RSS.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Council's Housing Need Survey (2006) recommends up to 50% affordable housing be sought on development sites. The RSS policy is a minimum against which this council has made representations. No change to the Council's approach.
Summary:
We contend that the Council's preferred option should be in line with the figure which is finally adopted as part of the RSS review and not one of the options PO5a to PO5g.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Fordhams Housing Need survey has been prepared following National guidance and good practice. Fordhams are a nationally renowned specialist in this area of research and no evidence is provided to justify these comments. In the absence of evidence to the contrary the council should base its policy on the recommendations of the Fordhams study. Rural Exceptions sites would be permissible under the preferred option - however this should be clarified within the final policy.
Con ID: 26477
Full Name: Mr Andy Fenn
Organisation: Travellers Liaison Officer Lincolnshire County Council

Summary:
If you are looking at providing new site(s) as suggested, there should be some reference to the DCLG 'Draft guidance on the design of the sites for Gypsies and Travellers.'

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Policy for sites should reflect the draft guidance note. The identification of land which may be suitable for use as sites for gypsies and/or travellers has been the subject of separate consultation.

Con ID: 26173
Full Name: Mrs Alice de la Rue
Organisation: Planning Officer Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group

Summary:
The Gypsy and Traveller study undertaken in South Kesteven was completed before the issue of draft government guidance on carrying out such assessments. As such the assessment does lack clarity and robustness in certain areas. I have included in with this response a copy of a benchmarking exercise where we have investigated the soundness of the assessment in accordance with recent research published by CLG. Whilst the South Kesteven study represents a starting point, it needs to be reviewed at the earliest opportunity, prior to the development of Site Specific Allocations, to ensure that a more comprehensive view is obtained. This would ensure that any weaknesses in the survey methodology are addressed, a more sound assessment of overcrowding made, and estimates of need made for a period of at least five years. We would happily advise on any future survey approaches. In the meantime, we welcome the wording of the proposed policy PO6 where it uses the word 'minimum'.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support for PO6 wording is welcomed. Lincolnshire GTAA is currently being undertaken to update earlier work.
Summary:
This states that"..the Council will seek to identify two or more appropriate sites..", however we would prefer to see this text amended to read"..the Council will seek to identify appropriate sites..". This would ensure that there is more flexibility to ensure appropriate sites are selected to meet the needs of Gypsy and Traveller communities, particularly as there is some doubt over the robustness of the existing needs survey. Furthermore, the following sentence in the same paragraph should be amended to read "..criteria in this policy should ensure that appropriate sites can be.."-that is, change the refer to 'appropriate site' in the sentence from singular to plural for consistency and clarity.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Paragraph will be amended accordingly.

Summary:
In the past, many authorised sites have been located in places which would not be considered appropriate for residential development, for example there are sites under motorway flyovers or next to sewerage works in some areas. It would be useful to insert a sentence in this paragraph prior to the mention of the planning circular that sites must not be located where existing land uses will cause nuisance to the site residents, for example through pollution (noise, smell, contamination etc). This would acknowledge that it is not just a case of assessing the impact of the site on the existing community, but of the existing community/land uses on the proposed site.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Paragraph will be amended accordingly.
| Comment ID: 26253 | **Summary:** | Difficult in rural areas where there is no - or very little infrastructure - transport, education, medical and employment to support a stable travelling community. | **Officers' Recommendation:** | Comments noted. National Guidance indicates that sites should be on the edge of, or within reasonable distance of, settlements which offer a range of services. |
| Full Name: Manager L Mernt | Organisation: Manager Buckminster Gliding Club |  |
| Title: GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS | Number: Preferred Option PO6 |  |
| Nature Of Response: Object |  |  |

| Comment ID: 26248 | **Summary:** | Consider that the effect of an adjoining Gypsies/Travellers site would have a very serious effect on the viability of a proposed residential area. | **Officers' Recommendation:** | Comments noted. Impacts of adjoining area upon site and site upon adjoining area will be considered when allocating sites for development. |
| Full Name: on behalf of Jenkinson | Organisation: Chartered Surveyors Escritt Barrell Golding |  |
| Title: GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS | Number: Preferred Option PO6 |  |
| Nature Of Response: Object |  |  |

| Comment ID: 26203 | **Summary:** | No alternative options provided. | **Officers' Recommendation:** | This is a criteria based policy based on national guidance. The number of pitches required is based upon evidence of need set out in the 'Gypsy and Traveller Housing Need Survey.' |
| Full Name: Mr C Townson | Organisation: |  |
| Title: GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS | Number: Preferred Option PO6 |  |
| Nature Of Response: Object |  |  |
Summary:
In view of what has happened in Cambridgeshire, no site should be in or near a residential area. There should be no more than two pitches on any site.

Officers' Recommendation:
Disagree. Circular 01/2006 (para.65) states 'In deciding where to provide for gypsy and traveller sites, local planning authorities should first consider locations in or near existing settlements with access to local services..' The number of pitches on a site depends on the level of need and the site area. However the gypsy and travelling community prefer smaller sites with capacity for 8-10 pitches only.

Summary:
The Environment Agency will not support any planning applications for sites in Flood Zone 3. The wording of the policy should be amended to represent this. We recommend that the reference to category 3 of the SFRA is replaced by 'PPS25 Flood Zone 3'.

Officers' Recommendation:
The policy accords with this approach. Reference to Flood Zone 3 should be amended accordingly.

Summary:
Concerns about visual impact.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comment noted. This aspect is covered in PO10 in relation to all development proposals and there is no need to identify criteria covered within other preferred options. Policy will be amended accordingly.
Summary:
We have no comments on the Preferred Option, except that as with affordable housing the pitch numbers specified could be superseded by the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (referred to in 3.6.3) the final report on which is expected in July 2007.

Officers' Recommendation:
Noted. Consideration will be given to rewording policy to enable it to always reflect current GTAA.

__________

Summary:
The aim set out in the policy of locating such sites within reasonable reach of main travelling routes and existing settlements and services is broadly welcomed from a sustainability perspective.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.

__________

Summary:
However, they should not be able to develop a greenfield site in a rural area when honest taxpayers cannot. I believe the site should be owned by the council and each pitch rented to the travellers, you could then keep control regarding crime etc, and numbers of inhabitants.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.
Con ID: 26293  
Full Name: Mrs M. A. S. Bates  
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust  
Comment ID: 1711  
Title: GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS  
Number: Preferred Option PO6  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary:  
Agree strongly with Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust emphasis on bullet point six under 'preferred option' about the need to safeguard the character of the landscape and biodiversity  

Officers' Recommendation:  
Support welcomed. However, this aspect is covered in PO10 in relation to all development proposals and there is no need to identify criteria covered within other preferred options. Policy will be amended accordingly.

Con ID: 26292  
Full Name: Councillor T Holmes  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 1688  
Title: GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS  
Number: Preferred Option PO6  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary:  
To remove the word 'seek to' from the first line.  

Officers' Recommendation:  
Support is noted. Disagree that "seek to"should be removed.

Con ID: 26212  
Full Name: Mrs C Curtis  
Organisation: Friends of Bourne Wood  
Comment ID: 1553  
Title: GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS  
Number: Preferred Option PO6  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary:  
Sites should be inspected regularly as an environment and public health issue.  

Officers' Recommendation:  
Comment noted.
Summary: The last bullet point (re not overdominating the settled community) is important, as small villages could not cope with an influx of travellers.

Officer's Recommendation: Agree. Circular 01/2006 para 54 states "Sites should respect the scale of, and not dominate the nearest settled community. They should also avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure".

Summary: Supports inclusion of the fifth bullet point: ‘The site would not materially harm the character of the landscape or the biodiversity value of the site and its surroundings’

Officer's Recommendation: Support welcomed. However, this aspect is covered in PO10 in relation to all development proposals and there is no need to identify criteria covered within other preferred options. Policy will be amended accordingly.

Summary: The last bullet point (re not overdominating the settled community) is important, as small villages could not cope with an influx of travellers.

Officer's Recommendation: Agree. Circular 01/2006 para 54 states "Sites should respect the scale of, and not dominate the nearest settled community. They should also avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure".
Summary:
In addition to the landscape and biodiversity criteria identified that consideration needs to be given to the historic environment. PPG15 and 16 state impacts upon Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and their related settings are relevant considerations. The following criterion should be added:• The site would not materially harm designated historic sites or their settings.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comment noted. The additional criteria is not required as this is covered in para. 52 of Circular 01/2006.

Summary:
Establish the main routes in advance, the better to identify and constrain likely sites.

Officers' Recommendation:
The GTAA considers travelling patterns but, does not specify the main routes/roads used. The GTAA recommends further qualitative work e.g. mapping travel routes. Reference to main travelling routes will be deleted until this information is available.

Summary:
Care should be taken with regard to local people where Gypsies sites could be located. As many feel threatened by such and may reduce the attractions of the area.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.
Summary:
Some aspects of the policy need further clarification: "The site is appropriately located to the main travelling routes used" Which routes are these? And what evidence exists to show this? "The proposed site provides an acceptable living environment for its residents" This criterion is welcomed, although this should be the same for all new residential development "The site is sufficiently close to existing schools, shops and other facilities likely to be required by residents" Agree that sites need to be in accessible locations. However need some steer over what is considered "sufficiently close" "The site is near or adjoining a residential area" This criterion should be deleted as the third criterion already states that the site should be close to existing facilities and that is the more important factor in terms of sustainability. "The site would not materially harm the character of the landscape or the biodiversity value of the site and its surroundings" This criterion should be deleted as it is covered in PO10, which applies to all new development. "The provisions of refuse facilities including recycling are available" This should be the case with all new development and should be covered in other policies elsewhere in the plan. "Consideration is given to the potential use of renewable energy" This criterion should be deleted as it is covered in PO13. It should also be noted that Gypsy and Traveller sites tend to be much more energy efficient than conventional housing. "In some circumstances it may be appropriate to re-visit the site after a temporary period to assess the situation" This sentence should be deleted—there is no equivalent included against other types of development. If issues relating to environmental

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree with many of these comments. In particular there should be no need to identify criteria which are covered within the other Preferred Options. Consideration will be given to the points raised and policy amended accordingly.
health or enforcement do arise, then these should be dealt with through normal procedures which do not need to be stated here, as would be the case with other types of development.

**Con ID:** 26203  
**Full Name:** Mr C Townson  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 1843  
**Title:** TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO7  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**  
No alternative given. Local weight limits would negate traveller requirements in most of our community.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comment noted. Consideration will be given to point raised and policy amended accordingly.

**Con ID:** 26286  
**Full Name:** Mr N Hydes  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 1596  
**Title:** TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO7  
**Nature Of Response** Object

**Summary:**  
It is considered that Harlaxton and Toft/Lound already accommodate travelling showpeople.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Noted. Existing travelling showpeople sites are at Honington Circus and Lound, there is not a site at Harlaxton. The criteria based policy will allow for the proper consideration of any planning application for a travelling showpeople site.
Con ID: 26304
Full Name: Mr J M Mettham
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 1897
Title: TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE
Number: Preferred Option PO7
Nature Of Response Object

Summary: Concerns about existing site at Honington railway junction.

Officers' Recommendation: Proposals for Travelling Showpeople sites will each be considered against policy criteria and on their own merits.

Con ID: 26229
Full Name: Mr Jacob Newby
Organisation: Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency
Comment ID: 2684
Title: TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE
Number: Preferred Option PO7
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary: The Environment Agency will not support any planning applications for sites in Flood Zone 3. The wording of the policy should be amended to represent this. We recommend that the reference to category 3 of the SFRA is replaced by 'PPS25 Flood Zone 3'.

Officers' Recommendation: The policy accords with this approach. Reference to PPS25 Flood Zone 3 should be amended accordingly.

Con ID: 26212
Full Name: Mrs C Curtis
Organisation: Friends of Bourne Wood
Comment ID: 1554
Title: TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE
Number: Preferred Option PO7
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary: It seems a shame that residents have to suffer with reduced car parking and access while the travellers are here.

Officers' Recommendation: Comment noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26149</th>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Miss E C Biott</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2291</td>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE</td>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response:</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Supports inclusion of the fourth bullet point: 'The site would not materially harm the character of the landscape or the biodiversity value of the site and its surroundings'.</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>Support welcomed. However, this aspect is covered in PO10 in relation to all development proposals and there is no need to identify criteria covered within other preferred options. Policy will be amended accordingly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26195</th>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Mr M Brebner</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Greatford Parish Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE</td>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response:</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>No objection but, the fifth bullet point is important as small villages could not cope with an influx of travellers.</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>Agree. Circular 04/07 para 45 states &quot;Sites should respect the scale of, and not dominate the nearest settled community. They should also avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26318</th>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Mr Cyril Day</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Highways Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2624</td>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE</td>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response:</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>This issue was not covered in the previous Preferred Options paper. The aim of locating living and storage sites for travelling show people within reasonable reach of main travelling routes and existing settlements and services is broadly welcomed from a sustainability perspective.</td>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Con ID: 26379  
Full Name: Mr M Brebner  
Organisation: Clerk Tallington Parish Council  
Comment ID: 2324  
Title: TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE  
Number: Preferred Option PO7  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary:  
No objection but, the fifth bullet point is important as small villages could not cope with an influx of travellers.  

Officers' Recommendation:  
Agree. Circular 04/07 para 45 states "Sites should respect the scale of, and not dominate the nearest settled community. They should also avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure".

Con ID: 26298  
Full Name: Mr J.J.S. Brown  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 1806  
Title: TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE  
Number: Preferred Option PO7  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary:  
Disagree with developing a travelling showpeople site on Greenfield land in the rural area. Consider the site should be Council owned and controlled, and each pitch rented.  

Officers' Recommendation:  
Noted. The criteria based policy is based on national guidance and will allow for the proper consideration of any planning application made for a travelling showpeople site.

Con ID: 26289  
Full Name: Mrs P J Kirby  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 1650  
Title: TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE  
Number: Preferred Option PO7  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary:  
Site on Bourne/Stamford Road near Toft tunnel.  

Officers' Recommendation:  
Noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26292</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Councillor T Holmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>1690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>The policy is extremely vague and relatively negative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>Noted. The criteria based policy is based on national guidance and will allow for the proper consideration of any planning application made for a travelling showpeople site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26293</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Mrs M. A. S. Bates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>1712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>But would emphasise bullet point four about the need to safeguard the character of the landscape and biodiversity - as LWT submission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26221</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Mr Alan Hubbard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>In addition to the landscape and biodiversity criteria identified that consideration needs to be given to the historic environment. PPG15 and 16 state impacts upon Registered Historic Parks and Gardens, Scheduled Ancient Monuments and their related settings are relevant considerations. The following criterion should be added: • The site would not materially harm designated historic sites or their settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>Comment noted. The additional criteria is not required as this is covered in para. 44 of Circular 04/07.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Con ID: 26189
Full Name: Mrs S Roberts
Organisation:
Comment ID: 1612
Title: TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE
Number: Preferred Option PO7
Nature Of Response Support with conditions

Summary:
Care should be taken with regard to local people where travelling showpeople sites could be located as many feel threatened by such and may reduce the attractiveness of the area.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Circular 04/07 para 45 states "Sites should respect the scale of, and not dominate the nearest settled community. They should also avoid placing an undue pressure on the local infrastructure".

Con ID: 26173
Full Name: Mrs Alice de la Rue
Organisation: Planning Officer
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group
Comment ID: 2657
Title: TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE
Number: Preferred Option PO7
Nature Of Response Support with conditions

Summary:
There are no criteria which mention proximity to facilities e.g. schools or healthcare. Reference to established local connections should be deleted. Conflicts with draft guidance “Consultation on revised planning guidance in relation to Travelling Showpeople” (paragraph 52) and with paragraph 62 of Circular 01/2006. Question the main travelling routes and what evidence exists. Bullet points 2 (living environments) and 3 (alternative modes of transport) are not solely applicable to travelling showpeople sites. Bullet point 4 (landscape or biodiversity value) should be deleted as covered in PO10 which applies to all new development. Bullet point 6 (environmental impact on community’s quality of life) is not considered specific to Travelling Showpeople sites as it should be considered when assessing all new development. Bullet point 7 (vehicle access and parking) should be covered in a general policy on new development. Bullet point 9 (renewable energy) should be deleted as it is covered by PO13.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree with many of these comments. In particular there should be no need to identify criteria which are covered within the other Preferred Options. Consideration will be given to the points raised and policy amended accordingly.
Con ID: 26295  
Full Name: Mr D J Holmes  
Organisation: Chairman Old Somerby Parish Council  
Comment ID: 1760  
Title: TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE  
Number: Preferred Option PO7  
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions  

Summary: Establish the main travelling routes in advance, the better to identify and constrain likely sites.

Officers' Recommendation: Agree with comment. However, main travelling routes were not incorporated in the GTAA, it recommends further 'qualitative' work e.g. mapping travel routes. The policy will be amended to refer to good access to the highway network.

Con ID: 26160  
Full Name: Cecil  
Organisation: c/o Strutt and Parker  
Comment ID: 1950  
Title: Employment Development  
Number: 3.8  
Nature Of Response: Observations  

Summary: The policy of providing high quality B1 and A2 office development within Stamford is supported.

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted.

Con ID: 26164  
Full Name: Mr R Machin  
Organisation: Savills  
Comment ID: 1701  
Title: paragraph  
Number: 3.8.1  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary: The general desire to deliver good quality and available employment land is supported. More positive wording associated with a town having growth point-status is needed. Omit 'adequate supply' and replace with 'well located, good quality employment land which is attractive to businesses'.

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted. Agree, change accordingly.
Summary:
Support is expressed for a comprehensive review of existing Local Plan employment allocations.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.

Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells
Comment ID: 1029
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.8.3
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Con ID: 26164
Full Name: Mr R Machin
Organisation: Savills
Comment ID: 1702
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.8.4
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
Concentrating employment land allocations in and close to the main urban areas is supported. Potential new B8 space set close to the A1 is set to be greenfield land as the urban centre is poorly accessible and congestion is one of Grantham's key environmental problems.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comment noted. The Core Strategy provides the overarching hierarchy, specific sites will be identified in the Site Allocations DPD.

Con ID: 26164
Full Name: Mr R Machin
Organisation: Savills
Comment ID: 1703
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.8.5
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
The proposed allocation of 240 hectares of employment land with circa half of this in and around Grantham is supported. This approach is well justified and must be delivered if growth point status is going to be developed in a sustainable manner.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.
Summary:
The land to the western edge of Stamford offers good road and public transport network connections and is easily deliverable within the plan period. A specific allocation concentrating on quality B1 and A2 uses to ensure the continued economic vibrancy of Stamford and stem the daily outward commuting of its labour force to Peterborough.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support for a specific allocation for B1 and A2 use along the western edge of Stamford is noted. This will be considered in formulating the Site Specific Allocation and Policies DPD.

Con ID: 26160
Full Name: Cecil
Organisation: c/o Strutt and Parker
Comment ID: 1952
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.8.6
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
General support for delivering growth in Grantham which has previously been stifled through inappropriate allocations.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.

Con ID: 26164
Full Name: Mr R Machin
Organisation: Savills
Comment ID: 1705
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.8.6
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
This is significantly different to previous Preferred Option and object to both the identification of development at Colsterworth and the introduction of reserved land at Grantham and Bourne, which is consistent with Objective 6 to promote Grantham as Sub-regional centre. Delete Other Site: Colsterworth A1 junction – up to 10 hectares for B2, B8 use’ Delete the paragraph starting In addition, a further 70 hectares for ...’. Replace ‘90 hectares’ with 160 hectares

Officers' Recommendation:
The Employment Land Review undertaken by Savills was undertaken in October 2005, and covered the period up to 2011. The Housing and Economic DPD Preferred Options Consultation Report (June 2006) identified options for the period up to 2021. This was subject to Sustainability Appraisal using the SEA framework. The Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation Report (May 2007) covered the period up to 2026, and revisited the portfolio of employment sites, and researched sites covered in the June 2006 report. There will be a need for a further review of this portfolio of sites before the Core Strategy is
This will embrace the emerging PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Development) and the approval of any recent planning applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26160</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Cecil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>c/o Strutt and Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response:</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
The current allocations detailed in PO8a are not supported. They should be amended to: Stamford 37ha, Bourne 34ha and The Deepings 26ha. The policy should be amended to include the following criteria: i Commercial viability, availability and deliverability of development ii Sustainable location within or close to existing settlements iii Ability to access the site by means of public transport iv Availability of on site infrastructure.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comments noted. The employment land figures in PO8a were derived using the Employment Land Study (Oct 2005). The criteria in PO8b does not reflect advise from the Government Office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26347</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Mrs N Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Town Clerk Bourne Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response:</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
Bourne Town Council would like reserves for Bourne to be increased as the council feels the proposed reserved area is not sufficient enough to encourage new industry moving into town.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comments noted. However, it is considered that a potential total of 78ha of land for a town like Bourne is more than sufficient for a 20 year period, especially when it is noted that xha have been developed over the last 10 years.
Con ID: 26111
Full Name: Mr W Barton
Organisation: Kennedy Leigh Charitable Trust
Comment ID: 2051
Title: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO8a
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
We propose that the last paragraph should be reworded to: "Within the rural areas new employment development that meets a local need will generally be supported within local service centres, larger villages and rural villages providing that the proposals will not have an adverse impact on the character and setting of the village, or negatively impacting on neighbouring land uses through visual, noise, traffic or pollution impacts."

Officers' Recommendation:
The criteria in Appendix A have been adopted to ensure that development is to be located in the most sustainable locations. No justification for development of employment uses other than those associated with existing uses in the smaller villages.

Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells
Comment ID: 1030
Title: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO8a
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
There is insufficient justification for the 'reserved sites' under this policy and in particular there is an absence of criteria for identifying some sites as reserved. The land to the west of Grantham and to the west of the A1 should be considered as a broad location for a strategic urban extension which will comprise a mix of employment uses along side residential and other services and amenities.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. Site has been forwarded for consideration in the Site Specific Allocation and Policies document. However, is not considered appropriate as a major urban extension to the town at this time - other more sustainable located areas of land are available.

Con ID: 26471
Full Name: Mr D Baker
Organisation: Head of Planning and Development Rutland County Council
Comment ID: 2047
Title: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT

Summary:
The preferred option proposes up to 24 ha of employment land in Stamford but the preferred residential option does not include any additional housing at Stamford. This could be a concern for Rutland if an imbalance between employment and housing at Stamford were to result in increased commuting from Rutland and surrounding areas. The Key Diagram shows an

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.
"A1 Opportunity Area” to the north and west of Stamford alongside the A1. This could be a concern for Rutland if large areas of green field development were to be located on Rutlands borders with potential impacts on Rutland in terms of traffic, landscape, etc.

**Con ID:** 26045  
**Full Name:** Mr Egerton Gilman  
**Organisation:** Chairman, Environment & Traffic Working Group Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce  
**Summary:** The Chamber does not understand the logic whereby Bourne is identified as having an allocation twice the size of that of Stamford, whereas Stamford’s location is eminently stronger, and more suited to a higher level of provision

**Officers’ Recommendation:**  
The hierarchy of employment land allocation has been informed by the 2005 Employment Land Review produced for the Council by Savills. Bourne - recognition of need to balance large scale housing development and local job provision to help reduce “out communting” dependency on Peterborough.

**Con ID:** 26469  
**Full Name:** Ms Alison Christie  
**Organisation:** Strategic Partnership Officer Lincolnshire County Council  
**Summary:** Commitment to identifying development opportunities for the employment sector – but transport is not mentioned as a key issue.

**Officers’ Recommendation:**  
Agree, make reference.
**Summary:**

As currently drafted, Policy PO8a states that the Council will seek to retain and enhance employment use unless three criteria can be met: In addition, we also consider that a fourth alternative criteria should be added which is where it can be demonstrated that redevelopment of the site for a use other than employment would deliver wider regeneration benefits.

**Officers' Recommendation:**

Agree. Comments will be taken into consideration when formulating Policy.

---

**Summary:**

The evidence base that is being used to calculate the specific amounts of land that it is proposed to allocate is unclear, especially under the Grantham heading. The Employment Land Review does not identify the level of allocation set out in PO8a. More detailed consideration of environmental capacity and the potential impact of specific sites are needed prior to land being allocated. Option PO8b is preferred, but subject to the inclusion of additional criteria in respect of harm not being caused to the natural or historic environment.

**Officers' Recommendation:**

The Employment Land Review undertaken by Savills was undertaken in October 2005, and covered the period up to 2011. The Housing and Economic DPD Preferred Options Consultation Report (June 2006) identified options for the period up to 2021. This was subject to Sustainability Appraisal using the SEA framework. The Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation Report (May 2007) covered the period up to 2026, and revisited the portfolio of employment sites, and researched sites covered in the June 2006 report. There will be a need for a further review of this portfolio of sites before the Core Strategy is finalized for submission. This will embrace the emerging PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Development) and the approval of any recent planning applications.
Summary:
In response to your document 'Local Development Framework for South Kesteven' we would like to see provision for industrial units, say up to 5000sq. ft. for SALE or for rent, on the east side of Stamford.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. Letter passed to Economic Development.

Summary:
Employment development of a significant size and sale should be delivered to ensure that a imbalance with housing growth does not materialise. The allocation of land previously identified as E1(o) for employment development is supported.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.

Summary:
Includes a more locally distinctive sequential policy, with little mention of specific allocations. In the forthcoming allocations DPD, the majority of employment land would be centred on Grantham, with significant levels in other Main Towns. The preference for sites in established centres is welcome. Option PO8a appears to be the more sustainable development approach put forward in the report, in comparison to PO8b, which would follow a criteria-led approach based upon that in national and regional guidance, but would not explicitly direct development towards
the main urban areas. However access onto the A1 will need to be modelled and mitigating measures implemented taking into account the potential impact on the junction at Colsterworth and close to Grantham in particular. Any development around the Colsterworth area will also impact on the A52. In general, it is important to ensure that the negative effects of transport access to employment sites are minimised. This can be achieved by ensuring that the sites have good alternative forms of access for commuters, such as appropriate cycle and walking facilities and good public transport links.

**Con ID:** 26605  
**Full Name:** HPC Homes, Namulas  
**Organisation:** c/o Anthony Aspbury Associates  
**Comment ID:** 2579  
**Title:** EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO8a  
**Nature Of Response** Observations

**Summary:**  
PO8a does not adequately address economic and employment needs. May contribute to lack of soundness of Core Strategy because of lack of clear and robust evidence base. No justification for maintaining oversupply of traditional industrial land. To reflect RSS objectives and provide sustainable Growth Point development, LDF needs to reflect better understanding of qualitative dimension of employment and actively promote broadening and diversification of economic base. Needs more B1a/b and non service employment. Need for substantial element of planned provision in and on the edge of town centres.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments noted. A Site Specific Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document will be published during 2008, which will identify locations for employment development.
Summary:
Linkage between objectives 1 and objective 8 and PO8a could be strengthened by mention of the economic diversification strategy and particularly which economic sectors are strategic. It could also be more spatial with reference to complementary measures such as training and development. It is noted that good use is made of the Savills Study.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree.

Comment ID: 2010
Title: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO8a
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
We welcome reassessment of economic development land as allocations in the past have usually proved sterile and the long term economy and employment pattern of the town needs urgently develop-able land for this purpose.

Officers' Recommendation:
noted.

Comment ID: 1807
Title: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO8a
Nature Of Response Observations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26334</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Encouraging local employment development will help to stop the 'migration' to Peterborough for work and shopping.</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
<th>Comments noted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Town Clerk Market Dee</td>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Clerk Market Deeping Town Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2351</td>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO8a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26164</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>This option is supported as the preferred option for allocating employment land in the District. Reserve sites should be carefully considered, focus should be given to delivering attractive sites close to the A1 and specifically Gonerby Moor. The allocation of land in the highest demand area (i.e Grantham) will allow the Council to allocate sufficient land to meet the requirements of the industrial and logistics sector.</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
<th>Support for the development of Gonerby Moor for employment is noted, this area will be considered in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies document.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Mr R Machin</td>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Savills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO8a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26484</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>We support the provisions of this policy in that the distribution of development across the district is entirely appropriate. We agree that the Council should seek to retain and enhance existing employment sites. We also strongly support the fact that new employment development in the LSCs and Larger Villages will be favoured where it meets a local need.</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
<th>Support noted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Trustees for the Belvoi</td>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Smiths Gore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2401</td>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO8a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con ID:</td>
<td>26165</td>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Macdonald Buchanan T</td>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26379</th>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Mr M Brebner</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Nature Of Response</th>
<th>Summary: Adequate parking in towns is important to avoid excluding people resident in villages without sustainable public transport.</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Adequate parking in towns is important to avoid excluding people resident in villages without sustainable public transport.</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26229</th>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Mr Jacob Newby</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Nature Of Response</th>
<th>Summary: The Environment Agency has no objection to the proposed policy. Care should be given to the phasing of development to ensure that it does not come forward prior to any necessary infrastructure improvements. Please note that any sites within Flood Zones 2 and 3 will be subject to the application of the PPS25 Sequential Test.</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>The Environment Agency has no objection to the proposed policy. Care should be given to the phasing of development to ensure that it does not come forward prior to any necessary infrastructure improvements. Please note that any sites within Flood Zones 2 and 3 will be subject to the application of the PPS25 Sequential Test.</td>
<td>Applications and allocations for development will be considered in the light of PPS25.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Con ID: 26203
Full Name: Mr C Townson
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 1844
Title: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO8a
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary: Local infrastructure and transport facilities must be improved to meet new employment opportunities supported by developer contributions to improve the infrastructure.

Officers' Recommendation: noted.

Con ID: 26293
Full Name: Mrs M. A. S. Bates
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Comment ID: 1714
Title: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO8a
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary: Concern about the need for strong nature conservation policies and robust evidence base in site consideration.

Officers' Recommendation: Environmental issues will be taken into consideration when any application is received.

Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer Planning & Conservation Lincolnshire County Council
Comment ID: 1862
Title: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT

Summary: Balanced approach to employment development and review of "reserved sites" is welcomed. LDF should also identify the Deepings as a location for local need.

Officers' Recommendation: Deepings is already identified as an area where employment land will be allocated. However, no reserve is identified - should consider a reserve figure for Deepings.
Nature Of Response  Support

Summary:
Support this option. However, suggest that criteria for re-use of existing employment sites in towns should be alternatives.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted. Comments noted.

Con ID: 26100
Full Name: Mr N Gough
Organisation: Bigwood Associates
Comment ID: 2443
Title: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO8a
Nature Of Response  Support

Summary:
Support commitment to ensuring range of employment uses and locations is maintained. Suggest additional paragraph encouraging small-scale shopping facilities in new housing development. [wording supplied]

Officers' Recommendation:
Support for policy noted. Comments regarding small-scale shopping facilities noted; however, retail development is the subject of Preferred Option PO9.

Con ID: 26166
Full Name: Mr A Evans
Organisation: Kimberley Developments Ltd
Comment ID: 2184
Title: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO8a
Nature Of Response  Support
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26195</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Mr M Brebner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Greatford Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Adequate parking in towns is important to avoid excluding people resident in villages without sustainable public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26298</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Mr J.J.S. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>More should be encouraged in the local service centre to keep people out of the town and also with extra rural housing they will not need to travel as far in their cars to the workplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26112</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Alison Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Director Smith Stuart Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Support with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary:</td>
<td>Broad support for policy: only by providing additional land for employment will sustainable communities be secured and maintained. However, in view of the findings of the Employment Land Study, it is considered that further justification needs to be provided on the derivation of the employment land requirements set out in Preferred Option PO8a: essential to clearly indicate whether figures are net or gross. Also essential that mechanism for release of reserved sites is clearly indicated. Less than a 5 year supply of land could trigger release.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Recommendation:</td>
<td>Agree, ensure policy adequately refers findings of background evidence. Figures are (gross or net) - clarify. Agree needs to be clearer. Agree retention is important issue. The Employment Land Review undertaken by Savills was undertaken in October 2005, and covered the period up to 2011. The Housing and Economic DPD Preferred Options Consultation Report (June 2006) identified options for the period up to 2021. This was subject to Sustainability Appraisal using the SEA framework. The Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation Report (May 2007) covered the period up to 2026,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intention to retain and enhance existing employment areas in the towns is contrary to the approach adopted in its Urban Capacity Study which relies very heavily upon the redevelopment of existing employment sites. Suggest that further consideration is given to the approach to be adopted both to the provision and retention of employment land within the urban areas.

and revisited the portfolio of employment sites, and researched sites covered in the June 2006 report. There will be a need for a further review of this portfolio of sites before the Core Strategy is finalized for submission. This will embrace the emerging PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Development) and the approval of any recent planning applications.

Summary: Strong nature conservation policies and a robust evidence base are essential prerequisites of site consideration.

Officers' Recommendation: Environmental issues will be considered during site allocation.

Con ID: 26149  
Full Name: Miss E C Biott  
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust  
Comment ID: 2292  
Title: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT  
Number: Preferred Option PO8a  
Nature Of Response Support with conditions

Con ID: 26470  
Full Name: Mr Roger Stafford  
Organisation: Manager Buckminster Estate  
Comment ID: 2035  
Title: EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT  
Number: Preferred Option PO8a  
Nature Of Response Support with conditions

Summary: Essential, given the New Growth Point status and expectant population growth for Grantham, that adequate provision is made for employment for local people and new residents alike to counter "out-commuting". Support is conditional on sufficient employment land being allocated for plan period. Allocated land should comprise sites within the urban area and also on the edge of the urban area, in recognition of the implications for development on greenfield sites as a result of the Growth point proposals for Grantham. Supports proposed allocation of land at A1 Colsterworth junction for B2 ad B8.

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted.
**Dr. Dennis FitzPatrick**

**Summary:**
I cannot categorically support this option because I am unclear as to how the specific areas (e.g., Grantham 90 hectares, Bourne 50 hectares) were arrived at. Assuming these numbers are appropriate then "yes", and that they do not adversely affect other Options, e.g., Options 3, 4 & 5.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comment noted. The employment land figures for the four towns were derived using the recommendations of the Employment Land Study (October 2005). The Employment Land Review undertaken by Savills was undertaken in October 2005, and covered the period up to 2011. The Housing and Economic DPD Preferred Options Consultation Report (June 2006) identified options for the period up to 2021. This was subject to Sustainability Appraisal using the SEA framework. The Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation Report (May 2007) covered the period up to 2026, and revisited the portfolio of employment sites, and researched sites covered in the June 2006 report. There will be a need for a further review of this portfolio of sites before the Core Strategy is finalized for submission. This will embrace the emerging PPS4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Development) and the approval of any recent planning applications.

**Councillor T Holmes**

**Summary:**
It sets out to create an employment enhancing policy, sorely needed in this low wage economy area. So long as it is adhered to and does not turn into backdoor residential development as has happened in the past, it must be welcomed. I would want to see the re-use of employment land for its original purpose and not the potential for 'Change of Use' to less desirable land use to the detriment of the viability of the local community.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Support for proposal noted. It is the intention of this Council to protect employment land. Policy clarified? a greater consistency with approach to change of use to residential.
Summary:
It is considered that further justification needs to be provided on the derivation of the employment land requirements set out in Preferred Option PO8a. In so doing it is essential to clearly indicate whether the stated figures are net or gross. Further, it is essential that the mechanisms for the release of the reserved sites is clearly indicated within the relevant LDDs. The release could be triggered once the employment land supply calculations indicate that there is less than a 5 year supply of readily available land. Finally it would appear that the stated intention to retain and enhance existing employment areas in the towns is contrary to the approach which the Council has adopted in its aforementioned Urban Capacity Study which relies very heavily upon the redevelopment of existing employment sites.

Requested Approach
It is therefore requested that further consideration is given to the approach to be adopted both to the provision and retention of employment land within the urban areas.

Officers' Recommendation:

Summary:
Both options have the potential to impact upon archaeological remains. However, as no specific sites have been identified it is difficult to comment.

Officers' Recommendation:
noted.
Mr Clive Bontoft
General Manager
Roseland Group Ltd

Summary:
It is considered that the proposed policy does not adequately address these concerns. The policy lacks any significant hierarchy, and other than the identification of a site at Colsterworth lacks any 'local -distinctiveness'. Roseland Business Park should be identified in a similar context to Colsterworth as it has as much if not more merit in terms of a successful and sustainable business location.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Roseland Business Park should be identified alongside Colsterworth as an important employment area within the A1 corridor.

Mr J Parmiter
Retail Needs Study must be extended to cover the whole plan period not just to 2021. And in relation to convenience floorspace, the strategy needs to recognise a substantial new floorspace requirement in Stamford. This will better inform a Preferred Option.

Officers' Recommendation:
It is unrealistic for Retail Needs Studies to predict floorspace needs beyond 5 years with any certainty. The study will not therefore be extended beyond 2021 at this stage, however an additional sentence in para 3.9.4 would clarify this. Agree mention should be made to the capacity for additional convenience goods floorspace in Stamford.

Con ID: 26055
Full Name: Mr Clive Bontoft
Organisation: General Manager
Roseland Group Ltd
Comment ID: 2552
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.8.14
Nature Of Response: Observations

Con ID: 26101
Full Name: Mr J Parmiter
Organisation: Retail Development
Comment ID: 2206
Title: Retail Development
Number: 3.9
Nature Of Response: Object

Con ID: 26101
Full Name: Mr J Parmiter
Organisation: Retail Development
Comment ID: 992
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.9.4
Nature Of Response: Object

Summary:
Two issues are mistakenly represented in the statements in this paragraph; they are on timing and capacity, these mistakes significantly affect the findings and conclusions of the preferred option.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree see response to Comment ID 2206
Summary:
Object to the wording of this paragraph as the conclusions of the Retail Needs Study show that there is some capacity for further convenience retail provision in Stamford, and this should be acknowledged in paragraph 3.9.4. The existing Sainsbury’s stores in Grantham and Bourne town centre can help to accommodate the identified need for additional convenience floorspace, and it is therefore recommended that paragraph 3.9.4 and Policy P09 should also recognise the merits of the consolidation and expansion of existing edge of centre development.

Officers’ Recommendation:
Agree reference will be made to convenience goods floorspace capacity in Stamford. Do not think it appropriate to encourage new comparison floorspace to locate in edge of centre locations as suggested. Such development should be on sites identified through the PPS6 sequence.

Summary:
Not aware of any development sites in or on the edge of Stamford town centre that can accommodate the identified scale of new retail floorspace required.

Officers’ Recommendation:

Summary:
We consider that Para 3.9.5 should be reworded to reflect the sequential approach to site selection, as set out in PPS6.

Officers’ Recommendation:
Agree. include referene to PPS6 sequence.
Councillor T Holmes

Summary:
It has been shown that, in the case of Bourne in particular, the size and type of residential dwellings which have been built so far, have resulted in occupiers who work and shop in London and other major conurbations. The need, therefore, for a bulldozer approach to creating shopping options is not appropriate. A more sympathetically managed and environmentally conserving approach would reap greater rewards for businesses and residents.

Officers' Recommendation:
Noted.

Mr J Parmiter

Summary:
RNS must be extended to cover the whole plan period not just to 2021. And in relation to convenience floorspace, the strategy needs to recognise a substantial new floorspace requirement in Stamford. This will better inform a Preferred Option.

Officers' Recommendation:
See response to Comment ID 2206

Mr J M Mettham

Summary:
Not enough investigation carried out on the effect on high and side streets shops and parking. Also the traffic gridlock and environment.

Officers' Recommendation:
The policy provides an overarching strategy for retail development. Specific site proposals will need to consider the potential impact upon the vitality and viability of the existing centres.
Con ID: 26046
Full Name: Wm Morrison Superma
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2367
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response  Object
Summary: Suggest omitting "and adjacent to the defined town centres" from para 3 of PO9. Suggest omitting final paragraph of PO9.

Officers' Recommendation:
Third para of PO9 should be clarified to properly reflect the search sequence set out in PPS6. ie that town centre sites should be considered first, followed by edge of centre sites, an only if no suitable sites are available in these locations should out of centre sites be considered. Final paragraph is useful signposting to PPS6 and should be retained.

Con ID: 26347
Full Name: Mrs N Jacobs
Organisation: Town Clerk Bourne Town Council
Comment ID: 2061
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response  Object
Summary: Bourne needs a variety of shops to provide a better choice across the boards. The proposal does not have sufficient space allocation for Bourne.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted, however evidence from the Retail Needs Study must inform future provision.

Con ID: 26151
Full Name: Mr Ivan Fuller
Organisation: Bourne Town Centre Management Partnership
Comment ID: 1879
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response  Object
Summary: The planned provision of a maximum 8,000 sq m net is insufficient since 6930 sq m will be required for the proposed Core Area alone allowing almost no other space to provide extra retail facilities to meet expanding population’s needs.

Officers' Recommendation:
Noted. However the LDF proposals need to be based on sound and robust evidence. In this instance this is provided by the Retail Needs Study (2006) which establishes a need for 8,000 Sq m of comparison goods floorspace in Bourne up to 2021.
Con ID: 26229  
**Full Name:** Mr Jacob Newby  
**Organisation:** Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency  
**Comment ID:** 2686  
**Title:** RETAIL DEVELOPMENT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO9  
**Nature Of Response** Observations  

**Summary:**  
Please note that any sites within Flood Zones 2 and 3 will be subject to the application of the PPS25 Sequential Test.  

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Applications and allocations for development will be considered in the light of PPS25.

Con ID: 26469  
**Full Name:** Ms Alison Christie  
**Organisation:** Strategic Partnership Officer Lincolnshire County Council  
**Comment ID:** 2019  
**Title:** RETAIL DEVELOPMENT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO9  
**Nature Of Response** Observations  

**Summary:**  
Commitment to concentrating new retail development within town centres – again transport should be mentioned as some of these town centres such as Grantham are under pressure from vehicle attractions.  

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Agree add reference to the role of the four towns to serve a wider catchment area by virtue of their accessibility by a range of modes of transport to para 3.9.1.

Con ID: 26481  
**Full Name:** Mr K Boon  
**Organisation:** Anglian Water  
**Comment ID:** 2276  
**Title:** RETAIL DEVELOPMENT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO9  
**Nature Of Response** Observations  

**Summary:**  
AW would promote developments in areas which are currently developed to enable connection to existing infrastructure.  

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Noted
Con ID: 26295
Full Name: Mr D J Holmes
Organisation: Chairman Old Somerby Parish Council
Comment ID: 1762
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
PO9 should be modified to include the following: The reasonable extension and expansion of embryonic (or residual) community and retail services which already exist in smaller settlements, will be considered sympathetically. The loss of existing retail services including public houses to conversion to other uses will be strongly resisted.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree with comments regarding possible loss of retail services and public houses in small villages and consideration should be given to the inclusion of a policy to promote and encourage development/retention of local services and employment in rural areas.

Con ID: 74056
Full Name: Mr Michael King
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2648
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
Suggest that PO9 is amended as follows: in the second paragraph, line 3: replace "can" by "should". Add to second paragraph: 'and there will be a presumption against change of use away from retail and services of existing retail and service premises.' This protection policy should also be made explicit for Larger Villages (which it would not otherwise be in Policy PO9).

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree addition to second paragraph will be made.

Con ID: 26484
Full Name: Trustees for the Belvoi
Organisation: Smiths Gore
Comment ID: 2402
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
We would question why the Larger Villages have not been included with LSCs in the retail hierarchy. Where appropriate, further small-scale retail development may well be required in the Larger Villages to maintain their viability. To some extent this would also make these villages more sustainable by reducing the need to travel.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree the Spatial Strategy will allow such development in larger villages, therefore this policy needs to be amended to include larger villages within third paragraph.
Con ID: 26379  
Full Name: Mr M Brebner  
Organisation: Clerk Tallington Parish Council  
Comment ID: 2326  
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT  
Number: Preferred Option PO9  
Nature Of Response Support  
Summary: It is important to ensure adequate parking in towns and local service centres.  
Officers' Recommendation: Comment noted.

Con ID: 26112  
Full Name: Alison Homes  
Organisation: Director Smith Stuart Reynolds  
Comment ID: 1961  
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT  
Number: Preferred Option PO9  
Nature Of Response Support  
Summary: The retail hierarchy is supported as reflecting the role of Grantham and the other Main Towns as the focus for growth.  
Officers' Recommendation: Support welcomed.

Con ID: 26285  
Full Name: Mr L J Blunt  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 1569  
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT  
Number: Preferred Option PO9  
Nature Of Response Support  
Summary: Care should be given to the design of shop buildings. Small shops provide variety for visitors and tourists.  
Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Full Name</strong></th>
<th>Mrs C Curtis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
<td>Friends of Bourne Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature Of Response</strong></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>In Bourne there are no large retail outlets such as Wilkinsons, Focus/Do It All which would encourage people to stay in Bourne to shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers' Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>1556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>RETAIL DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>Preferred Option PO9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con ID</strong></td>
<td>26212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Full Name</strong></th>
<th>HPC Homes, Namulas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
<td>c/o Anthony Aspbury Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature Of Response</strong></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Support and endorse policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers' Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>2574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>RETAIL DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>Preferred Option PO9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con ID</strong></td>
<td>26605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Full Name</strong></th>
<th>Mr Matthew Nicholson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation</strong></td>
<td>Senior Town Planner Sainsbury’s Supermarket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature Of Response</strong></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>In principle Sainsbury’s Supermarket Limited (SSL) agree with Preferred Option PO9, in that new development should be located within the town centres listed in the hierarchy and be subject to the criteria of PPS6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers' Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID</strong></td>
<td>2068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>RETAIL DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>Preferred Option PO9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Con ID</strong></td>
<td>26472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Con ID: 26299
Full Name: Mr John Plumb
Organisation: Stamford Town Partnership

Summary:
We support your commitment to ensuring the retail viability of the town centre.

Officers' Recommendation:
support noted.

Con ID: 26470
Full Name: Mr Roger Stafford
Organisation: Manager Buckminster Estate

Summary:
My Client is of the opinion that there is market evidence that there is too much of the wrong type of retail accommodation in Grantham Town Centre i.e. units which are either too small to provide a living for a Shopkeeper, poorly served by car and public transport, or operating on multiple levels. The view is that providing the viability of the Town Centre is not undermined favourable consideration should be given to changes of use away from retail.

Officers' Recommendation:
Disagree. Change of Use of town centre premises (particualrly the ground floor street frontage) away from A1 and A2 could have a detrimental effect on the viability of the town centre. If units are too small this policy would not prevent them being enlarged or redeveloped provided that the scheme was appropriate in its local context.

Con ID: 26210
Full Name: Dr R A Fuller
Organisation: Bourne Civic Society

Summary:
The allocation of proposed retail space seems to be disproportionate in the cases of Stamford and Bourne compared to their proposed housing (thus population) growth. The current central area redevelopment plans for Bourne include retail space equivalent to the upper level proposed - figures are therefore highly suspect.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Preferred Option does not propose any specific amount of retail space, although paragraph 3.9.5 includes the conclusions of the Retail Needs Study, which forms part of the background evidence for the LDF. This study applies tried and tested methodology to identify future floorspace capacities to guide the amount of new retail floorspace being developeed. Site allocations arising from this policy and the RNS will be the subject of a separate document.
Con ID: 26230
Full Name: Alison and Stamford H
Organisation: Director Smith Stuart Reynolds
Comment ID: 1993
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response Support

Summary: The retail hierarchy is supported as reflecting the role of Grantham and the other main towns as the focus for growth.

Officers' Recommendation: support welcomed.

Con ID: 26298
Full Name: Mr J.J.S. Brown
Organisation:
Comment ID: 1810
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response Support

Summary: Again, more in rural areas, such as hair salons

Officers' Recommendation: Noted policy already allows for "local" shops and services in LSC and will be expanded to include the "larger villages".

Con ID: 26238
Full Name: Rev Canon Chris Andre
Organisation: St Wulfram's Church, Grantham
Comment ID: 1791
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response Support

Summary: But this is too vague. Grantham will not thrive as a retail centre until it improves its hopeless traffic problems. Inadequate parking and its failure to pedestrianise part of the town centre.

Officers' Recommendation: Noted. These issues will hopefully be addressed as part of the Grantham Growth work through the Area Action Plan.
Con ID: 26195
Full Name: Mr M Brebner
Organisation: Greatford Parish Council
Comment ID: 2313
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary: It is important to ensure adequate parking in towns and local service centres.

Officers' Recommendation: Comment noted.

Con ID: 26203
Full Name: Mr C Townson
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 1845
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary: See additional information. Grantham must have meaningful parking and road system to match.

Officers' Recommendation: Noted. These issues will be dealt with as part of the Grantham Area Action Plan and the Grantham Growth work.

Con ID: 26166
Full Name: Mr A Evans
Organisation: Kimberley Developments Ltd
Comment ID: 2185
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary: Support policy, but reference needed to the need for local service centres and designated retail parades where considerable levels of new residential development are permitted.

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted. Agree, however this is only likely to occur in Grantham where the scale of new residential development proposed would require and support local shops. Reference should be made within the policy provision for small local shops and retail parades as part of the comprehensive planning of large residential areas in Grantham.
Summary:
Bourne desperately needs improved retail development to prevent it becoming a dormant town and many town centre shops are closed.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comment noted.

Con ID: 26149
Full Name: Miss E C Biott
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Comment ID: 2293
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary:
Strong nature conservation policies and a robust evidence base are essential prerequisites of site consideration.

Officers' Recommendation:
Environmental issues will be considered during site allocation.

Con ID: 26318
Full Name: Mr Cyril Day
Organisation: Highways Agency
Comment ID: 2155
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary:
This approach is supported as it seeks to meet retail demand in the most sustainable manner, however modelling of individual site allocations will be required.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.
Con ID: 26221
Full Name: Mr Alan Hubbard
Organisation: Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust
Comment ID: 2135
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary:
Approach is generally supported. However, Local Service Centre statement needs amending to read: "...can accommodate small-scale shopping facilities to serve the everyday needs of local people, but more significant development will not be appropriate.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted. The Local Service Centres sentence does not need expanding, it is considered that the sentiment is implicit in the policy.

Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells
Comment ID: 1031
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT
Number: Preferred Option PO9
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary:
Strategic development of the land to the west of Grantham will support Grantham Town Centre and subject to quantum of development can provide a district centre to serve local needs. The site is also relatively self-contained without harm to the landscape and is free from flood risk although clearly a drainage strategy is required for prevention of flood risk elsewhere.

Officers' Recommendation:
This comment does not relate to the retail policy as it is in support of a site suggested by the representation.

Con ID: 26045
Full Name: Mr Egerton Gilman
Organisation: Chairman, Environment & Traffic Working Group Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce
Comment ID: 2072
Title: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

Summary:
Supports option, but "...within and adjacent to the defined town centre.."requires additional clarity.

Officers' Recommendation:
Town Centres are currently defined in Saved Local Plan policy S1 (and on the proposals map) and will be reviewed and defined in the Site Allocations DPD. "Within and adjacent to ..."is considered to be clear in this context.
**Nature Of Response**  Support with conditions

**Con ID:** 26238  
**Full Name:** Rev Canon Chris Andre  
**Organisation:** St Wulfram's Church, Grantham  
**Comment ID:** 1792  
**Title:** Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District  
**Number:** 3.10  
**Nature Of Response**  Observations

**Summary:**  
Grantham looks tatty and in some places, a mess. A simple task such as taking away or repairing the damaged pedestrian guard railings at nearly every junction - a useless waste of money - would improve the look of the town. The disastrous building on all sides of Gainsborough Corner must go - hideous.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments noted, but not relevant to the policy option process.

---

**Con ID:** 26179  
**Full Name:** Mr Neil Pike  
**Organisation:** English Nature  
**Comment ID:** 1977  
**Title:** Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District  
**Number:** 3.10  
**Nature Of Response**  Observations

**Summary:**  
There are sections of 3.10 which are not sufficiently detailed. For example, national and regional policy is much more robust when it comes to protection and enhancement of biodiversity than the elements set down here. RSS policies, for example recognise that a net gain in biodiversity is necessary to offset significant historical losses. Section 3.10.5 to 3.10.8 then reflect issues relating to landscape but not biodiversity. This perhaps reflects the availability of baseline date, however we do not believe that it is sufficient focused on nature conservation or biodiversity.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
The policy aims to reflect the whole of the character of the area: landscape, materials, settlement and building patterns, etc. There is no need for LDF policies to reflect national and regional policy protection. However, reference to biodiversity issues and the presence of such wider protection could be included here to ensure that this issue is not "forgotten about".
Summary: We fully support the policy outlined. However, we feel that archaeological remains should also be mentioned within the text.

Officers' Recommendation: Archaeological features are mentioned in 3.10.5, and as historic character patterns and attributes of landscape in PO10.

Summary: You rightly point out that the draft Regional Plan promotes the use of Landscape Character Assessments. However, policy 29 of the Regional Plan also emphasizes the need for strong protection of ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees. Therefore, we believe that your Core Strategy should also contain a specific policy on the need to protect these irreplaceable habitats.

Officers' Recommendation: The Panel Report states "that Policy 29 adequately protects ancient woodland and that there [should] be no change to the draft strategy." LDF documents should not reproduce national and regional policies.

Summary: Paragraph 3.10.4 states that RSS8 stresses that Local Authorities should prepare Landscape Character Assessments to inform preparation of LDFs. RSS8 also highlights the poor state of biodiversity and stresses (Policy 28) the need to promote a major step change increase in the level of the region's biodiversity. It adds that this should be done by the achievement of the East Midlands regional contribution towards the
UK Biodiversity Action Plan targets.

Summary:
Recommend the first sentence includes the word archaeological remains

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Insert "archaeological remains" after "buildings".

Con ID: 26277
Full Name: Jenny Young
Organisation: Planning Archaeologist Heritage Trust for Lincolnshire

Comment ID: 968
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.10.5
Nature Of Response Support with conditions

Con ID: 26082
Full Name: Mr Tim Bladon
Organisation:

Comment ID: 2605
Title: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT
Number: Preferred Option PO10
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
para 3.10.3 National policy: This policy is mainly concerned with the protection of SSSIs and tree preservation orders. The character of a village is not solely dependant upon the protection of trees with preservation orders. One of the main features of village character is the existence of trees and their relationship to the built environment. If the area is to be promoted as a pleasant rural area for tourism, then it would seem logical to ensure that new development in rural communities should take positive steps to prevent the felling of trees whether or not they be the subject of a preservation order. This can easily be monitored and applied at the scrutiny stage of planning applications. para 3.10.5 Local Issues: The majority of new rural housing design, whether it be "estate"type or individual dwellings, has developed into a standard that can be found in abundance on urban housing

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. SSSIs and TPOs are used only as examples in para 3.10.3. Modern housing must reflect the needs and aspirations of modern families, to slavishly mimic older styles could result in modern estate layout becoming a pastiche. However, it is also important that new development is in keeping with the character and nature of its local context. This policy seeks to achieve a balance of needs to protect features of recognised importance, as well as allowing more locally relevant features. Village Design Statements (VDS) can be useful in identifying local characteristics to be taken into account in the design of development. VDSs will be added to the list of criteria against which applications for development will be assessed.
developments. It is important that there should be a very clear difference between the design of urban and rural housing.

**Comment ID:** 26179  
**Full Name:** Mr Neil Pike  
**Organisation:** English Nature  
**Comment ID:** 1980  
**Title:** PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO10  
**Nature Of Response** Object  

**Summary:**  
Objects to Preferred Option PO10 because we do not believe that it is consistent with policies 1, 27 and 28 of the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy, or PPS9, Government Circular ODPM2005/06 or recently published DCLG guidance on Section 40 Duties under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Believe that this policy should go further than simply to assess development proposals against a set criteria, but should make explicit the need to seek to enhance biodiversity through good development.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Agree. Policy will be amended.

---

**Comment ID:** 26179  
**Full Name:** Mr Neil Pike  
**Organisation:** English Nature  
**Comment ID:** 2005  
**Title:** PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO10  
**Nature Of Response** Object  

**Summary:**  
Whilst we have objected to this preferred option on the grounds that it is not, we believe, compatible with national and regional policy, we recognise that the policy in general meets sustainable criteria. We note, however, that the conclusions identify that the policy will help protect biodiversity but make no mention of enhancement.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments noted. Reference to biodiversity issues will be included.
Con ID: 26304
Full Name: Mr J M Mettham
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 1901
Title: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT
Number: Preferred Option PO10
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
New buildings, commercial or private, in general are not in keeping with the old surrounding. Most retail development look like Dutch barns cluttered with poorly maintained street furniture.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comment noted. Design and access statements will be required for most new-build development proposals; to demonstrate how the proposal will reflect and contribute to the distinct character of the area.

Con ID: 26045
Full Name: Mr Egerton Gilman
Organisation: Chairman, Environment & Traffic Working Group Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce
Comment ID: 2073
Title: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT
Number: Preferred Option PO10
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Welcomes positive and detailed stance of this Option, but objects to deletion of specific areas of strategically important undeveloped land. These should remain and include all land between the present built up area of Stamford and the A1.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support welcomed. No decision has yet been made regarding whether the LDF will include an equivalent policy to Policy EN6 of the Adopted Local Plan. This matter will be addressed as part of the Site Allocations DPD. Policy will be amended to include important open space criteria, against which planning applications will be assessed.
Summary:
Character areas on Map B must be regarded as "diagrammatic only" because of map scale. Suggest explanatory reference in text and insertion of inset maps for each of the towns.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. Explanatory references contained in LCA document to be included.

---

Summary:
The LCA work is not as detailed as elsewhere, especially in its assessment of historic influences upon the landscape and the work has not considered the wider issue of settings. The relevant criteria in PO10 need to be supplemented to make specific reference to settings in accordance with PPGs 15 and 16, and RSS Policies 27 and 31.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree that PO10 criteria should be supplemented to include reference to settings in line with RSS policies. Revisit in light of Panel Report.
Summary:
We feel that the current wording of the policy is too vague and open to varying interpretations and we would prefer a more specific wording in respect of ancient woodland. LAs should identify areas of ancient woodland which do not have statutory protection, and should not grant planning permission for developments that would result in its loss or deterioration. (PPS9, para 10)

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.

Summary:
The Water Framework Directive requires all inland and coastal water bodies to reach at least 'good status' by 2015. Accordingly new development should ensure that it is not having a detrimental affect on any controlled waters, including groundwater sources, either through direct or diffuse pollution. We recommend that 'controlled waters' be added to the list of issues that development proposals will be assessed in relation to.

Officers' Recommendation:
Amend policy by addition of: "impact on controlled waters"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: 26295</th>
<th>Full Name: Mr D J Holmes</th>
<th>Organisation: Chairman Old Somerby Parish Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>Preferred option PO10 should be modified to: Make it clear that the Character of the District includes the character of settlements. The character of settlements includes pre-identified open spaces (i.e., those to which Policy EN6 of the Adopted Local Plan refers) List these pre-identified open spaces as set out in the Adopted Local Plan under Policy EN6. Make it clear that permission will not be granted for development in such areas or which impacts on the setting of such areas. The designation of existing open spaces as protected open public and/or village greens will be sympathetically considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>No decision has yet been made regarding whether the LDF will include an equivalent policy to Policy EN6 of the Adopted Local Plan. This matter will be addressed as part of the Site Allocations DPD. Policy will be amended to include important open space criteria, against which planning applications will be assessed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26288</th>
<th>Full Name: Mrs J M Cutting</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>I would strongly support this policy and apply it vigorously to all development proposals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID: 1639</th>
<th>Title: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number:</strong> Preferred Option PO10</td>
<td><strong>Nature Of Response</strong> Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26295</th>
<th>Full Name: Mr D J Holmes</th>
<th>Organisation: Chairman Old Somerby Parish Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>Preferred option PO10 should be modified to: Make it clear that the Character of the District includes the character of settlements. The character of settlements includes pre-identified open spaces (i.e., those to which Policy EN6 of the Adopted Local Plan refers) List these pre-identified open spaces as set out in the Adopted Local Plan under Policy EN6. Make it clear that permission will not be granted for development in such areas or which impacts on the setting of such areas. The designation of existing open spaces as protected open public and/or village greens will be sympathetically considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>No decision has yet been made regarding whether the LDF will include an equivalent policy to Policy EN6 of the Adopted Local Plan. This matter will be addressed as part of the Site Allocations DPD. Policy will be amended to include important open space criteria, against which planning applications will be assessed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26288</th>
<th>Full Name: Mrs J M Cutting</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td>I would strongly support this policy and apply it vigorously to all development proposals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Con ID: 26212
Full Name: Mrs C Curtis
Organisation: Friends of Bourne Wood
Comment ID: 1557
Title: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT
Number: Preferred Option PO10
Nature Of Response Support

Summary:
Green areas should be retained and not used for housing or roads where there is an alternative.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comment noted.

Con ID: 26470
Full Name: Mr Roger Stafford
Organisation: Manager Buckminster Estate
Comment ID: 2039
Title: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT
Number: Preferred Option PO10
Nature Of Response Support

Summary:
Grantham will need to accommodate major Urban Extensions. These will have a significant impact on open countryside on the edge of the town. The Council's Preferred Option PO10 needs to be interpreted flexibly in practice in relation to the scale of development proposed to the northwest and south of Grantham. This is the context of my Client's opinion that more land will be needed for housing (to assist funding the Southern Bypass) and potentially for employment over the Plan Period than is currently being allocated.

Officers' Recommendation:
Noted. Areas identified as "urban extensions" in this document are considered sufficient in size to deliver current aspirations for Grantham as a Growth Point. If additional land is required beyond the plan period, consideration may need to be given to other areas. Wherever such additional growth goes it must be appropriately planned to ensure it meets the objectives of this and the other policies of the LDF.
Con ID: 26102
Full Name: Mr P R Tame
Organisation: National Farmers Union
Comment ID: 2121
Title: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT
Number: Preferred Option PO10
Nature Of Response  Support

Summary:
This policy is supported. It covers the whole District and advises developers what is required for development to go ahead and does not prevent development in certain areas which might have been subject to stronger policies in the past based on countryside attraction.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted. Policy enables developers to demonstrate how proposal will reflect and contribute to the distinct character of the area.

Con ID: 26189
Full Name: Mrs S Roberts
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 1615
Title: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT
Number: Preferred Option PO10
Nature Of Response  Support

Summary:
An additional area to be protected is Bourne wood and the surrounding fields - ensuring a best of land around the area as a buffer zone, this is an important area of land for recreational use and wildlife should be protected by specific mention, green areas are important for all.

Officers' Recommendation:
Specific designations of land will be addressed as part of the Site Allocations DPD.
Con ID: 26149
Full Name: Miss E C Biott
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Comment ID: 2294
Title: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT
Number: Preferred Option PO10
Nature Of Response  Support

Summary:
Supports Preferred Option 10, but does not consider it adequate to protect and enhance the biodiversity of the District, as described in the general comments below. We note, with disappointment, that specific reference to Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (as referred to in Paragraph 3.31 of the earlier draft) has been removed from this draft.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted. SNCIs are covered by point a of the policy: "local designation".

---

Con ID: 26292
Full Name: Councillor T Holmes
Organisation:
Comment ID: 1695
Title: PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT
Number: Preferred Option PO10
Nature Of Response  Support

Summary:
Conservation area status should mean just that. A proactive approach to the protection, enhancement and, if necessary the use of reclaimable funding to ensure the long term future of notable and listed buildings and areas of particular merit.

Officers' Recommendation:
Aim of policy is to assist in the protection and/or enhancement of the landscape.
**Full Name:** Mrs P J Kirby  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 1653  
**Title:** PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO10  
**Nature Of Response** Support with conditions

**Summary:** Good suggestions, however the loss of allotment land needs to be studied carefully. Don't Councils have a duty to preserve allotment provision?

**Officers' Recommendation:** Comment noted. Further consideration will be given to the protection of allotments.

---

**Con ID:** 26286  
**Full Name:** Mr N Hydes  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 1599  
**Title:** PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO10  
**Nature Of Response** Support with conditions

**Summary:** Providing these are strictly adhered to.

**Officers' Recommendation:** Support noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26231</th>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Mr D Bainbridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Senior Planning Associate Bidwells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response:</td>
<td>Support with conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
Strategic development at the land to the west of Grantham will support Grantham Town Centre and subject to quantum of development can provide a district centre to serve local needs. The site is also relatively self-contained without harm to the landscape and is free from flood risk although clearly a drainage strategy is required for prevention of flood risk elsewhere.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comment not relevant to policy option consultation. It is merely a reason for supporting a proposed development site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26277</th>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Jenny Young</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Planning Archaeologist Heritage Trust for Lincolnshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>PROTECTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response:</td>
<td>Support with conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**
Should include following "All development proposals will be assessed in relation to: its affect on the historic environment (whether this is the built environment or the buried environment) "

**Officers' Recommendation:**
It is considered that this is implicit in point c of the Policy.
Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer Planning & Conservation Lincolnshire County Council

Summary:
The Preferred Option (Policy PO10) is supported but more could potentially be made of encouraging the creation of wildlife habitats and improved green infrastructure, using development opportunities and other appropriate means. Further to this LCC will be contributing further guidance in relation to mineral working & restoration. Also, other provisions relevant to the environment seem to be accommodated reasonably well within the Preferred Options.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted. Additional wording to be added about biodiversity and enhancing, not just protecting.

Con ID: 26293
Full Name: Mrs M. A. S. Bates
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

Summary:
Need to reinstate the statement "development which is likely to have a detrimental impact on the natural features..."

Officers' Recommendation:
The use of the phrase 'Development which is likely to have a detrimental impact on the natural features of river and stream corridors, ponds or wetland habitats will not be permitted' is considered too restrictive.
Summary:
PO11,12 13 & 14 - See comments above, the sustainability of these options depends greatly upon the link that is made with the policies protecting landscape and biodiversity. Natural England believes that matters such as the sighting of wind generation sites should be considered in a strategic way and would hope that this is something that could be considered through SPD, for example, as one could argue that the sustainability of these policies is harmed by a lack of a strategic approach.

Officers' Recommendation:
Ensure appropriate linkages between policies is clarified. SKDC does not propose to identify a site/sites suitable for windfarms.

Summary:
Concerns about an apparent conflict between PO4b and the second bullet point of this policy [local distinctiveness & sense of place].

Officers' Recommendation:
Detailed planning of the Urban Extensions is a vital part of the process of delivering Sustainable Urban Extensions. Part of this process will be ensuring development creates a sense of place and is locally distinctive - thus SUE provides ideal opportunities for good practice.

Summary:
we support a policy which would seek to reduce the flooding risk of new development.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.
Con ID: 26481
Full Name: Mr K Boon
Organisation: Anglian Water
Comment ID: 2277
Title: REDUCING THE RISK OF FLOODING
Number: Preferred Option PO11
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
The Core Strategy should stress the importance of this issue. Reference should be made to the East of England RSS Secretary of State’s proposed changes policy WAT4.

Officers' Recommendation:
East of England RSS, policy WAT 4 directs LPAs to include within policies: • Flood Risk Assessments: already included within the text of the policy • identification of flood plains: only appropriate in Site Specific DPD • development in flood risk areas only in exceptional circumstances, with mitigation measures, and where benefits outweigh flood risks: policy amended to include "benefits outweigh flood risks" • sustainable drainage systems: to be included within EcoBuilding policy It is considered that the policy already makes reference to the points raised, with a few exceptions. Amendments will be made, as detailed above.

Con ID: 26149
Full Name: Miss E C Biott
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Comment ID: 2296
Title: REDUCING THE RISK OF FLOODING
Number: Preferred Option PO11
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
Support this option concerned that 'Development which would result in adverse impact on the water environment due to surface run-off should also be resisted' [Paragraph 3.11.1] has not been carried forward into the Preferred Option. Also concerned that the final point within the last draft (referring to protecting water resources) has been omitted. LWT would like to see this point 'Development which is likely to have a detrimental impact on the natural features of river and stream corridors, ponds or wetland habitats will not be permitted' reinstated within the strategy.

Officers' Recommendation:
The meaning of "surface run-off" in paragraph 3.11.1 is encompassed in the Preferred Option by the use of the terms "impeding the flow" and "water run-off". The phrase 'Development which is likely to have a detrimental impact on the natural features of river and stream corridors, ponds or wetland habitats will not be permitted' will be inserted into the policy.
**Con ID:** 26292  
**Full Name:** Councillor T Holmes  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 1696  
**Title:** REDUCING THE RISK OF FLOODING  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO11  
**Nature Of Response** Support

**Summary:**  
Must be carefully monitored and reflected in all applications for development, large or small.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Support noted.

---

**Con ID:** 26230  
**Full Name:** Alison and Stamford H  
**Organisation:** Director Smith  
**Stuart Reynolds**  
**Comment ID:** 1994  
**Title:** REDUCING THE RISK OF FLOODING  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO11  
**Nature Of Response** Support

**Summary:**  
The preferred option is generally supported. However, the SFRA has highlighted concern at Grantham regarding Mow Beck and the culverted nature of the drainage system within the urban area. It is unclear as to what extent the cumulative impact of the development of the identified brownfield sites will have on this system. In view of this, it is requested that any policy based on the wording of the Preferred Option contains an additional sentence stating that: “The cumulative impact of development, particularly at Grantham, will require a strategic solution and be assessed in relation to its impact on local drainage systems and the need to prevent any increased risk of flooding within the town. 

**Requested Approach** It is therefore requested that any policy in respect of flood risk incorporates the above statement.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Support noted. Concerns about the capacity of Grantham’s water infrastructure have been addressed in the Grantham Water Cycle Strategy, which has identified some areas of concern and suggested solutions. Reference to this study will be made within the text of the document.
Con ID: 26286  
Full Name: Mr N Hydes  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 1600  
Title: REDUCING THE RISK OF FLOODING  
Number: Preferred Option PO11  
Nature Of Response Support  

Summary: Providing these are strictly adhered to.

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted.

Con ID: 26212  
Full Name: Mrs C Curtis  
Organisation: Friends of Bourne Wood  
Comment ID: 1558  
Title: REDUCING THE RISK OF FLOODING  
Number: Preferred Option PO11  
Nature Of Response Support  

Summary: Less development would result in less risk of flooding.

Officers' Recommendation: Comment noted. The Council will seek to bring about an overall reduction in flood risk through development. However, the Council cannot prevent all development as homes, businesses etc are needed.

Con ID: 26189  
Full Name: Mrs S Roberts  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 1616  
Title: REDUCING THE RISK OF FLOODING  
Number: Preferred Option PO11  
Nature Of Response Support with conditions  

Summary: In addition one needs to consider alternatives. If they would detrimentally affect the area or if planning permission was granted could flooding be alleviated.

Officers' Recommendation: As well as the risk of flooding caused by development of a site, the cumulative effects of that development on other areas is also considered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26231</th>
<th><strong>Summary:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Name:</strong> Mr D Bainbridge</td>
<td>Strategic development at the land to the west of Grantham will support Grantham Town Centre and subject to quantum of development can provide a district centre to serve local needs. The site is also relatively self-contained without harm to the landscape and is free from flood risk although clearly a drainage strategy is required for prevention of flood risk elsewhere.</td>
<td>Not relevant to policy consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation:</strong> Senior Planning Associate Bidwells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID:</strong> 1033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> REDUCING THE RISK OF FLOODING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number:</strong> Preferred Option PO11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature Of Response</strong> Support with conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26229</th>
<th><strong>Summary:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Name:</strong> Mr Jacob Newby</td>
<td>We support many of the comments made under this policy. But there are concerns regarding the emphasis given to the Sequential and Exception Tests. Development within category 3 of the SFRA is unlikely to be supported. Recommend that applicants putting forward potential allocation sites are required to provide information to allow the Sequential Test to be carried out. We suggest that this requirement is included in the Core Strategy Policy, as it will affect both allocations and Development Control applications. Suggest requiring those putting forward land for allocation that may be affected by the Exception Test to provide details to enable decisions regarding Exception Test to be made. Policy is not PPS25 compliant. There should be a presumption towards Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS. We therefore suggest that the policy be amended to take account of these issues (wording suggested). We consider that unless the policy is amended it may not comply with Test of Soundness (iv,) in that it does not reflect the requirements of PPS25. We also suggest that unless a serious alternative</td>
<td>Support welcomed and comments noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation:</strong> Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment ID:</strong> 2688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> REDUCING THE RISK OF FLOODING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number:</strong> Preferred Option PO11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature Of Response</strong> Support with conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that considers the issues above is put forward and is subject to sustainability appraisal the policy may not comply with Test (vii).

**Summary:**
The Woodland Trust would like to see the role of wood fuel given a higher profile in the Core Strategy in your otherwise commendable policy on renewable energy generation. We would like to see your policy on renewable energy extended to become a more comprehensive policy on climate change. This should include both the need to reduce CO2 emissions by a variety of means, including renewable energy and energy efficiency, but also adaptation to the climate change that is inevitably going to occur. "Space for People" is the first UK-wide assessment of any form of green space and, while the targets may seem challenging, they represent the result of detailed analysis. We would like to see South Kesteven adopt the Woodland Access Standard as an aspirational target.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Support welcomed. Wood fuel is only one example of renewable energy, it is considered that it is incorporated in the term energy crops. Consideration will be given to extending the renewable energy policy to cover climate change. It is not considered that the Woodland Access Standard is relevant to this policy, as it considers public access to woodlands. However, further consideration will be given to including it in an alternative policy within the core strategy.

**Con ID:** 26201  
**Full Name:** Mr J Templeman  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 1675  
**Title:** paragraph  
**Number:** 3.12.6  
**Nature Of Response** Observations  

**Summary:**
It should be stated at 3.12.6 that commitments regards protocol have already been met; windfarms will have a negative impact due to the need to provide backup for when the wind does not blow.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Paragraph 3.12.6 states the council is committed to complying with the Kyoto Protocol, i.e. it is working to the objective of reducing greenhouse gases. No change to the Council's approach. The BWEA states "Wind power is a clean, renewable source of energy which produces no greenhouse gas emissions or waste products. All forms of power generation require back up and no energy technology can be relied upon 100%"(source:www.bwea.com/energy/myths.html)
Summary:
Para. 3.12.7 identifies the Fens as having particular use for wind farms, it is incorrect to make an assumption without all the investigation work and assessment of wind values being undertaken. Concerns about visual impact and risk to low flying aircraft from the structures.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. The areas suggested in para 3.12.7 stem from responses to the previous 'Issues and Options' consultation document, reference to these areas should be deleted as investigative work/assessment has not been undertaken. The Core Strategy does not identify specific sites for development, PO12 provides criteria which proposals to generate energy from renewable sources would be considered against.

Summary:
No explanation is given at 3.12.7 as to why a number of areas have particular uses - requires evidence.

Officers' Recommendation:
The areas suggested in para. 3.12.7 resulted from previous public consultation responses to the Issues and Options (Regulation 25 stage); reference to these areas should be deleted as investigative work/assessment has not been undertaken.

Summary:
The proposed wind farm at Sempringham Fen cannot be efficiently connected to the National Grid as the nearest sub station is to the West of Billingborough at Folkingham Road. There is no direct route to the sub station as the village comes between Sempringham Fen and the sub station. A route to the South would go through the historic site of Sempringham Abbey and a route to the North would go through the village. The building of a wind farm is not economic.

Officers' Recommendation:
The Core Strategy does not propose specific sites for renewable energy generation. The policy sets out the criteria which a planning application for a proposal to generate energy from renewable sources would be considered against. No change to the Councils approach.
Con ID: 26217  
Full Name: CPRE  
Organisation: c/o Community Council of Lincs  
Comment ID: 1828  
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION  
Number: Preferred Option PO12  
Nature Of Response Object  

Summary:  
Far too open-ended and unselective: would be likely to result in a very wide geographical spread of highly intensive wind generators within most of the landscape character areas. A specific study to highlight areas that could be acceptable for the development of wind farms needs to be undertaken.  

Officers' Recommendation:  
Disagree. Landscape Character Area document shows sensitivity of each area to wind farm development.

Con ID: 26484  
Full Name: Trustees for the Belvoi  
Organisation: Smiths Gore  
Comment ID: 2403  
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION  
Number: Preferred Option PO12  
Nature Of Response Object  

Summary:  
There should be no requirement for proposals to be connected to National Grid infrastructure as connections can be made to the regional electricity distribution system. National Grid is only concerned with the transmission of electricity at high voltages (275 and 400kV). These are not relevant to small scale renewable schemes.  

Officers' Recommendation:  
Comments noted. National Grid connection is not required if it can be shown that electricity generation meets specific end-user need (as set out in bullet point 1 of suggested policy).

Con ID: 26474  
Full Name: Mr S Chester  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 2079  
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION  
Number: Preferred Option PO12  
Nature Of Response Object  

Summary:  
PO12 seeks to grant planning permission to any wind farm proposal which can be connected efficiently to existing grid infrastructure. This is strongly objected to as it implies setting aside the normal planning procedures and sets a dangerous precedent in this respect. Wind farms would eventually dominate the region, concerns regarding level of noise generated.  

Officers' Recommendation:  
PO12 is in line with national and regional policy. Applications for wind turbines will be considered against this proposed policy and all other relevant proposed core policies e.g.PO10 Protection and Enhancement of the character of the district. The normal planning procedures will also be considered.
Summary:
In principle agree with installation of renewable energy systems but note that there are many questions about the medium term final effect on CO2 emission, eg real CO2 involved in installing windturbines; in preparing land and land working for some biocrops and consider that much more solid calculations are needed before installation even in the case of domestic roof insulation using the currently preferred mineral wool. Should seek solid calculation based evidence before proceeding.

Officers' Recommendation:
Noted. Policy should make reference to any installation demonstrating minimising real emissions/impacts arising from installation.

Summary:
No apparatus above 20m height to be erected within 3km of any existing dwelling. Necessary to protect the existing inhabitants from noise intrusion causing health issues.

Officers' Recommendation:
Disagree. It is considered that there is no need to include additional criteria within the policy as the policy states the proposals should accord to the other core policies. Planning applications are considered on their own merits, environmental health are consulted where appropriate.

Summary:
No real proof it is cost effective without spending vast amounts of money. Something to be considered on new build.

Officers' Recommendation:
The emerging Regional Plan requires LDDs to contain policies for promoting and encouraging energy efficiency and renewable energy. Agree renewable energy technologies should be encouraged on new build, as stated in PO13.
**Con ID:** 26267  
**Full Name:** Roger Callow  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 910  
**Title:** RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO12  
**Nature Of Response**  

**Summary:**  
To require an efficient means of connecting a development to the national grid would result in developers opting for overhead transmission of energy and would rule out the alternative of the below ground option of connection. Also a holistic approach to environmental appraisal for both the installation and the means of connecting to the national grid should be undertaken by the developer as part of a planning application.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Noted. Agree environmental appraisal should be both for installation and means of connecting to the national grid.

---

**Con ID:** 26045  
**Full Name:** Mr Egerton Gilman  
**Organisation:** Chairman, Environment & Traffic Working Group Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce  
**Comment ID:** 2074  
**Title:** RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO12  
**Nature Of Response**  

**Summary:**  
The suggestions that construction materials to be used should have low/zero CO2 and greenhouse gas emissions are ridiculous. PO12 and PO13 should be combined alongside similar points under a new heading 'Sustainable Construction.' Research study by Arup (2006) has found masonry homes can have a lowest whole life CO2 impact. A balanced view is required on sustainability issues, simplistic short cuts such as wood rather than concrete should be discounted.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments noted. Consideration will be given to the points raised. A revised policy should be created to link previous policies PO12 and PO13 and incorporate sustainable construction and climate change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26379</th>
<th><strong>Summary:</strong></th>
<th>Parish Council members are dubious about the contribution renewable energy can make.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name: Mr M Brebner</td>
<td><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>The District Council has signed the Nottingham declaration on Climate Change and considers renewable energy can make a significant contribution to reducing climate change effects. Policy should ensure any provision is properly planned and controlled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation: Clerk Tallington Parish Council</td>
<td><strong>Nature Of Response:</strong></td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: 2329</td>
<td><strong>Number:</strong></td>
<td>Preferred Option PO12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION</td>
<td><strong>Con ID:</strong></td>
<td>26379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26179</th>
<th><strong>Summary:</strong></th>
<th>The sustainability of these options depends greatly upon the link that is made with the policies protecting landscape and biodiversity. Natural England believes that matters such as the sighting of wind generations sites should be considered in a strategic way and would hope that this is something that could be considered through SPD, for example, as one could argue that the sustainability of these policies is harmed by a lack of a strategic approach.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name: Mr Neil Pike</td>
<td><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>The Core Strategy is not the tool to allocate land for specific uses e.g. wind generation. The identification of specific wind generation sites would be difficult without undertaking investigative/assessment work to ascertain the site viability. The sensitivity of the landscape to wind farm development, for each Character area, is considered in the Landscape Character Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation: English Nature</td>
<td><strong>Nature Of Response:</strong></td>
<td>Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: 2631</td>
<td><strong>Number:</strong></td>
<td>Preferred Option PO12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION</td>
<td><strong>Con ID:</strong></td>
<td>26179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID: 26470</th>
<th><strong>Summary:</strong></th>
<th>Support for PO12.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name: Mr Roger Stafford</td>
<td><strong>Officers' Recommendation:</strong></td>
<td>Support welcomed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation: Manager Buckminster Estate</td>
<td><strong>Nature Of Response:</strong></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID: 2041</td>
<td><strong>Con ID:</strong></td>
<td>26470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title:</strong> RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION</td>
<td><strong>Number:</strong></td>
<td>Preferred Option PO12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Con ID: 26289
Full Name: Mrs P J Kirby
Organisation: 

Comment ID: 1655
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION
Number: Preferred Option PO12
Nature Of Response Support

Summary:
Is Biomass the 'green' way? I support wind farms, make use of Lincolnshire's (8 at Deeping St Nicholas are a well sized group)

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted.

Con ID: 26151
Full Name: Mr Ivan Fuller
Organisation: Bourne Town Centre Management Partnership

Comment ID: 1883
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION
Number: Preferred Option PO12
Nature Of Response Support

Summary:
Concern expressed for the proposed biomass plant in Bourne - what are the environmental impacts?

Officers' Recommendation:
Previous public consultation resulted in suggestions from members of the public that adjacent to the household waste site in Bourne would be a good site for a biomass plant. There is no Council policy to that effect, reference to these locations should be deleted.
Con ID: 26272
Full Name: W McCallin
Organisation: Clerk Westborough and Dry Doddington Parish council
Comment ID: 956
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION
Number: Preferred Option PO12
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary: Support option

Officers' Recommendation: Support welcomed.

Con ID: 26149
Full Name: Miss E C Biott
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Comment ID: 2297
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION
Number: Preferred Option PO12
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary: Supports renewable energy generation where it does not have an adverse impact on biodiversity.

Officers' Recommendation: Support welcomed.

Con ID: 26210
Full Name: Dr R A Fuller
Organisation: Bourne Civic Society
Comment ID: 2341
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION
Number: Preferred Option PO12
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary: The option should be expanded to encourage wider sustainability objectives including relevant items described in the Introduction to section 3.12. Planning permissions for new housing must also take account of the proposed new government guidelines on 'green' housing as per section 3.13. This option seems to have received only superficial attention.

Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted. Consideration will be given to the points raised. A revised policy should be created to link previous policies PO12 and PO13 and incorporate sustainable construction and climate change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26203</th>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Mr C Townson</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Nature Of Response</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Provided the viability at Colsterworth is proven and meets requirements of preferred option 10. The local community will suffer some environmental impact and therefore cheaper power rates to compensate should be considered.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26102</th>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Mr P R Tame</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Nature Of Response</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2122</td>
<td>National Farmers Union</td>
<td>Policy on renewable energy is supported, provided it allows for and does not constrain development needed in connection with biofuels, to allow on-farm storage and processing.</td>
<td>Comment noted. Reference should be made in the accompanying policy text to biofuels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID:</th>
<th>26253</th>
<th>Full Name:</th>
<th>Manager L Mernt</th>
<th>Organisation:</th>
<th>Nature Of Response</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID:</td>
<td>2234</td>
<td>Manager Buckminster Gliding Club</td>
<td>Take into account safe guarding need for light aircraft and gliders. Recreational aviation needs its safety requirements recognised and supported by planners.</td>
<td>Where wind farm proposals are submitted consultation with the relevant aviation authority is undertaken. In addition there is a consultation zone around the Gliding club to ensure appropriate consultation for applications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Con ID: 26605
Full Name: HPC Homes, Namulas
Organisation: c/o Anthony Aspbury Associates
Comment ID: 2576
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION
Number: Preferred Option PO12
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary: No comment and no objections.

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted.

---

Con ID: 26292
Full Name: Councillor T Holmes
Organisation:
Comment ID: 1697
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION
Number: Preferred Option PO12
Nature Of Response: Support with conditions

Summary: May be about to be overtaken by events. No obstacle should be put in the way of renewable energy provision. EXCEPT it must not detract from the ambiance of the property or its surroundings. Windfarms suitably sited and in numbers proportionate to the aspect should be welcomed in this area, part of which has a history of the use of wind energy to power agricultural usage.

Officers' Recommendation: support noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Nature Of Response</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26229</td>
<td>Mr Jacob Newby</td>
<td>Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency</td>
<td>2689</td>
<td>RENEWABLE ENERGY GENERATION</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO12</td>
<td>Support with conditions</td>
<td>The Environment Agency supports the increase in the use and generation of renewable energy, but only if it happens in an environmentally sensitive way. Sources of renewable energy can have impacts on biodiversity, landscape, transport and air quality. (EA position statement on Renewable Energy attached)</td>
<td>Support noted. Consideration will be given to the Renewable Energy position statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26062</td>
<td>Miss H Mawson</td>
<td>The Home Builders Federation</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>Renewable Energy in New Developments</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>It is essential to ensure energy efficiency is maximised before considering renewable energy. Energy efficiency measures alone can reduce CO2 emissions and therefore it may not be necessary to explore renewable energy options. Policy is inflexible and unable to deal with changing circumstances, and is, therefore, not sound.</td>
<td>Comments noted. To achieve carbon neutral development it is important for new development to include both energy efficiency measures and utilise renewable energy sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26165</td>
<td>Macdonald Buchanan T</td>
<td></td>
<td>2113</td>
<td>RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO13a</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>The focus should be on reduced energy consumption, therefore, the policy should look to ensure a reduction in CO2 emissions by 10%.</td>
<td>Agree. Consideration will be given to the points raised and the policy amended accordingly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Con ID: 26305
Full Name: Mr D Gibbons
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 1911
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS
Number: Preferred Option PO13a
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
Preferred Option 13a should be clarified to state that the higher threshold of 1000m², or 10 dwellings should apply.

Officers' Recommendation:
PO13a states the threshold as 1000m² or 10 dwellings. No change to the Council’s approach.

Con ID: 26279
Full Name: Mr Richard Edwards
Organisation: Director of Planning Larkfleet Group
Comment ID: 977
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS
Number: Preferred Option PO13a
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
The preferred option is overly prescriptive in that it requires all new developments of 10 or more dwellings to provide at least 10% of the predicted energy requirements on site from renewable energy sources. The proposed policy does not take account of other energy saving initiatives other than on-site generation.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. A revised policy should be created to link previous policies PO12 and PO13 and incorporate sustainable construction and climate change.

Con ID: 26268
Full Name: Mr Stephen Bickford-S
Organisation: c/o JB Planning Associates
Comment ID: 939
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS
Number: Preferred Option PO13a
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
Preferred Option PO13a is overly prescriptive and inflexible and may not represent the most appropriate in all circumstances or based on a robust and credible evidence base, therefore failing tests of soundness (vii) and also is not sufficiently flexible to deal with changing circumstances and failing tests of soundness (ix). Preferred Option PO13a is therefore directly in conflict with paragraph 8 of PPS22. Suggested revisions are provided.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. Disagree with the proposed revision to PO13a as it is considered the final sentence of the policy already addresses viability.
**Con ID:** 26484  
**Full Name:** Trustees for the Belvoi  
**Organisation:** Smiths Gore  
**Comment ID:** 2404  
**Title:** RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO13a  
**Nature Of Response** Object  

**Summary:**  
Concerns about how effectiveness of policy to be measured and how the issue will be addressed at outline application stage. Concerns about implications for developments involving Listed Buildings and those in Conservation Areas. Concerns about the cost implications, especially relating to affordable housing. Suggest this policy is reserved for major developments of 50+ houses when renewable technologies become much more practical and economies of scale will arise. Do not believe the proposed approach is practicable, and would question 10% target. This target (for production of electricity by 2010) is included in the Energy White Paper, but not in the draft RSS, the basis for informing targets to be included in LDFs.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Comments noted. Reference to Listed buildings and Conservation areas is important and should be addressed as it will not always be possible to implement policy in such context. Although the RSS does not include a specific target for energy production/reduction, national policy is overarching, and local policy is intended to reflect this.

---

**Con ID:** 26284  
**Full Name:** on behalf of Jenkinson  
**Organisation:** Chartered Surveyors Escritt Barrell Golding  
**Comment ID:** 2395  
**Title:** RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO13a  
**Nature Of Response** Object  

**Summary:**  
Wording of policy is unduly harsh. Wording of second paragraph should read "....or conversion will be required to show where possible how the development will generate 10% of the sites electricity or heating needs from renewables." Renewable energy should be part of an overall energy strategy for a site which would also include energy efficiency of buildings, water conservation, reduce/recycle. The strategy should be flexible to allow for future improvements in technology.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Disagree. The third paragraph of the policy provides flexibility.
Con ID: 26221
Full Name: Mr Alan Hubbard
Organisation: Land Use Planning Adviser The National Trust
Comment ID: 2137
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS
Number: Preferred Option PO13a
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
The addition in the amended preferred option relating to energy efficient design etc. is an improvement on the previous proposal and it is supported. The Trust is less convinced of the need for the final paragraph that could equally apply to other preferred policy options more generally.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. The intention of the policy is to provide renewable energy in new developments. In exceptional circumstances the requirements may be relaxed to ensure some renewable energy is provided, opposed to no provision.

Con ID: 26481
Full Name: Mr K Boon
Organisation: Anglian Water
Comment ID: 2278
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS
Number: Preferred Option PO13a
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
Reference should be made in the document to comments on East of England RSS policy WAT 1 relating to water efficiency with a target per-capita consumption of 110 l/d compared to current regional average for metered properties of about 128 l/d.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted.

Con ID: 26160
Full Name: Cecil
Organisation: c/o Strutt and Parker
Comment ID: 1953
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS
Number: Preferred Option PO13a
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
Further clarification is needed regarding how policies regarding renewable energy and development within conservation areas and/or affecting listed buildings are going to interlink. A change in wording of 3rd para is advocated: to build in an exception policy where it can be demonstrated that the implementation of this policy will affect the character, appearance and or setting of a conservation area, or buildings within or located close to it.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. Policy will be amended to consider CA and LB applications. However, an exceptions policy would not reflect the Governments view and is not required. The targets are considered to be achievable and feasible, the 3rd paragraph is sufficient mentioning requirements may be relaxed.
Summary:
The sustainability of these options depends greatly upon the link that is made with the policies protecting landscape and biodiversity.

Officers' Recommendation:
PO10 addresses the issue of biodiversity and protecting the landscape. This policy will be relevant to the consideration of all development proposals.

Summary:
This Option as worded is too strictly defined. If a developer can demonstrate that the life-time energy needs of a development through appropriate design and construction techniques generates a lower energy footprint than conventional technologies, this could be considered acceptable in lieu of the renewable energy obligations of the Policy.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. The policy will be revised to consider both the provision of renewable energy and carbon neutral developments.
Con ID: 26298
Full Name: Mr J.J.S. Brown
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 1816
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS
Number: Preferred Option PO13a
Nature Of Response Support

Summary:
Developers should be encouraged to build solar water heaters and rainfall water systems for the lavatories in new housing development.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. Consider amending the policy to include energy-saving measures.

Con ID: 26292
Full Name: Councillor T Holmes
Organisation: 
Comment ID: 1698
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS
Number: Preferred Option PO13a
Nature Of Response Support

Summary:
No relaxation should be permitted. If the policy is to succeed, then it must be rigidly adhered to or it is not a policy but merely an aspiration.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted. The intention of the policy is to provide renewable energy in new developments. In exceptional circumstances the requirements may be relaxed to ensure some renewable energy is provided, opposed to no provision.

Con ID: 26102
Full Name: Mr P R Tame
Organisation: National Farmers Union
Comment ID: 2123
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS
Number: Preferred Option PO13a
Nature Of Response Support

Summary:
Policy is supported, provided it allows for and actively encourages biomass use from nearby farm and woodland sources in boilers etc installed in the new developments.

Officers' Recommendation:
Support noted. Policy does not explicitly state the preferred type of renewable energy source. The developers will be required to demonstrate that the buildings are energy efficient.
Summary:
We support any policy promoting the use of renewable energy. However, to suggest that relaxing the "Merton rule", if not deemed economically viable for the scheme in question, would seem to defeat the objective of the policy in aiming to increase the use of renewables?

Officers' Recommendation:
Support Noted. The intention of the policy is to provide renewable energy in new developments. In exceptional circumstances the requirements may be relaxed to ensure some renewable energy is provided, opposed to no provision.

Summary:
Renewable energy is not the ONLY contribution to be made for sustainable design in new buildings! Water saving, heat recovery, heat loss reduction, 'green' building material, should all be part of the consideration.

Officers' Recommendation:
Agree. The policy should be expanded to include other 'eco' building issues.

Summary:
Take into account safe guarding needs for light aircraft and gliders. Recreational aviation needs it's safety requirements recognised and supported by planners.

Officers' Recommendation:
Where wind farm proposals are submitted consultation with the relevant aviation authority is undertaken. In addition there is a consultation zone around the Gliding club to ensure appropriate consultation for applications.
Con ID: 26470
Full Name: Mr Roger Stafford
Organisation: Manager
Buckminster Estate

Summary: The essential flexibility in relation to economic viability is noted and is supported.

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted

Con ID: 26605
Full Name: HPC Homes, Namulas
Organisation: c/o Anthony Aspbury Associates

Summary: No comment and no objections.

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted.

Con ID: 26212
Full Name: Mrs C Curtis
Organisation: Friends of Bourne Wood

Summary: All new developments should be energy efficient, more than 10% should be considered.

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted.
Con ID: 26189
Full Name: Mrs S Roberts
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 1618
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS
Number: Preferred Option PO13a
Nature Of Response Support

Summary: Developers should be providing energy requirements on site and houses should be 'green' to reduce energy used. Decisions shouldn't be allowed to non-comply due to non-viability!

Officers' Recommendation: The intention of the policy is to provide renewable energy in new developments. In exceptional circumstances the requirements may be relaxed to ensure some renewable energy is provided, opposed to no provision.

Con ID: 26082
Full Name: Mr Tim Bladon
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 2608
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS
Number: Preferred Option PO13a
Nature Of Response Support

Summary: An additional source of renewable energy, whether it be for individual developments or generally, would be water turbines in suitable rivers.

Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted.

Con ID: 26289
Full Name: Mrs P J Kirby
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 1656
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS
Number: Preferred Option PO13a
Nature Of Response Support

Summary: Remove the final sentence - get tough with developers and force the issue.

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted. The intention of the policy is to provide renewable energy in new developments. In exceptional circumstances the requirements may be relaxed to ensure some renewable energy is provided, opposed to no provision.
Con ID: 26149  
Full Name: Miss E C Biott  
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust  
Comment ID: 2298  
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS  
Number: Preferred Option PO13a  
Nature Of Response Support  

**Summary:**  
Supports renewable energy generation where it does not have an adverse impact on biodiversity, BUT give stronger support to measures which reduce energy demand. Generally supports Preferred Option, but proposes a new title: 'Minimising Energy Dependence in New Developments' and additional points to include greater emphasis on design and incorporation of energy saving measures.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Consider changing the policy title and inclusion of additional points to cover energy-saving measures.

---

Con ID: 26290  
Full Name: Mrs Sheila Kostyrka  
Organisation: Deeping St James Parish Council  
Comment ID: 1670  
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS  
Number: Preferred Option PO13a  
Nature Of Response Support  

**Summary:**  
Should you really allow any relaxation?

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
This Option includes a caveat for instances where full compliance would not be economically viable for the specific scheme. This must be fully demonstrated by the applicant.

---

Con ID: 26293  
Full Name: Mrs M. A. S. Bates  
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust  
Comment ID: 1738  
Title: RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS  
Number: Preferred Option PO13a  
Nature Of Response Support with conditions  

**Summary:**  
Agree strongly but very concerned about the paragraph "these requirements may be relaxed..."If a scheme cannot be economically viable when complying it is arguable that it should not be allowed at all.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
The intention of the policy is to provide renewable energy in new developments. In exceptional circumstances the requirements may be relaxed to ensure some renewable energy is provided, opposed to no provision.
**Con ID:** 26231  
**Full Name:** Mr D Bainbridge  
**Organisation:** Senior Planning Associate Bidwells  
**Comment ID:** 1034  
**Title:** RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO13a  
**Nature Of Response** Support with conditions  

**Summary:**  
The intentions behind the policy are supported but there has to be consideration of viability and the practicalities of the potential to generate energy from renewable sources on site.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Support noted.

---

**Con ID:** 26229  
**Full Name:** Mr Jacob Newby  
**Organisation:** Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency  
**Comment ID:** 2690  
**Title:** RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO13a  
**Nature Of Response** Support with conditions  

**Summary:**  
The Environment Agency supports the increase in the use and generation of renewable energy, but only if it happens in an environmentally sensitive way. Sources of renewable energy can have impacts on biodiversity, landscape, transport and air quality. (EA position statement on Renewable Energy attached)

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Applications for development will be considered in terms of their environmental impact.
**Con ID:** 26480  
**Full Name:** Mr A Hoyle  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 2261  
**Title:** RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS  
**Number:** Alternative Option PO13b  
**Nature Of Response** Support  

**Summary:** Alternative energy sources are very expensive and would be prohibitive of small developments.  

**Officers' Recommendation:** This option is contrary to government guidance. The third paragraph of PO13a (the Council's preferred option) provides flexibility.

---

**Con ID:** 26189  
**Full Name:** Mrs S Roberts  
**Organisation:**  
**Comment ID:** 1619  
**Title:** RENEWABLE ENERGY IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS  
**Number:** Alternative Option PO13d  
**Nature Of Response** Support  

**Summary:** option 13d would be better.  

**Officers' Recommendation:** Support noted. However, it is considered that increasing levels would make developments unviable.

---

**Con ID:** 26062  
**Full Name:** Miss H Mawson  
**Organisation:** The Home Builders Federation  
**Comment ID:** 2582  
**Title:** Developer Contributions  
**Number:** 3.14  
**Nature Of Response** Observations  

**Summary:** The HBF believes that, in order to require developer contributions the Local planning Authority must have a credible evidence base to underpin the condition.  

**Officers' Recommendation:** Comments noted. Agree.
Summary: Developer contributions are now covered by Circular 05/05.

Officers' Recommendation: Comments noted. Reference to requirements of Circular 05/05 included.

Con ID: 26125
Full Name: Mr Graham Foster
Organisation: Senior Planning Officer - Lincolnshire and Rutland Area Team Government Office For The East Midlands

Comment ID: 2016
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.14.2
Nature Of Response Observations

Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer Planning&Conservati on Lincolnshire County Council

Comment ID: 1890
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.14.4
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary: Remove the word "infrastructure"from the third bullet point to reflect the fact that S106 agreement may also be used to provide revenue support bus services, not just public transport infrastructure improvements.

Officers' Recommendation: Agree. The word "infrastructure"will be removed from list.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>26277</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Jenny Young</td>
<td>Such work is now secured by condition as part of the planning process as outlined by PPG16 Archaeology and Planning. There is probably no longer a need therefore for this reference.</td>
<td>Remove from list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Planning Archaeologist Heritage Trust for Lincolnshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response:</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>26469</th>
<th>Summary:</th>
<th>Officers' Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name:</td>
<td>Ms Alison Christie</td>
<td>3.14.4 This does not include any reference to a S106 being used for Travel Plan measures i.e. subsidising a new bus service (it only focuses on infrastructure).</td>
<td>The list is not intended to be exhaustive: it is indicative only of the types of community benefit which may be sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation:</td>
<td>Strategic Partnership Officer Lincolnshire County Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response:</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment ID:</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>paragraph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number:</td>
<td>3.14.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response:</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Con ID: 26469
Full Name: Ms Alison Christie
Organisation: Strategic Partnership Officer, Lincolnshire County Council

Comment ID: 2023
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.14.4
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
3.14.4 Needs to mention Public Rights of Way and their importance for walking & cycling. Needs to have the commitment to improving both public transport infrastructure and services.

Officers' Recommendation:
Highways, cycleways and pedestrian routes - bullet point 3 - are public rights of way. The list is not intended to be exhaustive: it is indicative only of the types of community benefit which may be sought.

Con ID: 26252
Full Name: Mr Christopher Towns
Organisation:

Comment ID: 884
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.14.5
Nature Of Response: Support

Summary:
SKDC should be required to engage with both developers and parish councils in early stages of negotiation for contributions for developments over 5 new builds.

Officers' Recommendation:
Consider whether small-scale development in villages could provide community benefits.

Con ID: 26045
Full Name: Mr Egerton Gilman
Organisation: Chairman, Environment & Traffic Working Group, Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce

Comment ID: 2076
Title: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

Summary:
We object to the preferred option. The provision of, or financial contribution towards, highway infrastructure should be included in the list.

Officers' Recommendation:
The list is not intended to be exhaustive: it is indicative only of the types of community benefit which may be sought. Bullet point 3 includes "improvements to .. highways ...".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26286</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Mr N Hydes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Policy should be avoided could be seen as bribery. The developers in South Kesteven are not philanthropic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Recommendation</td>
<td>The principles of Planning Obligations are set out in Circular 05/05. They are governed by the fundamental principle that planning permission may not be bought or sold. Obligations must be relevant, necessary and directly related to the proposed development, and should never be used purely as a &quot;betterment levy&quot; for the local community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con ID</th>
<th>26304</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Name</td>
<td>Mr J M Mettham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment ID</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Preferred Option PO14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Of Response</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>This is a 'brown envelope' for companies to use to their advantage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers' Recommendation</td>
<td>Disagree. Planning obligations enable the Council to negotiate with developers to ensure a proposed development contributes to the creation of a sustainable community by securing contributions towards necessary infrastructure and facilities. S106 agreements are only to be used to make a development acceptable: the benefits gained via S106 obligations should only be secured to meet pressures created by new development, not to cover existing shortfalls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary:
Developers’ contributions to be used to benefit the area affected by the development (locally to the area of the development)

Officers' Recommendation:
The principles of Planning Obligations are set out in Circular 05/05. They are governed by the fundamental principle that planning permission may not be bought or sold. Obligations must be relevant, necessary and directly related to the proposed development, and should never be used purely as a "betterment levy" for the local community.

Summary:
Policy is too restrictive. Developer contributions essential to be used for the benefits of the whole community. We agree with results of previous consultation. Consultation must include first tier government, ie, the Parish Councils

Officers' Recommendation:
Consider whether small-scale development in villages could provide community benefits.

Summary:
Should as noted above, include an element to be allocated to extend broadband infrastructure districtwide.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comments noted. However, the list of suggested community benefits which may be pursued through developer contributions (para 3.14.4) is, as stated, indicative only and is not not intended to be exhaustive.
Con ID: 26290
Full Name: Mrs Sheila Kostyrka
Organisation: Deeping St James Parish Council
Comment ID: 1672
Title: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS
Number: Preferred Option PO14
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
The Parish Council is very keen to be closely involved with all discussions about developer contributions. The District Council - developer link must be broadened to include those whose community will be affected.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comment noted.

Con ID: 26179
Full Name: Mr Neil Pike
Organisation: English Nature
Comment ID: 2633
Title: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS
Number: Preferred Option PO14
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:
PO11,12 13 & 14 - See comments above, the sustainability of these options depends greatly upon the link that is made with the policies protecting landscape and biodiversity. Natural England believes that matters such as the sighting of wind generations sites should be considered in a strategic way and would hope that this is something that could be considered through SPS, for example, as one could argue that the sustainability of these policies is harmed by a lack of a strategic approach.

Officers' Recommendation:
These comments do not refer to this policy. They have been addressed in policies 11, 12 and 13.
Summary:

This preferred option does not appear to add anything to national policy and lacks a local distinctiveness of the District.

Officers' Recommendation:

Comment ID: 2008
Title: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS
Number: Preferred Option PO14
Nature Of Response: Observations

Summary:

Specific mention is made of transport improvements (including by-passes, public transport infrastructure improvements and improved provision for cyclists and pedestrians), which is welcomed.

Officers' Recommendation:

Comment ID: 2157
Title: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS
Number: Preferred Option PO14
Nature Of Response: Support
Con ID: 26212  
Full Name: Mrs C Curtis  
Organisation: Friends of Bourne Wood  
Comment ID: 1561  
Title: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS  
Number: Preferred Option PO14  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary: 
Developer contributions should be monitored.  

Officers' Recommendation: 
Support noted. Developer contributions are monitored.  

Con ID: 26484  
Full Name: Trustees for the Belvoi  
Organisation: Smiths Gore  
Comment ID: 2405  
Title: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS  
Number: Preferred Option PO14  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary: 
We broadly support the preferred option. We would, however, question the inclusion of the various training matters (under paragraph 3.14.4) as to meeting the five key requirements set out under PO14. This element is not supported by Government advice in Circular 05/05.  

Officers' Recommendation: 
Circular 05/05 does not prohibit or sanction any particular type of community benefit; specifying only that planning obligations must be "directly related to the proposed development". All planning obligations are negotiated, and agreements made, on an individual basis.  

Con ID: 26289  
Full Name: Mrs P J Kirby  
Organisation:  
Comment ID: 1657  
Title: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS  
Number: Preferred Option PO14  
Nature Of Response: Support  

Summary: 
Don't back down if things take too long! Elsea park school is a case in point.  

Officers' Recommendation: 
Support noted.
Con ID: 26272
Full Name: W McCallin
Organisation: Clerk Westborough and Dry Doddington Parish council

Summary: support preferred option

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted.

Comment ID: 957
Title: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS
Number: Preferred Option PO14
Nature Of Response Support

Con ID: 26291
Full Name: Mr S Mason
Organisation: Lincolnshire Co Council

Summary: The preferred option is excellent and provides a justifiable method of gaining community infrastructure funding to mitigate the effect of development on the community.

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted.

Comment ID: 1680
Title: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS
Number: Preferred Option PO14
Nature Of Response Support

Con ID: 26292
Full Name: Councillor T Holmes

Summary: The gain should be used locally to the source of the gain. It must be seen as a positive contribution to the community and its residents. They must see the fruits of their 'sacrifice'.

Officers' Recommendation: Support noted.

Comment ID: 1699
Title: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS
Number: Preferred Option PO14
Nature Of Response Support
**Con ID:** 26465  
**Full Name:** Mr Quentin Davies  
**Organisation:** MP Grantham & Stamford  
**Comment ID:** 2591  
**Title:** DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO14  
**Nature Of Response** Support  

**Summary:**  
I agree with the Council’s preferred options, and in particular with your Preferred Option 3b. I believe that the priority in allocating residential building consents should go to projects where planning gain can deliver significant benefits for the community as a whole.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Support noted.

---

**Con ID:** 26149  
**Full Name:** Miss E C Biott  
**Organisation:** Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust  
**Comment ID:** 2299  
**Title:** DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO14  
**Nature Of Response** Support  

**Summary:**  
Supports use of developer contributions for ‘Conservation and or provision of land and water for nature conservation and amenity’.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
Support noted.

---

**Con ID:** 26210  
**Full Name:** Dr R A Fuller  
**Organisation:** Bourne Civic Society  
**Comment ID:** 2343  
**Title:** DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS  
**Number:** Preferred Option PO14  
**Nature Of Response** Support  

**Summary:**  
The Option should be extended to encompass more significantly the list at 3.14.4 with the added items of improvements/upgrading of the facilities (gas, water, sewage & electricity) of the area, community buildings and sports facilities in conjunction with housing - also school facilities. In Bourne, such provision has previously been sadly lacking.

**Officers' Recommendation:**  
The list at 3.14.4 is intended to demonstrate the types of community benefit which may be sought through planning obligations. Each application for planning permission is unique, and negotiations for planning obligations are undertaken on an individual basis. What is reasonable in one instance will not be under different circumstances. It is not possible, therefore, to include a definitive list of planning obligations.
**Summary:**
Support, subject to caveat that LPA requirements for developer contributions must take into account the overall economic viability of development schemes. If a scheme is not economically viable it will not happen and there will be no developer contributions made or planning gain delivered. This is fundamental to all development schemes but particularly to the scale of projects envisaged in Grantham in relation to the housing and employment development consequent upon Growth Point status and the desire of the Council to deliver the South Grantham Bypass with a significant financial contribution generated from the enabling developments.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Support and comments noted. It is considered that a caveat within the policy is not required: negotiations will take viability into account.

---

**Summary:**
Developers should be made to make areas as nice for residents as possible ie.include community benefit areas, if amenities are close by there will be less travelling.

**Officers' Recommendation:**
Comments noted.
**Summary:**

We have no objections to the proposed policy, but would request that contributions towards flood alleviation measures be noted as an area of benefit to the community. We also request that reference to 'considering' sustainable drainage systems be amended to the 'implementation' of such systems. This will help to emphasise that such systems are to be expected rather than looked at as an 'add-on'.

**Officers' Recommendation:**

The list of types of community benefit which may be pursued through planning obligations is not intended to be an exhaustive one. Planning Obligations are governed by Government Circular 05/2005.

**Summary:**

Allison Homes is willing to consider the provision of, or contributions to, infrastructure and community benefits which are necessary in conjunction with development. However this must take account of the economic viability of the development which will be severely affected if a high proportion of affordable housing is required.

**Officers' Recommendation:**

Support and comments noted. It is considered that a caveat within the policy is not required: negotiations will take viability into account.
Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells

Summary:
The intentions behind the policy are supported but there has to be consideration of viability

Officers' Recommendation:
Support and comments noted. It is considered that a caveat within the policy is not required: negotiations will take viability into account.

Con ID: 26149
Full Name: Miss E C Biott
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

Summary:
Concerned that the lack of a robust and credible evidence base means that the Council is not in a position to assess the performance or effects of the Core Strategy using National Monitoring Indicator 8 and Local Monitoring Indicator L15. Lincolnshire Local Area Agreement, effective from 1 April 2007, includes the following within the Economic Development and Environment block:

- Identify, protect and enhance Lincolnshire's distinctive and diverse landscapes, built and natural habitats: improve the green infrastructure.
- 10% progress towards achievement of BAP targets for Lincolnshire per annum (SKDC, along with all other Lincolnshire LAs is a partner)
- Audit of Lincolnshire's biodiversity - baseline information available for 100% of Local Wildlife Sites by 2010
- Audit of extent and quality of green infrastructure and natural greenspace by 2010
- Accessibility strategy for green infrastructure and natural greenspace by 2010

Officers' Recommendation:

Comment ID: 2616
Number: 4
Title: Monitoring and Implementation

Nature Of Response: Observations
Summary:
It is extremely important to demonstrate that the Core Strategy accords with national guidance and emerging RSS. The broad locations for strategic development will need to be identified within the Core Strategy. There must be sufficient scope within the broad locations to be able to identify specific sites. The land to the west of Grantham on the west side of the A1 presents such a location where development is capable of being delivered in the period 2011 to 2021.

Officers' Recommendation:
Comment not relevant to policy option consultation. It is merely a reason for supporting a proposed development site.

Summary:
The monitoring should include an independent audit before submission.

Officers' Recommendation:
There is no requirement for independent audit before submission to the Secretary of State.
Summary:
We recommend that indicators regarding the biological and chemical quality of watercourses in the district be included in Local Monitoring Indicator L15. This will give an indication of whether water quality in the district is improving or declining. The percentage of new developments that incorporate SUDS should be monitored to indicate the effectiveness of Policy 11. We also suggest that a Local Monitoring Indicator showing the percentage of new developments that are achieving a 25% reduction in water use be included. This should be used to monitor the effectiveness of any policy that includes the need for the prudent use of water resources. Currently no policy looks to achieve this.

Officers' Recommendation:
L15 does not include any qualitative data. Consideration will be given to including this in the future.

Summary:
Corby Glen and Morton both have 8 of 9 essential facilities.

Officers' Recommendation:
The sustainability survey (2006) results showed these settlements to have less than 8 essential facilities. The survey, sent to Parish Councils, has been undertaken again in 2008 and the findings will guide the identification of Local Service Centres.
Summary:
1: The definition of a LSC is too rigid. Before a community can be identified as sustainable, an in depth appraisal of facilities must be carried out and agreed with the community that further growth can only be justified if facilities can genuinely meet growth. 2: In consideration of the LSC matrix included should be references to the infrastructure, eg, can the road system cope, parking, effects on the environment open space?

Officers' Recommendation:
The matrix is updated annually, through consultation with the Parish Councils. Further consideration will be given to the capacity of infrastructure as part of the site allocation work and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments.

Summary:
Criteria used to identify Local Service Centres should also include small employers and those working from home via internet. This type of community should be maintained and improved by controlled expansion within the village using infill and brownfield sites.

Officers' Recommendation:
The matrix includes local businesses as a 'desirable' rather than essential criteria. It is very difficult to monitor presence of 'work from home' businesses.

Summary:
We support the identification of Long Bennington as a Local Service Centre in both Appendix A and the Key Diagram.

Officers' Recommendation:
support noted.
Summary:
Meeting the criteria is logical provided the services on offer are adequate. The over-all effect of uncontrolled new builds at the moment in Colsterworth has resulted in facilities failing to keep pace with growth. Some form of additional checks need to be incorporated to control development to keep a balance.

Officer's Recommendation:
Noted.

Summary:
To respect the critical mass of the Local Service Centres, it would be preferable to recognise the likelihood that they will have more than one shop so I propose that the definition in Appendix A is changed to 'having 10 (or 12) local facilities available to the public of which at least 8 should be from the list below' As I am proposing a Core Strategy policy for a presumption against change of use away from service premises, to be precise it may be that the definition of services cannot contain 'a local bus service' for this purpose. A local bus service is a very important service in the wider sense but the Core Strategy is largely concerned with the use of land and buildings.

Officer's Recommendation:
The criteria used to define Local Services Centres have been selected with a view to determining the sustainability of the settlements. LSCs are those settlements which are able to sustain not only themselves, but also provide for the needs of smaller settlements nearby. A bus service is not just a means by which people can leave the village, it is also important to enable dwellers of other settlements access to the services contained within the LSC.
On 25 May, 2007, the Lincolnshire County Council announced that it would be closing Rippingale Church of England Primary School on 31 August, 2007. It is understood that this announcement was made after the completion of the LDF Preferred Options document. The result of this announcement now means that Rippingale can only be defined as having only 7 of the 9 essential features to qualify as a Local Service Centre, in that it now lacks an hourly or more frequent bus service and a primary school. Rippingale should now be reclassified as a Larger Village rather than a Local Service Centre.

The matrix is updated annually, through consultation with the Parish Councils. Further consideration will be given to capacity of infrastructure as part of the site allocation work and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments.