



SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL

South Kesteven Local Plan Summary of Regulation 18 Representations



SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL

Contents

Consultative Draft Local Plan, (Regulation 18) Consultation Summary	5
1. Comments on the Local Plan 2011- 2036.....	6
2. Conformity with the NPPF: Do you think the draft Local Plan is consistent with these?	6
3. Evidence Base Up to Date.....	6
4. Comments on the SA: Do you think the draft Local Plan is consistent with these?	7
5. Comments on HRA (Habitat Regulation Assessment): Do you think the draft Local Plan is consistent with these?.....	7
6. The Vision of the Local Plan 2036: Do you think the draft Local Plan Vision depicts the District that Communities would want to be living in by 2036?	7
7. How do objectives shape the Vision: Do you think the objectives will help achieve the vision?.....	7
8. Other Comments on the Vision: Anything else you think should be included?	8
9. The Vision for South Kesteven’s Local Plan	8
10. Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	8
11. Policy SD1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.....	8
12. Policy SD2 – The principles of Sustainable Development in South Kesteven.....	9
13. Spatial Strategy Settlement Hierarchy	9
14. SP1 – Spatial Strategy.....	9
15. SP2 – Settlement Hierarchy.....	9
16. SP3 – Infill Development	10
17. SP4 – Development on the Edge of Settlements	10
18. SP5 - Development in the open Countryside.....	10
19. Meeting Housing Needs	11
20. Policy H1 – Affordable Housing	11
21. Policy H2 – Self Custom Build Housing.....	11
22. Policy H3 – Meeting All housing Needs.....	11
23. Policy H4 – Gypsies and Travellers.....	12
24. Policy H5 – Travelling Showpeople	12
25. Protecting Existing Community Facilities and Providing New Facilities	12
26. SP6 - Retention of Community Services and Facilities.	12
27. Economic Prosperity	12
28. E1 – Strategic Employment Sites	12
29. E2 – Employment Allocations	13

30.	E3- Expansion of Existing Businesses and Protection of Existing Employment Sites	13
31.	E4- Loss of Employment Land and Buildings to Non-employment uses	13
32.	E5- Rural Economy	13
33.	E6 – Other Employment proposals	13
34.	E7 - Visitor Economy	13
35.	Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Built Environments	14
36.	EN1 – Landscape Character	14
37.	EN2 – Protecting Biodiversity and Geodiversity	14
38.	EN3 – Pollution Control	14
39.	EN4 – Reducing The Risk Of Flooding.....	14
40.	EN5 – The Historic Environment	15
41.	EN6 – Protecting and Enhancing Grantham Canal.....	15
42.	DE1 – Promoting Good Quality Design.....	15
43.	SB1 – Sustainable Building.....	15
44.	Policy OS1 – Open Space	16
45.	RE1 – Renewable Energy Generation.....	16
46.	South Kesteven’s Four Market Towns.....	16
47.	GR1 – Protecting and Enhancing the Setting of Belton House and Park.....	17
48.	GR2 – Sustainable Transport in Grantham	17
49.	GR3 – Grantham Town Centre Policy.....	17
50.	GR4 –H1 Grantham Residential Allocations – Spitalgate Heath – Garden Village (Southern Quadrant).....	17
51.	GR4 – H2 Grantham Residential Allocations – Rectory Farm (Phase 2 North West Quadrant) 17	
52.	GR4 –H3 – Grantham Residential Allocations – Land adjacent to Rectory Farm (Phase 3 North West Quadrant).....	17
53.	GR4 – H4 Grantham Residential Allocations – Land North of Longcliffe Road and Ryedale Close, Manthorpe Road	17
54.	GR4 – H5 Grantham Residential Allocations – Land at Trent Road/ Harlaxton Road	17
55.	GR5 – Grantham Reserve Allocation – Prince William of Gloucester Barracks	18
56.	STM1 – H1 Stamford Allocation.....	18
57.	STM1 –H2 Stamford Residential Allocations – Stamford East.....	18
58.	STM2 – Stamford Town Centre Policy.....	18
59.	BRN1 – Bourne Residential allocation: Land off Cedar Drive	18
60.	BRN2 – Bourne Residential allocation: Land West of Beaufort Drive	19

61.	BRN2 – Bourne Town Centre Policy	19
62.	DEP –H1 The Deepings Residential Allocations – Towngate West	19
63.	DEP – H2 The Deepings Residential Allocations – Millfield Road	19
64.	DEP – H3 The Deepings Residential Allocations – Linchfield Road	19
65.	DEP2 – Market Deeping Town Centre Policy.....	19
66.	South Kesteven’s Larger Villages	20
67.	LV-H1 Ancaster Residential Allocation	20
68.	LV- H2 Baston Allocation	20
69.	LV-H3 Barrowby Residential Allocation.....	20
70.	LV –H4 Billingborough	20
71.	LV-H5 Colsterworth Residential Allocation	20
72.	LV – H6 Corby Gel Allocation	20
73.	LV- H7 Great Gonerby Residential Allocation.....	21
74.	LV – H8 Langtoft Allocation	21
75.	LV-H9 Long Bennington Residential Allocation	21
76.	LV-H10 Long Bennington Residential Allocation.....	21
77.	LV-H11 Morton Residential Allocation	21
78.	LV-H12 South Witham Residential Allocation	21
79.	LV-H13 Thurlby Residential Allocation	21
80.	Infrastructure and Developer Contributions	21
81.	ID1 – Infrastructure for Growth.....	21
82.	ID2 – Transport and Strategic Transport	22
83.	ID3 – Broadband and Communications.....	22
84.	Appendix 1.....	22
85.	Appendix 2.....	22
86.	Appendix 3.....	22
87.	Appendix 4.....	23
88.	Miscellaneous Comments	23
89.	SKLP274	23
90.	Additional Site Information	23
91.	New Site Submissions.....	23

Consultative Draft Local Plan, (Regulation 18) Consultation Summary

South Kesteven District Council is preparing a new Local Plan. The new plan will cover the whole district for the period of 2011- 2036.

Regulation 18 was the third stage of public consultation. The first stage took place between January and March 2015, on the scope of the Local Plan; the second taking place between July and August 2016, on a Sites and Settlements Consultation.

The consultative draft Local Plan 2017 differs from previous consultations. It set out the strategic vision, objectives, spatial strategy for the District and planning policies to guide future development. It established policies and guidance to ensure local development is built in accordance with the principles of sustainable development. The consultative draft also identified a number of allocations across the district to contribute towards the deliverability of the Plan's strategic vision.

The Draft Local Plan 2017 consultation document can still be found here:

<http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=21077&p=0>

In the summer of 2017, a number of community events were held at Grantham, Stamford, Bourne, and the Deepings to inform communities of the consultation. The consultative draft Local Plan was published, in July 2017, when the third consultation period began and continued through to August 2017.

Copies of the Local Plan were available in Council offices, Libraries, and on the Council's website.

Over 800 comments were received from individuals and organisations. These comments and responses from those previous consultation periods have been taken into account to help shape the Proposed Submission Local Plan document.

Each section below summarises responses for individuals sections of the Local Plan along, with proposed actions.

Policy/Question:	Number of responses	Summary	Proposed Action
<p><u>1.</u> Comments on the Local Plan 2011-2036</p>	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timescales and review of the Local Plan Period should be shorter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central Governments recommend 15 to 20 years plan period. Longer plan periods allow for long term strategic projects to come forward and in preparation for submission to the Secretary of State.
<p><u>2.</u> Conformity with the NPPF: Do you think the draft Local Plan is consistent with these?</p>	102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans which are unsound as it is not, in accordance with Paragraph 28, or take a positive approach to sustainable development and sustainable growth. In order to achieve this growth in more than the Towns and Larger Villager should be documented • The Local Plan is not in accordance with Paragraph 14 the NPPF where there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. - Billingborough was assessed as being one of the most sustainable villages (offering a range of services and facilities) within the District, it has one of the lowest proposed amount of dwellings • We consider the Plan is currently unsound having regard to paragraph 182 of the National planning Policy Framework. The Plan also fails to meet the aspirations of the Housing White Paper • The plan is not justified as the Council has narrowly interpreted the Grantham Capacity Study, in that any potential site that does not wholly confirm with the (strategic) potential areas identified for growth around Grantham have been immediately discounted for this reason alone. • The Plan relies too heavily on the proposed sustainable urban extensions (SUE) to Grantham. The over reliance of the housing land supply on the SUEs risks the future delivery of housing in the District, rendering the Plan ineffective. • Policy SD2, Policy SP2 or Policy SP4 are not compliant with the NPPF • The Plan is not clear in how the housing numbers required are to be achieved through the entire Plan process and period and it is considered unlikely that the Plan as presently structured will be capable of delivering a rolling five year housing land supply. The amounts to be delivered from the sectors, windfall allowances and by managing and monitoring are not clear. • No, because the NPPF is from 2012 and due to change sometime soon. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan has been assessed as being in conformity to the current NPPF and will be examined against this.
<p><u>3.</u> Evidence Base Up to Date</p>	75	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SHMA is in the review process. Considerations should be given to the Settlement Hierarchy and Site assessment paper. • Consideration to be given to Joint Strategic Need Assessment • South Kesteven's Green Infrastructure strategy should be included as evidence to support the strategic approach, and should provide throughout the whole district. • Open space review not considered to represent a robust and up to date assessment of needs for sports facilities and opportunities for new provision in line with the requirements of NPPF. • Limited evidence regarding duty to co operate and cross boundary Dialogue within the HMA to address sustainable development opportunities, and to assess all reasonable alternatives. • In an event of evidence base shift the local plan is to be reviewed • Need to see the whole viability study • Evidence is needed for infrastructure needs across the district 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted, additional evidence is now available

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the evidence provided is out of date, or inconsistencies with previous documents produced (Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (December 2009), and District Wide Landscape Character Assessment (2007)). 	
4. Comments on the SA: Do you think the draft Local Plan is consistent with these?	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current draft local plan could impact social, environmental and economic aspects of villages if enforced. The SA and HRA are in draft, incomplete, not broad enough; need to include aspects of green infrastructure, biodiversity, and impacts of climate change. Limited Evidence of cross boundary dialogue with regard to consideration of all sustainable and deliverable options for growth at Market Deeping. The Local Plan should reiterate that opportunities should be sought to work collaboratively with other partners in the area. The statement of Community involvement completely ignores the views of local people. SA includes protection of open space. However, the Local Plan is not protecting Millfield Road or Bourne Woods. Inaccuracies within The Points of Compass evaluation. Suggested wording changes to Section 4.6 and B5. Clarification requested in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement of Duty to Co-operate to be produced on submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State. Reiterate that opportunities should be sought to work collaboratively with other partners in the area. Policy wording strengthened.
5. Comments on HRA (Habitat Regulation Assessment): Do you think the draft Local Plan is consistent with these?	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supportive for preparing a HRA at Regulation 18, this should be reviewed for consistency Concerned HRA is not broad enough in relation to green infrastructure, biodiversity and impact of climate change. There are concerns with spatial distribution and connectivity. Not considered potential impacts in neighbouring authorities Local Plans. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be taken into account in the HRA work Statement of Duty to Co-operate to be produced on submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State.
6. The Vision of the Local Plan 2036: Do you think the draft Local Plan Vision depicts the District that Communities would want to be living in by 2036?	91	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Vision is compliant with the NPPF. Over development and growth in Locations around the District The Vision is planning too far in advance, the event being planned may never happen. The Planning system is not flexible enough to respond to changes. The Local Plan is inaccessible, complicated to read, with unclear imagery Does not include community needs or Local views The Vision should incorporate a stronger aspiration for the creation of an extensive green infrastructure network which supports biodiversity and ecological value across the District. The Visions should be more aspiration in relation to the natural environment with a focus on both protection and enhancements. The Vision should refer specifically to creating healthy environments or the health and wellbeing of residents but is alluded to in other phrases (e.g. 'high quality of life'). The Local Plan should contain details on monitoring and review. The Vision does not take into account specific neighbouring towns and villages and reflect the relationship with them (Casterton /Rutland Heights communities, Peterborough). Does not take into account demographic changes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted Policy wording strengthened. Monitoring and implementation section added to the Local Plan.
7. How do objectives shape the Vision: Do you think the objectives will help achieve the vision?	59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In support of the Visions objectives. The Vision needs to reference health and wellbeing Further consideration to new developments to contribute to green space (Green infrastructure). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Vision needs to reference to protection and enhancement of ecological networks, green infrastructure and adaptation for wildlife, and soils as a finite resource. Objectives do not reflect what residents want. Objectives are not strongly worded, and there needs to be real targets. Too Long term, the plan should be reviewed at appropriate intervals to ensure that land being promoted for development is appropriately considered. Requires adjustment to include 'requiring support of existing and delivery of enhance and new (sports) infrastructure to meet identified needs' Objective 7 to include promotions of healthy towns. 	
8. Other Comments on the Vision: Anything else you think should be included?	72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not clear on how housing can be achieved. Support the Vision for the District, but in respect of Bourne we advocate greater flexibility in the allocation sites to support the delivery of the Vision. Policies should promote and encourage biodiversity and ecological gains/opportunities. Local Plan should reference health and healthy environments. Emphasis on green space vision needs to be clearer to understand what the Councils visions are. Need to reference health and wellbeing of residents, population changes should refer to demographics. High quality environments should be defined as a measurable objective in the Local Plan. Support the need for sustainable rural communities alongside urban communities. Highlighting specialised needs of rural communities is positive, and noting that jobs and homes are necessary to ensure their vitality in the future. Over building and overpopulation in Bourne is not a Vision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted Incorporate policy on health (public health) in the Plan, along with alterations to the objectives. Consider new objectives on health and wellbeing promotion.
9. The Vision for South Kesteven's Local Plan	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor vision More employment is needed not housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic policies strengthened
10. Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More facilities needed for development Housing should be sustainable for the future No development without the provision of a 24 hour A&E. Sustainable is meaningless within out genuine commitment to preserving assets we have now which, once destroyed, can never be put back. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted
11. Policy SD1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supportive of emerging policies and this policy in that it is consistent with paragraph 14 of the NPPF which gives a presumption in favour of sustainable development and allows for the grant of permission where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of date, providing there are no adverse impacts that outweigh the benefits and that the development is not contrary to specific policies within the Framework. It is nice to see preference given above and beyond the required guidelines. Should also include 'eco-friendly' Should build upon the presumption to ensure sustainable development with an approach that takes account of local factors in the wider authority area. Draft should be amended to maintain an up to date development plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor wording changes to policy to ensure conformity to NPPF

<p>12. Policy SD2 – The principles of Sustainable Development in South Kesteven</p>	<p>23</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should reference green infrastructure, wildlife friendly, biodiversity, ecological gains and opportunities. • Concerns of increased traffic congestion • Brownfield and PDL should be encouraged before greenfield sites, this will guide development to the most sustainable locations rather than land classifications. • Enhance and maintain character of existing towns and villages. • Should be reworded to be consistent with the NPPF. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wording changes to policy to ensure conformity to NPPF
<p>13. Spatial Strategy Settlement Hierarchy</p>	<p>6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of the Settlement Hierarchy Background Report and its revised approach to the larger villages, to allow small scale sustainable growth in the smaller settlements. • Claypole, Folkingham, should be recognised as a larger village. • Barrowby should not be a larger village • Out of date and incomplete information in the table of from Appendix 1, Village services Survey for Thurlby 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy based on consistent evidence through the assessment of services and facilities in settlements • No change proposed to settlement hierarchy
<p>14. SP1 – Spatial Strategy</p>	<p>26</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivery of homes should be a minima not a requirement • Housing requirements and future growth should consider meeting the housing needs of rural areas. • In support of Policy SP1. The focus on larger villages must not be done at the expense of the long-term economic and social sustainability of smaller villages and communities. • It is essential that the needs of the sustainable rural settlements are assessed. Level of growth should be sufficient to ensure housing needs of the rural population can be addressed. • Policy is in accordance with the NPPF. • Council should be more proactive in seeking delivery of new housing and growth, OAN should be expressed as a minimal figure. • The SHMA underestimates the overall housing need for the plan period; it should reflect the overall increased housing requirement. • Not consistent with the NPPF wording to change for sustainable cohesive communities – make most of developed land. • The figure of 624 per annum represents only a 4% increase about the 2014-based CLG household projections. This does not signal a strong intent by the Council to significantly boost the supply of housing and should be more proactive in seeking to deliver new housing and growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wording changes to policy to ensure conformity to NPPF and set out proposed growth above the minimum required to meet assessed needs
<p>15. SP2 – Settlement Hierarchy</p>	<p>32</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over funding for Market Deeping • No need for more housing development; more facilities should be provided. • The policy is supported as it recognised suitable development across larger villages to contribute to meeting housing needs. • Contrasting comments on whether Claypole should not be recognised as a larger village • Development should be appropriate to settlement. • 50% of housing within Grantham is ambitious, when it has only provided 30% over the last five years. Demand in Grantham may not be as high as anticipated and other sustainable and desirable locations should come forward within the plan period. • We support Policy SP2 but consider it fails to identify what is meant by appropriate development in the villages and does not properly identify the spatial distribution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Policy based on consistent evidence through the assessment of services and facilities in settlements • No change proposed to settlement hierarchy

		of housing across the settlement hierarchy.	
16. SP3 – Infill Development	31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development should be restricted to infill as this reduces the encroachment and outward growth. • This policy is reasonable and sensible and considered in accordance with the National Planning Policy. • Infill should be encouraged where it does not encroach upon any greenfield land. • The policy should allow each case to be examined on its own merits without any restrictions in terms of supply or demand. There should be no restrictions such as paragraph 3.13 ‘allow small, sensitive infill developments so that these smaller communities can positively respond to the housing needs of their people’ it is not clear what this means, and how it can be quantified as well as material planning consideration. • Concerns over the clarification of the ‘needs of their people’. There are many people who would prefer not to live in large urban development schemes and who require choice and it is important that this is recognised in the Plan to help facilitate appropriate village growth and help sustain local facilities. • Living space should be provided above shops • There is too much infill already, and this is not sensitive to its surroundings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Policy refers to appropriate infill developments
17. SP4 – Development on the Edge of Settlements	54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over the loss of character and the need for more facilities and infrastructure. • Market Deeping proposals join buffers between town and the bypass and there should be a buffer from Bourne Woods, to reduce encroachment of development. • ‘Substantial community support’ is not a land use issue. The approach taken which states that the market housing element of the scheme must ‘not exceed the number of affordable homes needed’ is questionable’. • The addition of a green Infrastructure policy is needed • Development encroaches on to valuable farm land. • Does not recognise environmental , social changes, • This policy is too restrictive, for example ‘Market housing would have to meet the ‘housing needs of current residents or those who have a local connection to the area’, this is not clear and how can it be quantified, and is not consistent with the NPPF. Additionally, the term ‘substantial support’ is too ambiguous. • Policy should demonstrate that it can meet ‘most’ of these criteria not all. • Development across the district should be balanced. • There is a lack of clarity on how much housing is expected from edge of centre development. • Difficult to regard to point (v) to identify a ‘specific targeted need for local market housing’. The proven local need for affordable housing should be dealt with as a standalone policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No proposed change to policy to ensure conformity to NPPF
18. SP5 - Development in the open Countryside	48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit development on to greenfield, development should be limited to brownfield and previously developed land before, to protect open countryside, biodiversity and local agricultural provisions. • Concerns over development encroaching upon Bourne Woods and development in and around Stamford. • Inconsistent approach with SP4, this policy may lead to inconsistencies within the decision process. • ‘Urban fringe’ should be reference to distinguish this policy from SP4 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No proposed change to policy to ensure conformity to NPPF

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Rural Diversification impacts. • Suggested wording • Development supported unless it harmful open space or views • Facilitating redevelopment at existing employment sites 	
19. Meeting Housing Needs	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More evidence needs to be provided, to support the need for more housing. • 625 is not an inspirational figure, and the National Methodology may change this requirement. • Affordable housing policies supported • Affordable housing should be provided in or by developments to meet needs, and should provide smaller affordable homes. • Allocated suitable sites through range of allocations rather than SUE, as this could result in a delay of delivering homes and ensure a rolling five-year supply of housing land. • The Local Plan does not include a housing trajectory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan will be assessed on the basis of a strong evidence base through the SHMA • Housing required meeting projected population changes, as well as, providing choice and contingency to the market. • Amendment made to affordable housing policy to support viability considerations • Add the housing trajectory within Monitoring and Implementation section within the Local Plan
20. Policy H1 – Affordable Housing	46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about the 35% affordable housing requirement on site of 11 or more units, and how this will impact on deliverability of sites. • Concerns about 80% of affordable housing to 20% intermediate housing has not been tested within the supporting Whole Plan Viability Study 2017, this should be reviewed. • Suggested text amendments to reflect costs requirements to be applied to developments, requirements for affordable homes, standards, infrastructure contributions and other requirements. • The council will need to demonstrate that housing will come forward to meet the OAN, suggested that SKDC increase supply to provide more affordable homes. • Concerns about the Viability costs and averages of all site calculations • The plan should be flexible and recognise the variations in house prices that are achieved across the district. • Seek clarity on accessible home standards and considerations as to what impact this would have on viability calculations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce affordable housing requirement to 30% • Assess the 70/30% split through the WPVS • Amend supporting text to reflect NPPF paragraph 173 regarding viability • Amend text by deleting “and internal floor space” from bullet point 3 in policy H1.
21. Policy H2 – Self Custom Build Housing	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change to support the delivery mechanism rather than supporting the delivery of more homes, to support windfall sites and small allocations. • Viability testing of the impacts have not been assess, no proposed release mechanism for such plots or for delivery which will remove them from Housing land supply. • Encourage character developments. • Spitalgate Heath Garden/ Southern Quadrant have not been included within the Self-build custom list • Should be controlled • More flexibility needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add an additional paragraph to the supporting text to set out a mechanism to release such plots from this restriction should they not be developed during the plan period. This should be taken into consideration in the next iteration of the WPVS. • Delete reference to specific sites
22. Policy H3 – Meeting All housing Needs	24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should consider it is inclusive to all members of society. • Reflect needs identified in the SHMA and seek a proportion of adaptable homes or dwellings which are Lifetime Home Compliant. • Aspirations should equally apply to rural settlements where development can help maintain the vitality of the community. • Should be a mixture of housing • Unviable to request mixture of housing on smaller sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reword policy to be more inclusive • Reflect suggested wording changes in policy

23. Policy H4 – Gypsies and Travellers	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more long term planning to respond to this matter. More integration in response to illegal encampments and the provision of long term accommodation. • Policy should encourage proposals within the Gypsy/ Traveller communities. • There have been incidents across the country caused by policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor wording changes to policy
24. Policy H5 – Travelling Showpeople	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rides causing damage to meadows 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments not relevant to Planning Policy. No action required.
25. Protecting Existing Community Facilities and Providing New Facilities	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More infrastructure and facilities are needed across the district • Over populated for facilities without more development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to policy
26. SP6 - Retention of Community Services and Facilities.	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a need to increase facilities and services • Community facilities are seen as un-viable as they are run by volunteers yet valuable to the community/ not enough services • Infrastructure for connectivity is needed. Walking, cycling, and public transport should be accessible. • Support for Policy SP6 regarding promotion and protection of local facilities. For clarification that inclusive description for 'community facilities' which would obviate the need to provide examples and ensure it covers all uses identified in paragraph 70 of the NPPF. • Community facilities should be accessible by sustainable transport. • The wording does not align with the NPPF paragraph 74, which allows for loss if a facility is replaced by equivalent or alternative provision, and so should be modified accordingly. • It would be helpful to provide a definition of '<i>community facility</i>' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No proposed change to policy • Add a definition of Community Facilities to the Glossary.
27. Economic Prosperity	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unable to predict 25 years in advance. • Welcomed policies on economic prosperity. Providing a wider economy and health and wellbeing, promoting mental health and job creation. • Unable to predict 25 years in advance • There should be more redevelopment to existing sites to provide more employment • Employment land should be developed outside of the centre of The Deepings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted – plan will be kept under regular 5 year review to take account of changing economic conditions
28. E1 – Strategic Employment Sites	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking, air quality, environment, and traffic congestion should not be exacerbated due to employment land. • Support for the encouragement of other employment generating uses on employment sites, the provision of employment land is essential to ensure towns are sustainable. • The Government does not recommend the protection of strategic employment sites when such are unlikely to ever be used for employment. • Concerns of employment site SKLP281 allocation for employment use • Policy E1 should reference King31 site • Support to allocation within Bourne for employment as it reduces the need to travel. • No future employment at Roseland Business Park, this should be included within the Local Plan Policy E1 or E2. • Clarification is needed within text, on the use of existing buildings as this is not suited to modern employment uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted

<p>29. E2 – Employment Allocations</p>	<p>17</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough allocation of employment land for expected number of intake. • Concerned of traffic congestion in Stamford • Drainage issues in Long Bennington should be acknowledged as in the Neighbourhood Plan Policy (LB1) • Requests that consideration is given to the safeguarding of waste sites in accordance with Policy W8 of the adopted CSDMP. Requests any allocations should consider potential conflicts with these areas. • Supportive of Policy E2. • SKLP 276 has be allocated as an employment site for 20years, and failed to development. This land should be identified as residential. • SKLP 276 should be allocated as mixed use. • An unclear boundary there needs to be a link to STM1-H3 to ensure delivery of the Ryhall Road Link. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment allocations supported by Employment Land Review Study
<p>30. E3- Expansion of Existing Businesses and Protection of Existing Employment Sites</p>	<p>13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stamford is crowded for employment; it must be allocated within new development areas. • Honeypot Lane and Colsterworth should be used for employment allocation to reduce impact on existing communities. • Requests an addition to text to facilitate redevelopment at existing employment sites to maintain modern facilities. • Supportive of policy, specific comments to the welcomed job creation, wider economy, health and wellbeing and mental health promotions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted
<p>31. E4- Loss of Employment Land and Buildings to Non-employment uses</p>	<p>5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment land and buildings should remain for employment for the Local Economy. • Concerns regarding the proposal of Uffington Road for housing allocations. This area is prime for employment but affected by heavy pollution from existing ground soil. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presumption in favour of developing Brownfield sites
<p>32. E5- Rural Economy</p>	<p>13</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development through this Policy will impact on the local economy • Development should be encouraged if there is no loss to farm land. • Long term projections cannot possibly anticipate the future needs and changes of the rural economy. • Supportive of the policy due to its provision for sustainable tourism development as part of the rural economy, and protection of natural and historic environment. • Supportive due to the inclusion of biodiversity, however, text needs clarity. • We are about the leave the EEC and such long term projections cannot possibly anticipate the future needs and changes of the rural economy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted – plan will be kept under regular 5 year review to take account of changing economic conditions
<p>33. E6 – Other Employment proposals</p>	<p>3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrictive policy. • Employment should be situated by existing infrastructure. • Policy should reference King 31 strategic employment site. • Concepts should be explained, comparisons and targets of what high job density and high workplace productivity would look like and how the District Council will achieve this. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted
<p>34. E7 - Visitor Economy</p>	<p>16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retail report is out of date. • SKDC need to work with LCC to ensure traffic and parking issues are resolved in order that Stamford visitor attraction is not diminished • There needs to be better ways to attract visitors to Bourne. Protect Bourne Woods, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments to be considered within the context if the Council’s Tourism Strategy as comments do not relate to land use policy

		<p>enhance the town centre, and transport.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable growth of tourism in the District must also focus on maintaining and improving the natural environment of the District as part of tourism offer. • The Policy and supporting text should recognise the natural environment to tourism and the underpinning the socio-economics • Support encouragement of visitor economy and local plan support for new tourism provision and initiatives. • Inadequate attraction and promotion of Grantham from the A1. • SKDC should work closely with Belton House and Woolsthorpe Manor 	
35. Protecting and Enhancing the Natural and Built Environments	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more open spaces and protection for local communities • Protect natural environments, heritage assets, and wildlife across the district 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wording of environmental policies strengthened
36. EN1 – Landscape Character	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrict development on open space • Provide more open space and recreational facilities • Enhance valued landscapes geological conservation interests and soils • Loss of good agricultural land and the effect on wildlife is concerning. There is also a number of public footpaths/right of ways within the area which would be lost. • We support emerging policy EN1 and the flexibility of allowing for Character Appraisals to assess the impact of the proposed development on the landscape. • We welcome this policy and are pleased to note the evidence base is provided in terms of the Landscape Character Assessment (2010) and the more recent Capacity Studies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted, there is a separate policy on open space – no proposed change to policy
37. EN2 – Protecting Biodiversity and Geodiversity	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect biodiversity and geodiversity. • All sites should be protected equally, the Local Plan should make references to habitats, protected species, encourage biodiversity. • There is no mention of Green infrastructure, this plan does not protect areas of Geodiversity importance, enhance biodiversity including priority species, ecological networks, wildlife corridors, or stepping stones. • This policy is inconsistent with Habitats Regulations • All sites should have the same protection, it should be applied to sites that meet the criteria for international, national, or local designation but that has not been designated. There should be specific reference to irreplaceable habitats, priority habitats and protected species, reflection the local authority’s biodiversity duty under NERC Act 2006. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy strengthened and separate policy included on green infrastructure
38. EN3 – Pollution Control	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New housing developments should not be located by unattractive locations • Houses should be insulated with the addition of solar panels. • The focus of this policy is on potential amenity impacts from new developments, consideration should also be given existing uses including sewage treatments. • Impacts from traffic, noise, light pollutions impact wildlife and surroundings • Increased traffic • Policy fails to refer to water quality and emphasise the objectives of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) as set out in River Basin Management Plans (RBMP). • Groundwater protection guidance should be referred to. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy consumption and water resources included in sustainable building policy • No proposed change to policy
39. EN4 – Reducing The Risk Of Flooding	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building on flood plain increasing risks of floods to that area, maintenance is needed to reduce the risks of flooding. • Reoccurring flooding is concerning, development could be impacting the increased 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor amendments made to policy wording • Add more text on SUDs and add <i>“On-site attenuation and infiltration will be required as part of any new development</i>

		<p>flood risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognised flood risk to Millfield fields, we are unaware of anything that has been or will be done to reduce this risk. Housing should not be built in areas which are liable to flooding. Run-off is also a problem with infill building and the loss of front gardens. Suggested wording and additional information on SUDs 	<p><i>wherever possible, and should consider the achievement of multiple benefits for example through green infrastructure provision and biodiversity enhancements in addition to their drainage function” to the policy text.</i></p>
40. EN5 – The Historic Environment	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are inconsistencies in terms of shop frontage. Heritage is important, historic interests are being lost in Bourne. One reason for this, the encroachment of development on Bourne Woods which needs protection. SKDC should be preserving historic environments across the whole district EN5 should recognise the distinction that the NPPF makes between ‘harm’ and ‘substantial harm or loss’, this policy should be reviewed to avoid any conflict with the NPPF. ‘Conserve’ is defined in the NPPF glossary and does not limit the historic environment to being ‘preserved’. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy wording strengthened and amended
41. EN6 – Protecting and Enhancing Grantham Canal	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supportive of policy EN6: this is a popular and all inclusive projects, The Canal Society have been doing a wonderful job, and, keep it in maintained condition. Suggested wording changes <i>“Proposals will be permitted that are designed to develop the canal’s recreational, nature conservation, heritage and tourism potential”</i> and replace ‘protect and preserve’ with ‘conserve’ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendment made to policy wording
42. DE1 – Promoting Good Quality Design	24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Character of buildings is and continues to be damaged by poor design and planning. Developers should be encouraged to build in a variety of appropriate designs, all new housing developments are consistent throughout the country, and design should reflect unique town character. This policy should not apply to all housing sites. Clearer thresholds are needed. The design review should only be for larger scale development (30+). Policies should explicitly reflect growing interests in promoting health equality, designing adaptable ‘ready for ageing’ homes. Policy DE1 may but a burden on elements of delivering sustainable growth opportunities viably, the policy should be amended so it encourages development proposals to regard relevant design principles. Clarification is required of what is asked for the Building for Life 12 and Lifetime homes. There is danger that if arbitrary and inflexible design standards are adopted applies in an ad hoc and inconsistent manner that could add unnecessarily to housing costs and to delays in determining individual planning application. Support policy as it is vital to have good design. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amendments made to policy wording
43. SB1 – Sustainable Building	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More affordable units should be delivered Policy should include/require safe cycle provision to access development This policy could specifically mention renewable energy developments. The Water Cycle Study 2016, demonstrates a “water neutral position” therefore, it is contended that South Kesteven is not an area of water stress and the higher optional water efficiency standard should be deleted as a requirement in Policy SB1. For Non domestic buildings achieving a formal ‘good’ BREEAM rating from the BRE is an expensive process in terms of the administration costs and BRE fees. It would be better to word the policy as Non-domestic buildings will be expected to reach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to policy

		<p>the equivalent of a “good” BREEAM status as a minimum.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supportive of policy 	
44. Policy OS1 – Open Space	37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open space must be secured Development is destroying open space An open space study is needed for each town A review of suggested walking distances should be undertaken along with the draft standards and revises the open space policy accordingly Policy OS1 is welcomed Protecting woodland is important across the district. Suggested wording ‘ <i>All new open space provision should take account of best practice guidance and design principles, and contribute to net gains in biodiversity on the site</i>’ Indications on how to improve walking and cycling links from surrounding residential areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy amended as suggested
45. RE1 – Renewable Energy Generation	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to encourage more renewable energy generation projects Specific areas could be allocated for renewable energy projects, but the Local Plan does not mention this. Preference over solar –photovoltaic cells for renewable source. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change proposed to policy
46. South Kesteven’s Four Market Towns	74	<p>Grantham:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future of Grantham’s hospital is concerning More infrastructure is needed to support developments Local plan needs a variety of housing to support the needs of emerging and aging communities. <p>Bourne:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More facilities; schools, leisure, shops Inadequate infrastructure Eastern By pass needed No need for more housing developments Fulfil housing requirements but do not encroach on Bourne Woods Maintain Bourne Woods Developments should be in keeping with the rest of the surroundings. <p>Stamford:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Plan keen to preserve historical importance Inadequate infrastructure and facilities No need for more housing developments Development needs to be balanced; there is already too much development in the north and west of Stamford centre. Protect character <p>Market Deeping:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to provide a rand of housing to meet needs of various groups, including affordable. Need to consider if more development is sustainable Development should be in keeping with the rest of the surroundings. <p>General comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mention of biodiversity, geodiversity, and the quality of the natural environment Loss of identity, impacts on the local environment. 	<p>Grantham:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted <p>Bourne:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future housing provision in Bourne to be addressed through the Neighbourhood Plan Infrastructure requirements to be addressed in IDP <p>Stamford:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted <p>Market Deeping:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted To be considered in IDP <p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted Covered in general environmental policies which have been strengthened

47. GR1 – Protecting and Enhancing the Setting of Belton House and Park	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of Policy GR1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No actions required.
48. GR2 – Sustainable Transport in Grantham	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be more connectivity with public transport and other transport methods (cycle/ foot paths) • Policy to mention GSRR, and accessibility • Concerns due to increased traffic congestion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy wording amended
49. GR3 – Grantham Town Centre Policy	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitors should be encouraged to Grantham • There should be better uses of the buildings within the town centre • Conservation, enhancement and promotion of Grantham’s historical fabric and character should be directly reflected in this Policy – promote heritage and regeneration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No proposed change to policy
50. GR4 –H1 Grantham Residential Allocations – Spitalgate Heath – Garden Village (Southern Quadrant)	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of school provision • Road construction, delaying delivery of the sites • Policy should recognise biodiversity or ecological networks • Concern on reliance of SUE to deliver housing supplies, generating future risks to the delivery of housing and the five year housing supply being at risk. • Contrasts to Policies in the Core Strategy – H2 and H3 should be developed as one master plan alongside Poplar Farm, for integration into poplar farm • Policies should identify biodiversity, green infrastructure contributions and ecological networks. • Wording changes from ‘heritage features’ and amended to heritage assets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments made to development principles
51. GR4 – H2 Grantham Residential Allocations – Rectory Farm (Phase 2 North West Quadrant)	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition to treatment capacity and waste water treatment works • Policy should recognise biodiversity and ecological networks; green infrastructure • Wording should be in line with the NPPF • A flexible, sufficient and sustainable approach is need in delivering SUEs and draft plan allocations • Unsure of indicative figures • Suggested boundary changes between GR4 H2 and GR4 H3. • Importance for flexibility – should be an overarching Masterplan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments made to development principles
52. GR4 –H3 – Grantham Residential Allocations – Land adjacent to Rectory Farm (Phase 3 North West Quadrant)	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should recognise biodiversity and ecological networks • Allocations should be within small and medium housing sites across Grantham and the districts this will allow a boost to housing supply • Word changes to be in line with NPPF terminology • Concerns on the delivery of housing, additional sites should be identified to come forward early in the Plan period. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments made to development principles
53. GR4 – H4 Grantham Residential Allocations – Land North of Longcliffe Road and Ryedale Close, Manthorpe Road	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase traffic and air pollution • Belton heritage assets affected weak and not consistent with NPPF, as great weight should be given to conservation assets (paragraph. 132) • No recognition of biodiversity, or ecological networks • Should identify and maximise green infrastructure and ecological networks • Word changes to be in line with NPPF terminology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments made to development principles
54. GR4 – H5 Grantham Residential	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should recognise biodiversity and ecological networks • Addition to set out that development should provide net gains in biodiversity and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed allocation deleted as site promoted for non-residential uses

Allocations – Land at Trent Road/ Harlaxton Road		<p>contribute to wider green infrastructure and ecological networks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Word changes to be in line with the NPPF • Reference to treatment capacity and water quality targets 	
<u>55.</u> GR5 – Grantham Reserve Allocation – Prince William of Gloucester Barracks	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This site cannot be considered deliverable • Allocation accords with the Grantham Capacity study 2015, a potential site to make shortfall in housing delivery • Concerns of loss of woodland • Policy should recognise biodiversity and ecological networks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further work has now been commissioned by the MoD to undertake a masterplan for the potential development of the Prince William of Gloucester Barracks site. On the basis of this work and following discussions with the highways authority, this site is now proposed to be allocated for development, with an assumption made in the Local Plan that 500 dwellings would be built within the plan period
<u>56.</u> STM1 – H1 Stamford Allocation	142	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of a new primary school should reference the involvement of existing primary schools of Stamford. Also, reference to the strategy for development of education in the town and involving education leaders from the town’s school. • Policy should recognise biodiversity or ecological networks. • All allocations within Stamford should identify and maximise opportunities to include multifunctional green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancements. • Concerns of Sydney Farm Lane becoming a relief road for Stamford. • Concerns over the reliance of housing delivery through one single allocation. • Development should the design is within keeping of Stamford. • There is likely to be cumulative impact on the A1 which will need to be considered through a Transport Assessment. • Developments require local consultation and agreement and the Council needs to devise clear policies to strictly control such development within its borders. • A range of concerns are raised include increased traffic congestion and traffic cutting through Little Casterton to the A1; the need for a bypass of Little Casterton, the lack of infrastructure and local facilities; the impact on local residents, services, public transport, school runs and parking in Stamford; that any houses in within the County boundaries must be included in Rutland’s housing totals; that the requirement that “<i>development is expected to include</i>” to is too weak and that the requirements for a country park and a strong mitigation framework need to be strengthened; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Local Plan does not propose the use of Sydney Farm Lane as a bypass for the town. Traffic forecasting will be undertaken to assess the potential effects of traffic leaving the site upon all relevant roads and junctions within the existing network. • Amendments to text to ensure connections and promotion of safe walking to local schools, town, and local centres.
<u>57.</u> STM1 –H2 Stamford Residential Allocations – Stamford East	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns over insufficient infrastructure to support development. • More detail on the proposed east-west link road to ensure improvements with traffic congestions and road infrastructures • Concerns over wildlife habitats, biodiversity, and ecological networks due to the impacts of air pollution and congestion from development • Suggested wording : ‘<i>Development should provide net gains in biodiversity on site and contribute to wider ecological networks where possible</i>’ – maximise multifunctional green infrastructure and biodiversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments made to development principles
<u>58.</u> STM2 – Stamford Town Centre Policy	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure – increase pressure on road links • Developments should contribute to the character and appeal of the town centre. • Avoid over concentration of certain uses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No proposed change to policy
<u>59.</u> BRN1 – Bourne Residential allocation: Land off Cedar Drive	307	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient infrastructure to support development • Concerns of the impacts on biodiversity, wildlife, environment, habitat of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future housing provision in Bourne to be addressed through the Neighbourhood Plan

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> developments by Bourne Woods Concerns about access to allocations (Cedar Drive and Beaufort Drive) Need for local green spaces. Core Strategy says no further allocations are needed in Bourne. If Grade 2 agriculture acceptable for employment allocations, why not for housing allocations. The Local Plan is incomplete and out of date No developments in the past 20 years has '<i>protected the heritage, character and landscape</i>' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure requirements to be addressed in IDP
60. BRN2 – Bourne Residential allocation: Land West of Beaufort Drive	200	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient infrastructure to support development Traffic and access concerns Already too many developments, Elsea Park will provide enough development. This proposed allocation is at risk of flooding There is a need to concentrate on service facilities Concerns of the impact on biodiversity, wildlife, environment, habitats of the developments by Bourne Woods. Second time, we have opposed plans for the allocation of a development on land situated at the end of Beaufort Drive. Bourne petition: 103 signatures put forward. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future housing provision in Bourne to be addressed through the Neighbourhood Plan Infrastructure requirements to be addressed in IDP
61. BRN2 – Bourne Town Centre Policy	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage visitors Inadequate parking Avoid over concentration of certain uses Needs to be more attractive, many shops are empty due to high rates. The new population of Bourne will not use the town centre. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No proposed change to policy
62. DEP –H1 The Deepings Residential Allocations – Towngate West	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient infrastructure to support development. A loss of open space, not providing amenities for a healthy and environmentally friendly area More houses should be allocated here Would increase the risk of runoff and flooding to areas downstream. Policy should recognise the provisions and net gains in biodiversity and contribute to wider green infrastructure and ecological networks Word changes from '<i>heritage features</i>' to '<i>heritage assets and their setting</i>' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy wording amended.
63. DEP – H2 The Deepings Residential Allocations – Millfield Road	146	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments oppose to the development on Millfield Road. Many of responses expressed their concerns over development on this allocation due to the loss of open space that has been established and used by residents, loss of natural habitats and wildlife, increased traffic congestion, insufficient infrastructure, flood risks, and a Village green application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site removed due to a Village Green application
64. DEP – H3 The Deepings Residential Allocations – Linchfield Road	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrict development. There is insufficient infrastructure to support development in the Deepings. Concerns over additions of footpaths and safety. Clarification is needed, whether footpaths will be diverted along the site and existing routes will be retained. Site should be connected and accessible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No proposed change to policy
65. DEP2 – Market Deeping Town Centre Policy	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car parking issues Destruction of the character The Market is barely viable now, and is slowly disappearing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No proposed change to policy

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure • Unsuitable locations • Facilities should be kept together for connectivity 	
66. South Kesteven's Larger Villages	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns were raised on inadequate infrastructure in larger villages across the district to support developments. • Support for inclusion of Neighbourhood plans and identification of specific larger villages. • Need to consider phasing for developments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be considered in IDP • Noted • Unable to implement restrictive policies on phasing; plan to be kept under regular 5 year review
67. LV-H1 Ancaster Residential Allocation	27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The road infrastructure is insufficient to support additional traffic from developments. • Archaeological constraints • Conservation Area impacts • Recreational impacts and air pollution should be considered at site. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change proposed - site appraisal evidence supports proposed allocations
68. LV- H2 Baston Allocation	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support shown for the site allocation • Concerns of development as Baston is part of South Lincolnshire Fenlands project area. This location is importance for Sand and Gravel Extraction, is within catchment zone for Cross Drain SSSI and 2km of Baston Fen SAC. • Recommended to include reference to wildlife of relevance in the area, as it does not currently recognise the value of the area for nature conservation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site granted permission
69. LV-H3 Barrowby Residential Allocation	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should recognise biodiversity or ecological networks • Concerned on the impacts • Limited facilities • SKLP250 should be a separate allocation with a higher density. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provisional allocation at Low Road in Barrowby has been extended to include an adjoining site following a review of the site appraisal. The combined capacity of the new site is indicated as 230 dwellings, compared to 89 in the Consultative Draft Local Plan
70. LV –H4 Billingborough	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should recognise biodiversity or ecological networks within the development principles either for maintenance, creation or enhancement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted
71. LV-H5 Colsterworth Residential Allocation	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colsterworth could support more housing developments. • The Development principles should be amended to reflect the Neighbourhood Plan (Should be designed to appear as a series of small estates, rather than one large estate, Refer to air and noise from A1, Re-enforce need to create linkages to village, Consult with highways regarding improvements to the present slip roads to/from the north-bound carriageway of the A1 and to the adjacent mini-roundabout). • Policy should recognise biodiversity and ecological networks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change proposed – site appraisal evidence supports proposed allocations • Additional wording included on development principles
72. LV – H6 Corby Gel Allocation	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments supported and welcomed the allocation LV-H6. • More sporting facilities for all ages are required. • Development would require infrastructure investments, supported by section 106 Agreement, to facilitate infrastructure provisions such as traffic management, speed limit purposes, open space, bus service, retail, drainage infrastructure, and employment initiatives. • Policy should recognise biodiversity and ecological networks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider additional site requirements for inclusion in policy • Add additional policy setting out that development should provide net gains in biodiversity and contribute to wider green infrastructure and ecological networks.

73. LV- H7 Great Gonerby Residential Allocation	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable for development • Policy should recognise biodiversity and ecological networks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site boundary and capacity amended with minor changes to development principles
74. LV – H8 Langtoft Allocation	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small scales because of previous large housing projects • Concerns over the close proximity of Langtoft Gravel Pits SSSI and the potential impacts on the nationally designated site should be carefully considered. • Policy should recognise biodiversity and ecological networks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update SA and site Appraisal work to recognise site within 500m of SSSI if required. • Add additional policy setting out that development should provide net gains in biodiversity and contribute to wider green infrastructure and ecological networks.
75. LV-H9 Long Bennington Residential Allocation	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should recognise biodiversity and ecological networks • Allocation should be maintained and not increase to accommodate shortfalls in the district. • Identified infrastructure deficiencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change proposed – site appraisal evidence supports proposed allocation • General environment policies strengthened
76. LV-H10 Long Bennington Residential Allocation	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should recognise biodiversity and ecological networks • Allocation should be maintained and not increase to accommodate shortfalls in the district. • Identified infrastructure deficiencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change proposed – site appraisal evidence supports proposed allocations • General environment policies strengthened
77. LV-H11 Morton Residential Allocation	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SKLP121 should be allocated. • Site is suitable, and deliverable • Policy should recognise biodiversity and ecological networks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change proposed – site appraisal evidence supports proposed allocation
78. LV-H12 South Witham Residential Allocation	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of allocation, this will be deliverable in the early Plan period. Comprehensive Masterplan with SKLP123 is not needed as there are separate accesses. Site SKLP43 would be much more suitable to SME house builders if not tied to SKLP123 under a comprehensive Masterplan. • Concerns over impact of the Quarry (Geological interest) • Policy should recognise biodiversity and ecological networks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The capacity of the site allocated at Thistleton Lane and Mill Lane has been amended from 59 to 34 dwellings to reflect site constraints. An additional site allocation is proposed for the land north of High Street, with an indicative capacity of 31 dwellings
79. LV-H13 Thurlby Residential Allocation	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient infrastructure • Concerns over flood risks, access, natural habitats, road infrastructure, increased traffic congestion, drainage and air pollution. • Site is agricultural grade 2; the site potentially proposes the loss of high quality agricultural land. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change proposed – site appraisal evidence supports proposed allocation
80. Infrastructure and Developer Contributions	98	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure investment is needed before development is permitted • Detrimental impacts on smaller rural communities due to development in Grantham and larger villages. • Public transport network is insufficient • Congestion and slow traffic flows (specific comments between Morton and Peterborough, Grantham, Spaulding and Lincoln). • Increase in traffic and pollution levels • Pressure on all services and facilities. Including schools, hospitals, and doctors. • Recycling centre provisions needed. • More detail on provisions and future infrastructure improvements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to liaise with service utility providers to prepare a detailed IDP alongside a housing trajectory to match expected infrastructure delivery to house delivery rates. • Forward comments to Lincolnshire County Council Highways about traffic flows
81. ID1 – Infrastructure for Growth	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient infrastructure provisions to support additional developments • Support to the policy • A robust and up to date evidence base is required to underpin this policy and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include reference to ‘<i>green infrastructure</i>’. • Add to paragraph to supporting text to reflect NPPF paragraph 173 regarding viability.

		<p>support its application, which does not at present appear to be in place in relation to sports facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green infrastructure should be an integral part of any future development • Policy should reference paragraph 173 of the NPPF 	
82. ID2 – Transport and Strategic Transport	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient infrastructure provisions to support additional developments • Reference to GSRR and the £5m from the Highways England Growth and Housing Fund (GHF). • Transport should be accessible to all 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update paragraph 4.15 including reference to the grant from GHF. • Include references within the 5 principles to transport being accessible to all.
83. ID3 – Broadband and Communications	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internet, phones, mobile phones should be upgraded so it is accessible, and faster • Broadband and Communications restricting developments of businesses • Current wording of this policy could act as a block on development, suggested changes : <i>“.....Proposals of 30 dwellings or more will be required to provide fixed fibre superfast broadband where this is technically feasible, subject to viability New developments must be served, where this is technically feasible, subject to viability by either: ”</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Policy amended as suggested.
84. Appendix 1	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The OAN for SKDC is approximately 19% higher than the current Planning practice aware of other studies that support a higher OAN (739 dwellings per annum). It is suggested to continue to review their suggested OAN throughout the plan making process. • The Council should to re-assess the OAHN to ensure that the Council proactively • Support to the sustainable development to deliver the new homes needed in the District (paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework). • Concerned about the methodology for the SHMA update. Should fully consider job-forecasts of each forecasting model in order to gain a complete understanding of the employment forecasts in the SHMA going forward to identify the best approach. It does identify the potential labour force shortage in SKDC relative to the demographic trend-based outputs and suggests and uplift to the need in this area should be considered when developing the OAN for individual authorities. • SKDC is consistent with the NPPF as it accounts for economic growth. • Sites and assessment is reasonable • The SHMA makes no adjustment to the housing requirements. There should be a standardised methodology for OAHN, and it may be necessary to prepare an assessment of housing needs based on this standard methodology. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments made to site allocations and projected levels of growth
85. Appendix 2	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text in the Glossary within Appendix 2 should be changed from <i>‘designated heritage asset’</i> and <i>‘heritage asset’</i> to <i>‘setting of a heritage asset’</i>. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amended text within Appendix 2
86. Appendix 3	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing playing fields does not appear to be affected by proposals, if it is then compliance with the NPPF would need to be demonstrated. • Castle Bytham Earthworks (SNCI) and Deeping gravel pits (SSSI) are both missing from the map. • Policies maps should be updated to show the extent of the existing employment area by Land at Burton Lane/High Dyke, Easton, and Grantham for consistency. • Sites allocated in conservation site would impact on the nature conservation, objects to any site of LWS quality being allocated for development in the Local Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted

87. Appendix 4	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about the restrictiveness on renewable energy, agricultural land, and other policies within the Local Plan New developments should provide electric charging points for vehicles Specific sites should be identified for wind turbine sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change proposed to policy Electric charging points included in sustainable building policy
88. Miscellaneous Comments	91	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A monitoring and implementation section of the Plan should be added to the Local Plan Green Infrastructure provision should be included as a policy or included within policies. Local Plan should include policies to ensure the protection and enhancement of public rights of way Questionnaire and the presentation of the consultation needed improvement. No publicity of the Local Plan consultation Too much information provided to comment on. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A monitoring and implementation section will be added to the Local Plan Noted Events were published by the local press, local radio, the Council's own SK Today which is distributed throughout the District. Also, all Parish/Town Councils, and Neighbourhood Plan groups were notified of the dates for the consultation.
89. SKLP274	52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Representations express support of the decision to de-allocate site SKLP274 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted
90. Additional Site Information	27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments were submitted on various sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategy for Billingborough is redevelopment of proposed allocation No proposed allocation in LSCs No future employment allocations in Bourne have been proposed. The Bourne Neighbourhood Plan Group will determine housing allocations. No further allocations are being proposed in Barrowby Low Road, Barrowby is now included as a proposed allocation. It is not proposed that Claypole will be a LSC It is considered that the proposed employment sites are suitable. SKLP181 is of a significant scale and not considered necessary for the Plan Period. If smaller sites are suitable for development, it is not considered that they would necessarily need an allocation. SKLP3, is not proposed to allocate this site for development
91. New Site Submissions	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Sites submissions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site at Newstead Farm, Stamford. Land at Deeping Bridge Site at Granary Barkston Land to the rear of 5 Pointion Road, Billingborough Land at Tudor Lodge, Gorse Lane, Grantham, Lincolnshire Land off Oster Fen Land, Claypole 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional new submissions of sites have been assessed: <u>Site at Newstead Farm, Stamford</u>: site is not in accordance with The Capacity Study. <u>Land at Deeping Bridge</u>: is not within the South Kesteven District Boundary <u>Land to the rear of 5 Pointion Road, Billingborough</u>: the strategy for Billingborough is redevelopment of the proposed allocation <u>Land at Tudor Lodge, Gorse Lane, Grantham, Lincolnshire</u>: this site is too small to be considered as an allocation <u>Land off Oster Fen Land, Claypole</u>: Claypole is not a LSC.

