



**South Kesteven District Council comments on the Submission Version of the Ropsley and District  
Neighbourhood Plan**

<b><u>Policy / Paragraph</u></b>	<b><u>Comment / Recommendation</u></b>
<b><u>Paragraph 1.11</u></b>	SKDC disagree with the assertion of the paragraph as it reads quite negatively and could be more positively worded.
<b><u>Paragraph 2.4</u></b>	Needs a comma after " <i>Stamford Town Council</i> " in the first sentence
<b><u>Paragraph 2.6</u></b>	Needs deleting as it is a duplicate of paragraph 2.5.
<b><u>Community Objective 1 (p21)</u></b>	SKDC have concerns that the objective is not clear as there is not a single urban extension to the "north and east of Stamford" – They are allocations within the SKDC Local Plan.
<b><u>Community Objective 6 (p21)</u></b>	Second sentence – " <i>Development</i> " needs an " <i>s</i> " at the end.
<b><i>Policy 1: Integration of New Residential Allocations (Stamford North)</i></b>	<p>SKDC have concerns regarding the title of the policy – as there are two Local Plan allocations within Stamford (Stamford North and Stamford East respectively) The title only refers to Stamford North. would suggest that the "<i>(Stamford North)</i>" part is removed.</p> <p><b>Part 1</b> – SKDC has concerns that only the Stamford North (STM1-H1) masterplan is mentioned here and there is no reference to the Stamford East (STM1-H2) Masterplan. We would suggest a rewording to state "<i>they have regard to the appropriate masterplan policy criteria set out in the SKDC Local Plan polices STM1-H1 and STM1-H2</i>".</p> <p><b>Part 1</b> – SKDC would suggest removing "<i>where appropriate</i>" from the end of the policy.</p> <p><b>Criteria a)</b> – SKDC has concerns over the first sentence and the wording of "<i>social space</i>" as vagueness would make it difficult to make a decision on from a decision making standpoint and is not a technical planning term.</p> <p><b>Criteria a)-</b> Second sentence -SKDC suggest the removal of the words "<i>it is essential that</i>".</p> <p><b>Criteria b)</b> SKDC suggest changing "<i>new development</i>" to "<i>development</i>" for consistency across the policy.</p> <p><b>Criteria b)-</b> SKDC suggest the removal of the first full stop and replacement of "<i>they should</i>" in the second sentence with "<i>and</i>" in order to make the policy flow better.</p> <p><b>Criteria b)-</b> Second sentence - SKDC suggest the removal of the words "<i>replicate to</i>" and replace them with "<i>development should</i>" in order for the policy to flow better.</p>



	<p><b>Criteria c)</b>- SKDC suggest there should be a comma after <i>“Primary”</i>.</p> <p><b>Criteria d)</b>- SKDC suggest that the word <i>“public”</i> is removed as there are different types of open spaces implemented across the allocations.</p> <p><b>Criteria d)</b>- SKDC have concerns over the use of <i>“important gaps”</i> as these have not been defined within the Neighbourhood Plan and would be difficult to judge from a decision making standpoint.</p> <p><b>Criteria d)</b>- first sentence suggest replacing the second <i>“spaces”</i> with <i>“areas”</i> in order to make the policy flow better.</p> <p><b>Criteria d)</b>- SKDC suggest the removal of the last part of the policy – <i>“and prevent development sprawling into the green space beyond.”</i> As it does not particularly add anything to the policy and can be seen as quite restrictive which is not in conformity with SP4 of the SKDC Local Plan.</p> <p><b>Criteria e)</b>- SKDC suggest the removal of the word <i>“celebrated”</i> as it only adds vagueness to the policy from a decision making standpoint.</p> <p>SKDC also suggest that <b>criteria e/f</b> could be merged into one policy criterion.</p> <p><b>Criteria g)</b> – SKDC suggest that the reference be made to which views should be protected (i.e. making reference to map 8 and policy 10 in which these views are defined)</p> <p><b>Criteria g)</b> SKDC has concerns that the <i>“Local Landmarks”</i> within the policy have not been defined.</p> <p><b>Criteria h)</b> SKDC have concerns around the overall wording as it does not read as a policy criterion. SKDC therefore suggest that the criterion be reworded to state <i>“buildings should be orientated to face areas of open space.”</i></p> <p><b>Criteria i)</b> SKDC suggests the replacing <i>“They may”</i> of the second sentence with <i>“Gateway features should”</i>.</p> <p><b>Criteria j)</b> SKDC have concerns around the overall wording as it does not read as a policy criterion. SKDC suggest that the criterion simply state <i>“Gateway buildings should be reflective of the local character of the area (i.e. in their use of local materials, the design of chimneys and fenestration ect)”</i></p> <p><b>Criteria k)</b> SKDC has concerns over the criterion as <i>“high quality landscape features”</i> have not been defined and could be seen as vague.</p> <p><b>Criteria l)</b> first sentence - SKDC suggest replacing <i>“that will guide the visitor legibly”</i> with <i>“clear legibility”</i> in order to make the policy clearer in its intentions.</p> <p><b>Criteria l)</b> third sentence - SKDC suggest replacing <i>“will”</i> with <i>“should”</i> to make the policy read more positively.</p>
--	---



**Criteria l)** fourth sentence – SKDC suggest the removal of the phrase “*formally to*” before shared surfaces in order to make the policy read more clearly.

**Criteria m)** SKDC suggest adding “surrounding” before materials.

SKDC also suggest that **criteria m/n** could be merged into one policy criterion i.e. – “*and where appropriate, the provision of electric car charging points*” (at the end of criteria m)

**Criteria o)** – SKDC has concerns over this criteria of the policy as it does not add anything to the already established SKDC LP policy H4 - Meeting All Housing Needs – which applies to all major developments.

**Criteria p)** – First sentence - SKDC suggest replacing the word “*generally*” with “*should*”.

**Criteria p)** SKDC suggest the removal of the third sentence as it does not particularly add anything of value to the policy criterion.

**Criteria q)** SKDC suggest adding “*developments should*” at the start of the criterion.

**Criteria r)** SKDC suggest the removal of the policy as it is difficult to interpret, and it is unclear as to its intentions.

**Criteria r)** If the policy is to remain then SKDC suggest deleting “*the existing to avoid any*” and replacing it with “*to respect neighbouring amenity*”. SKDC also suggest adding in “*should be*” between “*density lower*” to make the policy read clearer.

**Criteria S)** first sentence – SKDC suggest the removal of “*sufficient*”.

**Criteria S)** first sentence – SKDC suggest the removal of “*considered to strike an appropriate balance between*” and replacement of “*respecting*” with “*which respects*”.

**Criteria S)** first sentence – SKDC suggests the removal of “*whilst providing a development ‘of its time’ which is not seeking to be a poor pastiche scheme*” as it does not particularly add anything to the policy and is difficult to implement.

**Criteria S)** second sentence – SKDC suggests replacing the word “*embrace*” with “*incorporates*” and “*should be considered appropriate*” with “*will be supported*”.

**Criteria O)** SKDC suggest replacing “*will need*” with “*where applicable should*” as it would not realistically affect all types of developments within the allocations.



	<p><b>Criteria O)</b> – SKDC suggest putting brackets around the proposed measures so that it does not look like a part of the policy criterion.</p>
<p><b>Policy 2: Additional Residential Development</b></p>	<p><b>Criteria 1b)</b> SKDC suggest deleting “<i>of the proposal</i>” and replacing “<i>it can</i>” with “<i>should</i>” in order to make the policy flow better.</p> <p><b>Criteria 1c)</b> SKDC have concerns over this criteria as it does not make sense in terms of its structure. SKDC suggest changing the criteria to “<i>it safeguards the amenity of existing garden space</i>”.</p> <p><b>Criteria 1e)</b> SKDC suggest replacing “<i>it will not</i>” with “<i>it should not</i>”.</p> <p><b>Criteria 2)</b> SKDC suggest the removal of the first sentence as it does not particularly add anything to the policy.</p> <p><b>Criteria 2)</b> SKDC suggest replacing “<i>and they can demonstrate, where appropriate:</i>” with “<i>and where appropriate, the following criteria:</i>”</p> <p><b>Criteria 2b)</b> SKDC suggest that the policy criterion is not clear and could be reworded to the following: “<i>Appropriate landscaping measures should be used between Stamford and the open countryside to prevent the formation of a hard edge</i>”.</p> <p><b>Criteria 2c)</b> SKDC suggest changing the first section of the criterion to “<i>demonstrate how landscaping has been used ...</i>” in order to provide more clarity to the criteria.</p> <p><b>Criteria 2d)</b> SKDC suggest changing the first section of the criterion to “<i>demonstrate how a lower density has been used ...</i>” in order to provide more clarity to the criteria.</p> <p><b>Criteria 2e)</b> SKDC suggest replacing “<i>it will not</i>” with “<i>it should not</i>”. SKDC also recommend that reference is given to map 8 and policy 10 in terms of the Locally Important Views.</p> <p><b>Criteria 2f)</b> SKDC suggest replacing “<i>it will not</i>” with “<i>it should not</i>”.</p> <p><b>Criteria 2g)</b> SKDC recommended the “<i>s</i>” needs removing from the end of “<i>proposal</i>”. SKDC also suggest replacing “<i>it will not</i>” with “<i>it should not</i>”.</p>
<p><b><u>Paragraph 8.24</u></b></p>	<p>SKDC suggest the last sentence is reworded to say – “<i>...so that they do not negatively impact on the existing infrastructure</i>”.</p>
<p><b><u>Paragraph 8.25</u></b></p>	<p>SKDC has concerns as the first sentence seems out of place and does not make sense.</p>
<p><b>Policy 3: Housing type and Mix on New Developments.</b></p>	<p><b>Criteria 1)</b> SKDC suggest replacing “<i>Must</i>” with “<i>should also</i>” and suggest deleting “<i>how they have catered for the following:</i>”</p>



	<p><b>Criteria 1b)</b> SKDC suggest the removal of the criteria as it does not add anything further to what is already set out in policy H2 of the adopted SKDC local Plan.</p> <p><b>Criteria 2)</b> SKDC suggest changing “<i>recent housing standards</i>” as it is a vague statement to have within the policy and does not appear to be referenced.</p>
<b><u>Paragraph 9.2</u></b>	SKDC suggest the word “ <i>have</i> ” is inserted before “ <i>a reasonable level of qualifications</i> ”.
<b>Policy 5: River Welland Green Corridor</b>	<p>SKDC have strong concerns around the policy as there appears to be no evidence based work behind the inclusion of a “River Welland Corridor.” SKDC also have concerns that the corridor area has been significantly expanded upon from what was originally consulted upon as part of the Regulation 14 Stamford draft Neighbourhood Plan consultation and no evidence has been provided into why this change has been implemented within the submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><b>Part1/2)</b> SKDC suggest merging these parts as part 1 does not read as a standalone policy, it is simply making reference to the map.</p>
<b><u>Paragraph 10.12</u></b>	First sentence – SKDC suggest adding in “ <i>where appropriate</i> ” after “ <i>new development</i> ” as not every development is required to provide open space.
<b>List of Important Green Spaces</b>	<p>SKDC has strong concerns over the title of the table in respect of the policy. SKDC would therefore suggest naming the table “<i>List of Important open Spaces</i>”.</p> <p>SKDC note that there are some omissions in respect of the table where open space information has been taken from what is currently identified by SKDC – These are as follows.</p> <p>S10 – should Refer to Stamford Indoor Bowls Club</p> <p>S59 – Is an omission from the original open space evidence work commissioned by SKDC in 2008, no site exists that is coded with this number. SKDC suggest therefore that it is removed instead of stating “N/A”</p> <p>S66- Stamford FC appears to have been omitted from the table or no reason has been provided as to why it is not seen as an “important green space”. -</p> <p>S67 – Appears to have been duplicated or missed. S67 as identified by SKDC refers to Stamford Junior School playing fields and not Land off Laughton Walk. No reason has been provided as to why it is not seen as an “important green space”.</p> <p>SKDC also have strong concerns over the following “<i>identified green spaces</i>” that have been added to the Neighbourhood Plan document/ open space map, as there appears to be no evidence within the document to show why these areas should be identified as open spaces and should therefore be protected</p>



	<p>by the relevant policy or how they comply with the Open Space definition in the NPPF.</p> <p>S67 - Currently identified as Land off Laughton Walk S68 - Belvoir Close S69- Collins Avenue S70- Cherryholt S71 -Land off Priory Road (Water Meadows)</p>
<b>Policy 6: Important Open Space</b>	<p>SKDC suggest that the table on pages 51/52 are included as part of the policy.</p> <p><b>Part 1 / 2 )</b> SKDC suggest merging these two parts of the policy as part 1 does not read as a standalone policy.</p>
<b>Paragraph 11.3</b>	<p>SKDC suggest that the paragraph is reviewed to take into account the use class changes that came into force in September 2020.</p>
<b>Paragraph 11.5</b>	<p>SKDC suggest the word <i>“having”</i> is inserted before <i>“a Primary Shopping”</i>.</p> <p>SKDC suggest that the second sentence is reviewed to take into account the use class changes that came into force in September 2020.</p>
<b>Paragraph 11.6</b>	<p>SKDC suggest that the paragraph is reviewed to take into account the use class changes that came into force in September 2020</p>
<b>Paragraph 11.11</b>	<p>SKDC suggests a review of this paragraph to ensure that it makes sense.</p>
<b>Policy7: Diversifying Stamford Town Centre</b>	<p><b>Part 2)</b> SKDC suggest this part is reviewed to take into account the use class changes that came into force in September 2020.</p> <p><b>Part 3)</b> SKDC suggest this part is reviewed to take into account the use class changes that came into force in September 2020.</p> <p><b>Part3 b)</b> SKDC suggests the second <i>“proposed”</i> is deleted to make the criteria read clearer.</p>
<b>Policy8: Public Realm in Stamford Town Centre</b>	<p><b>Part1a)</b> SKDC suggest the removal of the word <i>“understand”</i> as it is difficult to implement form a decision making standpoint.</p>
<b>Policy 9: The Historic Environment</b>	<p><b>Part1)</b> SKDC have concerns that no <i>“non-designated heritage assets”</i> have been identified throughout the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p><b>Part2 (c,d,e)</b> SKDC have concerns that no <i>“non -designated heritage assets”</i> have been identified throughout the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p><b>Part2 e)</b> SKDC suggest the deletion of <i>“where demolition is proposed”</i></p>



<b>Policy10: Locally Important Landscape Views</b>	<p>SKDC have concerns over some of the proposed viewpoints within the Neighbourhood Plan as follows:</p> <p>V1 – is a viewpoint which falls into the administrative boundary of Rutland County Council, which is an area not covered by the designated area of the Stamford Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>V2 – lies within the Stamford North housing allocation, there are concerns of how the designation of a locally important view point will impact on the implementation of Policy STM1-H1 within the SKDC Local Plan and Policy 1.</p> <p>V4 – Part of the description for view 4 (p72) states that <i>“Any further loss of these managed fields to the west of the settlement would erode important links to the historic and surviving agricultural landscape”</i>. There is concern how the designation of this viewpoint will impact on the implementation of the employment allocation ST-SE1 which is located on the fields in which this landscape view is proposed.</p> <p>V9 - (South) is a viewpoint which falls into the administrative boundary of Peterborough City Council, which is an area not covered by the designated area of the Stamford Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><b>Part2)</b> SKDC has concerns over this part of the policy as it is not a criterion in its own right and there are concerns on the evidence to justify these views.</p>
<b>Policy12: Sustainable Transport</b>	<p><b>Part1)</b> SKDC has concerns in respect of the phrase <i>“those that are proposed in areas not directly served by public transport”</i> as it would not be applicable to apply these criteria to every type of development that is not located close to public transport.</p>
<b>Policy 14: The Provision of New Educational Facilities in Stamford</b>	<p><b>Criteria1b)</b> SKDC suggest replacing <i>“has a”</i> with <i>“should have”</i> in order to make the policy read clearer.</p>
<b>Paragraph 16.1</b>	<p>First sentence – SKDC suggest replacing <i>“or”</i> with <i>“and”</i></p>
<b>Policy 15: The Provision of New Cultural or Creative Facilities in Stamford</b>	<p><b>Part1a)</b> SKDC suggest replacing the word <i>“would”</i> with <i>“should”</i> in order to make the policy clearer in its intentions.</p>
<b>Paragraph 16.8</b>	<p>SKDC is concerned that the supporting text paragraph reads more like a policy. SKDC is therefore unsure whether it is the Neighbourhood Plan group’s intention for this to be a policy and it has been missed.</p>



<b>Policy 16: Overnight Accommodation</b>	<b>Part1a)</b> SKDC suggest replacing the word “ <i>would</i> ” with “ <i>should</i> ” in order to make the policy clearer in its intentions.
<b>20 Appendix 2: Criteria for Demonstrating Community Support for New Developments on the Edge of Stamford</b>	<b>Paragraph 20.1</b> - SKDC is concerned that there is not enough clarity in this statement regarding community consultation. The paragraph states how “ <i>all schemes proposing additional residential development in Stamford in relation to Neighbourhood Plan Policy 2</i> ” - however policy 2 in the Neighbourhood Plan relates to both edge of settlement and Development within the Existing Built Form of Stamford. Therefore SKDC would like to see the paragraph changed to reflect that this only relates to edge of settlement developments as found in the policy criteria.