

## Consultation Summary and Key Changes

### 1.1 Key Issues Raised

- 1.1.1 Representations from 18 x members of the public and 3 x consultees were received as a result of the public consultation held Jan – Feb 2019.
- 1.1.2 The majority of representations from members of the public expressed concerns about the general principle of development, lack of infrastructure, amount of traffic generated and highway safety issues. It should be noted that the principle and quantum of development has already been established through allocation of the site in the Local Plan.
- 1.1.3 A number of specific issues including pollution control, renewable energy and retention of trees were also raised which are already covered in the SPD or policies of the South Kesteven Local Plan and will be further scrutinised at the planning application stage.
- 1.1.4 Natural England raised concerns that Green Infrastructure and biodiversity net gain should be given more prominence in the document.

### 1.2 Key Changes

- 1.2.1 The consultation did not raise any major issue and has not resulted in the need to make significant changes. However a number of very minor changes have been made as a result of the Public Consultation including further paragraphs relating to green infrastructure and biodiversity net gain.
- 1.2.2 Furthermore, references to policies have been updated to reflect the new Local Plan and updated NPPF

### 1.3 Summary of consultation Responses

- 1.3.1 Comments received (grouped by theme) and officer comments thereon are summarised below:

#### Climate Change:

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF001	<b>Name:</b> 4Sight Design
<b>Summary:</b> The additional pollution which will be created by the extra traffic should be taken into consideration and measures put in place to ensure the development does not further impact air quality.	
<b>Officer Comments:</b> The quantum of development is set out in the allocation policy. Minimisation and mitigation of pollution is covered in Local Plan policies DE1, SP1 and EN4	
<b>Representation ID:</b> RF016	<b>Name:</b> Dr Patricia Scriven
<b>Summary:</b> Energy production may well be routine on all south facing surfaces and be distributed locally. Good insulation and energy saving measures must be encouraged to facilitate efficient use of energy.	
<b>Officer Comments:</b> Covered under Local Plan policies DE1 and SB1	

### **Form, Massing and Layout:**

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF003	<b>Name:</b> Dr Patricia Scriven - Resident
------------------------------------	---

**Summary:** The map states that it shows areas suitable for single storey dwellings, however no such areas are shown on the map. Single storey dwellings should be in the areas to the West on the rectory farm site, to reduce an adverse impact on views from the Vale of Belvoir. Ideally no houses should be built near these trees and the ridge line viewed from Barrowby, the A52 road, and from the land in the vale of Belvoir to the west, so that the trees continue to stand out and retain the image of a green area to be seen from far away. Any houses close to these Scots pines and the higher land should be single storey.

**Officer Comments:**  
The plans show area to the NW of the site to be particularly suitable for single storey dwellings. A large area to the east of the Scots pines (which are on the highest part of the site) will remain open allowing them to remain prominent in the landscape.

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF023	<b>Name:</b> Mrs Laura Wright
------------------------------------	-------------------------------

**Summary:** We live to the eastern side of the proposed development. Newark View directly borders the land and our house has views straight across towards Rectory Farm, which already stands considerably higher. New dwellings built on the higher ground would significantly impact views from our property and the amount of daylight reaching our property.

We require additional information including height of houses, how many stories, siting, layout, and access.

**Officer Comments:**  
Private views from a property are not a material consideration. The site is sufficiently large to accommodate dwellings without impacting on the occupiers of neighbouring properties' daylight. The exact details of dwellings will be assessed and determined under any planning application relating to that part of the site.

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF013	<b>Name:</b> Ian and Gretl Giles
------------------------------------	----------------------------------

**Summary:** Objects to additional traffic entering and leaving Barrowby Road, as more houses are built. Queries in relation to my property, Boundary Farmhouse, which borders the proposed development. Two houses shown to be built adjacent my boundary, appear very close. Query access to boundary hedges, requests clarification of siting and seeks changes to layout and design so development does not to have an adverse impact on sunlight to my garden. We have a private access road, what mitigation will there be to protect this.

**Officer Comments:**  
Dwellings adjacent to Boundary farm already approved under S16/2819. All issues mentioned above taken into account. The quantum of development is set out in the allocation policy and therefore the amount of traffic which will enter/leave Barrowby Road. Through traffic on Barrowby Rd will significantly fall following completion of the GSRR in 2023. LCC Highways do not object on traffic capacity and highway safety grounds.

### Landscape/Streetscape Character:

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF003	<b>Name:</b> Dr Patricia Scriven - Resident
<b>Summary:</b> The Scots pines at Rectory Farm are a prominent landmark from the east. The Scots pines indicated a place for shelter for drovers in the past. The Scots pines should be retained for their historic significance and to maintain this distinctive landmark.	
<b>Officer Comments:</b> The Brief does not propose removal of any of these trees which may have the potential to be TPOed.	
<b>Representation ID:</b> RF020	<b>Name:</b> Dr Patricia Scriven
<b>Summary:</b> Sections 6.5.5 / 6.5.6 / 6.5.8. Suggest that three primary routes should run in a north/ south direction through the development with secondary roads running east west. This is unreasonable because:- The alignment of these north/south roads does not comply with the recommendation in 6.5.20 that they should be aligned towards Great Gonerby church spire, a local landmark. A chance to give residents a sense of identity with the local landmarks would be lost.	
<b>Necessary Changes:</b> North/south roads should be realigned with Great Gonerby church spire.	
<b>Officer Comments:</b> It would be unreasonable and impracticable for all N/S roads to align with Gt Gonerby church spire in their entirety due to the topography. However the brief recognises the potential for some roads, or sections of roads to align (including the main spine roads) to incorporate view corridors. The exact alignment would be determined at the planning application stage	
<b>Representation ID:</b> RF017	<b>Name:</b> Dr Patricia Scriven
<b>Summary:</b> On the south side of the A52 the houses are moderately spaced apart behind grassed areas and trees, with driveways opening directly onto the road. I support the intention of 6.5.5 to reflect this pleasant arrangement for the north side of the road.	
<b>Necessary Changes:</b> The houses next to the A52 (on the north side) should be set back behind grassed areas and trees, and be moderately spaced apart by driveways opening directly onto the A52. This layout should reflect and enhance the setting of the houses opposite on the south side of the A52 to produce a pleasant environment and introduction to Grantham.	
<b>Officer Comments:</b> This feature has been incorporated into the layout of planning applications S16/2816 and S16/2819 which have been approved	

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF018	<b>Name:</b> Dr Patricia Scriven
<p><b>Summary:</b> From Barrowby conservation area and the approach from the east towards Grantham the western edge of the development along the road from the A52 to Rectory Farm is visible on the skyline. This part needs to be less dense and green, as outlined in 6.5.7 to 6.5.11. I support this. Map 7 marks a point close to Rectory Farm, so on the skyline, as a site for a “landmark building”. The subscript explains that this could be 2.5 storeys in height. I object to this because it runs directly counter to the section 6.5.7 to 6.5.11. This building would be on the skyline and ruin any attempts to make the western edge greener and softer.</p> <p><b>Necessary Changes:</b> Remove the landmark building site close to Rectory Farm (on the western edge) in map 7.</p>	
<p><b>Officer Comments:</b> The landmark building referred to is the existing Rectory farm itself which would be retained.</p>	

### **Flooding and Drainage**

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF004	<b>Name:</b> Guy Hird, Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board
<p><b>Summary:</b> Development should be determined, in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority to agree implementation and future maintenance of the attenuated surface water drainage system. Discharge rates and locations have already been established as part of the Drainage Strategy for the adjacent Popular Farm site. Provisions should be made to ensure that upstream and downstream riparian owners and those areas that are presently served by any drainage routes passing through or adjacent to the Site are not adversely affected by the development.</p> <p>Drainage routes shall include all methods by which water may be transferred through the Site and shall include such systems as “ridge and furrow” and “overland flows”. The effect of raising Site levels on adjacent property must be carefully considered and measures taken to negate influences must be approved by the Local Planning Authority.</p>	
<p><b>Officer Comments:</b> Strategic drainage corridors are identified in the brief. Detailed drainage issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage and the LLFA consulted.</p>	

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF012	<b>Name:</b> Mr Duncan Brown
<p><b>Summary:</b> Where is the water for this development going to come from, and how is the waste going to be dealt with?</p>	
<p><b>Officer Comments:</b> The site is allocated for development in the Local Plan. The site would have been assessed at the plan making stage as capable of being adequately served with water provision and sewage disposal. The issue is also covered in para 5.3.52. The issue will be dealt with in more detail at the planning application stage.</p>	

## **Archaeology and Heritage**

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF005	<b>Name:</b> Dale Dishon, Historic England
<b>Summary:</b> Historic England suggests that the views of SKDC's specialist conservation and archaeological advisers are sought as relevant.	
<b>Officer Comments</b> No objection has been raised by the Council's Conservation Team	

## **Open Space**

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF010	<b>Name:</b> Mrs Hazel Ryan, Resident
<b>Summary:</b> The plans for the Sport and Changing facilities on the playing fields, appear to be directly opposite the property we are purchasing, 99 Balmoral Drive. It is considered that the open space is positive feature, however, have concerns regarding the location of the sports facility and changing rooms. Concerns regarding, noise, flood lighting, boundary treatment (screening), parking, crime, and security. What mitigation would be put in place to prevent neighbour amenity issues.	
<b>Officer Comments:</b> The address mentioned, as well as the sports facilities, is not within or directly adjacent to Rectory Farm.	

## **Nature Conservation**

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF011	<b>Name:</b> Mrs Roslyn Deeming, Natural England
<b>Summary:</b> Whilst Natural England generally welcomes the Nature Conservation section, we consider that it could be strengthened in terms of its guidance on green infrastructure (GI) provision and the requirement for biodiversity net gain. Natural England would like to see a specific section on GI which sets out a cohesive approach for the proposal. This section should bring all the various elements which are discussed in different sections together to provide an integrated GI approach which aims to provide real benefits for people and wildlife. Biodiversity net gain should be considered within the Brief to follow the guidance set out in the revised NPPF and the government's 25 Year Environment Plan (A Green Future). The Brief should include consideration of the Best & Most Versatile land that is present within the proposed site.	
<b>Officer Comments:</b> The site is allocated for development in the Local Plan so the issue of the best and most versatile land will have already been considered at the plan making stage. Whilst a high level GI plan is provided, a GI section will be incorporated as per NE's advice	

## **Overarching design principles**

**Representation ID:**  
RF019

**Name:** Dr Patricia Scriven

**Summary:** Support design principles for housing as in section 6. As in the brief, housing should use organisation and grouping of buildings to create character and beauty.

Object to 3 north south primary routes, as previously submitted.

Risk of accidents from 3 primary routes when one will be enough. Access to all other parts should be via roads that are safer for residents. The design of the road network should increase the safety of residents by using traffic calming measures. Examples are multi-use areas where drivers proceed cautiously because they realise that the space is shared, and uneven/ cobbled surfaces to slow cars. Parked cars are unsightly. Pedestrians and cyclists must have extra access points and through routes. Reduced use of the car means that storage space for cars can be reduced, leading to creation of more communal space. The loss of fertile green fields to development is to be regretted. This must be compensated by the creation of beautiful living spaces of which people can feel proud.

**Officer Comments:**

Detailed issues of design/layout will be addressed at the planning application stage. LCC Highways support the 3 primary NS routes from a traffic capacity and highway safety perspective.

**Representation ID:**  
RF021

**Name:** Mr Mark Emmett x traffic

**Summary:** Objects to changes in the road layout that would be detrimental to highway safety.

**Officer Comments:**

LCC Highways raise no objection to the layout from a traffic capacity and highway safety perspective.

## **Delivery and Implementation**

**Representation ID:**  
RF030

**Name:** Mr Stephen Short, Escritt Barrell Golding on behalf of Jenkinson Family Trust

**Summary:** Whilst referring to Poplar Farm the proposed south to north progression of development appears very simplistic and does not adequately reflect integration of the two sites. The Poplar Farm Primary School is now open. The School and adjoining land allocated for a local service centre is on the west side of the Poplar Farm site and these facilities will also serve the adjacent Rectory Farm land. It would therefore be logical for development to radiate and progress from the School/service centre as well as from the Barrowby Road frontage. Our clients' land is in the north-east quadrant of the Rectory Farm site and adjoins the current Barratt/David Wilson development at Poplar Farm where the estate road abuts the boundary. The land would accordingly be a natural progression of the existing development. There is advanced agreement between Barratt/David Wilson and the Jenkinson Family Trust and accordingly, the opportunity exists to deliver much needed new housing at an early date.

In view of the above we request further consideration to be given to the proposed phasing and suggest that the second sentence of paragraph 7.1.5 should be amended to read : In doing so, a phased development will be encouraged from the

Barrowby Road frontage on the southern edge of the site northwards and also from the adjoining Poplar Farm development to the east”

Officer Comments:

Phase 1 as shown on the plans already has planning permission for much of its extent. It should also be noted that there is sufficient flexibility in the masterplan to allow the other eastern areas bordering Poplar Farm to come forward prior to the land to the north west of the site, if this can be justified by the developer.

### **Vehicular Access**

Representation ID: RF020 Name: Patricia Scriven

Summary: Sections 5.3.17 / 5.3.18 Suggest that three primary routes should run in a north/ south direction through the development with secondary roads running east west. This is considered unreasonable because:-

The north/south routes as on maps 4, 5, 9 are likely to encourage speeding due to their length and relatively straight alignment. This is unsafe. Satnavs may encourage big vehicles and more cars to use these major north/south roads as “rat runs” during rush hour/ traffic jams. There is no advantage in having three primary routes when one would be sufficient.

Necessary Changes:

- 1) There should be one primary road, initially north/south then turning towards the east, through the rectory farm site as drawn in map 5.
- 2) The road servicing the south-westernmost section, south of the green corridor, needs to be downgraded to a minor route, with natural obstructions /narrower areas slowing traffic speeds, and terminating in a pedestrian/cyclist route to cross the green corridor.
- 3) There should be one road junction onto the A52 because three primary road exits would cause significant disruption to traffic along the A52.
- 4) Three primary roads exiting onto the A52 have the potential to become traffic rat runs. This is unacceptable.

Officer Comments:

LCC Highways support the 3 primary NS routes from a traffic capacity and highway safety perspective.

### **Pedestrian and Cycle Movements**

Representation ID: RF020 Name: Dr Patricia Scriven

Summary: The present footpath/cycleway along the north side of the A52 would become more dangerous if three major primary routes have exits directly onto the A52. It would be much safer for vulnerable pedestrians (and cyclists) to cross just one exit, as originally proposed in the first draft plan.

The wildlife corridors (Map 4) and the leisure route (map 6) both run east/west. It is unsafe for people (and animals) following this pleasant route to cross three north/south primary routes.

Master plan 3 shows the distances to be walked to reach the nearest bus stops. There is a need for good routes east/west to allow these distances to be shortened to encourage the use of public transport.

Opposes the support of environmentally friendly pedestrian/cycling policies (as in sections 4.7.8 /5.3.8 /5.3.22). These policies encourage people to make shorter journeys on foot or by bike to the school and the local services. For most people these journeys will be in an east west direction. Crossing three main north/south roads is an unsafe design.

**Necessary Changes:**

- 1) Three primary routes exiting onto the A52 would be a major hazard to the pedestrians and cyclists using the existing mixed use pathway on the northern side of the A52. A single exit, as in the previous plan via a roundabout would be safer.
- 2) Several access points for pedestrians and cyclists to the A52 would allow shorter routes to bus stops etc and give them an advantage compared to motorists.

**Officer Comments:**

LCC Highways support the 3 primary NS routes from a traffic capacity and highway safety perspective.

**Transport and Access Network:**

<b>Representation ID: RF001</b>	<b>Name: 4Sight Design</b>
<b>Unsound on the grounds of:</b>	
<p><b>Summary:</b> The company comments that the town is already failing regularly to provide satisfactory traffic flow and parking. Queried what changes are planned to avoid the inevitable issues that the additional traffic associated with this development will undoubtedly cause, from the new residents and additional journeys by couriers and other delivery providers. New development will add to regular congestion issues, especially when the A1 has an issue. Existing parking is expensive and inadequate.</p> <p>Additional educational and medical provision would be required for a further 2000 residents.</p>	
<p><b>Officer Comments:</b> The principle of development has already been established through the allocation in the local plan. General impact of the additional traffic on Grantham as a whole has already been assessed at the plan making stage. Neither LCC Highways or Highways England object.</p>	

<b>Representation ID: RF002</b>	<b>Name: Dr Patricia Scriven, Local Resident</b>
<b>Unsound on the grounds of:</b>	
<p><b>Summary:</b> Stated that the proposed roundabout would take all of the developments traffic and both current, southern part, applications should be developed at the same time to remove the need for an independent western access.</p> <p>Safety impacts to pedestrians and cyclists, due to its proximity to the A52, and additional hazards and risks of accidents near the A1 junction.</p> <p>The widening of the road to make a ghost island access would cause additional risk of accident due to heavy traffic close to the cycle and pedestrian pathway</p>	

Officer Comments:  
The replacement of the roundabout with ghost island junctions has already been established under full planning permissions S16/2186 and S16/2189

Representation ID: RF006 Name: Mr Keith Blake, Local Resident

Unsound on the grounds of:

Summary: Raises concerns regarding the increased challenges residents would face in accessing the A52 from existing properties, especially due to the proposed roundabout. Comments were also raised, with regard to the specific times and dates of the relief road.  
Comments also outlined pollution from traffic, noise pollution and the rise in sub-road vibration to existing properties.

Officer Comments:  
The replacement of the roundabout with ghost island junctions has already been established under full planning permissions S16/2186 and S16/2189. The principle of development has already been established through the allocation in the local plan. General impact of the additional traffic on Grantham as a whole has already been assessed at the plan making stage. Neither LCC Highways or Highways England object. Noise and pollution will be addressed under LP policies SB1, DE1 and EN4.

Representation ID: RF007 Name: Mr Peter Hubbard, Resident

Unsound on the grounds of:

Summary: Concerned about the use of Gloucester Road and its increased use as a 'rat run', due to the main site entrance being opposite Gloucester Road. Concerns also raised regarding the safety of the area and increased difficulty in exiting adjoining Closes due to the increased volume of traffic and obscure bends. Outlines necessary changes to the proposal, including: the use of the existing A52/Barrowby Gate access, exit the site to a new roundabout in a location closer to the A1 and the need for extensive traffic calming measures on Gloucester Road to ensure safety.

Officer Comments:  
The replacement of the roundabout with ghost island junctions has already been established under full planning permissions S16/2186 and S16/2189. The principle of development has already been established through the allocation in the local plan. General impact of the additional traffic on Grantham as a whole has already been assessed at the plan making stage. Neither LCC Highways nor Highways England object. Through traffic along Barrowby Road will be significantly reduced following the completion of the GSRR in 2023.

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF008	<b>Name:</b> Mr Mark Emmett, Resident <span style="color: red;">]]</span>
<b>Unsound on the grounds of:</b>	
<p><b>Summary:</b> Queries are raised regarding what evidence there is that there will be commercially sustainable demand and evidence of demand for large development in Grantham?</p> <p>Outlines that Grantham does not have the necessary infrastructure or support services to cope with current demand, never mind additional dwellings.  Inadequate recreational facilities on the western side of the town.  Raises Traffic concerns, due to congestion.  Lack of National Health dentists and NHS services such as doctors, maternity unit and A&amp;E.  Insufficient educational facilities, with schools already having significant numbers of students.  Impact on Quality of life.</p>	
<p><b>Officer Comments:</b>  The principle of development has already been established through the allocation in the local plan. General impact of the additional traffic on Grantham as a whole has already been assessed at the plan making stage. Neither LCC Highways nor Highways England object. Through traffic along Barrowby Road will be significantly reduced following the completion of the GSRR in 2023. Recreational facilities will be developed within both Rectory farm and the adjacent Poplar Farm. Upgrades to health and educational infrastructure will be provided under section 106 agreements at the planning application stage.</p>	
<b>Representation ID:</b> RF009	<b>Name:</b> Mr Paul Martin, Resident
<b>Unsound on the grounds of:</b>	
<p><b>Summary:</b> Objections are raised due to traffic concerns within this area of Grantham during weekdays and weekends, with the A1 also causing increased traffic concerns. Outlines traffic projections from Gonerby and Gonerby Hill Foot (village faces the possibility of 100% road occupancy at peak times) placing pressure on Gonerby/Belton Lane junction and the narrow road towards Manthorpe will be unsustainable.  The design does not consider future requirements for traveling into the Town Centre and alternatives to driving.  States that it is vital the plan allows for the linking up of a road to the North of Grantham and that a Northern bypass should be developed, specifically stretching Alma Park-Manthorpe-Gonerby Hill Foot- Barrowby Gate. This bypass should then be built as part of the new developments to reduce costs.</p>	
<p><b>Officer Comments:</b>  The principle of development has already been established through the allocation in the local plan. General impact of the additional traffic on Grantham as a whole has already been assessed at the plan making stage. Neither LCC Highways nor Highways England object. Through traffic along Barrowby Road will be significantly reduced following the completion of the GSRR in 2023. A Grantham northern bypass is not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.</p>	

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF015	Name: Mr Roger Graves
Unsound on the grounds of:	
<p>Summary: Objections are raised due to the existing levels of traffic on Barrowby Road and resultant levels of traffic in the area following the new developments. This would be regardless of whether the southern by-pass is completed. Increased likelihood of accidents due to new junction at Gloucester Road, with increase and difficulty in traffic exiting Winchester Road and Gloucester Road. Raised queries about why the link road from the development to Great Gonerby has not yet been developed, stating that this would alleviate traffic.</p>	
<p>Officer Comments: The principle of development has already been established through the allocation in the local plan. General impact of the additional traffic on Grantham as a whole has already been assessed at the plan making stage. Neither LCC Highways or Highways England object. Through traffic along Barrowby Road will be significantly reduced following the completion of the GSRR in 2023. The Pennine Way link road is not part of the Rectory farm development</p>	

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF016	Name: Patricia Scriven
Unsound on the grounds of:	
<p>Summary: Careful design is required to ensure road surfaces, lack of pavements and natural obstacles slow down traffic on secondary roads, with safe crossing points required for main roads.</p>	
<p>Officer Comments: Detailed highway and layout issues will be addressed at the planning application stage.</p>	

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF022	Name: Mr Alastair Hawken
Unsound on the grounds of:	
<p>Summary: Oppose on safety grounds, expressing difficulty in entering and exiting property onto the A52, due to volumes and speeds of traffic, resulting in safety issues. No objections to the initial plans and principle of development on the site, especially when proposing a roundabout positioned at Gloucester Road junction. However, if this is allowed, it will present increased safety concerns and traffic.</p>	
<p>Officer Comments: The replacement of the roundabout with ghost island junctions has already been established under full planning permissions S16/2186 and S16/2189. The principle of development has already been established through the allocation in the local plan. General impact of the additional traffic on Grantham as a whole has already been assessed at the plan making stage. Neither LCC Highways nor Highways England object. Through traffic along Barrowby Road will be significantly reduced following the completion of the GSRR in 2023.</p>	

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF024	Name: Mr Keith Blake
Unsound on the grounds of:	
<p>Summary: It is considered inconceivable that there is planning going forward for 2000+ homes. Outlines that access and exit from driveways of existing houses is difficult and raises concerns with regard to a roundabout and lack of link road. Pollution, noise, crime, and loss of value are amongst reasons for the objections. State that a link road, with the A52 moved in location from the Barrowby Road properties should be sought.</p>	
<p>Officer Comments: The principle of development has already been established through the allocation in the local plan. General impact of the additional traffic on Grantham as a whole has already been assessed at the plan making stage. Neither LCC Highways nor Highways England object. Through traffic along Barrowby Road will be significantly reduced following the completion of the GSRR in 2023. Detailed issues of pollution, noise, crime will all be assessed at the planning application stage. Loss of property value is not a material planning consideration.</p>	

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF025	Name: Mr Anthony Fletcher
Unsound on the grounds of:	
<p>Summary: Expressed safety concerns, with difficulty and excessive time taken to exit onto the main road, with the proposal resulting in increased safety issues. States discontent with proposed replacement with 3x tee junctions. Resident also outlines parking has resulted in less visibility, with vehicle speed also raising concerns.</p>	
<p>Officer Comments: The principle of development has already been established through the allocation in the local plan. General impact of the additional traffic on Grantham as a whole has already been assessed at the plan making stage. Neither LCC Highways or Highways England object. Through traffic along Barrowby Road will be significantly reduced following the completion of the GSRR in 2023.</p>	

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF026	Name: Andrew Hayton
Unsound on the grounds of:	
<p>Summary: Objecting to the updated plan as it is contrary to South Kesteven Core Strategy Policy EN1 and NPPF Sections 4 and 7 and the Lincolnshire Transport Plan. States that the three T-junctions would cause danger and likely to cause accidents. Also outlining the refusal of 199 dwellings (S15/0911) which cited "it is considered the type and position of the access directly opposite the access to a consented scheme for 300 dwellings would lead to an unacceptable adverse impact on highway safety". The principle of this remains. Dwellings should not have direct frontage access onto Barrowby Road. No provision for an equipped play area, with no playground within close proximity.</p>	

The originally proposed roundabout should be reinstated, citing LCC highways design documents and Manual for Streets.

Officer Comments:

The Core Strategy has been superseded by the South Kesteven Local Plan. The principle of development has already been established through the allocation in the local plan. General impact of the additional traffic on Grantham as a whole has already been assessed at the plan making stage. Neither LCC Highways nor Highways England object. Through traffic along Barrowby Road will be significantly reduced following the completion of the GSRR in 2023. The refused scheme referred to was materially different to the recently approved S16/2816 and S16/2819

Representation ID:  
RF027

Name: Barbara Johnson

Unsound on the grounds of:

Summary: Provided a number of rhetorical questions, whilst expressing congestion concerns due to the development and highway safety due to the three access roads.

Stated no disagreement with the development in itself, although reemphasised highway safety and proposed access as being paramount, citing vehicle speeds and the previously proposed roundabout as reasons for concern.

Officer Comments

The replacement of the roundabout with ghost island junctions has already been established under full planning permissions S16/2186 and S16/2189. The principle of development has already been established through the allocation in the local plan. General impact of the additional traffic on Grantham as a whole has already been assessed at the plan making stage. Neither LCC Highways nor Highways England object. Through traffic along Barrowby Road will be significantly reduced following the completion of the GSRR in 2023.

Representation ID:  
RF028

Name: Mr Keith Hargraves

Xxxxxx

Comment ID

Legally  
Compliant:

Sound:

Complies with Duty to  
Cooperate:

Unsound on the grounds of:

Summary: Objections raised, as access to Barrowby Road will be less easily achieved from the development due to the loss of the roundabout, with less easing on traffic flow and additionally hazardous.

Raises concerns with the use by lorries and speed of vehicles along Barrowby Road. The objection states that a roundabout would make access easier and safer for residents, vehicle users and bus routes.

Highway Safety concerns.

Object to the development as a whole but would require the implementation of a reduction in traffic speeds to 30Mph, resurfacing of Barrowby Road to low noise tarmac, construction of Barrowby Gate to Gonerby road to reduce traffic and redevelopment of the A1 junction with a roundabout.

**Officer Comments:**

The replacement of the roundabout with ghost island junctions has already been established under full planning permissions S16/2186 and S16/2189. The principle of development has already been established through the allocation in the local plan. General impact of the additional traffic on Grantham as a whole has already been assessed at the plan making stage. Neither LCC Highways nor Highways England object. Through traffic along Barrowby Road will be significantly reduced following the completion of the GSRR in 2023. The A1/A52 junction will be upgraded with traffic signals to mitigate increased traffic.

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF029	Name: Mr Mark Emmett
<b>Unsound on the grounds of:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b> Outlined queries in relation to the amended plans, relating to the removal of the Gloucester Road junction roundabout and the loss of cul-de-sac arrangement between existing house, the A52 and the development. The resident expressed vehicle speed as a reason for concern and the impact the roundabout amendment would cause; querying future speed restrictions, formal speed cameras and reduction warnings.	
<b>Officer Comments</b> The replacement of the roundabout with ghost island junctions has already been established under full planning permissions S16/2186 and S16/2189. The principle of development has already been established through the allocation in the local plan. General impact of the additional traffic on Grantham as a whole has already been assessed at the plan making stage. Neither LCC Highways nor Highways England object. Through traffic along Barrowby Road will be significantly reduced following the completion of the GSRR in 2023.	

**Pedestrian and cycle movements**

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF014	Name: Mr David Berry, Resident
<b>Unsound on the grounds of:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b> It is expressed that revised plans are required, as the 'Key Movement Plan' indicates a main pedestrian route and cycle route over a farm track that has an existing 99 year lease. The resident states that this is not a public right of way.	
<b>Officer Comments:</b> It is correct that the track is not a PROW. However a large section will become part of phase 3 of Rectory farm which is not covered by the brief.	

<b>Representation ID:</b> RF016	Name: Patricia Scriven
<b>Unsound on the grounds of:</b>	
<b>Summary:</b> Concerns raised regarding speeding vehicles and the danger/safety issues. Outline that design can reduce the issues, by limiting speed and the number of car journeys. Expresses the need for more direct and faster pedestrians and cycling routes to schools and local services.	

**Officer Comments:**

The masterplan provides for east west direct access to Poplar Farm school and neighbourhood centre. Detailed safety/design issues will be addressed at planning application stage