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1. **Introduction**

1.1 This statement has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 30(1)(e)\(^1\) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008.

1.2 The Council is required to prepare and publish a statement setting out the number of representations received in accordance with Regulation 28(2) following publication of the Development Plan Document (DPD) and a summary of the main issues raised in those representations.

1.3 Details of the consultation carried out during the preparation of the Site Allocation and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) up to publication of the submission document, including who was consulted, the methods of consultation, a summary of the main issues raised and how those issues have been addressed, are contained in the Regulation 30 (1)(d) Statement.

1.4 In response to a number of matters raised in the representations, a number of changes have been proposed to the Submission Site Allocation and Policies DPD. These are intended to:

- correct typographical errors
- provide clarification
- improve thoroughness

These are set out in a separate Schedule of Proposed Changes.

1.5 Changes resulting from the late publication of the Final Report of the Water Cycle Study are proposed. These are set out in a separate section of the Schedule of Proposed Changes. Some of these changes result from the responses submitted by the Environment Agency and/or Anglian Water.

2. **The Representation Period**

2.1 The Site Allocation and Policies DPD, the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and the supporting documents were published on Friday 7 October 2011. Representations were invited over a six-week period, closing on 18 November 2011, in accordance with Regulations 27 and 28.

2.2 A further representation period (five weeks) was allowed, in order that respondents might have an opportunity to amend or withdraw their representations in the light of the publication of the Final Report of the Water Cycle Study as part of the evidence base for the plan and to consider the proposed changes to the plan arising from this study. This second representation period ended on 20 January 2012.

---

\(^1\) The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008
3. **Representations Received**

3.1 A total of 247 responses were received from 97 different respondents. This includes 20 responses as a result of the second representation period following publication of the Final Report of the Water Cycle Study.

3.2 At the time of Submission of the plan to the Secretary of State a total of 30 respondents have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination to support their representations that the Site Allocation and Policies DPD is not sound.

3.3 The remaining 67 respondents have either stated that they do not wish to participate at the examination or have not indicated how they wish to progress.

4. **Summary of the Main Issues Raised in the Representations**

4.1 Set out below is a summary of the key issues raised in the representations submitted, starting with general comments applicable to the whole document. Comments have been summarised in respect of each policy/chapter.

4.2 The consultees that raised the issues are identified: the number after their name refers to the representation number. Copies of representations are available to view in full via the Council’s consultation website (http://consult-southkesteven.limehouse.gov.uk).

5. **Conformity with Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)**

5.1 Under Regulation 29, the East Midlands Council was requested to provide an opinion of the ‘general conformity’ of the Submission Site Allocation and Policies DPD with the RSS. The current statutory RSS for the East Midlands is RSS8. The East Midlands Council (2) has stated that, as the DPD reflects the Core Strategy, and that document is in general conformity with the RSS, it is not appropriate to comment.

6. **General Comments**

6.1 Several representations were received which related to the document as a whole. Four of these were expressions of support.

6.2 Natural England (204) expressed overall satisfaction with the DPD and welcomed the Habitats Regulations Assessment conclusions.

6.3 Anglian Water (202) stated that the DPD does not reflect the findings of the Water Cycle Study (WCS), which was finalised after the publication of the submission DPD. This was raised by several respondents, including the Environment Agency. A further representation period was allowed after the publication of the study, in order that respondents might have the opportunity to amend, or withdraw, their representations in light of the report and the changes which the Council propose to make to the plan arising from the WCS: these are considered in section 16.

6.4 Representations relating to the background evidence were received from the National Trust (218), who expressed concern that the Belton House Setting Study was not explicitly included
in the list of Background Evidence documents, and English Heritage (55) who expressed concern about the lack of a specific policy relating to the setting of Belton House. The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (86) felt that the biodiversity evidence base is not robust and credible, as much of the data is not up-to-date.

6.5 Expressions of support for the objectives were received from English Heritage (56), Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (87) and Stamford Property Company (95). Two respondents (Bidwells, 117 and Boyer Planning, 193) requested clarification of the housing provision required in Objective 1, to accord with that required by the Core Strategy, and one response suggested that the concept of Green Infrastructure should be expanded on as part of Objective 11.

7. Stamford

7.1 A total of 70 responses were received from 38 separate respondents.

7.2 General comments about Stamford include concern about the impact of development on its heritage assets and the amount of cross-town traffic that would be generated. English Heritage (57) expressed support for the decision not to allocate land adjacent to St Leonard's Priory (a scheduled ancient monument site). Clarification is sought about the amount of housing required in the town.

7.3 It was suggested that more detail of the results of the Stamford traffic model should be included in the text (Boyer Planning, 194). The same respondent suggested that the text should be expanded to provide more detail about the results of the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study (197).

7.4 One respondent (on behalf of a property developer) suggests that there will be shortfall in the provision of new homes (Bidwells, 116).

7.5 General comments on allocated sites include concern about the impacts of development on the historic fabric of Stamford and on the quality of the landscape at the western side of the town. One respondent [representing the landowners] felt that land outside the District [known as RUT1] should have been acknowledged as suitable for development (Bidwells, 199) and the promoters of land adjacent to St Leonard's Priory [known as ADD41] suggest that its non-allocation will jeopardise delivery of the required housing numbers (Strutt & Parker, 157). Support for the amount and phasing of housing delivery in Stamford was expressed by Peterborough City Council (19). One respondent [representing landowners] expressed concerns about the phasing of the allocations and disagrees with the assessment of infrastructure constraints in relation to wastewater (Boyer Planning, 227 & 228).

7.6 **Allocation site STM1a:** Two expressions of support were received [one from representatives of owners of the site (1) and one seeking its expansion to encompass adjacent land, owned by the respondent (176). Two objections to this allocation were received expressing concern at traffic impacts and loss of open space (21, 43).

7.7 **Allocation site STM1d:** One objection was received from the Ryhall Road Residents Association, because of traffic impacts and because of the requirement to relocate the football club (32).
7.8 **Allocation site STM3 (including STM1e):** Concerns were expressed about allocation of this site for an Urban Extension include the impact of cross-town traffic on Stamford town centre (eg 35, 165, 203 and 132), the impact on the setting of the town from the west (eg 16, 48, 158, 169, 206 and 212), and concern about building on greenfield land. Natural England (206) suggests that the site represents an opportunity to provide exemplary standards of design and development, in particular high standards of sustainability. It was also suggested that the site is not the best one to provide the required housing (Stamford Property Company, 97 and Stamford Chamber of Trade, 100). Suggested changes include allocation of land to the east of Stamford instead (97 and 100). The Highways Agency (162) welcomes the requirement for detailed Transport Assessments, although suggests references to need for sustainable travel measures, such as Travel Plans, could be included to ensure compliance with Core Strategy Policy SP3.

7.9 **Boyer Planning (representing the landowners)** expressed support for the allocation but seeks amendments to various policy criteria including landscaping (234) and access links (230, 238). They were concerned that the requirement for "at least 140 affordable homes" is not in accordance with either National Policy or the Core Strategy and seeks an amendment to reflect the Core Strategy target of "up to 35%" affordable homes (236). They also seek the deletion of the requirement to provide wastewater infrastructure improvements, stating that these are not based on "robust and credible evidence" (240).

7.10 **Allocation site STM2 (including STM2c):** General comments include concern about the impacts of development on the historic fabric of Stamford. Specific concerns are that the policy does not acknowledge that land outside the District [known as RUT1] could provide development (agents for the landowner, 200) and that land to the east of Stamford should be allocated instead (Stamford Property Company, 98). Boyer Planning (representing the landowners) support the allocation but seek changes in the type and quantum of employment land to be provided (229).

8. **Bourne**

8.1 A total of six responses were received: all relating to the allocations except for one respondent who disagrees with the Landscape Character.

8.2 Very few responses (five only) were received in respect of the allocations: three wished other sites to be allocated, one respondent (representing the landowner, 172) wanted allocation site B1a amended to allow for C2 care home use, and one respondent expressed concern that industrial development might be allowed on site B1c which would negatively affect the health of neighbouring residents.
9. **Deepings**

9.1 There were few representations of a general nature. One respondent (on behalf of a developer, 110) seeks a change of wording in the Development Needs section from "23ha of employment land" to up to 23ha..." to reflect Core Strategy Policy E1. Two representations were received about the WCS (78, 108): both were concerned that the text did not accurately reflect the latest study. The Environment Agency (78) is concerned that the phasing of allocations was not appropriate. Both respondents requested changes to the wording to reflect the updated WCS.

9.2 Few general comments on allocated sites were received (4): stating that the phasing of allocations was not being based on robust and credible evidence as well as suggestions that other sites be allocated (71, 179). Support was expressed by Peterborough City Council (20) for the allocations and phasing.

9.3 **Allocation site DE1a:** Two comments were received: the Environment Agency (79) want the phasing of the allocation to be altered to reflect the WCS, and a local resident objected to the allocation because of impacts on existing development and infrastructure (159).

9.4 **Allocation site DE1b:** One representation was received: the Environment Agency (80) wants the phasing to be altered to reflect the WCS.

9.5 **Allocation site DE3 (including DE1d):** Few representations were received (6). One respondent stated that development would be too close to Langtoft. One respondent was concerned that not enough Green Infrastructure initiatives were being promoted. Natural England (207) suggests that the site represents an opportunity to provide exemplary standards of design and development, in particular high standards of sustainability. Support was expressed for the allocation (on behalf of landowners, 106, 107) and a local resident (160) seeks reassurance that development at the Peterborough Road frontage will be appropriate to its location as a gateway to the Deepings.

9.6 **Allocation site DE2a:** One representation expressed concern that not enough Green Infrastructure initiatives were being promoted (148).

9.7 **Allocation site DE3b:** Two representations were received: one concerned that not enough Green Infrastructure initiatives are being promoted (147) and one (on behalf of developers, 111) suggests amendments to the text to allow for up to 6ha of employment land and the addition of B8 uses.

10. **Local Service Centres**

10.1 Twelve responses were received of a general nature. The Environment Agency (81) wants the text amending to reflect the findings of the WCS. One respondent feels that allowing villages to increase, to maintain viability, is flawed and will destroy the character of the countryside (184). Two respondents state that proposals for allocations have not been based on robust and credible evidence and that more growth should be directed to LSCs (Carter Jonas 5, Capita Symonds, 129). Both representations are on behalf of landowners and advocate further allocations be made within the LSCs, in addition to those proposed by the DPD.
10.2 **Allocations policy LSC1:** Thirteen representations were received. Eleven of these suggested that more allocations should be made: in Billingborough (3), Castle Bytham (2), Long Bennington, Morton, Great Gonerby (3) and Ancaster. There was also support for not allocating land at Ancaster, concern that there was no additional allowance of at least 20% (as per draft National Planning Policy Framework) and the National Trust (217) would like additional criteria for development at Colsterworth and Great Gonerby. The requests for allocation of land in Billingborough included two representations for the allocation of the former Aveland School site: one from the Parish Council (175) and one from Lincolnshire County Council (135) who own the site.

10.3 **Allocation sites LSC1a-1f:** A small number of representations were received: Crown Estates commented on all sites, except Great Gonerby, that development in the villages was not justified and that more sustainable sites are available in Billingborough.

10.4 Support was expressed (2) for the allocation at Barrowby and for the allocation at Corby Glen (2) (although one respondent preferred a different site). Five representations were received about land at Harlaxton (all against the allocation). Eight representations were received about land allocated at Long Bennington: 7 against and 1 in support (from the developer of the site).

10.5 Responses were received stating that both the Harlaxton and the Long Bennington sites were not the best sites for allocation and better sites are available in those villages.

11. **Housing Development and Managing Delivery**

11.1 Two representations were received, both from developers: one seeking a table showing housing allocations for each settlement (114), and one suggesting that the phasing of development was not justified and that references to phasing should be removed (198).

11.2 **Policy SAP H1: Other Housing Development:** Three responses were received, all in support, including the National Trust (219) and English Heritage (62).

12. **Policies**

12.1 **SAP1 Retention of Services and Facilities:** Two representations were received: both in support of the policy but wanting it extended to all settlements (English Heritage (63) and Deepings Town Centre Design Steering Group (150)).

12.2 **SAP2: Rural Exception Affordable Housing:** Two representations of support were received (English Heritage (64) and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (88)): both welcoming the environmental and historic criteria in the policy.

12.3 **SAP3: Supporting Local Business in Local Service Centres:** Three representations of support were received (English Heritage (65), National Trust (216) and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (89)): all welcoming the environmental and historic criteria in the policy.
12.4 SAP4: Business Development in the Countryside (Including Rural Diversification Schemes): Three representations of support were received (from English Heritage, (66), National Trust, (215), and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust, (90)): all welcoming the environmental and historic criteria in the policy. The National Farmer's Union (3) is concerned that the policy landscape criteria may be used to prevent development which would otherwise be allowed.

12.5 SAP5: Locally Important Existing Employment Sites: Three representations were received: all supportive of the policy. One respondent would like the uses permitted by the policy extended to include retail (Savills, 223). English Heritage (67) and the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (91) are concerned about the environmental impacts of site redevelopment.

12.6 SAP6: Employment Development at Gonerby Moor: Two representations were received: both in support of the policy but suggesting that it should be site-specific and identify their client's land (121 & 174).

12.7 SAP7: Development Within the Defined Town Centres: The four responses to this policy commented on the lack of a map within the DPD (173), the policy not identifying land or buildings to accommodate growth and the policy's unrealistic ambitions (142, 151). English Heritage (68) supports the policy but is concerned that development respects the integrity of conservation areas and listed buildings.

12.8 SAP8: Town Centre Opportunity Areas: Four representations were received. Aldi (93) is concerned that the text may not accurately reflect the findings of the Retail Needs and Town Centre Study. Sainsbury's (161) would like the policy amending to support retail uses at out-of-centre locations where there are no sites available in the town centres. NewRiver Retail (85) and the Deepings Town Centre Design Steering Group (152) would like the policy to identify specific sites (NewRiver Retail suggests its land in Market Deeping for allocation (85)).

12.9 SAP9: Bourne Core Area: Two representations were received: English Heritage (69) welcome the policy and the preservation of heritage assets that should result, and a local resident (186) welcomes the redevelopment of Bourne Core Area but suggests that a single-developer scheme is not the answer.

12.10 SAP10: Open Space Provision: Four representations of support were received: English Heritage (70), Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (92) and Natural England (205) welcome the policy and Boyer Planning (195) supports the policy but suggests the text be expanded to justify the standards requested. One respondent (Lely, 214) disagrees with the protection afforded to allotments, and a further strategy on Green Infrastructure is requested (Deepings Town Centre Design Steering Group, 143).

13. Implementation and Monitoring

13.1 No representations were received in respect of the Monitoring Framework.

13.2 A small number of representations were received in respect of the Implementation of the DPD. Two representations questioned the statement that there are no capacity issues in the District's medical centres (53 and 155 and the Environment Agency (83 & 84) requests amendments to reflect the final Water Cycle Study. The Highways Agency requests the
inclusion of further details (163) and a local resident suggests that new footways and cycleways be resisted (187).

14. Proposals Map

14.1 Table 1: Allocations or Policy Designations to be ADDED: Four representations were received (all on behalf of landowners) stating that the DPD fails to identify specific sites (in Billingborough (136), Castle Bytham (138), Bourne (140) and Great Gonerby (225)) for allocation.

14.2 Table 2: Allocations or Policy Designations to be DELETED: Two representations were received on behalf of landowners stating that specific sites should not be de-allocated (at Stamford (224) and Bourne (99)).

15. Sustainability Appraisal (SA)/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)/Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

15.1 Natural England (204) comment that it is satisfied with the content, objectives and aspirations in the DPD stating that they "Welcome the inclusion of the HRA which has concluded that there will be no likely significant effect on the four European sites identified at potential risk.". No comments were received from the Environment Agency or English Heritage in connection with either the SA/SEA or the HRA.

16. Consultation responses about the Water Cycle Study and the proposed minor changes arising from it

16.1 Three responses have been made about those allocated housing sites which are identified in the WCS as having constraints which might delay the commencement of building works. In particular, sites: LSC1f (Main Road, Long Bennington) (246), STM1e (STM3) (between Empingham Road and Tinwell Road, Stamford) (253) and DE1d (DE3) (between Peterborough Road and Towngate East, Market Deeping) (257). Evidence has been submitted as part of these representations demonstrating that Anglian Water has considered the requirements of each site for connection to the water and foul sewage network as a Pre-Development Inquiry. These reports indicate that there are either no constraints to the proposed development being serviced or that there are solutions to any constraint identified. The representations, therefore, question the justification for phasing of these allocations.

16.2 Six separate responses consider that the WCS identify constraints which make proposed allocations undeliverable (224, 255 and 247 about site STM3; 245 about site STM1d and 243 about site LSC1f). Three responses state that the WCS supports alternative sites which should be allocated either instead of or in addition to those which have been allocated (247 and 255 about land off Uffington Road Stamford and 258 about land adjacent to STM1a).

16.3 Representation has been made by the Environment Agency (260) that they would support the proposed changes which address many of their earlier representations. However, they are still concerned that the phasing of proposed allocations does not accord with the recommendations of the WCS. Anglian Water (261) has responded with a set of suggested revisions to the proposed changes which update and revise the constraints identified in the
WCS. Natural England (256) support the work and make reference to the role of SUDs as part of Green Infrastructure.

16.4 Representation 259 questions the procedural issues arising from publication this part of the background evidence after the Submission plan was published, and questions the implications of the constraints imposed on the ability to deliver a five year housing land supply in this early part of the plan period. This later point is also made by representation 258.