AGENDA - Session 1

Date: Tuesday 6th November

Time: 10AM

Session 1: Procedural and General Points

Representors:
- Bidwells for Diploma PLC - MM66.
- Bidwells for Larkfleet Ltd - MM51-MM53.

Issues:

A) Procedural matters

- What is the current situation with regard to the Council’s existing Local Plan? Is it saved?
- Has the DPD been prepared in accordance with the statutory procedures under Section 20(5)(a) of the 2004 Act, and the Council’s Local Development Scheme?
- Has the DPD been prepared in accordance with an approved Statement of Community Involvement? If not, does it meet the minimum requirements in the Regulations?
- Is the DPD supported by a Sustainability Appraisal? Are the Council aware of any fundamental procedural shortcomings in the process of preparing the DPD?
- Has the Council undertaken a Self Assessment of Soundness to assure itself that the likely questions which arise have answers? Has a Self-Assessment of Soundness of the DPDs been undertaken using the draft model produced by the Planning Advisory Service? Is this placed in the library and on the Council’s web-site?
- Is the programme for preparing other LDF documents generally as set out in the Council’s latest Local Development Scheme?
- Does the DPD take account of the Council’s other plans, including the adopted Local Plan and Community Strategy, and the plans of adjoining authorities?
- Does the Council believe that it has fulfilled the Duty to Co-operate as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework?
B) Post Submission Modifications

Minor Changes Document
- Are all of the detailed changes Minor Modifications?

General NPPF issues
- What is the Council’s position regarding a review of the Core Strategy? MM52
- Does the Plan accurately set out the Localism Act provisions which have come into effect? MM51
- Terminology issues MM53
- Duty to co-operate MM66
- Has the Council undertaken an examination of the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that the DPD covers all relevant issues?
  - Model policy – see GAAPMM05 NPPF13
  - Sequential testing of retail proposals
  - Financial and functional testing for agricultural workers dwellings
  - Contamination of land

C) Proposals Map
AGENDA - Session 2

Date: Wednesday 7th November

Time: 9.30AM

Session 2 General Housing Provision Issues

Representors:
- Anglian Water - MM75.
- Bidwells for Larkfleet Ltd - MM54-MM56, MM58-MM61.
- Concept Town Planning - MM7.
- Environment Agency - 81, 83, 24 & MM74.
- Heaton Planning for Bullimore’s Sand & Gravel - MM64, MM65.
- Mr Dieter Asbach-Cullen - MM1-MM4.
- Mr J M Mettham - 105.
- National Trust - MM42.
- Persimmon Homes (East Midlands) Ltd - 259.
- Savills - 255.

Issues:

Housing requirement
- Core Strategy requirements MM63, MM64
- Review of Core Strategy arising from National Planning Policy Framework provisions
  - Identification of additional 5% housing sites in paragraph 3.5.2-3 – is this position justified by past delivery rates?
- Progress in complying with housing trajectory of Core Strategy
  - Change SAPMM04 amends housing requirement in Objective 1 117, 193, 116, MM54
  - Does the text of the Plan accurately describe commitments and residual requirements? MM56, MM58
  - What is the current position on provision?
  - Can the Council demonstrate a 5 year supply (+5/20%) of housing land? 259, MM7, MM61, NPPF14
- Up-dating of requirements

Locational Strategy of Provision
- Relevant Core Strategy provisions MM42
- Impact on villages 105, MM02, MM03, MM04
Village boundaries

**Phasing**
- Is the Council’s general approach to phasing consistent? *MM70, MM71*
- Is phasing placing arbitrary constraints on development? *198, 227, 231, 251 (STM3)*

**Delivery**
- Should the Plan contain a single source of information showing provision in all settlements? *114*

**Site Selection Process**
- How did the Site Selection process operate? *MM59, MM60, MM64, MM65*
- Is it clear that the best options were chosen? *MM67*
- Infrastructure Provision considerations
  - Highways MM1
  - Water and sewerage – Have the effects of water and drainage provision been properly taken into account in the Site Selection Process? *254, 255, 259, MM55, MM74, MM75*
  - Have the changes made by the Council satisfied parties that drainage issues have been properly addressed? *108, 109, 81, 83, 84*
AGENDA - Session 3

Date: Thursday 8th November

Time: 9.30AM

Session 3: Allocated Sites - Stamford

Representors:
- Bidwells - 115
- Bidwells for Diploma PLC - MM66
- Boyer Planning - 194, 196, 197 & 228
- Boyer Planning for Commercial Estates Group - MM68
- DLP Planning for Stamford Property Company Ltd - 96
- Mr P West & Mrs S Wilson - 1,
- Ryhall Residents Association - 32
- W R Davidge Planning Practice for Mr William Strain – 176 MM5 & MM6

Issues:

General Issues
- Core Strategy housing requirements for Stamford
  - Progress in complying with Core Strategy housing trajectory for Stamford
    - SAPMM010 updates current position. 115, MM5, MM68
    - Is this in line with Core Strategy trajectory?
  - Up-dating of requirements
  - Does the Council’s position reflect actual needs? 96
  - Is the Council’s approach sufficiently flexible? MM66
  - Does the Plan make provision for an additional 5/20% allocation in Stamford in-line with the National Planning Policy Framework? MM6

- Site Selection Process
  - Principles behind choice of sites

- Stamford Traffic Model
  - Should the Plan show the results of the Stamford Traffic Model? 194, 228

- Impact of constraints in the sewerage network
  - Have any issues with infrastructure to serve development in Stamford been overcome? 196
  - Are the changes to paragraph 3.1.14 (SAPMM012) sufficient to address concerns about drainage matters?
Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study
   o Is it necessary for the text to refer to the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study? 197, 228

Policy Sites
   ▪ STM1a
      o Should the site be increased in size by including adjacent land? 176
      o Would the allocation lead to unacceptable traffic issues? 32
   ▪ STM1d – Stamford Football Club
      o Is the allocation realistic given the need to re-locate the football club? 32

   ▪ STM2a
      o Would the allocation for employment use lead to unacceptable traffic congestion? 32
AGENDA - Session 4

Date:  Friday 9th November

Time:  9.30AM

Session 4 Stamford – Policy STM1e, STM2c and STM3

Representors:
- Anglian Water - MM75
- Bidwells for Diploma PLC - 199, 200, NPPF11 & MM66
- Boyer Planning for Commercial Estates Group - MM69, MM72
- DLP Planning for Stamford Property Company Ltd - 98
- English Heritage - 57,
- Mr Malcolm Brandwood - 164
- Savills - 222, 224,
- South West Approaches Group – 44, 244,
- Stamford Chamber of Trade & Commerce - 100, 247 & NPPF9.
- Strutt & Parker - 157
- W R Davidge Planning Practice for Mr William Strain - 258

Issues:

Policies STM1e, STM2c and STM3

Detail of policies
- Should the STM2c entries be changed to provide greater flexibility? 229, MM72
- Should the STM3 entries include mention of sustainable transport, 'rat-running', pedestrian and cycle access, etc? 230, 238
- Should the STM3 entries include additional detail to justify major, mixed-use developments? 233
- Should the STM3 entries include mention of landscape corridors? 234
- Does Policy STM3 deal adequately with issues of sustainable design and construction? 241
- Are the Policy STM3 requirements regarding affordable homes in line with Core Strategy requirements? 236

Policies STM1e, STM2c and STM3 – site characteristics

- Why are the Policy STM1e, STM2c and STM3 sites the most suitable to deliver Stamford’s requirements for housing and employment land? 98, 44, 164, 222, 244, 247
- Do the Policy STM1e, STM2c and STM3 sites accord with National Planning Policy Framework guidance? NPPF9
- Are constraints to water infrastructure properly identified in Policy STM3 and are they properly addressed through the site selection process? 240, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 253, 254
- Does the phasing of the Policy STM1e, STM2c and STM3 sites properly reflect the constraints imposed by drainage? 252, 255, MM69, MM75

**Alternative Stamford sites**

- Newstead site 97
  - Core Strategy consideration of site
  - Ring Road 100, 164
- Site **ADD41** Priory Road, Stamford 57, 157
- Site RUT1 199, 200, MM66, NPPF11
- Site STAM14 224, 255, 258
AGENDA - Session 5

Date: Tuesday 13th November

Time: 9.30AM

Session 5: Bourne Sites

Representors:
- Bigwood Associates – 171, 172
- Mike Sibthorp for Workplace Property - 208

Issues:

Policy B1 Sites
Site B1a
- Are there sound reasons why the site should be extended? 171
- Should the policy entry specifically include Class C2 uses? 172

Alternative Sites
- Land at The Slipe 208
AGENDA - Session 6

Date: Tuesday 13\textsuperscript{th} November

Time: 2PM

Session 6: Market Deeping and Deeping St James Sites

Representors:
- \textit{Bidwells for Diploma PLC} - MM62
- \textit{Environment Agency} – 78, 79 & 80

Issues:
\textit{Policy DE1, DE2 and DE3 sites}
- Does the Plan make employment provision in-line with Core Strategy requirements? 110, 112, 113
- Have issues of water infrastructure been adequately resolved? 78, 108

DE1a
- Should the phasing of the site be amended in order to resolve drainage issues? 79

DE1b
- Should the phasing of the site be amended in order to resolve drainage issues? 80

DE1d, De2b and DE3
- Should DE1d site be brought forward in phasing? 109, 107, 106
- Is the wording of Policies DE2b and DE3 consistent? 111
- Are the affordable housing requirements accurate? MM62
AGENDA - Session 7

Date: Wednesday 14th November

Time: 9.30AM

Session 7: LSC Allocations

Representors:
- Ancer Spa for Buckminster Trust Estate – 133 & 242
- Capita Symonds – 131 & 246
- English Heritage - 61 & MM8
- Environment Agency – 81 & 82,
- Larkfleet Homes -123,
- Mike Sibthorp for Mr G Cakebread - 103
- National Trust - 217

Issues:
Selection of LSCs
- Core Strategy Provisions
- National Planning Policy Framework issues

Water infrastructure
- Do the changes to 3.4.1.4 deal adequately with drainage constraints? 81, 24

Policy LSC1 Sites
- LSC1a
  - Should the Policy impose restrictions in terms of building heights? 217
- LSC1b
  - Should allocation be deleted or reduced in size to protect heritage significance of Woolsthorpe Manor? 217
  - Should the phasing of the site be brought forward? 123, 242
- LSC1c
  - Should the phasing of the site be brought forward? 133
- LSC1d
  - Should the Policy impose restrictions in terms of building heights and boundary planting? 217
- LSC1e
  - Has selection of the site taken proper account of Heritage Assets? 61, MM8
  - Is the site the most appropriate choice for development in Harlaxton? 103
LSC1f
  - Has the phasing of the site taken full account of drainage issues? 82, 246
  - Support 131?
AGENDA - Session 8

Date:  Thursday 15th November

Time:  9.30AM

Session 8: Omission Sites

Representors:
- Bidwells - 118
- Bidwells for Larkfleet Ltd - MM55, MM59
- Billingborough Parish Council - 175
- Capita Symonds - 131
- Concept Town Planning - MM7, NPPF2.
- Framptons for Dr D Burston - 210
- Larkfleet Group - 124, 191
- Mr Mike Sibthorp for Messrs Eaton, Fearn & Blankley – 101, 102 & 104
- Mrs J Shaw - 209

Issues:

- Baston
  - Are there sound reasons for including a site at Baston in the allocations? 118
  - Are there sound reasons for including the BAST02 site in the allocations? MM55, MM59

- Gt Gonersby (Belvoir Gardens)
  - Are there sound reasons for including the site in the allocations? 101

- Ancaster
  - Are there sound reasons for including a site at Ancaster in the allocations? 104

- Long Bennington
  - Are there sound reasons for including the Costa Row site in the allocations as an alternative to the allocated site (LSC1f)? 124, 131
  - Are there sound reasons for including the west of Old Great North Road (LB18) site in the allocations as an alternative to the allocated site (LSC1f)? 102
  - Are there sound reasons for including Royal Oak public house site in the allocations? MM7, NPPF2

- Billingborough (Aveland School)
  - Are there sound reasons for including the site in the allocations? 175
- Billingborough (rear of Pointon Road)
  - Are there sound reasons for including the site in the allocations? 209
- Castle Bytham (Old Quarry)
  - Are there sound reasons for including the site in the allocations? 210
- Morton
  - Are there sound reasons for including the site in the allocations? 191
AGENDA – Session 9

Date:  Friday 16th November

Time:  9.30AM

Session 9:  SAP Policies

Representors:
- Barton Wilmore for P & B Lely – 214 & NPPF23.
- Bigwood Associates - 173
- Boyer Planning - 195
- Indigo Planning for Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Ltd - 161
- Savills - 223

Issues:

- SAP5
  - ExeS3 - Would it be appropriate to include tourism, leisure, community and retail uses in the list of uses appropriate in Policy SAP5 areas? 223

- SAP7
  - Bourne Town Centre – Is the Town Centre boundary appropriately shown on the Proposals/Policies Map? 173

- SAP8
  - Is it appropriate for the policy to support additional retail development at existing out-of-centre locations? 161

- SAP10
  - Are the standards of open space provision properly justified and should they be applied more flexibly? 195
  - Is the policy protection of existing allotments necessary and could it be applied more flexibly? 214, NPPF23
AGENDA - Session 10

Date:  Friday 16th November

Time:  11AM (approx start time)

Session 10:  Belton House and Heritage Assets

Representors:
- English Heritage - MM9
- National Trust - MM43

Issues:
- Do the Council’s proposed changes (SAPMM043) provide adequate protection to Belton House and Park? MM43, MM09
- Are additional minor changes to the new Policy necessary? MM09
AGENDA - Session 11

Date:  Friday 16th November

Time:  2PM

Session 11:  Monitoring and Implementation

Representors:

Issues:

- Do the Council’s proposed changes provide a robust Monitoring and Implementation regime?
AGENDA - Session 12

Date:  Friday 16\textsuperscript{th} November

Time:  3.45PM (approx start time)

Session 12:  Outstanding Matters, Changes and Closing

Representors:

•

Issues: