Local Plan for South Kesteven

Site Allocation and Policies Development Plan

Session 3 – Allocated Sites - Stamford

8th November 2012
1. Core Strategy Housing Requirement

1.1 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?

   1.1.1 Housing development in Stamford is taking place in line with that expected by the Core Strategy (CS) housing trajectory. Appendix 1 to this statement shows the adopted CS Trajectory for the District and how this has been met by completions in the period 2006-2012. This table shows that whilst housing completions in Stamford dipped slightly below the projected rates in the two years 2009-2011 they exceeded the projected rate in 2011-2012. Overall for the six years of the CS plan period which have already passed it was expected that 467 homes would be built in the town and 478 homes were actually completed (this includes an additional 12 homes identified as completed within the period 2006-2011, when a physical survey of completions was undertaken in April 2011, but which cannot be allocated to a specific year. This is due to a small number of developers who use private building inspectors to discharge building regulation requirements. These Inspectors do not always notify the Council that a development is complete. For this reason a physical survey is undertaken periodically).

   1.1.2 When averaged out over the six years both the projected trajectory rate (of 78 units per annum) and the actual completed rate (79 units per annum) exceed the annual average building rate for the town required by Policy H1 of the Core Strategy of 58 units per annum.

   1.1.3 Main Modification SAPMM010 [SAP11] updates the completions and commitments figures for the town to reflect the situation at 1st April 2012 as shown in the Five Year Housing Land Supply paper [SK24]. In its response to the Inspector’s Issues for Session 2 (paragraph 1.3.2) the Council has agreed that the figures for completions and commitments should be rounded and the phrase “at least” used to describe the shortfall to be allocated (this applies to each section of the plan which describes the housing supply situation). Paragraph 3.1.2.1 (to which rep 115 refers) discusses the provision which is made within the plan for Stamford rather than the shortfall (which is concluded in para 3.1.9), thus 760 is the sum of 200 homes with planning permission, and the 560 homes allocated in Policy STM1 of the plan.
1.1.4 Arising from discussion at the Grantham Area Action Plan (GAAP) hearing sessions a revised paragraph is being prepared for inclusion in the GAAP which summarises the up to date situation with regard to completions, commitments, plan provision and the ability to deliver a rolling five year supply of housing land across the District. For consistency it is suggested that a similar paragraph is prepared and added to the Site Allocation and Policies (SAP) which summarises the housing provision made by the plan for the plan period.

1.1.5 The modifications update the supply situation, they do not result in a loss of supply or a reduction in the amount of housing provided for the town. As sites move from allocation to commitment and from commitment to completion the shortfall and provision figures will change. However, the overall housing supply for the town over the plan period remains in accordance with the strategic requirement set out in the CS and sufficient housing provision is made to continue to meet this requirement over the remaining 14 years of the plan period. This provision is actually about 90 homes more (or 7% greater) than the 1140 homes required by the CS.

o Up-dating of requirements

1.1.6 The figures for completions and commitments have been updated as part of the Main Modifications [SAP11]. See response above and the Council’s response to Session 2

o Does the Council’s position reflect actual needs? 96

1.1.7 The SAP DPD has been prepared in conformity with the adopted CS. The housing requirement set out in the adopted CS was based upon that included in and tested by the approved East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy, which still forms part of the development plan for the District. The CS also distributes the District housing requirement for the plan period across six sub areas. These sub areas follow the spatial strategy established within Policy SP1 of the CS. The housing requirement is, therefore, divided between the four towns of the District, the 16 larger villages identified in CS Policy SP2 as Local Service Centres (LSCs) and the “rural area”. The distribution of houses to each of the sub areas is set out in Policy H1 of the adopted CS.

1.1.8 CS Policy H1 sets out a clear framework used to distribute the District housing requirement to each sub area. In respect of Stamford this framework seeks to maintain development levels in Stamford to meet a local need. The Core Strategy implies no requirement for additional growth to be directed towards the town. Historic development rates in the town in the five years proceeding the CS plan period (2001-2006) averaged 54 homes per annum. In the period since 2006 average completions have increased to over 70 homes per annum. The DPD makes provision for a total of 1227 homes over the plan period: this would mean that on average 61 homes would be delivered each year of the plan period. This is in line with the average build rates experienced in the town over the last 10 years and would appear to meet the needs of the town and its housing market.

1.1.9 The Spatial Strategy (Policies SP1 and SP2), the District housing requirement and its division between the sub areas (in Policy H1) were considered and debated as part of the CS examination in 2010, and were consequently found to be sound. In preparing
this DPD it would be inappropriate to re-examine the spatial strategy and pattern of housing distribution established in the CS this would be most appropriately reassessed as part of a review of the Core Strategy.

- **Is the Council’s approach sufficiently flexible?** MM66

1.1.10 The Framework requires provision to be made for a rolling five year supply plus 5% buffer of housing land. The DPD makes sufficient provision to meet the CS housing requirement with an additional provision of about 10% (or just over 650 homes). In Stamford the additional provision is 87 homes which equates to just over 7% of the housing requirement for the town. This plan also phases the release and delivery of housing allocations to help ensure that there is a rolling five year supply across the 15 years 2011-2026. In addition Policy SAP H1 provides the policy framework to allow for windfall sites to come forward as additional housing supply. The Plan, therefore, makes sufficient provision to allow flexibility for the delivery of allocated sites and other windfall sites across the whole plan period. If the planned provision fails deliver a rolling five year supply of housing land the Core Strategy and the DPD establish a framework to allow for the re-prioritisation of allocations phased to a later period and if necessary to approve planning applications for sites which meet the locational requirements set out in the Core Strategy.

- **Does the Plan make provision for an additional 5/20% allocation in Stamford in-line with the National Planning Policy Framework?** MM6

1.1.11 It should be noted that the Framework does not require a buffer for each sub-area. The requirement is to ensure that the district has a five year supply of deliverable housing land with a 5 or 20% buffer.

1.1.12 The DPD does however make sufficient provision to meet the CS housing requirement with an additional provision of about 10% (or just over 650 homes). In Stamford the additional provision is 87 homes which equates to just over 7% of the housing requirement for the town. The Council can demonstrate that it has consistently delivered an appropriate amount of housing development during the plan period to date and therefore believes that it is appropriate to make provision for an additional 5% housing land in the plan.

1.1.13 Proposed Main Modifications to paragraphs 3.5.1 – 3.5.3 [SAPMM037-39, SAP11] set out the requirements of the Framework in respect of five year land supply and the Council’s approach to provision for a buffer, which is, at this time, assessed at 5%. This will, however, continue to be monitored and appropriate action taken if it is apparent that under-delivery is becoming a persistent problem.

### 1.2 Site Selection Process

- **Principles behind choice of sites**

1.2.1 The Council’s response to the Inspector’s note dated 9 February 2012 [ED6] sets out the process of site selection. This sets out that the areas of search for allocation sites is as set out in CS Policies SP1 and SP2, that is in the market towns of Stamford, Bourne and Deepings as well as in the Local Service Centres. It is also clear that all
sites would be assessed against the criteria established in the Core Strategy [para 5.1.5]. Sites which have major constraints, those with planning permission and small sites (those which could accommodate fewer than 10 houses) were not considered for allocation. The Evidence Document [SAP19] sets out the results of the assessment and the justification for the allocation or rejection of each site. Those sites allocated in the plan are those with nor or resolvable constraints and which are available, deliverable and which perform the best through the assessment process.

1.2.2 The quantum of housing needed to meet the CS requirements, together with the shortage of infill and/or brownfield sites, meant that a suitable greenfield site(s) had to be found to provide an urban extension. In addition to the standard assessments outlined above, a Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study [SK30] and the Stamford Traffic Model were prepared, to assist in determining which of three areas would be the most suitable to meet the development needs of Stamford. The selection of the urban extension site is considered in greater detail in the Council’s statement for Session 4.

1.3 Stamford Traffic Model

1.3.1 The Stamford Traffic Model was prepared on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council to consider and compare the potential impact of each of the proposed urban extension areas (north, east and west) on the existing highway network within Stamford. This was one of a number of evidence reports used in the site assessment process for the urban extensions to help determine which site was the best (or least worst) for meeting the development needs of the town.

1.3.2 The Council considers the inclusion of additional text which summarises the conclusions of this study would be unnecessary repetition of information which is available within the background evidence for the plan.

1.4 Impact of constraints in the sewerage network

1.4.1 Since the plan was submitted Anglian Water have undertaken the UPM recommended by the Water Cycle Study [SAP18]. An update to the Water Cycle Study has been prepared by Anglian Water and the Environment Agency and submitted to the examination. This confirms the outcome of the UPM for Stamford, and the implications of this work on phasing and delivery of allocations. The UPM considered four different growth scenarios, which considered committed and infill development plus each of the proposed extensions area (east, west and north) together with a +20% growth scenario (which combined the north and west areas). Anglian Water concluded from this work that for each scenario considered there is “insignificant impact on the existing water quality due to overflow operation at Hudds Mill pumping station”. The report concludes that the amount of growth considered in the scenarios could be accommodated by the existing sewerage network within the necessary environmental limits.
1.4.2 In response to the undetermined planning application for the proposed allocation STM3, Anglian Water has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity within the water network to accommodate the proposed development.

- Are the changes to paragraph 3.1.14 (SAPMM012) sufficient to address concerns about drainage matters?

1.4.3 As a result of the work undertaken by Anglian Water in respect of the UPM this paragraph could be updated to give greater clarity.

1.5 Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study

- Is it necessary for the text to refer to the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study?

1.5.1 The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study was prepared to consider and compare the potential impact of each of the proposed Greenfield extension sites on the landscape around Stamford (and also Deepings and Grantham). It was one of a number of evidence reports used in the site assessment process to help determine which areas are the most suitable (or least worst) for allocation to meet the development needs of each town. The study makes conclusions about the capacity of the landscape to absorb new development in particular locations as well as how sensitive the landscape would be to the effect of development.

1.5.2 The Council considers the inclusion of additional text which summarises the conclusions of this study would be unnecessary repetition of information which is already available within the background evidence for the plan.

2. Policy Sites

2.1 STM1a

- Should the site be increased in size by including adjacent land?

2.1.1 The additional parcel of land adjacent to the allocation on Kettering Road, Stamford was brought to the Council’s attention after the Submission version of the plan was published and the site assessment process had been concluded. As a result this site has not been subject not public consultation.

2.1.2 The Council has sought the Highway Authority’s comments about the site and subjected it to the site assessment criteria and an SEA/SA (Appendix 3) in accordance with the process undertaken for all other sites which have been considered. This has concluded that the site would appear to be largely suitable for development.

2.1.3 The Highway Authority has concerns about the cumulative impact on the local network arising from development of this site and the two others allocated as STM1a and STM1d. However they have concluded that it would be better to have a single access to serve both sites south of Kettering Road, and that as a combined site, development could fund junction improvements to increase its capacity.
Would the allocation lead to unacceptable traffic issues?

2.1.4 LCC as Highway Authority has provided the following as additional comments relating to the impact of adding this field to allocation STM1a:

Individually in addition to the football site currently supported by the local highway authority there would be concerns in bringing forward either of the two sites opposite (south of Kettering Road) due to the introduction of new accesses onto the A43 Kettering Road and the likely increased movements affecting capacity at the Kettering Road/High Street junction. The local highway authority would be keen to keep the number of developments directly served by new junctions off principal roads to a minimum. Individually, each site will likely adversely affect capacity through the Kettering Road/High Street junction and improvements (traffic signals) sought. However, as individual proposals, they may not be capable of sustaining the costs involved.

Together the two sites to the south as one package and served off a single ghost island junction may be more acceptable in terms of delivering improvements. It is likely the local highway authority would require the junction Kettering Road/High Street to be signalised to improve capacity and aid movement due to the increased patronage.

It is noted that the promoter suggests that joint development (to include to football club) would give this “greater scope to bring forward improvements” It is however, further noted that the football club site already has planning approval subject to S106

2.2 STM1d – Stamford Football Club

Is the allocation realistic given the need to re-locate the football club?

2.2.1 Yes. Three interlinked planning applications have been made by the landowner (Burghley Preservation Trust) and the football club. The applications are for a new stadium located on Ryhall Road, redevelopment of the existing ground on Kettering Road for 55 houses and the provision of 20 affordable houses on a site to the rear of Coronation Villas. The applications have been considered by the Council’s Development Control Committee who resolved to approve them subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement. The applications are linked by conditions which require the provision of the new stadium before any redevelopment of the existing ground takes place. For this reason the site is placed within the 2nd phase of the plan (2016-2021), which should allow sufficient time for the stadium to be constructed before any homes are delivered. In considering these planning applications, LCC as the Highway Authority has been consulted. They have not indicated any major concerns which cannot be overcome through traffic management and local highway improvements. They had no objection to the applications relating to the impact on the highway network of redevelopment of this site.

2.2.2 A letter from the agent acting on behalf of the Burghley House Preservation Trust has been prepared (and is attached at Appendix 2) which updates the situation with regard to these proposals and demonstrates the commitment of both the Trust and the football club to deliver a new stadium for the town, which will in itself release the site of the existing ground for redevelopment.
2.3 STM2a

Would the allocation for employment use lead to unacceptable traffic congestion? 32

2.3.1 LCC as the highway authority have not indicated any major concerns relating to the impact on the highway network of this site.
Appendices

Appendix 1: Housing Delivery against Core Strategy Housing Trajectory

Appendix 2: Letter from agent on behalf of Burghley House Preservation Trust updating progress on the Stamford Football Club relocation applications.

Appendix 3: SEA/SA matrix of site assessment for additional land at Kettering Road, Stamford
## Appendix 1: Housing Delivery against Core Strategy Trajectory (with updated completions figures at 31/04/12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grantham other</th>
<th>Grantham SUE</th>
<th>Stamford</th>
<th>Bourne</th>
<th>Deepings</th>
<th>LSC</th>
<th>Rural (includes LSCs 2006-2010)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trajectory rate</td>
<td>Actual rate</td>
<td>Trajectory rate</td>
<td>Actual rate</td>
<td>Trajectory rate</td>
<td>Actual rate</td>
<td>Trajectory rate</td>
<td>Actual rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 - 07</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 - 08</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 - 09</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 - 10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 - 11</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* survey completion</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 - 12</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 - 13</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 - 14</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 - 15</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 - 16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 - 17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 - 18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 - 19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 - 20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 - 21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 - 22</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 - 23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023 - 24</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024 - 25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025 - 26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2681</td>
<td>1537</td>
<td>5080</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>2334</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Survey undertaken in April 2011 revealed a number of homes noted as started but which had actually been completed and occupied. These cannot be attributed to a specific year but have been completed since the monitoring period began on 1/04/2006.
### APPENDIX 6: SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR ALLOCATED SITES

**BROWNFIELD / GREENFIELD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL</th>
<th>BIODIVERSITY</th>
<th>SOIL</th>
<th>AIR</th>
<th>CLIMATIC FACTORS</th>
<th>MATERIAL ASSETS</th>
<th>CULTURAL HERITAGE</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To protect / enhance the District’s Natural Assets and Biodiversity</td>
<td>To protect and enhance the District’s Flora</td>
<td>To ensure that development is located on the most appropriate sites in relation to the development strategy</td>
<td>To maintain air quality within the district</td>
<td>To manage prudenty the natural resources of the district to reduce vulnerability to flooding</td>
<td>To minimise energy usage through sustainable design and development</td>
<td>To protect and enhance the District through sustainable design and development</td>
<td>To maintain / enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the District’s Landscape Character Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### STM1a
Laid adjacent to Kettering Road, Stamford

- Landscaping conditions could be used to protect boundary trees and hedges
- Paddock
- No known protected species
- Greenfield site
- Development will have a negative effect on soil
- MT reduces need to travel by private car
- EN4 requires energy efficient measures
- No known archaeological remains - Saxon smelting site to west of site - archaeological evaluation required
- EN1 & EN4 require these measures
- Development must be related to that of the surrounding area - area within the Kesteven Uplands, which is an area of Medium-High sensitivity - site is adjacent to built-up area of town

#### Rep SA Sub176
Laid adjacent to Kettering Road, Stamford

- Landscaping conditions could be used to protect boundary trees and hedges
- Paddock
- No known protected species
- Greenfield site
- Development will have a negative effect on soil
- MT reduces need to travel by private car
- EN4 requires energy efficient measures
- No known archaeological remains - trial trenching found no evidence relating to iron production or of Benedictine nunnery of St. Michael - geophysical anomalies found - archaeological evaluation required
- EN1 & EN4 require these measures
- Development must be related to that of the surrounding area - area within the Kesteven Uplands, which is an area of Medium-High sensitivity - site is separated from built-up area of town by small paddock

#### KEY
- ✓ compatible objectives
- • partly compatible
- ❌ incompatible
- - no relationship
- ? uncertain
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land adjacent to Kettering Road, Stamford</th>
<th>Land adjacent to Kettering Road, Stamford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure the needs of all sections of the population of the District are met.</td>
<td>To ensure the needs of all sections of the population of the District are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that the housing needs of the community are met, in particular the affordable housing requirements.</td>
<td>To ensure that the housing needs of the community are met, in particular the affordable housing requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to community safety by encouraging good design.</td>
<td>To facilitate the provision of recreation facilities for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To facilitate improved health provision where appropriate.</td>
<td>To encourage employment opportunities for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To facilitate the development of new technology to support a modern economic infrastructure.</td>
<td>To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve accessibility to jobs and services by increasing the use of public transport, walking and cycling.</td>
<td>To improve accessibility to jobs and services by increasing the use of public transport, walking and cycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable for residential development - allocate.</td>
<td>Suitable for residential development - allocate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 6: Sustainability Assessment Framework for Allocated Sites

#### Land adjacent to Kettering Road, Stamford

- **To** ensure the needs of all sections of the population of the District are met.
- **To** ensure that the housing needs of the community are met, in particular the affordable housing requirements.
- Contribute to community safety by encouraging good design.
- To facilitate improved health provision where appropriate.

**Indicative Yield:**
- 30 houses, including 10 affordable homes

**Allocation:** Suitable for residential development - allocate.

---

#### Land adjacent to Kettering Road, Stamford

- **To** ensure the needs of all sections of the population of the District are met.
- **To** ensure that the housing needs of the community are met, in particular the affordable housing requirements.
- Contribute to community safety by encouraging good design.
- To facilitate improved health provision where appropriate.

**Indicative Yield:**
- 20 houses, including 7 affordable homes

**Allocation:** Suitable for residential development - allocate.

---

This is a small site, on the edge of Stamford, but separated from the built-up part of the town by allocation site STM1a. Both sites could be developed together, giving a capacity of 50 homes, although the cumulative impact of these two sites and the football ground (STM1d) must be considered. It is possible that mitigation to permit STM1d could be negated by development of this larger site. Development of the site would extend the built-up part of Stamford further towards the village of Wothorpe.
R Armstrong  
Senior Planning Policy Officer  
South Kesteven District Council  
St Peters Hill  
Grantham  
Lincolnshire  
NG31 6PZ  

18 October 2012  

Dear Rachel  

STAMFORD AFC RELOCATION  

Thank you for contacting me regarding the Stamford AFC relocation scheme. I understand that you are preparing your evidence to the Examination of the Site Allocations DPD, and that the Inspector has requested clarification of progress with the football club relocation scheme. I am therefore writing with a summary of the position, which I am happy that you include with your evidence.  

There are three elements to the relocation scheme. The first is the development of a new football ground on land west of Ryhall Road. The second element is the redevelopment of the current ground at Kettering Road for housing. The third element is the provision of affordable housing on land at Barnack Road in lieu of on-site provision at Kettering Road. All three elements have been the subject of outline planning applications, which your Authority resolved to approve in June and August 2012, subject to completion of a s106 planning obligation. That obligation is nearing completion, and I anticipate that the outline planning permissions will be issued very shortly. As you know, all three sites are within the single ownership of Burghley House Preservation Trust.  

A key aspect of the s106 obligation is that the new ground must be suitable for use for football matches before the redevelopment of the current ground is commenced. There has been significant development industry interest in delivering the relocation scheme package, in the knowledge of this conditional requirement. You will appreciate that commercial confidentiality prevents me from giving any detail of this, but I am confident that the relocation scheme is deliverable and that the Inspector can conclude that inclusion of the existing ground at Kettering Road as a residential allocation is sound.  

I hope that this summary of the position is useful.  

Yours sincerely  

Mark Flood MRTPI  

Cc: D Pennell (BHPT)