Local Plan for South Kesteven

Site Allocation and Policies Development Plan

Session 8 - Omission Sites

15th November 2012
1: General

1.1 The Site Allocation and Policies DPD has been prepared in conformity with the adopted Core Strategy, which sets out a clear framework for housing distribution throughout the District. The Spatial Strategy [Policies SP1 and SP2] and the housing requirement and distribution [in Policy H1] were considered and debated as part of the Core Strategy examination in 2010, and were found to be sound. The quantum of housing allocated in this DPD is in conformity with the requirements of the adopted Core Strategy, and the Council considers that to make allocations in excess of that requirement would risk the DPD not being in conformity with the Core Strategy.

1.2 The National Planning Policy Framework [the Framework] is clear that Local Authorities should provide an additional 5% buffer of housing land above the five-year housing supply. The Framework is also clear that this buffer should be increased to 20% where there has been a record of persistent under-delivery of housing [para 47]. The Council considers that it is a consistently delivering authority and that, therefore, a 5% buffer is appropriate [see response to Session 2].

1.3 The Council's response to the Inspector's note dated 9 February 2012 [ED6] sets out the process of site selection and assessment of village capacity, and the Evidence Document [SAP19] sets out the justification for each allocation or rejection of each site.

2: Baston

2.1 Are there sound reasons for including a site at Baston in the allocations? 118

2.1.1 As part of the process of identifying which settlements are the most appropriate for housing allocations, the Council took into consideration historic building development patterns and local infrastructure capacities, as well as the local appetite for additional development (as expressed in the views of the Parish Councils and local population) and the identified level of housing need. The Council determined that the best option to meet the District's housing requirement during the plan period was for a modest development in a few settlements.

2.1.2 There is no medical facility in Baston and the village assessment process [set out in ED6] concluded that the village of Baston is highly vulnerable to flood risk and that much of the village, including all but one of the suggested sites are completely covered by flood zone 3.
2.1.3 It was concluded that infill development [as permitted by SAP policy SAP H1] would provide sufficient housing to meet the identified need in Baston. The lack of an allocation has been supported by the Parish Council in their response to the Submission DPD [SAP 6].

2.2 Are there sound reasons for including the BAST02 site in the allocations? MM55, MM59

2.2.1 No [see response to 1 above].

2.2.2 The highway authority objected to development of the site, stating that there were serious concerns relating to the means of access: a position that they maintain [see Appendix 1]. Septicity issues and concerns about the impact of surface water on the Baston Fen SAC were also raised during the site assessment process. These serious concerns meant that the site was not considered suitable for development. Subsequent to the submission of the SAP, an application for planning permission for residential development was made to the District Council. This was rejected by the Development Control Committee at its meeting on 2 October 2012.

3: Great Gonerby (Belvoir Gardens)
3.1 Are there sound reasons for including the site in the allocations? 101

3.1.1 No. [see response to 1 above]. This site was assessed as a possible housing allocation site under the reference GGON05 [ED19].

3.1.2 Objections to development were received from the highway authority and concerns expressed about drainage from the site. The site is in a prominent position and there were also concerns about the likely impacts on the landscape of development. Given the highway objections to the site it was considered that the site was not suitable for residential development or allocation.

4: Ancaster
4.1 Are there sound reasons for including a site at Ancaster in the allocations? 104

4.1.1 No [see response to 1 above].

4.1.2 The assessment process identified that, should some small amount of development be required in Ancaster, it could be provided on a site off St Martin's Way. The site which is the subject of this representation was not considered to be suitable for residential development. The highway authority expressed serious concerns about its use for housing on the grounds of highway safety. Should additional land be required in Ancaster, it is considered that there is another, more suitable site in the village.
5: Long Bennington
5.1 Are there sound reasons for including the Costa Row site in the allocations as an alternative to the allocated site (LSC1f)? 124, 131

5.1.1 No [see response to 1 above].

5.1.2 This site was assessed for its suitability as a housing allocation under the reference LB16 [ED19]. Concerns were expressed by the Highway Authority about housing at this location because of its proximity to the A1 and access to the site. Anglian Water has also stated that upgrades are required to the sewerage system in the village, which affects this site and which requires further investigation and is likely to require significant engineering works to effect a solution.

5.2 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

5.2.1 No [see response to 1 above].

5.2.2 This site was assessed for its suitability as a housing allocation under the reference LB18 [ED19]. The Highway Authority objected to development at this location on road safety grounds.

5.3 Are there sound reasons for including Royal Oak public house site in the allocations? MM7, NPPF2

5.3.1 No [see response to 1 above].

5.3.2 This site was assessed for its suitability as a housing allocation under the reference LB05 [ED19], and the Highway Authority objected to development at this location, as the site cannot be accessed. In addition to the highway objection, there are concerns that the site encroaches upon a locally important open area. This area has been identified in the Long Bennington Parish Plan as a "defined open space" which includes a riverside walk. Anglian Water has also stated that upgrades are required to the sewerage system in the village, which affects this site and which requires further investigation and engineering works to effect a solution.

6: Billingborough (Aveland School)
6.1 Are there sound reasons for including the site in the allocations? 175

6.1.1 This site was not assessed during the plan preparation for its suitability as a housing allocation. During the preparation of the DPD the Parish Council expressed support for the redevelopment of the school site at some future time. Since the SAP DPD was prepared it has been confirmed by Mouchel [who act for Lincolnshire County Council] that the school site is no longer required and that a planning application is to be submitted, in the near future, for residential development. The Council considers that residential development on this site would be acceptable in principle, and could come
forward under Site Allocation and Policies DPD Policy SAPH1 without the need for a specific allocation. [The SA-SEA in respect of this site is attached as Appendix 2].

7  Billingborough (rear of Pointon Road)
7.1 Are there sound reasons for including the site in the allocations? 209

7.1.1 No [see response to 1 above].

7.1.2 Two sites in this location were assessed for their suitability as a housing allocations under the reference BIL05 and BIL06 [ED19]. The Highway Authority objected to development on both sites.

8: Castle Bytham (Old Quarry)
8.1 Are there sound reasons for including the site in the allocations? 210

8.1.1 No [see response to 1 above].

8.1.2 This site was assessed for its suitability as a housing allocation under reference ADD11 [ED19]. There is a Site of Special Scientific Interest on this site and, in response to the consultation on additional sites in August 2010, Natural England objected to development and also stated that the site is currently struggling and in unfavourable condition.

8.1.3 The site has had a complex planning history over the years and at present there are three extant planning permissions: for 15 affordable homes on the northern part of the site, granted on 5 October 2010 on which no progress has been made towards implementation; for a nursing home on part of the site, granted on 19 October 2010 and not yet implemented; and outline approval for community health centre, granted on 11 January 2012 but, as yet, no reserved matters applications have been received.

8.1.4 Development in this site has been agreed in principle through the employment, medical centre and nursing home approvals referred to above. However, the Council considers that the site is unsuitable for major residential development because of concerns about the SSSI, surface water flood risk and the capacity of the Sewage Treatment Works.

9: Morton
9.1 Are there sound reasons for including the site in the allocations? 191

9.1.1 No. [see response to 1 above]

9.1.2 It is assumed that this representation refers to the site assessed under reference ADD26 [ED19]. At the time of the assessment, this site had extant planning permission for 20 affordable homes. Construction has started and the site is expected to be completed in early 2013. Further development of this site would encroach into the open countryside and result in an extension of the village. It was not considered appropriate to include sites under construction in the SAP DPD.
For the attention of Mrs M Parr

Dear Sirs,

**SAP Examination – Possible Allocation Sites**

In response to your request for further information in respect of the above, please find comments of the local highway authority relating to the following sites:

**Sites General**

- **GGON05**
  Comments remain as previously stated

- **LB05**
  Comments remain as previously stated

- **LB16**
  Error in text. Please substitute “south” for “north”

- **LB18**
  Comments remain the same as previous

- **BAST02**
  Add into text “vehicular” after “Direct”

- **BOUR17**
  Looking at my file, it looks as if no comments were made in respect of this site (?). However, there are concerns relating to the access with no adequate direct link to the public highway

- **ADD2**
  Comments remain as previously stated

- **ADD11**
  Comments remain as previously. Note: There are current grants of Permission for some development

- **ADD26**
  Comments as previous, but add “Potential drainage issues to overcome for the larger site over and above that granted permission”

- **ADD41**
  Comments remain as previously stated

- **Aveland High**
  Comments remain as previously stated
BIL05 Comments remain as previous

BIL06 Comments remain as previous

RUT1 Within bounds of Rutland. Careful consideration required due to potential additional demands on Stamford services and infrastructure

Land at Kettering Rd., Stamford

STAM05 Planning Application (Current football ground) supported by local highway authority subject to mitigating works.

Other Sites and Comments

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

Stamford Sites

STAM 14 & 16b Combined

The individual and combined sites as outlined have no obvious connection to the public highway and either a single or two direct links to Ryhall Road to the west is likely to be unacceptable in highway terms due to the existing nature of occupied development, infrastructure and constraints.
Would require improved links to Uffington Road or north to Ryhall Road or more likely both, subject to detail, land availability and a Transport Assessment to an agreed Scope to determine the affects on the wider network.

Any benefits from removing some north/south-east movements away from Ryhall Road/Uffington Road/St Pauls Street junction and the town centre may be negated by the size of the proposal and associated trip generation therefrom.

STAM 15, 16 & 17 Combined

The outlines on the plans provided indicate that there is no obvious connection to the public highway off A16 Uffington Road without the acquisition of further land to the east of Newstead Road to avoid the cluster of buildings/dwellings that sit outside the south east corner of site STAM15. Without this, a suitable connection is unlikely to be acceptable to take the anticipated traffic generated from the combined or individual proposal.

A full Transport assessment to an agreed Scope would be required.

That said, and without the benefit of a full link to the A1, and whilst the town centre may see some relief from north/south-east movements (as for STAM14 & 16b), a shorter link to service the site(s) - A16 Uffington Road to Ryhall Road will likely be to the overall detriment of traffic movements and capacity through Stamford which affords little opportunity for improvement.

I hope the above is of some assistance.

Should you wish to discuss this matter, do not hesitate to contact Chris Tidswell at the above number

Yours faithfully

C B Tidswell

For Nigel Simons
Highways Support Manager
### APPENDIX 6: SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR ALLOCATED SITES

#### BIODIVERSITY
- To protect and enhance the District's Flora
- To protect and enhance the District's Fauna
- To ensure that development is located on the most appropriate sites in relation to the development strategy

#### BROWNFIELD / GREENFIELD
- To protect and enhance the District's Natural Assets and Biodiversity
- To protect and enhance the District's Flora
- To protect and enhance the District's Fauna
- To ensure that development is located on the most appropriate sites in relation to the development strategy

#### SOIL
- To conserve soil resources and quality

#### WATER
- To maintain air quality within the district
- To manage prudently the natural resources of the district to reduce vulnerability to flooding
- To minimise energy usage through sustainable design and development
- To minimise waste and encourage recycling and reuse of waste

#### CLIMATIC FACTORS
- To protect and enhance the District's cultural, built and archaeological heritage
- To enhance and conserve the environment of the district through sustainable design and development
- To maintain / enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the District's Landscape Character Areas

#### MATERIAL ASSETS
- To protect and enhance the District's cultural, built and archaeological heritage
- To enhance and conserve the environment of the district through sustainable design and development

#### CULTURAL HERITAGE
- To maintain / enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the District's Landscape Character Areas

#### LANDSCAPE
- To protect and enhance the District's Natural Assets and Biodiversity
- To protect and enhance the District's Flora
- To protect and enhance the District's Fauna
- To ensure that development is located on the most appropriate sites in relation to the development strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>BIODIVERSITY</th>
<th>BROWNFIELD / GREENFIELD</th>
<th>SOIL</th>
<th>WATER</th>
<th>CLIMATIC FACTORS</th>
<th>MATERIAL ASSETS</th>
<th>CULTURAL HERITAGE</th>
<th>LANDSCAPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former Aveland School Site, Birthorpe Road, Billingborough</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Site formerly in use as school
- No known protected species
- Site already developed
- LSC reduces need to travel by private car
- Not in floodzone
- EN4 requires energy efficient measures
- No known archaeological remains
- EN1 & EN4 require these measures
- Development must be related to that of the surrounding area - area within the Fen Margin, which is an area of Low Medium

#### KEY
- ✔️: Compatible objectives
- ✔+: Partially compatible
- ❌: Incompatible
- ✓: No relationship
- ?: Uncertain
## Appendix 6: Sustainability Assessment Framework for Allocated Sites

### Former Aveland School Site, Birthorpe Road, Billingborough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL FAIR AND HEALTHY COMMUNITIES</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>TRANSPORT</th>
<th>CONCLUSIONS</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 that the housing needs of the community are met, in particular the affordable housing requirements.</td>
<td>To facilitate the provision of recreational facilities for all.</td>
<td>To improve accessibility to jobs and services by increasing the use of public transport, walking and cycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to community safety by encouraging good design.</td>
<td>To facilitate improved health provision where appropriate.</td>
<td>To facilitate the development of new technology to support a modern economic infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To facilitate the provision of recreational facilities for all.</td>
<td>To encourage employment opportunities for all.</td>
<td>To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To facilitate improved health provision where appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- ✓: Site suitable for residential use.
- n/a: Not applicable.

May be suitable for residential use. The site comprises the former school buildings and land immediately adjacent. (The whole site includes playing fields and other undeveloped land). The Highway Authority state that residential use is unlikely to increase the traffic impact of the site. Development of the brownfield part of the site could provide community benefit, in addition to houses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Size</th>
<th>S106 Agreement</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S106 agreement could provide recreational facilities.</td>
<td>n/a residential</td>
<td>n/a residential</td>
<td>n/a residential</td>
<td>n/a residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To facilitate the development of new technology to support a modern economic infrastructure. To improve the social and environmental performance of the economy. To improve accessibility to jobs and services by increasing the use of public transport, walking and cycling.