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1 Introduction

1.1 This Hearing Statement has been prepared by David Bainbridge MRTPI, Partner in the Planning Division of Bidwells on behalf of Larkfleet Limited.

1.2 This Statement has been submitted to the Examination into the South Kesteven Site Allocation and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD). In particular this Statement responds directly to the Issues raised by the Planning Inspector in advance of the opening of the Hearing Sessions on 6 November 2012.

1.3 It is acknowledged that there is no need for participants in the Examination to prepare hearing statements where relevant points are already covered in the original representations.

1.4 Bidwells on behalf of Larkfleet Limited have participated fully in the preparation of the DPD as listed below however the issues raised by the Planning Inspector give rise to the requirement for comment as contained in this Statement.

1.5 Bidwells on behalf of Larkfleet Limited have participated in the following stages of preparation of the DPD.

- Responses submitted in respect of Proposed Main Modifications Consultation, July 2012.
- Responses submitted in respect of Submission Publication Stage, November 2011.
- Responses submitted in respect of Additional Sites Consultation, October 2010.

1.6 This Statement responds to the relevant Issues laid down by the Planning Inspector in respect of Session 7: LSC Allocations. Where there is no response to an Issue this is because it is not considered relevant for example where the Planning Inspector has posed questions primarily intended for the Council to respond to.

1.7 This Statement does not exceed the 3,000 word limit.
2  **Question: Selection of LSCs**

2.1  Response: Three of the sites currently identified for residential development under Policy LSC1 appear to have been selected in part or mostly on the basis of additional benefits to the local community beyond the provision of up to 35 affordable housing on-site and open space/play provision i.e. LSC1b, LSC1c and LSC1e.

2.2  Policy LSC1 does not require or guarantee delivery of the additional benefits to the local community. If the Council considers these additional benefits outweigh some or all of the constraints/concerns about residential development on these sites then policy should make it clear exactly how and when the additional benefits will be delivered relative to delivery of the residential development.

**Policy LSC1 Sites**

3  **Question: LSC1a Should the policy impose restrictions in terms of building heights?**  217

3.1  Response: Site LSC1a at Barrowby is in an especially exposed location with only development on the east side. The site is not accessible to the centre of the village. There is support by the Parish Council, who is the landowner, and therefore the practical means of delivering the site for development has to be questioned. In addition, given its location the attractiveness of this site to developers and housebuilders is highly questionable.

4  **Question: LSC1c Should the phasing of the site be brought forward?**  133

4.1  Site LSC1c at Corby Glen is in an even more exposed and prominent location with only building on the opposite (west) side of the road. This is the changing rooms for the sports ground and hence the nearest existing residential is remote from the site being further north along Swinstead Road. The additional community benefit stated for this site is the provision of a pedestrian and cycle link to Bourne Road (A151), however the proposed site allocation does not include sufficient land to make this physical connection and even if it did there is little benefit in the connection due to the remoteness of the site. If the connection is capable of being made then this would appear likely to connect to the south of the fire station on Bourne Road. This will require extension of the 30 mph speed limit which does not appear to have been assessed. The policy does not state provision of a pedestrian and cycle link from the site along Swinstead Road northwards which must be a requirement given that the existing footway along the east side of the carriageway does not extend along the frontage of the site and it is currently sub-standard. In addition, the site frontage to Swinstead Road is partially within national speed limit and hence access details should be considered.
5  Question: LSC1d Should the Policy impose restrictions in terms of building heights and boundary planting? 217

5.1 Site LSC1d at Great Gonerby is also visually prominent with a pronounced slope downwards from west of the site towards the south east corner.
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