



# AGENDA

## CABINET

**MONDAY, 4 DECEMBER 2006**

**11.00 AM**

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, ST PETERS HILL,  
GRANTHAM**

Duncan Kerr, Chief Executive

<b>CABINET MEMBERS:</b>	Councillor Mrs. Linda Neal (Leader/ Portfolio: Strategic Partnerships & Community Safety), Councillor Ray Auger (Portfolio: Healthy Environment), Councillor Teri Bryant (Portfolio: Resources & Assets), Councillor Paul Carpenter (Deputy Leader & Portfolio: Access and Engagement), Councillor Mrs Frances Cartwright (Portfolio: Organisational Development & Housing) and Councillor John Smith (Portfolio: Economic Development)
-----------------------------	---

Cabinet Support Officer:	Jo Toomey 01476 406152 e-mail: <a href="mailto:j.toomey@southkesteven.gov.uk">j.toomey@southkesteven.gov.uk</a>
-----------------------------	--

**Members of the public are entitled to attend the meeting of the Cabinet at which key decisions will be taken on the issues listed on the following page. Key decisions are marked \*.**

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| <b>1.</b> | <b>LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: SUMMARY OF PREFERRED OPTIONS FOR CORE STRATEGY - CONSULTATION RESPONSES, SUMMER 2006</b><br>Report PLA627 by the Economic Development Portfolio Holder.<br><div style="text-align: right;">(Attached)</div> |
|-----------|---|

## REPORT TO CABINET

REPORT OF: ECONOMIC PORTFOLIO HOLDER

REPORT NO.: PLA627

DATE: 4<sup>th</sup> December 2006

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: SUMMARY OF PREFERRED OPTIONS FOR CORE STRATEGY – CONSULTATION RESPONSES, SUMMER 2006</b>
<b>FORWARD PLAN ITEM:</b>	YES
<b>DATE WHEN FIRST APPEARED IN FORWARD PLAN:</b>	17 AUGUST 2005
<b>KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:</b>	KEY DECISION

<b>COUNCIL AIMS/PORTFOLIO HOLDER NAME AND DESIGNATION:</b>	Councillor John Smith Economic Development
<b>CORPORATE PRIORITY:</b>	Town Centre Regeneration (A) Affordable Housing (A) Planning and Conservation (M)
<b>CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS:</b>	Minor
<b>FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT IMPLICATIONS:</b>	All LDF documents are made available on the Council's web site when published, and are made available for public inspection at the District Council's offices and the local libraries in the district

<b>INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>Carried out and appended to report?</b>  No	<b>Full impact assessment required?</b>
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS:</b>	Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 PPS12: Local Development Frameworks Lincolnshire Structure Plan (Revised Deposit Draft) RSS8: Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands to 2021 Letter from GOEM 11 <sup>th</sup> April 2005 Letter from PINs 13 <sup>th</sup> April 2005 Letter from DCLG 11 <sup>th</sup> August 2006 Cabinet reports and minutes dated 24 <sup>th</sup> November 2004, 7 <sup>th</sup> February 2005, 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2005, 9 <sup>th</sup> May 2005, 6 <sup>th</sup> June 2005, 5 <sup>th</sup> September 2005, 10 <sup>th</sup> October 2005, 6 <sup>th</sup> January 2006 and 3 <sup>rd</sup> April 2006	

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Public consultation on the Issues and Options for Future Development in South Kesteven took place in late 2005. The Issues and Options paper was the first formal stage when the community was invited to become involved in the preparation of policies and identification of land for development for the emerging Local Development Framework (LDF). A total of 259 responses were received, and helped shaped the development of preferred options for addressing key issues facing the district for the next two decades.
- 1.2 Two preferred options reports were published for public consultation on 26 June for six weeks until 7 August 2006: the Core Strategy and the Housing and Economic Development Plan Document. Approximately 250 copies of both documents were sent out to statutory consultees, a further 550 letters were posted out to parties registered on our database to inform them of the consultation exercise, documents were made available at libraries in the district and were available on request, all documentation was available on the internet, and three workshops were held for the public and agents to which a total of 60 people attended.
- 1.3 Over 220 responses were made in total during the consultation period (90 of which specifically related to the Core Strategy); these comments have now been registered and input onto a database. The comments made about the Core Strategy during this consultation are included in a separate document Appendix 1: LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Consultation Responses, which will be available to Members in the Members Lounge from Monday 27<sup>th</sup> November 2006 (and will be posted on the councils' website at the same time). These comments have been used to help inform the Revised Preferred Options being presented to Cabinet on 4<sup>th</sup> December under a separate report (Report No: PLA 626).

## **2. RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 That Members note the comments made about the Core Strategy Preferred Options during public consultation in Summer 2006 (see separate report Appendix 1: LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Responses which will be available from Monday 27<sup>th</sup> November in the Members Lounge and on the councils' website) and recognise that, where applicable, these comments have been used in the preparation of the revised Preferred Options for the Core Strategy, which will be published for public consultation in early 2007.**

## **3. DETAILS OF REPORT**

- 3.1** The Core Strategy Preferred Options Report was published by the council for public consultation on 26 June for six weeks. 90 responses were received from the public, developers, charities, public bodies, and other stakeholders during the consultation period. The response received from the Government Office for the East Midlands suggested that they, and the Planning Inspectorate, had concerns regarding the manner in which the options were presented for public consultation. This concern emanated from the recent experience of the first examinations nationally into LDF Core Strategies at Lichfield and Stafford.
- 3.2** Following completion of the preferred options consultation, the council was intending to move directly to the production and publication of the submission drafts of both the Core Strategy and the Housing and Economic Development Plan Document in November 2006. However, as a result of the comments received, a revised LDF structure and timetable has been agreed in principle by Cabinet (Report No. PLA615) that will result in the Core Strategy being prepared separately and in advance of a Site Specific Allocations DPD and a Development Control DPD. All documents will need to go through the "preferred options" consultation stage again, providing greater detail about alternative options considered and why these options are not the council's preferred option.
- 3.3** Many of those who submitted their representations during the summer have been concerned that their efforts may be wasted as a result of this change. However the responses received have been used to help formulate the revised Preferred Options being presented to Cabinet under a separate report (Report No: PLA 626). Whilst it must be recognised that not all the comments received will have resulted in a changed approach, many points have been acted upon, either within the options considered or in the justification for them. This is particularly the case for the many people who suggested that the Draft Regional Plan (RSS) figures should be used rather than those in the recently adopted Lincolnshire Structure Plan. This has resulted in a fundamental change to the approach for housing, employment and retail development within the revised Core Strategy Preferred Options report, to be published for public consultation in early 2007.
- 3.4** As part of consultation on the revised Core Strategy Preferred Options report early in the new year, the Council will invite consultees that responded to the original Preferred Options consultation in Summer 2006 to submit further comments about the options that have altered. However, if consultees are

happy with their original response then their comments will simply be carried forward.

#### **4. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND ASSESSED**

- 4.1 The alternative approach would be to disregard the comments received in response to the consultation held in the summer and rely upon comments made when the preferred options stage is repeated next year. As the preferred options stage is to be repeated this would not present any technical issues relating to the statutory process set out in the regulations. However it must be recognised that many people have spent time and money reading and commenting upon the documents in order to inform us of their views. In these circumstances it would be inappropriate and unreasonable for the Council to disregard what consultees had said. The object of public involvement in the LDF process is to gauge public opinion of policies as they are being developed to involve the community in shaping policies and therefore ensure that the final policies have a degree of public support/consensus.

#### **5. COMMENTS OF SECTION 151 OFFICER**

- 5.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

#### **6. COMMENTS OF MONITORING OFFICER**

- 6.1 No Monitoring Officer comments.

#### **7. COMMENTS OF OTHER RELEVANT SERVICE MANAGER**

- 7.1 N/A

#### **8. CONCLUSION/SUMMARY**

- 8.1 This report considers the comments made about the Core Strategy when it was published for consultation in the summer. The comments received about the documents will be made available in a separate report, which will be available from Monday 27<sup>th</sup> November 2006. The comments received have been used to inform the development of revised Preferred Options for the Core Strategy, which will be published for consultation early in the new year.

#### **9. CONTACT OFFICER**

- 9.1 Mark Harrison  
Planning Policy Manager  
01476 406438  
m.harrison@southkesteven.gov.uk

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mrs C Curtis			Support with conditions	A good idea to build where there is a rail link as well as bus link to ease traffic congestion.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Support with conditions	We have severe concerns regarding the scale fo housing development in Bourne and its effect on the sustainability of the overall community, a seperate statement on this will be submitted.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr B Thompson	Williamson Cliff Ltd		Object	<p>We formally object to the policy on the grounds that Brownfield sites which help maintain and support the role of the market town of Stamford should have a higher priority than Greenfield sites and town extensions in Grantham. Whilst it is accpted that the majority of new future housing development should be directed to the sub-regional centre of Grantham. If the Core Strategy is to be accepted as sound, the overall spatial strategy of the district needs to be sustainable and conducive to the creation of sustainable communties, taking account where necessary, of issues in neighbouring regions likely to impact upon the district. In this respect, there is an apparent inconsistency between the preferred sequence of development throughout the district at option 1 and the apparent moratorium on further development outside of Grantham, as expressed on page 9 of the Housing and Economic DPD Preferred Options. The inference of this inconsistency between DPD's (which itself fails a test of soundness) is that greenfield sites both within and on the periphery of Grantham are sequentially preferable to brownfield sites at other locations, irrespective of whether they have better accessibility to public transport modes and services. this represents an all or nothing strategy, where future delivery is likely to be compromised if the local housing market at Grantham reaches saturation.</p> <p>Furthermore, the strategy appears blind to the major growth happening south of Stamford in the Cambridge Sub-Region, which is directing very major housing growth to Petreborough. The combination of a moratorium on further development in Stamford, with massive growth in Peterborough, will have the effect of drawing new households and younger workers out of the south of the district, to the further detriment of the vitality and viability of the town. The correct spatial strategy to adopt is to focus new develoment at both Grantham and Stamford in sequentially preferable locations, in the order specified, for example, capitalising on previously used land at the northen periphery of Stamford, via a combined Area Action Plan with the neighbouring authority. In summary, less sustainable greenfield locations should not be prioritised in Grantham over more sustainable brownfield locations bordering the Cambridge Sub-Region, as to do so is not conducive to a district-wide sustainable spatial strategy and would not give the Plan the inherent flexibiltiy it needs to meet the relevant test of soundness.</p>
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr J Coleman	William Davis Ltd		Support with conditions	We support the emphasis placed upon Grantham as the focus for the majority of new deveopment. This is consistent with both the extant Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS8) and its emerging Review. It is important that the Core Strategy fully acknowledges the emphasis in RSS8 on Grantham's role as a Sub-Regional Centre being supported and STRENGTHENED. This is a meassage already contained in RSS8 although emerging papers for the Review of the Regional Plan have referred to a need for "significanlty strengthening" the sub-regional role of the town. This strategy is contrasted with that for Stamford and the other smaller towns. These towns do not have the status of 'Sub Regional Centres' and where the emphasis must be on a proportionally lower level of development as required to maintain and enhance the existing roles of these towns in line with Policy 7 of RSS8. We further support the policy preference for sequential consideration of development proposals for Grantham separate to the sequence to be followed in the other towns. It would be contrary to the RSS spatial strategy to consider all brownfield sites (i.e. those outside of Grantham) before proceeding to the next level of the sequence, as it would potentially direct the Core Strategy away from Grantham as the prime focus for development.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr N Pike	English Nature		Support with conditions	Support caveated by the fact that brownfield development should be compatible with other core policies (Biodiversity, for example)
Preferred Option 1:	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Object	Support sequential development but think restrictions proposed for rural areas will be too

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Sequential Development in South Kesteven					severe and unfair on rural communities.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr M Richardson			Support with conditions	Consideration should be given to 3 & 4 bedroom developments in the countryside for families. Not too much emphasis on flats. Areas in the countryside also allow for recreational sport and this should be encouraged as part of diversification.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr T Bladon			Object	It is advocated in this option that new development will be permitted in the 14 local service centres identified on the key diagram. Of those centres identified, five have no public transport to serve their communities. In the light of Objective 4 "Accessibility and Travel" and 3.2 "Sustainable Communities" it would seem that these communities cannot achieve improved accessibility to jobs, houses and services by the reduction of traffic growth and / or by the use of public transport, walking or cycling. There is no proposal contained in this option as to how public transport will be made available for these communities in order for them to fulfil the requirements of the above objectives. Option 1.3.5 also emphasises the need for the reduction in travel. In the case of Rippingale there is no regular daily form of public transport to enable residents to dispense with the need for the use of their cars to travel to Peterborough, Bourne, Stamford or Grantham in order to reach their place of work or to shop. It would be foolhardy and dangerous to attempt to walk or cycle to Bourne along the busy A15 road, carrying some 6,000 vehicles per day, because there is no footpath or cycle track alongside this road until reaching Morton. There are no employment opportunities in the village and only a primary school which is currently the subject of possible closure by the County Council. Should there be a natural or manmade emergency preventing travel, the village shop would be unable to cope with the daily needs of some 800 residents.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Councillor D Nalson			Support with conditions	Any new development in Stamford should be strictly controlled.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr C Blackman	Cambridgeshire County Council		Object	Housing at Stamford and the Deepings. There is a possible conflict between Preferred Option 1, with a sequential approach that refers to appropriate town extension sites in Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings, and Preferred Option 4, which says that allocations will only be made in these towns if it becomes apparent that existing commitments are unlikely to be delivered. The latter is supported by Paragraph 3.21 stating that an alternative option (not supported) would have been to identify urban extensions, but this would not conform to Core Policy 1 (Preferred Option 1?). There appears to be some contradiction here or, at the least, a lack of clarity which needs remedying.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support with conditions	Sequential development: agreed The only question to implementing what is in effect a central government policy is what is meant in Stamford by appropriate town extension sites? more information would be needed on the specifics of this before useful comment could be made.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Miss H Edwards	British Waterways		Object	Preferred Option 1 Sequential Development in South Kesteven The proposed wording does not reflect the exception being proposed in Preferred Option 32, E13: Visitor Management of the Housing and Economic Development DPD. We therefore suggest that in the other villages and the countryside section an additional exception should be made to the general policy of restraint. Proposals acceptable in the countryside should also include those supported by policies in other Development Plan Documents. As these are likely to be very specific exceptions related to non-footloose assets such as waterways we also suggest that this should come after the text on less sustainable options.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Jacob Newby	Environment Agency		Support with conditions	PO1 The SA recommends the inclusion of areas at risk of flooding as part of the sequential test used here. Whilst we do support the use of the sequential test we feel that it may be better applied as part of a specific option relating to flood risk, which we discuss under PO12.
Preferred Option 1:	Miss E C Biott	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust		Observations	It may not be appropriate to develop some brownfield sites because habitats important

## Report of Consultation Responses Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Sequential Development in South Kesteven					for nature conservation may have developed on the land. In recognition of this 'appropriate' should be inserted before brownfield to read 'Appropriate brownfield sites within the built up part of the town/settlements'.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Support with conditions	Put housing near employment opportunities.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr C J Townson			Support	
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Cllr A Pelling			Object	Greenfield sites should only be used as an absolute last resort. Support should be given to help prevent such sites becoming 'underused'. The proposed option may actually encourage landowners to 'underuse' Greenfield sites, so that they may then gain planning approval for development.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Miss H Mawson	The Home Builders Federation		Object	The HBF acknowledge that the strategy aims to concentrate development within the urban areas. However, the strategy must also recognise that the provision of market housing is fundamental to the success of rural areas. For example: Economic prosperity is synonymous with the provision of market housing, a potential consequence of not providing rural market housing is that the rural economy will decline which would result in an unsustainable and unviable community; Market housing is the predominant delivery vehicle for affordable housing, particularly in rural areas. Therefore, without a significant proportion of market housing, issues of affordability will worsen further; Advances in ICT are enabling more home working opportunities. This is conducive to sustainable development and should be encouraged. Therefore more market housing attributed to this sector should be considered. In terms of the sequential approach, this method of site identification is flawed. The emerging PPS3 advocates site analysis through the sustainability test. For example, it may be more sustainable to develop a PDL site in a rural area over a greenfield site in an urban area. Preferred Option 1 should be revised to reflect this.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support	
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Support with conditions	Provided mainly in Grantham as proposed.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Ms J Young	Heritage Lincolnshire		Support with conditions	Development of brownfield sites within the historic core of the towns and villages does have the potential to impact upon buried archaeological remains. However, these sites are generally preserved beneath a certain amount of post-medieval build up/demolition material/reclamation and therefore in some cases mitigation measures can be put in place to minimise impact and achieve preservation in-situ. In contrast, in rural areas, archaeological remains are generally just below the topsoil and it is more difficult to achieve preservation in-situ. In these cases, archaeological excavation and recording may be required, which is in itself destructive. Therefore, identified Sequential Development sites should take into account page 15 of RSS8: Policy 3: Sustainability Criteria" an assessment will be required of the impact development of sites will have on the regions cultural assets Ref to conversion of buildings" in line with Policy 31 of RSS8
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Ann Plackett	English Heritage		Observations	Option 1: Sequential Development " As the nationally important historic town of Stamford is also proposed as a development location, the effect of development on the town could be significant, in terms of the potential impact on archaeology, historic landscape and urban character and the setting of historic assets. Limited development within villages could nevertheless affect their character. Assuming that development will not directly affect designated sites, mitigation would include appropriate archaeological assessment and evaluation in order to inform the appropriate conservation strategy, the use of characterisation, e.g. conservation area appraisals, to inform development decisions and the use of development briefs to guide the design of development on sensitive sites.
Preferred Option 1:	Ann Plackett	English Heritage		Object	Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven Objection It should be



## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Sequential Development in South Kesteven					made clear that the development of brownfield sites also includes the reuse of vacant and underused buildings. This approach is supported by PPG 15 with respect to listed buildings and vacant premises over shops (paragraphs 3.8-3.11 and 4.11) and Policy 31 of RSS8 with respect to the reuse of historic buildings generally. Recommendation That point 1. under Grantham and Stamford etc is amended to: 'Brownfield sites and buildings'
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mrs S Murray	The Countryside Agency		Support with conditions	The option accords with national guidance regarding the sequential approach to the use of land. CAR fully supports the emphasis on the reuse of previously developed land as the most sustainable option for future development. However, there is always more detailed consideration required in terms of landscape, biodiversity and access to wild spaces, which are those where people can experience nature, a feeling of being in a natural place and remove themselves from an otherwise urban environment. It is important to note that PPS3 specifically excludes the following from previously developed land that should be used to meet the new brownfield' housing targets: land that was previously developed but where remains of any structure or activity have blended into the landscape in the process of time (to the extent that it can reasonably be considered as part of the natural surroundings), and where there is a clear reason that could outweigh the re-use of the site 'such as its contribution to nature conservation.' It is recommended that, in order to achieve challenging targets for the use of previously developed land whilst also ensuring that valuable assets are not lost, a brownfield audit is undertaken in the borough, to assess the value of sites in terms of their contribution to the local landscape, local biodiversity and people's access to wild spaces. It is likely that, as a local authority intending to use predominantly previously developed land for new development, a brownfield potential study or urban potential study will need to be undertaken and regularly updated. An assessment of any site's contribution to nature conservation, local landscape and accessible natural greenspace can be included in this assessment and its updates. In order to consider whether any greenfield sites can be released for development, the local authority must ensure it has the relevant baseline information to make sound decisions on land allocations. Landscape Character Assessments are an important tool for the new Local Development Framework process. Once the landscape characteristics are better understood, specific allocations that are proven necessary in greenfield land can be informed by the landscape sensitivity and environmental capacity of an area. The restrictions to development in all other villages and countryside' needs further consideration. Any of the types of development considered acceptable' have the potential to be damaging to the local environment. It is advised that equine development can be very visually intrusive, out-of-keeping and damaging to local landscape character, and its inclusion in the acceptable list is therefore questioned. Unless this list is expanded to include sustainable access and recreation in more general terms, there is no reason why equine development should be considered acceptable over other developments not listed, which may be far less damaging to the local landscape. If a local farm intends to diversify to provide horse riding or stabling facilities, this can be considered under the general banner of 'rural diversification projects' referred to later in the policy option. CAR therefore advise that either equine development is removed or the term is replaced with a more general reference.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr M S Herbert	Brown & Co		Object	The plan is premature and should be postponed until the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) is finalised. It is inappropriate to formulate policies now which are unlikely to be consistent with the RSS and which will determine the overriding planning policies to be implemented by SKDC for the period to 2026.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Barbara Robinson	Fulbeck Parish Council		Object	We object to the restriction on "less sustainable" villages. Fulbeck Parish Council understands the sustainability principle which SKDC has adopted, which means that the bulk of new residential development will be located in Grantham, Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings. However we strongly oppose the extension of this principle to virtually rule out any development in so called less sustainable villages such as Fulbeck. In the past infill planning applications have been allowed and we fail to understand and do not accept the necessity for the draconian measure of restricting development in the future. The number of available sites would, in no material way, result in any over provision of

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					homes in the District.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Ms J Bateman			Object	I do not support this presumption to develop and strongly question the targets set by government.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mrs S Roberts			Support with conditions	Grantham should be the main site for any new developments, Bourne and other towns should have no new developments other than those already planned as this will lead to excess of housing needs.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust		Support with conditions	We are pleased to see Objective 1 on page 10 to facilitate a pattern of development that will meet the cultural needs of the community.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Object	It is unclear how underused greenfield sites' in Grantham (and the 3 market towns) will be identified, or indeed that it has been shown that there is more than adequate greenspace within these settlements at present. In accordance with the sequential approach set out in RSS8 (Policy 2) brownfield sites in other settlements should be given greater priority. In the second set of bullets under 2 refer to'...in the three market towns...' for clarity.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Cholmely Settlements	Savills		Support with conditions	Our clients support the supporting text, but it is considered that the text should also state the national planning policy stresses the importance of the countryside being a place where people live and work and that new development in settlements can ensure a better and more sustainable way of living.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Object	Focus on development in Grantham might lead to a withering of services in and around the south of the district, causing an increased need to travel to Grantham (confounding the environmental assessment), thus negating the desire to minimise the impact of travel in the environment.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Marston Parish Council	Marston Parish Council		Support with conditions	But should be more flexibility in rural areas for small scale new development.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr J Judge			Support with conditions	Support but concerned about intensification of housing to above a maximum 30 per Hectare, I consider sufficient for comfortable living standards.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr A Clark			Object	Whilst sequential development in urban areas is fine the restrictions proposed for rural areas is unfair to rural communities and will potentially desimate the smaller villages.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Councillor J Judge	Stamford Town Council		Support with conditions	Support but feel much more than 30-35 houses per hectare will not give residents space to enjoy their properties and social provision ie halls for all to use.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr P R Tame	National Farmers Union		Object	A slight objection in criteria c) i) modern farm buidlings can be reused for non farming purposes. will c) i) preclude this? If it does can the text be altered to allow suitable reuses outside of agriculture.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr S Pease	Ancer Spa	Ancer Spa	Object	Option 1 places too much emphasis on the development of Grantham and that would be to the detriment of the properly planned growth of other sustainable town locations such as Stamford. By focussing development on one location, this option restricts housing choice and so is contrary to Government Policy PPG3 that states that the aim is to provide a choice of sites which are both suitable and avialable for house building. The Government set out its vision for sustainable communities in 'Sustainable Communities Building for the Future' stating that planning should create communities 'where people want to live and which will enable people to meet their aspirations and potential'. Therefore the previously identified option set out in the earlier 'Isuses and Options paper and referred to in para 3.8 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options document, is generally supported as it is more realistic in relation to accommodating housing choice and where people actually want to live. Option 1 is too negative in its apprach, being reactive and control orientate. Instead there should be more recognition that properly planned mixed-use town extension sites, whether bronwfield, greenfield or a combination of both can make a significant positive contribution to the sustainable revitalisation of the economy of towns ensuring that they are maintained as true sustainable communities for the long

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					term. Such extensions should comprise a balance of housing and employment and this will help to ensure that the devleopment in these locations does not lead to an increase in out-commuting. Such extensions can help to facilitate the infrastructure and facilities that a town badly needs but cannot be funded by the public sector alone. E.g. town bypasses, education and health facilities. Option 1 appears to support 'town cramming', directing development to 'underused greenfield sites' in towns. further clarification is required of exactly which sites fall into this category. It may be that they should be retained in open space and community use through more postive planning policies and proposals. It is likely that properly planned mixed-use town extension sites will make a better contribution to maintaining, enhancing and developing the character and sustainability fo the towns in question. For the above reasons the following alternative option for sequential development in Kesteven is proposed: 1. Brownfield sites in Grantham, Stamford, Bourne and Deepings 2. Mixed-use town extension sites in Grantham, Stamford, Burne and the Deepings and other appropriate local service centres.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr J Easter	Humberts	Humberts	Object	Concentration of development in Grantham will frustrate genuine opportunities elsewhere and is inconsistent with the inclusion in the key diagram of A1 corridor opportunity areas.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr J Easter	Humberts	Humberts	Support with conditions	Support concentration on Brownfield sites in Grantham but with reservations abut the consequent embargo elsewhere.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr J Easter	Humberts	Humberts	Support with conditions	Support concentration in Grantham but oppose the presumption in favour of brownfield sites when there is an acknowledged shortage of industrial land in the area.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr A Evans	CgMs	CgMs	Support with conditions	Preferred Option 1 Given the policy background as outlined in Government Guidance and Regional Policy, it is noted that we support the incorporation of the Sequential' process for guiding the location of new development within South Kesteven. Government Policy within the recently adopted PPS1 and within PPG3 and subsequent revisions, state that preference for new development should be given to land within existing urban areas that has been previously developed and that this should take priority over land which has not been developed. Accordingly, reference to this approach within the Core Strategy document is entirely consistent with national guidance and should be retained. Given that Grantham is designated as a sub-regional centre, priority for new development should take place within its environs, and this is also highlighted within the Core Strategy. However, the reference to the Sequential Approach within Preferred Option 1 is considered to be somewhat general as it does not distinguish varying types of development. In particular, there is no reference to development that is not appropriately located within the urban area or on previously developed land. For example, some development associated with modern B1/B2/B8 facilities is incompatible with the historical urban layout and pattern of development and is ideally suited to an out-of-centre location. Accordingly, it is recommended that locational criteria for particular types of employment development are referred to within the sequential process outlined within Preferred Option 1. Reference to this is made within the Housing & Economic Development Plan Document, currently subject to public consultation, whereby it is stated Under Policy E4 (Preferred Option 23) that wherever possible the Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that new developments of higher density employment generators located within or adjacent to town centres, whilst directing lower density employers to appropriate edge and out of centre sites, either through the allocation of land or through the development control process. It is therefore recommended that Preferred Option 1 be amended in part, to read as follows: - Sequential Development in South Kesteven The majority of new development should be focused upon Grantham to support and strengthen its role as a Sub-Regional Centre. In Grantham the sequence for consideration of new development proposals is as follows: 1. Brownfield sites within the built up part of the town (with exceptions for certain types of employment development; refer to Housing & economic DPD Policy E4 for details); 2. Underused Greenfield sites

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					that are not identified and protected by other LDF Policies (including intensification of existing permitted sites); 3. Appropriate town extension sites; General support for the sequential process as outlined by Government guidance and regional policy , however, reference to locational criteria for types of employment (as preferred option 23 of the H & E DPD) is required. Given the policy background as outlined in Government Guidance and Regional Policy, it is noted that we support the incorporation of the Sequential process for guiding the location of new development within South Kesteven. Government Policy within the recently adopted PPS1 and within PPG3 and subsequent revisions, state that preference for new development should be given to land within existing urban areas that has been previously developed and that this should take priority over land which has not been developed. Accordingly, reference to this approach within the Core Strategy document is entirely consistent with national guidance and should be retained. Given that Grantham is designated as a sub-regional centre, priority for new development should take place within its environs, and this is also highlighted within the Core Strategy. However, the reference to the Sequential Approach within Preferred Option 1 is considered to be somewhat general as it does not distinguish varying types of development. In particular, there is no reference to development that is not appropriately located within the urban area or on previously developed land. For example, some development associated with modern B1/B2/B8 facilities is incompatible with the historical urban layout and pattern of development and is ideally suited to an out-of-centre location. Accordingly, it is recommended that locational criteria for particular types of employment development are referred to within the sequential process outlined within Preferred Option 1. Reference to this is made within the Housing & Economic Development Plan Document, currently subject to public consultation, whereby it is stated Under Policy E4 (Preferred Option 23) that wherever possible the Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that new developments of higher density employment generators located within or adjacent to town centres, whilst directing lower density employers to appropriate edge and out of centre sites, either through the allocation of land or through the development control process. It is therefore recommended that Preferred Option 1 be amended in part, to read as follows: - Sequential Development in South Kesteven The majority of new development should be focused upon Grantham to support and strengthen its role as a Sub-Regional Centre. In Grantham the sequence for consideration of new development proposals is as follows: 1. Brownfield sites within the built up part of the town (with exceptions for certain types of employment development; refer to Housing & economic DPD Policy E4 for details); 2. Underused Greenfield sites that are not identified and protected by other LDF Policies (including intensification of existing permitted sites); Appropriate town extension sites;
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mrs J Gardener	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Support with conditions	Having regard to national and regional planning policy, it is accepted that the focus of new development should be on Grantham to support and strengthen its role as a sub-regional centre. However Allison Homes Eastern welcomes the inclusion of Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings within the second part of the sequence for consideration of new development proposals as this will enable development to be provided, commensurate with the role of these three market towns, including on appropriate town extension sites. This will be essential if these towns are to be able to devleop as sustainable settlements providing the homes, jobs and services which their residents should be able to reasonably expect.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mrs J Gardener	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Support with conditions	Having regard to national and regional planning policy, it is appropriate for the focus of new devleopment to be on Grantham to support and strngthen its role as a sub-regional centre.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr P Frampton	Framptons	Framptons	Object	The option fails to recognise that in the villages, development may be acceptable that responds to a local comminty need - possibly identified through a Parish Plan. Such needs many not simply be confined to affordable housing and could include low cost market housing. Furthermore the local community may support new development as a means to secure environmental improvements to the village including the removal of inappropriate development by reason of siting, access, form and/or scale. The option

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					should allow for new development that responds to an identified local community need.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr M E Hendry	Bidwells	Bidwells	Support with conditions	The recognised need of the towns of Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings for development to support their roles as market towns is welcomed.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr J Parmiter			Support	
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr J Parmiter			Support	
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr N Gough	Bigwood Associates	Bigwood Associates	Support	
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr D M Rixson	Vincent and Gorbing Planning Associates	Vincent and Gorbing Planning Associates	Object	There should not be predetermination to favour grantham exclusively for housing allocations. Allocations should be made for Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings commensurate with size and role. The preferred option will skew the sequential choice of sites and be contrary to national planning guidance.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Object	We do not feel that some of the stated objectives are incorrect and again premature because of the announcement expected this Autumn on the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). We do not appear to have been invited to comment on the defined objectives which we feel should be refined to accord with the general position and sustainable representations made in respect of the Preferred Options. If the Plan is to proceed at this stage, it is inappropriate to identify development policies relating to Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings. There is no allocation to support the sequential approach to the towns in question. It is premature to make comment over these three centres until the RSS has been finalised. The first papers of substance are expected this September. If the RSS has been finalised. The first papers of substance are expected this September. If the RSS supports some growth in the market towns, the policies will become relevant again subject to restrictions on the numbers. It is also pertinent to the local service centres. Grantham must continue to be seen to be the major growth area. The Core Strategy document is premature and should be left until the Regional Plan has been finalised when strategies and allocations can be made which will accord with the RSS.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Object	The plan is premature and should be postponed until the Regional Spatial Strategy is finalised. It is inappropriate to formulate policies now which are unlikely to be consistent with the RSS and which will determine the overriding planning policies to be implemented by SKDC for the period to 2026.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support with conditions	this policy is supported so far as it relates to Grantham only and the support should not be interpreted therefore as an endorsement of the approach set out to other settlements.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr I Smith	Smiths Gore	Smiths Gore	Object	We do not agree with the current list of Local Service Centres and believe that Woolsthorpe by Belvoir should be classified as such. Woolsthorpe has a wide range of local facilities and its influence extends well beyond the South Kesteven boundary due to its geographical location. Given that development is proposed to be restricted to the four main settlements and just 15 Local Service Centres - the number of locations is very few in relation to the total number of settlements in the district. The only key facility which Woolsthorpe lacks is a primary school and that is because schools already exist in nearby Denton and Harlaxton. We do not agree with the approach to development in 'Other Villages and the Countryside'. This gives open countryside the same planning status as a village with a population of over 1,000 which seems an odd approach . We are unsure of any national guidance which supports that approach. In Planning Policy terms there must be a difference between true open countryside and reasonable sized rural settlements. Preferred Option 1 purports to be concerned with sequential development. Sequential development generally refers to the process of searching for housing land to be allocated in development plans. However, the second part of PO1 (villages and the coutryside) appears to be more concerned with development control

# Report of Consultation Responses

## Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					<p>matters - these are not really to do with the search sequence. The approach presented in PO1 indicates that there will be no development in any settlements below Local Service Centres apart from a limited range of exceptions. This is a very restrictive approach akin to that typically found in areas of Greenbelt or Areas of Outstanding natural beauty. Such an approach has implications for the continuation of rural services and facilities, the provision of much-needed rural affordable housing, house prices and the ability of the younger generation to establish their own households in the rural villages. It is far too restrictive an approach in our view and will result in a number of undesirable side effects. Given that the housing requirements in the Regional Spatial Strategy are not yet known - how can the Council be sure that this Preferred Option is appropriate for this planning period? it could well be that the RSS housing requirements is such that a very different approach to identifying housing land is required. At this point in time it cannot be certain that the Preferred Option is capable of meeting as yet unknown RSS housing requirements. Under 'All Other Villages and the Countryside' the policy is confusing where it says "and/or" makes it unclear as to which criteria are definitely applicable or are alternatives. For example, can a barn conversion to market housing be permitted or does it have to be for the uses listed under a). Considerably greater clarification is required here as the current wording is confusing.</p>
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr I Smith	Smiths Gore	Smiths Gore	Observations	<p>We act as managing agents for the Aslackby Estate which owns a considerable amount of land and property in and around Aslackby. We wish to make comments in relation to Preferred Option 1 as follows: We do not agree with the approach to development in 'other villages and the countryside'. This gives open countryside the same planning status as a village with a population of over 1,000 which seems an odd approach. We are unsure of any national guidance which supports that approach. In planning policy terms there must be a difference between true open countryside and reasonable sized rural settlements. Preferred Option 1 purports to be concerned with sequential development. Sequential development generally refers to the process of searching for housing land to be allocated in development plans. However, the second part of PO1 (villages and the Countryside) appears to be more concerned with development control matters - these are not really to do with the search sequence. The approach presented in PO1 indicates that there will be no development in any settlements below local service centres apart from a limited range of exceptions. This is a very restrictive approach akin to that typically found in areas of Green Belt or areas of outstanding natural beauty. Such an approach has implications for the continuation of rural services and facilities, the provision of much-needed rural affordable housing, house prices and the ability of the younger generation to establish their own households in the rural villages. It is far too restrictive an approach in our view and will result in a number of undesirable side effects. Given that the housing requirements in the Regional Spatial Strategy are not yet known. How can the Council be sure that this Preferred Option is appropriate for this planning period? it could well be that the RSS housing requirement is such that a very different approach to identifying housing land is required. At this point in time it cannot be certain that the Preferred Option is capable of meeting as yet unknown RSS housing requirements. Under 'All other villages and the countryside' the policy is confusing where it says 'and/or' below item a). Use of 'and/or' makes it unclear as to which criteria are definitely applicable or are alternatives. For example, can a barn conversion to market housing be permitted or does it have to be for the uses listed under a) considerably greater clarification is required here as the current wording is confusing.</p>
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr D Crofts	RPS Planning	RPS Planning	Support with conditions	<p>* The trust supports the approach in the first sentence of Preferred Option 1, that the majority of new development should be focussed upon Grantham to support and strengthen its role as a sub-regional centre. * The trust also supports in principle the sequential approach to development in Grantham which follows. However, the Council should consider two aspects of this. First, it should define "underused" in the supporting text which follows, since it might lead to a situation in which land on the urban fringe is deliberately neglected to increase its prospects for development. Secondly, and more importantly, the Council should consider whether it has actually applied this sequence in</p>

# Report of Consultation Responses

## Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					the consideration of suitable sites for employment uses. The sequential approach is not so much "particularly relevant" to housing development; there are simply more opportunities to find sites for housing on brownfield sites within the built up part of the town. * The third part of the sequence, "appropriate town extension sites", is broadly consistent with national guidance, but the implication of this phrase, and the guidance of PPG3, is that extensions to urban areas should be contiguous with existing urban areas. This is not the case with a number of the proposed allocations around Grantham. Site E1 (c) is detached from the main urban area although contiguous with existing devleopment. This applies also to site E15 depicted on the draft proposals map, which we assume is the same as site E1 (0) listed on page 41 fo the DPD. The council should ensure consistency in refernce numbers. Site E1 (b) can only be described as contiguous with the urban area on the basis that it adjoins the A1, on the other side of which lies existing development forming part of the urban area. However, the fact that it lies to the west of the A1 means that a defensible boundary is crossed, increasing the sprawl of the town. Site E15/E1(o) is both detached and outside a defensible boundary (in this case the Great North Road). * This clearly indicates that the Council has not applied its own principles in slecting sites for development. These comments should be read in conjunction with the representations on Preferred Option 20 in the Housing and Economy DPD.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	David Bainbridge	Bidwells	Bidwells	Object	I object to the wording of this preferred option, on similar grounds to the objections to Spatial Objective 2. The term "new development" can equally apply to housing as employment and hence would conflict with spatial objective 6. I recommend that it is made explicit that new housing growth will be directed to Grantham as per the sequential sequence 1 to 3. Clarification is required that only housing as subordonate components of redevelopment sites which present regeneration opportunities within the urban area will be considered or alternatively, limited greenfield development commensurate with any growth in employment opportunities. In particular, paragraph 3.7 should be amended to describe this position.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Object	The overall aspirations of the policy are supported. However, the requirement for only affordable housing (rural exception sites) in villages and the countryside will restrict the growth of rural settlements, inasmuch as it is often economically unviable for developers to supply 100% affordable housing sites. As the population ages and older people stay in their houses for longer, villages will require young families and new houses if the health of such settlements is to be retained. As such villages will inevitably grow over the next 15 years to 2021 and beyond. Only allowing rural exception sites for residential development in villages will place limits on their growth and longer-term viability.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Antony Aspbury Associates			Object	The comments made here are subject to the representations made in respect of Preferred Options 3 and 4 below with respect for the level of development provided for in the LDF. The proposed policy fails to pay adequate regard to the legitimate development needs of rural areas (including both housing and employment) over the whole period of the LDF. It is also inconsistent (or vice versa) with H&ED DPD PO5/H5. A substantial proportion of the District's population live in the 105 recognised villages, of which, 90 (94%) are do not by themselves meet the criteria to qualify as Local Service Centres. A more flexible and permissive approach is required to all rural settlements, both LSCs and 'Other Villages'. 'Sustainability' and the 'sequential approach' is interpreted too rigidly in the draft Core Strategy and particularly in PO1, with an excessive emphasis on urban concentration and the implicit assumption that development outside urban areas is, for the most part, intrinsically unsustainable. This is not the case. Sustainability is not an absolute, but a relative concept and, as PPS7 recognises, can still be achieved in rural areas, if not to the same level as in urban areas. Whilst it is recognised that there are at present a significant number of residential commitments in the rural areas relative to the Structure Plan distributional allocation, as these are taken up (at latest by 2011) supply will decline and this decline will not be compensated for by development restricted to brownfield sites in Local Service Centres, affordable housing and conversions. The LDF needs to recongnise and acknowledge in the wording of Core Strategy and Housing and

**Report of Consultation Responses**  
**Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)**

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					<p>Economic Development DPD policies that market housing, in itself, has a continuing role in meeting the housing needs of the rural population, as well as being the most important 'enabling mechanism' for the delivery of affordable housing. Realistically, the affordable housing needs of rural areas cannot be met on exception sites alone, because the RSLs simply do not have the resources to deliver the numbers required. The LDF should also accept that, in pursuit of the Government's objectives of providing wider housing opportunity and choice and meeting the housing needs of the whole community (See PPG3 paragraphs 1 and 2), an appropriate proportion of the needed provision to meet the overall housing requirement should be provided in rural areas. PO1 makes inadequate provision for economic development (something more than 'rural diversification') in rural areas and in this respect the draft Policy needs to have greater regard to the guidance in PPS7 at paragraph 5 and to Policy E3 of the H&amp;ED DPD. The Objectors consider that development within the built up parts of Local Service Centres should be admitted on more than just brownfield sites. If LSCs are regarded as sustainable rural settlements it is difficult to see why development should not be admitted on all previously developed land (a wider definition than the implicitly narrow criteria 'brownfield') and underused greenfield sites within the defined built-up area. By way of an example of the anomaly that rigid restriction to brownfield sites causes, it will be known that farmland and buildings are excluded from the definition of previously developed land in PPG 3 and are likely to be similarly excluded from the definition of brownfield in the forthcoming PPS3. However, there are, within the built-up areas of many villages, including LSCs, extensive farmsteads that have either become redundant or will do so over the LDF period as a result of the radical changes in agriculture that have occurred and are continuing. Many of these farmsteads consist of intensively developed complexes, often with large modern, functional industrial style buildings. To the objective observer it is logically absurd that such sites should be treated as greenfield. but, be that as it may, the redevelopment of such sites which, as well as providing needed housing and employment, may also produce significant visual, environmental and amenity benefits for the village, would be proscribed by PO1 as presently worded, unless it also fell into one of the limited (in number and scope) exceptions for 'Other Villages'. In addition to the incorporation of under-used greenfield sites within the built-up area to the list of acceptable locations for development in LSCs, it is suggested that, for clarity, the bulleted exceptions for development in Other Villages should also explicitly apply to LSCs. It is considered that economic development and employment development of an appropriate scale and character should be admitted on sites outside, but immediately adjacent to the built-up area of Local Service Centres. Such an exemption will allow suitable commercial developments that assist enterprise and employment creation in rural areas, thereby contributing to greater economic and social inclusion and sustainability, but which may, if located within villages, be damaging to amenity, to be brought forward. Finally, with respect to LSCs, it is felt that clarity and comprehension of PO1 would be improved if they were treated as a category of settlement separate from the towns so that the draft policy set out a clear hierarchy of settlements. Turning to the Other Villages, it is proposed that the bulleted list of exempted development should be extended to include: * Small scale (up to five dwellings) infill or rounding off within the main built up area of the village, including the redevelopment of sites that in their present use and condition have an adverse impact on the visual or environmental amenity of the village;" "Small-scale economic development schemes within the main built-up area of the village (in accordance with Policy E3 of the Housing &amp; Economic Development DPD);</p>
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Savills	Savills	Savills	Support with conditions	<p>It states, " in all other villages and the countryside, development will be restricted. Proposals will only be considered acceptable if they are: a) sites for: Affordable housing (rural exception sites), Agriculture, Forestry or Equine Development, Rural Diversification Projects, Local Services and Facilities. b) Replacement buildings (like for like); or c) Conversions of buildings provided that the existing building(s): i) contribute to the character and appearance of the local area by virtue of their historic, traditional or vernacular form; ii) are in sound structural condition; and iii) are suitable for conversion</p>



## Report of Consultation Responses Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					without substantial alteration, extension or rebuilding and that the works to be undertaken do not detract from the character of the building(s) or their setting In all cases planning permission will only be granted on a less sustainable site where it has been proven that there are no other more sustainable options available or ther are other overriding material considerations all cases will also be subject to all relevant policies wihtin the remainder of the LDF". We are in support of the supporting text which states that regional and national plannig policy recognise the need to protect the character and nature of settlements. However we consider that it should also state that national plannning policy stresses the importance of the countryside being a place where people live and work, and that new development in settlements can ensure a better and more sustainable way of living.
Preferred Option 1: Sequential Development in South Kesteven	Mr E Banks			Support with conditions	CPRE generally support this option, but wish to see small groups of affordable homes built in some of the smaller settlements , to meet local need. We would wish these to be on sites with no market housing alongside. CPRE is unclear as to what is meant by UNDERUSED greenfield sites. As regards development in all other villages and the countryside, no criteria are listed as to what might be suitable Rural diversification project. These will need to be carefully specified.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mrs C Curtis			Support with conditions	agree with paragraph e, especially would like to see more cycle paths.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Support with conditions	Excellent principle but we see little evidence that current development practice meets the objectives.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr N Pike	English Nature		Support with conditions	Support the preferred option as point (6) six is important.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr M Richardson			Object	The area's roads need to become safer with speed restrictions as well as improved access and surface of roads, plus pavements before too much emphasis is placed upon new development and reducing the need to travel.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr T Bladon			Object	The comments at Preferred Option 1 indicate that Rippingale, and probably the other Local Service Centres, cannot achieve the parameters specified at paras. a, b, and c (use of public transport, reduction in the need to travel and journey safety). The SA report supports the premise that access by car only should not be treated as a consideration in favour of proposals to make the service centres sustaible. The SA report does not draw any comparison between the two major north/south routes in South Kesteven of the A1 and the A15. Whilst the A1 is a dual carriageway which by-passes all settlements, the A15 is a single carriageway with a major congestion point presented by Bourne having no north/south by-pass and other communities having speed limits. It is significant that the A15 carries approximately 50% of the volume of traffic in comparison to the A1. The length of the A15 between Osbournby and the County boundary north of Peterborough passes through mainly agricultural land and has many junctions throughout its length, whilst the A1 has a significantly lower quantity of these. The Lincolnshire Local Transport Plan identifies the fact that roads are below current design standards with consequential low speeds and safety problems, and the SKDC local strategic partnership identifies road safety issues. In these respects the A15 has been designated as a "Red Route" which obviously supports the concerns of these two plans. A major contributor to these problems is the frequent use of the A15 by slow moving agricultural vehicles. Unfortunately, the drivers of agricultural vehicles do not generally observe the obligation of giving way to accumulating traffic behing them. In this situation

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					drivers become increasingly frustrated at the lack of progress, which in turn leads to desperate and dangerous overtaking manoeuvres by them. In an effort to resolve the problems of tailback and road safety it is suggested that "agricultural roads" formed of hard-core should be made parallel to the A15 inside the boundaries of the existing roadside fields, thus removing these vehicles and the problems they create. No doubt there will be strong opposition from the farming community to such a proposal - primarily on the grounds of cost. However, it is felt that as the agricultural community has the benefits of low cost road tax and fuel together with Council Tax exemption on their land, the funding of "agricultural roads" could be achieved by the farming community by designating them as part of the "set aside" scheme currently in operation.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Councillor D Nalson			Support with conditions	There should be no new mixed sites in Stamford
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Ben Hunt	Sport England West Midlands		Support with conditions	Sport England supports this option, especially the emphasis on walking and cycling.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support	Sustainable integrated transport: agreed
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Jacob Newby	Environment Agency		Observations	PO2 We have no significant concerns regarding this Option, but we are unclear what is meant by point (g). It is unclear what types of environmental impacts are being referred to. Any potential contamination of controlled waters from surface water run-off from areas accessible to vehicles will not be considered acceptable and mitigation measures should be taken in these circumstances. If the decision is taken to broaden Spatial Objective 13 this Option can be shown as linking to that Objective.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Support with conditions	Preference should be given for pedestrians and cyclists
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr C J Townson			Support with conditions	Any large scale developments should contain an element of business developments ie workshops to encourage communities to become sustainable and reduce commuting.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Cllr A Pelling			Support with conditions	Funding should be made available from / associated with developments for improvements to sustainable transport eg for improving footpaths & cycle routes, bus shelters & signage, re-opening railway stations.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support	
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Support with conditions	In principle fine, in practice a farce. In Stamford, public transport very poor cycling in central stamford - try it!
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Ms J Young	Heritage Lincolnshire		Support with conditions	In line with RSS8 policy 51
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Ms J Young	Heritage Lincolnshire		Support with conditions	In line with RSS8 policy 51
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Ann Plackett	English Heritage		Observations	Option 2: Transport Traffic reduction in historic settlements could bring benefits to historic areas. It is important, therefore, that the Core Strategy recognises the policy context of RSS8, which promotes demand management and behavioural change.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mrs S Murray	The Countryside Agency		Support with conditions	LAR is supportive of this option, which places great emphasis on sustainable transport. LAR strongly supports the requirement for developer contributions towards green networks, which enable people to walk or cycle to destinations, whilst also enjoying a green and wildlife rich environment. Green networks should link residential and employment areas and also link into open spaces and the wider countryside. Point G

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					should be reworded to accord with PPS9, following the sequential approach to preventing environmental damage, starting with seeking avoidance measures before mitigation. A suggested amendment to the text is as follows: 'Minimising environmental impacts of new development through the requirement for avoidance and then mitigation measures where appropriate.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr M S Herbert	Brown & Co		Support with conditions	We generally agree with the sustainable integrated transport policy proposed.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mrs G M Foster			Observations	Should also incorporate the fact that disabled people with mobility problems who cannot walk very far, or carry anything far cannot use buses, unless there is a bus stop immediately outside their house and a bus stop close to their destination. And this also applies to the proposal highlighted on the Grantham Journal's front page on 19 May, to make the narrow stretch of the High Street one-way, single lane and signal controlled in order to widen the pavements. Most certainly I need to use the High street to display my disabled parking badge in order to park on occasions, outside my bank, Boots, WH Smith etc. - and it will cause even more congestion and deter even local people from shopping in Grantham. Also will add to the extra congestion and hold-ups we now experience on the inner relief road since those large shops were built near the junction of Dysart Road. Will you also please let me know exactly what LCC Divisional Highways Manager is intending to inflict on our High Street, as the map does not conform with RNIB's clear print guidelines. The print needs to be a denser black so that people who wear glasses for reading, or partially sighted people, are able to read it. This also applies to your Grantham maps as I cannot read the names of the streets,etc. So please send me copies with dense black print on ordinary copier paper, as holding these very heavy consultation documents has made my osteoporosis hands more painful. Also please incorporate in this Option, that all new roads should be of the correct width and not too narrow when given planning permission, such as the cul-de-sac area in which I now live - Webster Way/Bell Close which causes vehicles to park on the footpaths and endanger disabled people and parents with prams and young children who have to go on the road to get past. Also, being so narrow, driving round the somewhat blind bend corner, might collide with a vehicle in the opposite direction.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Barbara Robinson	Fulbeck Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Ms J Bateman			Support with conditions	Far more should be done to reduce dependancy on the car and longer journeys and to improve public transport and integrated transport
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mrs S Roberts			Support with conditions	People should be encouraged and aided to use public transport or cycle or walk. Public transport should be improved, more frequent services and with stops near housing. Cycle paths should be installed where possible on busy roads. All new main roads should have cycle paths. Alleyways between housing estates should be left as cut throughs into towns or other estates.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Object	The Core Strategy should promote, at a) and c), the provision of integrated transport facilities which thereby aid multi-mode journey and also assist in supporting existing transport facilities to improving their viability.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Support with conditions	PROVIDED that it is ensured that there is adequate parking in towns etc for the villages without transport links.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr J Judge			Support	
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr A Clark			Support	
Preferred Option 2:	Councillor J Judge	Stamford Town Council		Support with conditions	Design of some developments makes it difficult for access and movement of public

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Sustainable Integrated Transport					transport. This must be taken into consideration.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr S Pease	Ancer Spa	Ancer Spa	Support with conditions	Bullet point b. relating to promoting a balanced mix of land uses and patterns of development which reduce the need to travel, is a key objective that should tie in with the chosen policy on 'Sequential Development in South Kesteven'. This objective is more likely to be achieved by planning for mixed-use town extensions comprising a balance of housing and jobs, rather than allowing housing-only schemes on a variety of brownfield and greenfield site remote from employment areas. It is implicit in bullet points d and g that such town extensions will contribute to the necessary highway and public transport infrastructure to ensure strong inegration with the existing town.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr J Easter	Humberts	Humberts	Object	The preferred option makes no reference to the A1 corridor opportunity areas.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr J Easter	Humberts	Humberts	Support with conditions	Policy criteria and objective confirm suitability of the subject site for inclusion as an allocation under Policy H3 of the Housing and Economic DPD.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr J Easter	Humberts	Humberts	Support with conditions	The subject land, either in isolation or in association with adjacent land, is capable of delivering a package of measures consistent with preferred option 2.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mrs J Gardener	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Smith Stuart Reynolds		The key principles of the Preferred Option are enshrined in current national and regional planning guidance on sustainability and integrated transport and, as such, are welcomed. In terms of developer contributions, as referred to at point e), the same response as given to Preferred Option 16 is appropriate, in that Stamford Homes and Allison Homes will consider suitable contributions where appropriate, but these must take into account the economic viability of the development as a whole". Support with conditions
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr P Frampton	Framptons	Framptons	Object	The Policy should recognise that where new development is accpetable in the villages the opportunity for travel other than the motor car is limited. Sustainable integrated transport is but one aspect of sustainable develoment and has to be considered in the context of all other features of sustainable development.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr M E Hendry	Bidwells	Bidwells	Support	
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr J Parmiter			Support	
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr N Gough	Bigwood Associates	Bigwood Associates	Support	
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support with conditions	We generally agree with the sustainable integrated transport policy proposed.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support	
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr I Smith	Smiths Gore	Smiths Gore	Support with conditions	We support the general aims of this policy. However it is not clear what item g is referring to (in a transport context) given what is already covered by items a-f. An example would assist here
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr D Crofts	RPS Planning	RPS Planning	Support with conditions	The Trust supports Preferred Option 2, in particular part a which refers to locating development in areas which are accessible by sustainable transport means. Land in the Trust's ownership, which forms a major part of proposed employment allocation E1(a), is more suitably located than any of the other proposed employment allocations in and around Grantham to encourage movement by sustainable means. It is considered that all the other proposed employment allocations around Grantham are much less suitably

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					located in this respect.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Support with conditions	It should be recognised that private motor transport, generally the car, will be the mainstay of transport for those living in the rural areas of the District. The level of public transport services, their frequency and limited routes, together with the distances between rural settlements and the location of employment and shopping opportunities make this inevitable. However, the car should - as in the urban context - be seen as the transport of last resort for short trips in rural areas.
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Antony Aspbury Associates			Support	
Preferred Option 2: Sustainable Integrated Transport	Mr E Banks			Support	
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mrs C Curtis			Support with conditions	Ok for Stamford or Grantham. But don't think the town (Bourne) or roads (A15) will support too many new businesses and there is no point in building offices etc if they remain empty. Bourne is too far from the A1 for a lot of industry.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Support with conditions	The statement in paragraph 3.18 reflects a policy currently being implemented but contradicts the intent expressed earlier in paragraph 1.21.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr B Thompson	Williamson Cliff Ltd		Object	We formally object to the policy on the grounds that the area of search is not broad enough and that it does not encompass Quarry Farm; In Rutland but an extension to the Stamford market town. Quarry Farm is a more sustainable location in principle than any of the locations in Bourne, given the relevant settlement hierarchy of Stamford to Bourne. The Council should prepare an AREA ACTION PLAN in collaboration with Rutland for the future of North Stamford. As we understand it, an AAP is a new Development Plan Document designed to allow such cross-boundary working.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr N Pike	English Nature		Observations	English Nature neither supports or objects to this option though this policy should be broadly compatible with sustainable development principles.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Object	Support general policy but would like to see small rural employment opportunities developed and supported.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr M Richardson			Support with conditions	Areas away from urban centres can also be managed effectively for economic development eg. Rural/Farm yards.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr T Bladon			Support	
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Councillor D Nalson			Support	
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support with conditions	Economic Development: agreed. Stamford Vision has always promoted a diverse economy as a way of ensuring the towns long term vitality. It is particularly important that Stamford does not lose any more buildings to residential development, see the supporting paper. There is concern that the inclusion of gardens in the definition of brownfield land will add to the density of the central core and add to the parking issues for town centre residents. The importance of delivering larger sites which are ready for development cannot be overstated especially in Stamford's case where sites which are achievable and deliverable are not easily found.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Support with conditions	Flexibility should be used in defining land for economic development.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr C J Townson			Support	
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Cllr A Pelling			Support with conditions	Out of town retail/business developments should be stopped and rents/rates in towns should be affordable. Recent example in Market Deeping where a retail licence was granted on an out of town industrial site which has had a detrimental impact on town centre businesses (opening of Discount warehouse - closure of Hereward Discounts).
Preferred Option 3:	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support	

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Economic Development					
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Support	Total failure in recent years to develop most remaining brownfield land. This will continue unless major transport issues are resolved.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Ann Plackett	English Heritage		Observations	Options 3 and 4: Economic and Residential Development - Specific allocations could directly affect historic assets or their setting. This could be mitigated by ensuring that proposed development sites are properly assessed for their potential impact on the historic environment, including consideration of setting, before the decision is taken to include the sites as allocations in the development plan.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mrs S Murray	The Countryside Agency		Observations	In order to adhere to sustainability principles, employment land should take the same sequential approach as that adopted for residential development, using previously developed land in the first instance. Similarly however, LAR would advise that environmental constraints on individual sites need to be considered, and this may alter the site preference. LAR would hope to see employment land used with attention given to opportunities for green network creation within and around employment areas, open space provision for those employed in the area and spaces for habitat creation. New employment developments can contribute to the achievement of biodiversity targets through commitments to habitat creation within their own land holding. LAR encourages innovative ideas to create employment areas that aim to be as green and diverse as the open countryside.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr M S Herbert	Brown & Co		Support with conditions	It is, we feel, important for the future well-being of the District to allocate more than sufficient employment land to ensure there are opportunities and employment for the well-being of the community.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Barbara Robinson	Fulbeck Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mrs S Roberts			Object	I am concerned that land is being put aside for employment land that may never be used. How can the council encourage employers to move to the area! Employment land allocation is sensible if it can be filled. Must be reviewed to ensure it is used and other areas are not used instead.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Object	Para 3.15 - sustainable communities require 'sustainable consumption and production' (UK Sustainable Development Strategy, 2005). It is unclear how this has been assessed as part of the Economic and Community Development Strategy, and in particular the consideration that has been given to environmental limits (see also related comments on the seperate sheet in respect of the Sust Appraisal).
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Marston Parish Council	Marston Parish Council		Support with conditions	But we oppose extension into greenfield site E15 at Gonerby Moor on landscape, amenity, traffic generating grounds.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr J Judge			Observations	Would support this if Welland Quarter was the priority with a second bridge and relief road considered.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr A Clark			Object	I would support the general policy but would like to see appropriate small rural employment opportunities developed and actually encouraged and supported.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Councillor J Judge	Stamford Town Council		Support with conditions	Employment such as necessary shops on a development is fine but employment areas can become an eyesore destroying the asthetic amenity that people can enjoy within their area. Careful consideration need to be made to this effect.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr S Pease	Ancer Spa	Ancer Spa	Support with conditions	The economy of towns such as Stamford is in need of revitalisation through modernisation and diversification. The economy of Stamford is vulnerable as nearly 50% of the industrial floorspace is occupied by just three businesses. There is a need to attract new service sector businesses, but there is a shortage of modern and/or high quality premises to achieve this objective. It has to be recongnised that some existing sites are unsuitable for the provision of high-quality sites as part of mixed-use town extension schemes. The allocation of stand-alone remote employment areas is inappropriate for the towns in South Kesteven and a more subtle, sesitive approach is required. Future Employment Land Reviews should take this into account.
Preferred Option 3:	Mr J Easter	Humberts	Humberts	Object	Option 3 states that employment land allocations will be identified, in part, based upon

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Economic Development					the core policies of the LDF. Those core policies should reflect the key diagram and include reference to A1 corridor opportunity areas.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr J Easter	Humberts	Humberts	Support with conditions	but with reservations over the use of CPO Powers
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr A Evans	CgMs	CgMs	Support with conditions	Identification of Employment Land allocations through a regular employment land review is supported. Furthermore, reference to the use of C.P.O powers is welcomed in order to ensure comprehensive development. Government Guidance in PPS1 and PPS12 dictates that Local Planning Policies should set out a relevant portfolio of land and buildings that are allocated for relevant uses and that there is an appropriate proportion of such allocations in order to meet established targets for certain types of development. It is further stated that Local Planning Authorities should implement regular reviews of allocated land in order to determine whether or not targets are being met. Accordingly support is given to Preferred Option 3 in terms of employment land allocations, particularly whereby it is stated that such allocations will be identified using the conclusions of the employment land review in combination with Core Policies. Support is also given to CPOs whereby it is stated that in specific cases the Council will consider using Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO) to ensure land which is suitable for employment development can be delivered within an appropriate timescale, as this will ensure the continued consistent delivery of relevant land for employment, and therefore comprehensive development. This allows for continued sustainable economic growth and supports Granthams role as a Sub-Regional Centre. It is pertinent to note that support is also given to some of the allocations within the Housing & Economic DPD, which is also currently the subject of public consultation and for which separate representations on behalf of Grantham Estates & Kimberley Developments PLC have been submitted.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mrs J Gardener	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Object	Whilst the strategy for Economic Development is supported, the mechanisms of site release following the identification of a shortage of employment land should be identified (i.e. the trigger for the release of additional land). The wording could be similar to that proposed for housing in response to Option 4 below.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr P Frampton	Framptons	Framptons	Object	The policy should recognise that the overall public interest may be better served in existing employment sites being developed for alternative forms of development, for example housing development or mixed use. Such a circumstance may be appropriate in circumstances where the siting, scale, form, and access to permitted industrial development does not serve the public interest.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr M E Hendry	Bidwells	Bidwells	Object	My client welcomes the recognition of the need to develop employment by providing sufficient site. I would like to propose the sites illustrated in maps A28,916 and A28,917 for employment at Market Deeping to meet local requirements.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr J Parmiter			Support	
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr N Gough	Bigwood Associates	Bigwood Associates	Support	
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support with conditions	In general we support the preferred option three for economic development
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support with conditions	The support is qualified and subject to the general view that the publication both of the Core Strategy Preferred Options and the Housing and Economic DPD Preferred Options (upon which Messrs Pask are also making representations) is premature having regard to the advanced stage reached by the review of RSS8 - Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands, which will shortly supersede the Lincolnshire Structure Plan 2001-2021 and in light of the Council's application for Growth Point status for Grantham. One of the key topics being addressed by the RSS review is economic development and employment needs in the Region and this is likely to affect the quantity and quality of employment land required in the LDF area. Changes in the levels of population growth and housing provision consequent upon the RSS Review and the Growth Point Application will also affect the level of amount and kind of employment land needed in the District as a whole and in Grantham.

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr I Smith	Smiths Gore	Smiths Gore	Object	This option makes no mention of the importance of rural economic development and how rural economic development might fit in with Preferred Option 1 which appears to prohibit most new development in settlements below Local Service Centre. The approach to these rural settlements needs to be clearer. In addition - PO 1 gives priority to brownfield sites many of which are existing or former employment sites. These are potentially conflicting objectives and clarity is required here as to the future of employment sites. It is important that a good stock of employment land is retained and such land is not all turned over to housing use. The Option makes no mention of this which is an important LDF issue.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr D Crofts	RPS Planning	RPS Planning	Support with conditions	The Trust supports the first part of this Preferred Option in seeking to ensure that a portfolio of land and buildings is available to achieve the stated objectives. However, these objectives should be extended to include (at the end of the first paragraph) "and to provide sufficient employment land to meet the needs of the existing and future workforce". The trust also supports the principle that "sufficient" land should be allocated. However, there is no indication here of any operational definition of "sufficient"; nor is there in the Housing and Economic DPD. Our representations on that DPD suggest that too much land has been identified. The consequences of over-allocation might be that even if the objectives in the first paragraph (as proposed to amended) are achieved, this might be at the expense of dispersed development, excessive take-up of greenfield land, and unsustainable travel patterns. It is acknowledged that the Council is obliged to outline other options considered, but the two in this case are scarcely realistic. The preferred option, in its operational guise as defined in Housing and Economy Preferred Option 20, represents the other extreme to the first alternative outlined in paragraph 3.17. To give meaning to the process, the Council should have set out two or three options based on different levels of employment allocation.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	David Bainbridge	Bidwells	Bidwells	Object	The statement that employment development will be encouraged on sites identified for mixed-use allocations is supported. However, this is not translated on a site specific basis with many of the preferred option sites for employment not comprising mixed-use. Spatially, employment land will need to be sited in accessible locations, attractive to the market and taking into consideration environmental issues. The identification of relatively large areas of employment land without any mix of uses is contrary to Spatial Objective 4.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Support with conditions	New employment allocations should be made in villages and rural areas, as well as in the urban centres, to ensure that residents have the opportunity to work locally. Employment sites which are no longer economically viable should be considered for mixed-use developments.
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Antony Aspbury Associates			Support with conditions	Preferred option subject to qualifications, modification and amplification. The support is qualified and subject to the general view that the publication both of the Core Strategy Preferred Options and the Housing and the Housing and Economic DPD Preferred Options (upon which Messrs we are also making representations) is premature having regard to the advanced state reached by the review of RSS 8-Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands, which will shortly supersede the Lincolnshire Structure Plan 2001-2021 and in light of the Council's application for Growth Point status for Grantham. One of the key topics being addressed by the RSS review is economic development and employment needs in the Region and this is likely to affect the quantity and quality of employment land required in the LDF area. Changes in the levels of population growth and housing provision consequent upon the RSS Review and the Growth Point Application will also affect the level of amount and kind of employment land needed in the District as a whole and in Grantham. The LDF as a whole, including the Core Strategy also needs to take a realistic approach to economic development and to reflect the fundamental changes in the structure and character of the World, European, National, Regional and Local economy. Land use planning in districts such as South Kesteven has, to date, laid too much emphasis on a traditional and fast-disappearing employment structure. The recent migration eastwards to Eastern Europe, the Indian Sub Continent and the Far East of primary production and manufacturing has



**Report of Consultation Responses**  
**Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)**

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					<p>accelerated a national trend towards employment in services. This had radical implications for the type of land use planning policies relating to economic development that are needed in future. Traditional employment land classifications as reflected in Part B of the Use Classes Order represent an increasingly narrow, inadequate and restrictive framework for accommodating employment generating development as many of the fastest growing employment sectors do not fall into these use classes at all. Slavish adherence to this outdated framework, both in attempts to quantify and meet 'employment land' (itself a questionable term in the contemporary economic dispensation) need, through reliance on predictive models of doubtful reliability, and in development control policies that subsequently seek to restrict use of employment land only to UCO Part B uses, will ensure neither stability nor growth, and will act as a straight jacket inhibiting the needed evolution of the local economy. There is no necessary correlation between the level of employment land supply and the health and vitality of the local economy, including both levels of employment and wages. Non-land use planning considerations such as access to employment based on the health, education, training and mobility of the local workforce are at least as important here. Provision for economic development in the LDF should sensibly reflect the skills, but also aspirations and ambitions of the workforce, who will otherwise be denied appropriate employment opportunities or will seek them elsewhere, through commuting or migration. At the same time, over-provision of land can lead to unsustainable long distance in commuting from outside the district. On balance the LDF needs to encourage a wider range of employment than simply that capable of being accommodated by development falling in UCO Classes B1, B2, and B8 through the promotion of more mixed use development, with a broader land use base, in more locations, particularly where this can be seen to contribute to sustainability. Less emphasis should be based on accommodating inward investment, particularly by major multi-national concerns, as this is likely to occur less and less (particularly in the field of traditional manufacturing) in the face of competition from low cost/wage economies in the world. However, there will be an increasing need (partly again arising from the movement of manufacturing overseas) for UCO Class B8 warehousing and distribution and the District is particularly well placed astride major inter-urban roads, notably the A1 Trunk Road, to exploit this trend. Notwithstanding the latter requirement, emphasis should be placed on promoting an indigenous enterprise culture and meeting the needs arising therefrom and from the development and diversification of the local economy, including the formation and expansion of SMEs (in the rural areas as well as in the towns). The LDF should not, therefore, seek to quantify employment land needs, but should adopt a broadly-based, flexible, opportunistic and positive approach to ALL economic development and to employment creation in the context of a clearly expressed and transparent set of criteria for protecting other interests of acknowledged importance. This does not mean that provision should not be made for traditional industrial land (see above in relation to B8) to but such provision should take a proper place on a wider suite of policies aimed at promoting economic regeneration and growth, and should not be confined to accommodating UCO part B uses only. New economic development allocations should be well related to existing and proposed housing, including in overtly mixed use allocations, and either have good access to a range of transport modes, or have the potential to be made more accessible to those modes (including through development-funded improvements and green travel plans). Where additional land is demonstrably needed, extensions to existing industrial estates and business parks is likely to be the most sustainable option for further provision, as that will maximise utilisation of existing investment in infrastructure and create better critical mass for initiatives to enhance accessibility by a wider range of transport modes. Active promotion of mixed use development, in and on the edge of the towns, particularly where there is good access to a range of transport modes, or such access can be provided through developer contributions, should also be an explicit part of the LDF strategy for accommodating employment land. The overriding objective should be for the LDF (both Core Strategy and other DPDs) to be so drawn as to be able to recognise,</p>

# Report of Consultation Responses

## Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					<p>acknowledge and encourage ALL forms of economic development and employment creation, including where that is not the primary object of a development proposal. Furthermore, in seeking to accommodate a broad range of enterprises that bring economic and employment benefits, the Core Strategy and the Housing and Economic DPD should be flexible and responsive to the rapidly evolving character of the economy and the varied and changing needs of business. The aim should be, therefore, to maximise variety and choice of location, and to adopt as permissive approach to land use as possible consistent with sound land use planning principles, e.g. sustainability and environmental and amenity protection. Proscription as to alternative use should be confined to those uses that would demonstrably have little or no economic and employment benefits, or that would clearly prevent, displace, inhibit or constrain other development with economic and employment benefits on or near the site. One approach might be to adopt a general designation, such as - 'Economic Development Opportunity Site', or, in the case of previously developed or brownfield sites within the urban area, 'Mixed Use Regeneration Site' - in preference to the implicitly narrow and somewhat restrictive terminology of Employment Site, and to admit on these sites not simply UCO Part B uses, but also Part A, C and D uses, subject always to other relevant land use planning considerations. For all these reasons, whilst recognising that some site-specific economic development land use allocations are necessary in the LDF, to accommodate current and short-term market demand, to protect suitable land from competition from other non-commercial uses, such as housing, to guide investment decisions, particularly those related to infrastructure, and to provide certainty and transparency, medium and long term needs might be better dealt with through criteria-based development control policies. The alternative to this latter apprach would be the use of phasing, for our comments upon which see Issue Six below. It is suggested that the LDF should identify broad locations whre economic development will be appropriate and accorded priority and should then allocate a limited number of sites to meet immediate, short-term, needs (e.g. by extensions of existing sites), whereafter, land should be released in future accordance with a criteria-based policy in the Housing and Economic DPD. Amongst the criteria in this policy would the prevailing level of supply and other economic indicators. PO3 needs, therefore, to be amended to reflect the above considerations. Amongst other things it needs to incorporate some defined criteria that will inform other policies in the LDF and not simply cross-refer to other documents such as the Economic and Community Development Strategy. It also needs to include an explicit commitment to making appropriate provision for economic development in the ruarl parts of the District.</p>
Preferred Option 3: Economic Development	Mr E Banks			Observations	Generally support but CPRE is unclear as to implications of Key diagram notation "Opportunity Areas - A1 Corridor". This is not referred to in the text of the Core strategy document. It could imply widespread sporadic development beyond the settlement identified for accommodating growth.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mrs C Curtis			Support with conditions	We do not need any more houses in Bourne. Many peole living on the Elsea Park estate work in London and Peterborough and do not support Bourne Town Centre. The A15 does not need any more trafic.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Support with conditions	We support the preferred option but this policy is NOT being followed in Bourne! Rather than the policy is that expressed in Paragraph 3.20 which was rejected!
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr J Coleman	William Davis Ltd		Object	We object to the proposal to restrict the Core Strategy to meeting the current housing requirements of the Lincolnshire Structure Plan. These housing requirements are based on 1996-based household projections from RSS8 and are now known to significantly underestimate housing requirements relative to the 2003-based projections, which will be used in the Review of the Regional Plan. These figures therefore present an unrealistic and inappropriate basis for the Core Strategy and will dictate that the strategy will have to be reviewed almost immediately upon its adoption. Such process would have a serious impact on the credibility of the system. We consider that whilst being broadly consistent with Structure Plan Policy the core strategy msut seek to accommodate emerging figures from the review of the Regional Plan. These are due to be submitted to the Government Office for the East Midlands in September 2006. Any subsequent

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					ammendment of these figures next year, following public examination of the regioal plan, can be considered at the examination for the core strategy and Housing/Employment DPD. It is also important that the Core Strategy is consistent with emerging guidance in PPS3 for LDF's to make provision for 15 years supply of housing land from the projected date of adoption. Assuming adoption in early 2008, an end-date of 2021 would not provide for a full 15-year period. An end-date of 2026 would provide this necessary longer-term vision and bring the LDF directly into line with the review of the Regional Plan. Given the nature of emerging housing figures in the Review of the Regional Plan, we consider that the Core Strategy is likely to need to bring forward at least one strategic greenfield site at a relatively early phase of development. Existing commitments and other brownfield urban capacity sites may not ensure the delivery of the required annual rate of development. PPG3, associated guidance on 'planning to deliver' the managed release of housing sites', and the emerging PPS3, acknowledge the potential need for strategic greenfield sites to be released before priority brownfield sites, when it can be demonstrated to be required to ensure the effective delivery of housing numbers.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr N Pike	English Nature		Observations	English Nature neither supports nor objects to this option, though we would like to object to the proposed greenfield extensions unless sufficient green infrastructure to recognised standards were to be provided as an integral element of the development.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Object	Option biased too much towards urban centres at the expense of small rural development. Although villages have no allocation, the restrictions are too light and could mean an unfair influence over the 15 year planning period.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr M Richardson			Object	Not allowing allocation for villages or open countryside ignores the reason why communities were established away from urban centres in the first place. The countryside is not a dead backwater and it needs new homes and people to keep a balance of a managed countryside.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr T Bladon			Object	The statement "No allocations will be made in villages or the open countryside, other than for affordable housing as an exception" would seem to be at variance with the statement at option 1 which states "New development which helps to maintain and support the role of the three market towns of Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings as well as those sttlements identified as Local Service Centres will also be allowed in accordance with the following sequence". There is no provision for residential development in Local Service Centres contained in the Council's LDF document "Housing and Economic DPD prefferred options". It would seem that this aspect of the Core Strategy requires clarification.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Councillor D Nalson			Support	
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support with conditions	Residential Development: agreed within the limits imposed by the regional spatial strategy.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Jacob Newby	Environment Agency		Observations	PO4 It should be established that there is sufficient capacity in the sewage system and water resource availability for any housing sites that are to be allocated. This can most effectively be done by commissioning a water cycle study. This is discussed further under PO12.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Object	Allocations for housing other than affordable could be made in sustainable villages
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr C J Townson			Object	Para 3, flexibility is needed! There may be cases where, for example, a parish could gain land/money for allowing development that is limited. If a parish council can show overall benefit to the community and has community backing this should be considered.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Cllr A Pelling			Support with conditions	Concern about allocations. Would prefer that only sites already identified in the UCS are considered.
Preferred Option 4:	Miss H Mawson	The Home Builers Federation		Object	The housing provision identified within Core Strategy is based upon the RSS figure of

**Report of Consultation Responses**  
**Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)**

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Residential Development					9,200 dwellings in the period 2001-2021. This equates to an annual average build rate of 460 dwellings per year. However, when examining previous completions (Period 1990-2005) the average annual build rate is 698 dwellings. As identified within the South Kesteven Annual Monitoring Report (December 2005), the highest annual completion rates have been experienced over the last two years (700+ dwellings per annum). Therefore, historically, this identifies increased growth within the district. In addition, both the RSS and Core Strategy figures do not take into consideration the most recent Sub Regional Household Projections (ODPM, Released on 14 March 2006). The Projections identify that over the period of 2001-2021 there will be 13,000 additional households, 3,800 more than what is planned for within the Core Strategy. This would equate to an annual average of 650 dwellings constructed per year, which is 190 more than currently proposed. In conclusion, by reducing the housing allocations to 9,200 dwellings over the planned period the Core Strategy would constrain growth within South Kesteven, and have detrimental consequences in terms of; * Securing good quality affordable housing; * Stimulating economic growth; and * Sustaining viable market towns and rural communities. All of which are essential to achieving the vision set out within the South Kesteven Core Strategy. Also, the existence of in-migration cannot be ignored or stopped, and as such must be catered for in any estimate of housing requirement. A greater amount of housing provision would provide flexibility in terms of the deliverability of sites. For example, should some sites not come forward as programmed, an over-allocation would ensure the fluid continuous delivery of housing over the planned period. In accordance with emerging guidance PPS 3, the Local Planning Authority should ensure there is at least a five-year supply of housing which is developable. The HBF would encourage a high supply of housing land beyond a five-year supply within the bank. By having a greater supply, the Local Planning Authority could easily respond to changing circumstances, for example, an upsurge in the economy. An appropriate phasing policy, Core Policy 5, would be the mechanism to bring forward land should the need arise. Furthermore, the implementation of a moratorium within the rural area could potentially have disastrous consequences. The HBF considers that the Council have hastily attempted to 'plan, monitor and manage,' but have actually implemented a policy of 'prevent, monitor and manage.' The imminent RSS review will be revising housing numbers to take account of the recent household projections. In essence, South Kesteven will soon be presented with a revised housing requirement, where the overall number of houses being sought in the RSS will increase significantly. The HBF accepts that the District has achieved a high number of completions and commitments in relation to its modest Structure Plan requirement to 2021. However, the plan making system is about ensuring a supply of land that is available, suitable and viable. The District is effectively 'turning off the tap' in rural areas because it feels that, with completions and commitments in place, the allocations in the Plan and windfall allowance will give a modest over-supply of housing for the period until 2021. It appears shortsighted to consider that preventing new housing land from coming forward in rural areas. The Council should be actively looking to ensure it maintains a supply of land and retains developer interest, if it is to minimise the inherent delays that go with needing to implement a 'step change' and increase housing land availability. The Council is attempting to remain in conformity with the existing strategic policy, but one must question that decision when the revision of the RSS is well underway and all parties are accepting that an increase in housing requirements is imminent. The HBF would urge the Council to be more proactive and forward thinking in its approach. The Council should not restrict supply for what will effectively be a short period of time and yet take considerably longer for the industry to respond to when the supply 'tap' is turned back on again.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support with conditions	The last sentence in second paragraph should be removed; as no further allocations should be made, even if existing commitments are not delivered.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Support with conditions	location, quantity and affordable policies supported

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Ann Plackett	English Heritage		Observations	Options 3 and 4: Economic and Residential Development - Specific allocations could directly affect historic assets or their setting. This could be mitigated by ensuring that proposed development sites are properly assessed for their potential impact on the historic environment, including consideration of setting, before the decision is taken to include the sites as allocations in the development plan.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mrs S Murray	The Countryside Agency		Observations	LAR supports proposals that conform with national guidance on the sustainable and sequential use of land. Furthermore, LAR would expect local authorities to consider all existing redundant housing stock and encourage refurbishment/restoration in order to contribute to housing needs as the most sustainable option prior to new development on previously developed land. LAR strongly encourages local authorities to ensure that new developments are subject to sustainability measures, including targets for waste minimisation and recycled materials use during construction, and that houses are designed in a way that is energy efficient, recycles grey water and encourages household recycling by providing appropriate storage facilities. It is essential that sites are chosen with adequate information on landscape character and environmental capacity, in order to make decisions on land allocations that represent the most sustainable option. LAR advises that until such information is available, final decisions on the use of greenfield sites on urban edges cannot be made. The environmental capacity of a potential site can be increased by long-term planning. By adding woodland belts, for example, to future land allocations that may result in adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape, a site can develop adequate soft landscaping that screens and softens future development. By adding features a number of years in advance, their maturity at the time of development will have increased the environmental capacity of the site to make it better able to accommodate the development. New residential allocations should include provision for accessible natural greenspaces and green infrastructure that links greenspaces and provides a safe and sustainable route from residential areas to employment, shopping or services and from built up areas into the open countryside. The latter point is particularly important on sites that were previously greenfield on the edge of the countryside. The development must also be designed to fit into the existing landscape, retaining important features such as topography, hedgelines and trees, lanes and stone walls, open ditches and streams.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr M S Herbert	Brown & Co		Object	The plan is premature and inappropriate at this stage. Very shortly papers will be published relating to the RSS and to set the scene in Lincolnshire for the period up to 2026. It is therefore inappropriate to consider allocations and policies until the RSS is concluded. There must be flexibility in view of the RSS and to provide a range of housing in towns and villages. Sites must be sustainable and comply with PPG3, the RSS and general Structure Plan requirements until these are replaced.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Barbara Robinson	Fulbeck Parish Council		Object	We oppose the blanket exclusion of development in "less sustainable" villages.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Ms J Bateman			Object	Again I question the presumption to build so many houses and the targets set.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mrs S Roberts			Support with conditions	Allocations should not be allowed in Bourne even if existing commitments are not met and Bourne Stamford Deepings have met their allocation, especially in Bourne. The town cannot cope with increased housing. Any housing in Bourne must not be on greenfield sites only brownfield.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Object	Generally the approach is supported, but in accordance with the response to the sequential approach it is considered that previously developed land (but not greenfield sites) in the three market towns and the villages should be brought forward in advance of the urban extension of Grantham (albeit that there is still likely to be the need for a degree of urban extension of the sub-Regional centre).
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Cholmely Settlements	Savills			Our clients object to no consideration being given to allocations in villages, other than for affordable housing as an exception. They recommended that the document states that it is an intention of the LDF to review settlements/villages and produce character assessments. This could then identify suitable sites for development and allow for appropriate public consultation and consideration of key issues. At 3.30 the document

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					states that: "Development in the open countryside could irreversibly damage the character and nature of the district and should be carefully controlled. We recommend the insertion of 'inappropriate' so that it reads: 'Inappropriate development in the open countryside....' In conclusion, our clients agree with the latest government thinking in PPS7, which states: "Re-use of buildings in the countryside 17. The Government's policy is to support the re-use of appropriately located and suitably constructed existing buildings in the countryside where this would meet sustainable development objectives. Re-use for economic development puposes will usually be preferable, but residential conversions may be more appropriate in some locations, and for some types of building. Planning authorities should therefore set out in LDDs their policy criteria for permitting the conversion and re-use of buildings in the coutryside for economic, residential and any other purpose, including mixed uses. These criteria should take account of - The potential impact on the countryside and landscapes and wildlife; - Specific local economic and social needs and opportunities; - Settlements patterns and accessibility to service centres, markets and housing; - The suitability of different types of buildings, and of different scales, for re-use; - The need to preserve, or the desirability of preserving buildings or historic or architectural importance or interest, or which otherwise contribute to local character". Object
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Support	But more flexibility in rural areas
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Marston Parish Council	Marston Parish Council		Support with conditions	But more flexibility in rural areas.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr J Judge			Support	
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr A Clark			Object	Option too much in favour of urban centres. Would like to see a more balanced approach. Although the villages have no allocation restrictions are too tight and could mean an unfair influence over the 15 year planning period.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Councillor J Judge	Stamford Town Council		Support with conditions	Providing this option is adhered to I am comfortable with this.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr S Pease	Ancer Spa	Ancer Spa	Object	Option 4 places too much emphasis on the development of Grantham, and that would be to the detriment of the properly planned growth of other sustainable town locations such as Stamford. By focussing development on one location, this option restricts housing choice and so is contrary to Government Policy PPG3, that states that the aim is to provide a choice of sites which are both suitable and available for house building. The Government set out its vision for sustainable communities in 'Sustainable Communities Building for the Future' stating that planning should create communities 'where people want to live and which will enalbe people to meet their aspirations and potential'. If it becomes clear that the housing provisions specified in new Regional Spatial Strategy require additional housing sites to be released, new allocations should be based on the following priorities: 1. Brownfield sites in Grantham, Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings. 2. Mixed-use town extension sites in Grantham, Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings and other appropriate local service centres. It could be argued that the LDF Core Strategy including Option 4 is premature in advance of the release of Government revised housing requirement figures in the forthcoming draft revised Regional Spatial Strategy RSS8. The current low housing targets for the District that have led to this restrictive housing strategy for South Kesteven may be the subject to significant change and require a different strategy option.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr J Easter	Humberts	Humberts	Object	Housing provision figures likely to be rendered invalid by impending RSS8 review. Autumn Park in its entirety excluded from UCS and allocations within draft housing and economic DPD.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr J Easter	Humberts	Humberts	Object	* Housing provision figures likely to be rendered invalid by impending RSS8 Review. *Release of Greenfield sites at later stages only, implies the wholesale release of Brownfield sites at a time of acknowledged industrial land shortage.

**Report of Consultation Responses**  
**Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)**

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr A Evans	CgMs	CgMs	Observations	There is a requirement for mixed-use communities to be developed in accordance with national guidance. Support is given to the need for urban extension sites to be developed, and this can be done in accordance with mixed-use particularly B1/B8, development. General support is given to the objective in Preferred Option 4, whereby a target for the number of dwellings is provided and that a relevant number of sites are to be allocated for new housing accordingly. Further support is given to the focus on new housing in Grantham, and that an urban capacity study will be produced and updated in order to determine whether new residential dwelling targets are being met. However, in accordance with Government Guidance detailed within PPS1 and the draft PPS3, reference should be made within this Preferred Option to the provision of mixed-use development and the role that this plays within the provision of a range of new uses including housing and employment uses. The development of mixed-use communities allows for a sustainable form of development to take place whilst allowing the Council to meet targets for the provision of new development. With specific regard to employment site allocations, the incorporation of a mixed-use element allows for the potential of additional uses to be provided that can act as a buffer between the existing residential development and allocated areas for employment. It is therefore recommended that a new paragraph is added within Preferred Option 4 which states that mixed-use development is an important element of housing provision which makes the best use of land. Accordingly, it is recommended that an additional paragraph is added into the policy below the Greenfield urban extension sites paragraph, stating: - "Land allocated for housing development within Grantham should be developed in line with any adjacent sites that are allocated for a use other than housing in order to enable mixed-use development throughout the district.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mrs J Gardener	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Smith Stuart Reynolds		In their comments on Preferred Option 1 above Allison home accepted that "the majority of new development should be focussed upon Grantham". However as it is anticipated that the housing requirement in the emerging RSS will be significantly higher than that contained in the Lincolnshire Structure Plan 2001-2021 and as the Preferred Option sets out a sequential approach for development not only in Grantham but also in Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings (where new development which helps maintain and supported the role of these three market towns will be allowed, including, if necessary on "appropriate town extension sites"), it is not considered appropriate to stipulate at this stage that "new allocations will be identified in Grantham only". It is therefore considered that whilst maintaining the focus of new development on Grantham, the possibility of urban extensions to the three market towns should not be discounted in advance of the publication of the draft RSS and the housing figures contained therein; particularly as these will be made available in the comparatively near future. In this context, it is noted that allocations in the three market towns will only be made "if it becomes apparent that existing commitments are unlikely to be delivered". This provides insufficient guidance on the trigger for firstly, the allocation of such sites and ther their release. It is therefore considered that in view of the changing planning policy framework, reserve site in Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings, must be identified as part of the preparation of the Housing and Economic DPD, in order to enable the rquisite amount of land to be released for development when it is required and without having to be delayed whilst a review of the development plan is undertaken. Finally, as for the preferred option on economic development (No 3), it is essential that the mechanisms for the release of "additional housing sites", following the identification of a shortage of housing land be clearly identified for housing it is suggested that an appropriate policy could state: "The determination of whether a reserve site should be released will be based on the annual housing provision in the development plan and the requisite amount of land required to deliver this amount of housing. If on the basis of this calculation there is less than a five year supply of land for housing the reserve sites will be released..... Object
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mrs J Gardener	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Object	In their comments on Preferred option1 above Allison and stamford Homes supporte dthe stated intention that "the majority of new development should be focussed upn Grantham". however as it is anticipated that the housing requirement in the emerging

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					RSS will be significantly higher than that contained in the Lincolnshire Structure Plan 2001-2021, and as the Preferred Option sets out a sequential approach for development not only in Grantham but also in Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings (where new development which helps maintain and supported the role of these three market towns will be allowed, including, if necessary on "appropriate town extension sites"), it is not considered appropriate to stipulate at this stage that "new allocations will be identified in Grantham only". It is therefore considered that whilst maintaining the focus of new development on Grantham, the possibility of urban extensions to the three market towns should not be discounted in advance of the publication of the draft RSS and the housing figures contained therein; particularly as these will be made available in the comparatively near future. For the same reason, it is not considered possible to categorically state that over the plan period there is "a need for up to 600 new dwellings to be built on one or more greenfield urban extension sites in Grantham" in advance of the RSS housing figures. It could be significantly more and to imply otherwise is potentially misleading. Finally as for the preferred Option on Economic Development (No 3), it is essential that the mechanisms for the release of "additional housing sites", following the identification of a shortage of housing land be clearly identified (i.e. the trigger for the release of additional land). In view of the current uncertainty about the figure to be used to determine the requisite amount of land to be identified for housing it is suggested that an appropriate policy could state: "The determination of whether a reserve site should be released will be based on the annual housing provision in the development plan and the requisite amount of land required to deliver this amount of housing. If on the basis of this calculation there is less than a five year supply of land for housing the reserve sites will be released in the following order: 1. RMU1-Poplar Farm, Grantham 2. RMU2-Land between Spittlegate Levels and Somerby Hill Grantham"
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr P Frampton	Framptons	Framptons	Object	The Policy should not be so restrictive in the villages, and should recognise that new housing, other than affordable housing, may be appropriate at a small scale where the need has been identified by a community appraisal, or in circumstances where residential development secures a substantial planning advantage in the overall local public interest.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr M E Hendry	Bidwells	Bidwells	Object	Allocation should be made in the market towns of Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings in recognition of the need to sustain the role of these settlements and meet the need for housing. I propose two sites for housing in Market Deeping illustrated in maps B7974 and B7974 as areas of potential search.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr J Parmiter			Object	Appropriately sited windfall sites in urban areas need to be factored in.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr J Boyd	JB Planning Associates Limited	JB Planning Associates Limited	Object	While supporting the acknowledgement in Preferred Option 4 that there is a need for up to 600 new dwellings to be built on one or more greenfield urban extension sites in Grantham we are concerned that there appears to be inconsistency between the Core Strategy and the Housing and Economic DPD's. This is because the Housing and Economic DPD does not refer explicitly to the scale of new dwellings to be built on greenfield sites. PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO PREFERRED OPTION 4 We consider this inconsistency needs to be rectified by the inclusion of the following sentence from Preferred Option 4 within Policy H3 of the Housing and Economic DPD: "There is a need for up to 600 new dwellings to be built on one or more greenfield urban extension sites in Grantham". This amendment has been proposed in representations in Policy H3 of the Housing and Economic DPD. In order to be consistent with the proposed changes recommended to Policy H3 that form part of separate representations to the Housing and Economic DPD preferred options we propose that the subsequent sentence 'this will be phased into the latter part of the plan period' should be deleted.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr N Gough	Bigwood Associates	Bigwood Associates	Object	To have no policy for new housing for Bourne for 15+ years is simply unreasonable in sustainability terms and from an economic viewpoint. Provision for new employment development needs to go hand-in-hand with provision for housing. Reserve sites should be identified now. This does not meet the Objectives set.
Preferred Option 4:	Mr D M Rixson	Vincent and Goring	Vincent and Goring	Object	New housing allocations should be made in Stamford and other sustainable settlements



## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Residential Development		Planning Associates	Planning Associates		to secure choice, diversity and community sustainability. a contingency on safety-net policy is inconsistnet with national planning policy and will not work in practice. It provides no reliable, forward-looking basis upon which infrastructure and other investments need to be made.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Object	The plan is premature and inappropriate at this stage. Very shortly papers will be published relating to the RSS and to set the scene in Lincolnshire for the period up to 2026. it is therefore inappropriate to consider allocations and policies until the RSS is concluded. We also contend that it is inappropriate to record that: "Allocations in Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings will only be made it it becomes apparent that existing commitments are unlikely to be delivered". If these are not to be delivered, and given the status of Grantham as the subregional centre, it would be inappropriate to make further allocations in the three market towns in preference to Grantham. Grantham should receive any allocations for sites that are not going to be delivered elsewhere. The 600 dwellings would comfortably fit into a mixed use scheme on our land at Belton Lane, Manthorpe. The other sites are either too large or have other constraints which would delay delivery. We have commented on these in more detail in the Housing and Economic Development DPD responses.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Object	The plan is premature an inappropriate at this stage. Very shortly papers will be published relating to the RSS and to set the scene in Lincolnshire for the period upto 2026. It is therefore inappropriate to consider allocations and policies until the RSS is concluded. We also contend that it is inappropriate to record that: "allocations in Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings will only be made if it becomes apparent that existing commitments are unlikely to be delivered". If these are not to be delivered, and given the status of Grantham as the subregional centre, it would be inappropriate to make further allocations in the three market towns in preference to Grantham. Grantham should receive any allocations for sites that are not going to be delivered elsewhere. The 600 dwellings should be part of the site reserved and designated RMU1 on the DPD paper. The 600 houses should be at the Eastern end of this site and in the area that was originally allocated. Our reasons are explainedin the comments we have made on the DPD paper.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Object	The plan is premature and inappropriate at thsi stage. Very shortly papers will be published relating to the RSS and to set the scene in Lincolnshire for the period up to 2026. It is therefore inappropriate to consider allocations and policies until the RSS is concluded. It is quite possible that new allocations will be needed in the Deepings under the RSS. This being the case, the policies as proposed are too restrictive and will not be consistent with the RSS.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Object	The plan is premature and inappropriate at this stage. Very shortly paper will be published relating to the RSS and to set the scene in Lincolnshire for the period up to 2026. It is therefore inappropriate to consider allocations and policies until the RSS is concluded. If the plan proceeds, the policy is too restrictive and it needs to be widened to cater for the growth and diversity which will follow the RSS. It is inappropriate to say that: "no allocations will be made in the villages or open countryside, other than for affordable housing as an exception". A more diverse form of development must be allowed for the reasons we have stated in my comments on the Housing and Economic Development DPD paper.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Object	The plan is premature and inappropriate at this stage. Very shortly papers will be published relating to the RSS and to set the scene in Lincolnshire for the period up to 2026. It is therefore inappropriate to consider allocations and policies until the RSS is concluded. If the plan proceeds, the policy is too restrictive and it needs to be widened to cater for the growth and diversity which will follow the RSS. It is inappropriate to say that: "no allocations will be made in the villages or open countryside, other than for affordable housing as an exception". A more diverse form of development must be allowed for the reasons i ahve stated in my comments on the Housing and Economic Deveopment DPD paper. I own land in Billingborough which would make a very sensible and sustainable site given its proximity to the village centre and employment areas.

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Observations	The plan is premature and inappropriate at this stage. Very shortly papers will be published relating to the RSS and to set the scene in Lincolnshire for the period up to 2026. It is therefore inappropriate to consider allocations and policies until the RSS is concluded. We also contend that it is inappropriate to record that: "allocations in Stamford, Bourne and the Deepings will only be made if it becomes apparent that existing commitments are unlikely to be delivered". If these are not delivered, and given the status of Grantham as the subregional centre, it would be inappropriate to make further allocations in the three market towns in preference to Grantham. Grantham should receive any allocations for sites that are not going to be delivered elsewhere. The 600 dwellings should be part of the sites reserved and designated RMU1 on the DPD paper. The 600 houses should be at the Eastern end of this site and in the area that was originally allocated. Our reasons are explained in the comments we have made on the DPD paper.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Object	The publication of the Core Strategy Preferred Options and the Housing and Economic CPD Preferred Options (upon which Messrs Pask are also making representations) is premature having regard to the advanced stage reached by the review of RSS 8 - Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands, which will shortly supersede the Lincolnshire Structure Plan 2001-2021 and in light of the Council's application for Growth Point status for Grantham. On the evidence, the RSS, which is based on more up-to-date demographic data and projections than is the Structure Plan, is likely to make significantly increased housing provision for South Kesteven (and therefore for Grantham). Furthermore, if Growth Point status for Grantham is granted, it will self evidently also result in a further significant increase in housing provision. These developments will impact fundamentally on the assumptions underlying Preferred Option 4 amongst others, including: the overall level of housing to be provided for, the level of housing allocation required and the strategic and local spatial distribution of such allocations. The Council should, therefore, either revise PO4 to take account of projected housing provision arising from the RSS review, with an option that also takes account of the granting of Growth Point Status, or, should defer both the Core Strategy Preferred Options and the Housing and Economic DPD Preferred Options until later in the year when the picture will be clearer. Commitment now to housing provision levels that will clearly be superseded shortly may lead to a defective strategy and will prejudice and pre-empt full consideration and assessment of all the development options. It will also necessitate either amendments to the Core Strategy and the Housing and Economic DPD in course of progress towards adoption, or a review of both documents immediately after their adoption, either of which will be cumbersome, time consuming, expensive of public and private resources and confusing.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr I Smith	Smiths Gore	Smiths Gore	Object	it is unrealistic to say that the Council will meet the RSS housing figures when those figures are unknown. Those figures could potentially be of a scale that requires rethinking of the settlement strategy or the sequential search for housing land.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	David Bainbridge	Bidwells	Bidwells	Support with conditions	Object and support. Ideally, the preferred option DPD should have been delayed to take into consideration emerging East Midlands Regional Plan draft housing provisions, scheduled for September 2006. The structure plan figure of 9,200 dwellings to 2021 would be an undersupply of housing and this is confirmed by County Council officers. Land allocated for residential in the existing Local Plan, but without planning consent should be reviewed as part of the evidence base, and if unsuitable and/or constrained and hence unlikely to be delivered, the allocation should be removed. I object to the statement that allocations will be made if existing commitments are unlikely to be delivered. In particular, where extant consents expire the allocation should consider alternatives to residential so that the oversupply of housing in the urban areas (except Grantham) can be addressed. I support the statements that no new allocations, except affordable housing exception sites, will be made in the villages or open countryside. The housing allocations in and around Grantham should take into consideration the most recent urban capacity. Unfortunately, the most recent study was published in December 2005 with the original survey work undertaken in September 2004. Therefore, urban capacity sites must be reviewed and the findings and recommendations consulted upon.

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					The results of the survey, following consultation, should help to inform the annual monitoring report. I recommend that the option makes it explicit that the anticipated housing provision at the regional level is likely to to exceed the Structure Plan under-provision of 9,200 and hence one or more mixed-use urban expansion sites will be required at Grantham.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Object	Housing allocations should be made in the villages for residential development alongside rural exception sites. Villages and rural areas may suffer from out-migration or become dormitory villages if populations are not kept at sustainable levels (i.e. implications for school rolls, bus services, local shops etc). PPG3 Housing Update (Jan 2005) Annex B notes that rural exception sites are not appropriate for general market housing or market housing for local needs only. It further notes that, through the planning process, occupiers will always be found for affordable housing provided on rural exception sites. The Council needs to define what it considers to be affordable' housing and define the need criteria which will be used to allocate such housing. Care needs to be taken that rural exception sites of affordable housing are not forced on local communities. PPS3 (Consultation Paper, December 2005, paragraph 28) identifies that affordable housing should be provided as a means of creating more mixed communities and should avoid creating concentrations of deprivation. 100% affordable housing sites are often difficult to develop, for economic reasons. It is suggested that 75% affordable be the ceiling requirement on any site, so as to allow enabling development.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Antony Aspbury Associates			Object	The publication of the Core Strategy Preferred Options and the Housing and Economic DPD Preferred Options (upon which we are also making representations) is premature having regard to the advanced stage reached by the review of RSS 8 - Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands, which will shortly supersede the Lincolnshire Structure Plan 2001-2021 and in light of the Council's application for Growth Point Status for Grantham. On the evidence, the RSS, which is based on more up-to-date demographic data and projections than is the Structure Plan, is likely to make significantly increased housing provision for South Kesteven (and therefore for Grantham). Furthermore, if Growth Point status for Grantham is granted, it will self evidently also result in a further significant increase in housing provision. These developments will impact fundamentally on the assumptions underlying Preferred Option 4, amongst others, including: the overall level of housing to be provided for, the level of housing allocation required and the strategic and local spatial distribution of such allocations. The Council should, therefore, either revise PO4 to take account of projected housing provision arising from the RSS review, with an option that also takes account of the granting of Growth Point status, or, should defer both the Core Strategy Preferred Options and the Housing and Economic DPD Preferred Options until later in the year when the picture will be clearer. Commitment now to housing provision levels that will clearly be superseded shortly may lead to a defective strategy and will prejudice and pre-empt full consideration and assesment of all the development options. It will also necessitate either amendments to the Core Strategy and the Housing and Economic DPD in course of progress towards adoption, or a review of both documents immediately after their adoption, either of which will be cumbersome, time consuming, expensive of public and private resources and confusing.
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Savills	Savills	Savills	Object	We object to no consideration being given to allocations in villages, other than for affordable housing as an exception. We would recommend that the document states that it is an intention of the LDF to review settlements/villages and produce character assessments. This could identify suitable sites for development. It would allow for appropriate public consultation and consideration of key issues. 3.30 It states that, "Development in the open countryside could irreversibly damage the character and nature of the district and should be carefully controlled". We would recommend the insertion of 'inappropriate' so that it reads, ..."inappropriate development in the open countryside....".
Preferred Option 4: Residential Development	Mr E Banks			Support	

# Report of Consultation Responses

## Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mrs C Curtis			Support with conditions	We need affordable houses for local people on allocated sites. Also houses and bungalows for the elderly.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Observations	We do not have a confirmed opinion on Affordable Housing Policies. We do not believe that the 50% proportion of new development is being achieved but nor do we believe that this is either practical or desirable.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr J Coleman	William Davis Ltd		Object	We query the adequacy of the recent housing needs assessment as a robust evidence base for the Core strategy over an extended period to 2021, or 2026 as we suggest is required. The Review of the Regional Plan will be providing strategic guidance on affordable housing needs related to the revised housing requirements for this period for the region as a whole, and for individual Housing Market Areas. This approach is wholly consistent with emerging PPS3 which indeed has directed that these regional based Housing Market Assessments will replace local housing need assessments as a basis for planning for affordable housing. It is the Review of RSS8 therefore which will be more appropriate for the Council's long term Core Strategy approach towards affordable housing rather than the mroe 'short term' Housing Needs Survey, based principally on ODPM July 2000 guidance relating to 5-year assessment. The policy is also too detailed for a Core Strategy and would be better pursued in the Housing DPD. Notwithstanding the above objection in principle to the nature of the policy William Davis Ltd further objects to the detail of the policy as follows: * A 50% target is excessive particularly where no public funding is available. This taget is likely to affect the viability of many schemes and hence will affect the delivery of overall housing numbers within the district. If retained the target shoudl be reduced to a more realistic figure of 30% and the policy should make reference to the Council having regard to the availability of public funding and the viability of individual sites in its applicaiton of the policy. This would bring the policy into line with the approach of Circular 6/98 and draft PPS3. * The policy should not express a preference for a split of tenure between rent and intermediate housing. Current government advice in circular 6/98 confirms that planning policy should not be expressed in preference for any particular tenure and includes low cost market housing within the definition of affordable housing. it says: "planning policy should not be expressed in favour of any particular form of tenure. Therefore, the terms "affordable housing" or "affordable homes" are used in this Circular to encompass both low-cost market and subsidised housing (irrespective of tenure, ownership-whether excesive or shared - or financial arrangements) that will be available to people who cannot afford to rent or buy houses generally available on the open market." (paragraph 4) Although draft PPS3 suggested a redefinition to exclude low cost housing we cannot be sure this stage that this will not change in the final policy statement. * Flexibility will also be required regarding the precise quantum and mix of affordable housing delivered on individual sites depending on the availability of Housing Corporation funding and the overall viability of the development. The lack of Housing Corporation funding is clearly acknowledged by the ODPM as a material consideration. It is noted in the Draft of PPS3 that local planning authorities "should make informed assumptions about the levels of finance available for affordable housing". (paragraph 27 refers). PPS3 promises further guidance in a future companion guide on innovative approaches to securing affordable housing where levels of funding previously assumed are not forthcoming. Unfortunately this further guidance has not yet been released. However, the earlier consultation paper on 'Planning for Mixed communities' in January 2005, noted that: "Where necessary planning obligations should include an appropriate cascade or fallback mechanism to ensure delivery of affordable housing.....Through an alternative arrangement (for example a different split between social rented and intermediate housing or a different proportion of affordable housing)....."
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr N Pike	English Nature		Observations	English Nature neither supports nor objects to these options
Preferred Option 5:	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Support with conditions	Pleased to see rural and urban developments are treated differently. In view of option 4

## Report of Consultation Responses Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Providing for Affordable Housing					not sure how this option will work in practice in rural areas.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr M Richardson			Support with conditions	Yes there are sites capable of fulfilling this objective both in urban and rural environments especially those close to settlements with key services e.g. schools/shops/transport partnership rural land owners and developers/housing associations very important I have sites suitable.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr T Bladon			Support with conditions	For the sake of clarity it would perhaps be better to express the "2+ dwellings" in the second paragraph as "two or more dwellings" to agree with the comment at 3.23 of this option.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Councillor D Nalson			Support	
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support with conditions	Providing for Affordable Housing; agreed, although the impact on those mixed use sites which are delivering other community aspirations needs to be fully considered.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Miss H Edwards	British Waterways		Object	Preferred Option 5: Providing for affordable housing In BW's experience it is not always possible to provide affordable housing on brownfield sites to the level sought in the LDF document. Circular 6/98 clearly sets out the criteria which should be taken into account in negotiating the level of affordable housing to be provided on any sites which may come forward as follows: The proximity of local services and facilities and access to public transport; Whether there will be particular costs associated with the development of the site; and Whether the provision of affordable housing would prejudice the realisation of other planning objectives that need to be given priority in the development of the site. Furthermore, Draft Planning Policy Statement PPS 3 states that: "Local planning authorities should balance the need for affordable housing against the viability of sites in their area. We would seek for any policy to reflect the criteria in Circular 6/98 to ensure high quality development on underutilised brownfield sites along the waterway corridor.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Jacob Newby	Environment Agency		Observations	PO5 The occupants of affordable housing are often more vulnerable to the impacts of flooding as they are less likely to be able to afford adequate home and contents insurance. They may also be more physically vulnerable. The budget restrictions for such development can also restrict the type and extent of mitigation that may be practicable. Sites for affordable housing schemes should not, therefore, be granted within areas that have been identified as at risk of flooding in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). This should be made explicit within this option.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Object	50-50 mix is about right.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr C J Townson			Support with conditions	Colsterworth has approximately 70 families/requirements from local people. It is important these local people are consulted EARLY in the planning process so that only suitable housing is built, we have examples where affordable housing has been offered but not accepted because of 'unsuitable neighbour's.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Cllr A Pelling			Support	
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Miss H Mawson	The Home Builders Federation		Object	The shortage of affordable housing will not be addressed without greater increase in the provision of housing across the whole spectrum. Where affordable housing is sought to be subsidised by open market housing, this will not come forward without a substantial increase in the provision of open market housing to accommodate it. Furthermore, when an excessively high level of affordable housing is sought, as is currently the case in the proposed Core Strategy, this is likely to prevent sites coming forward and thus hamper the provision of both affordable and or open market housing. The HBF objects to the level of affordable housing being sought by the Core Strategy without identification of

## Report of Consultation Responses Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					individual sites ability to meet such a requirement. The proposed level of affordable housing requirement is likely to result in sites not coming forward and a slowing rate in delivery. This will further lead to a rise in house prices and increased pressure for affordable houses. In addition, the policies stipulate a high threshold for the provision of affordable housing and do not take account of the economics of the development of individual sites. The policies should therefore introduce flexibility, allowing for a lower level of contribution where justified and raising the threshold to more realistic levels. The affordable housing target is based upon a Housing Needs Assessment. It is important to note that such surveys are now changing and the Government is to place increased emphasis on Housing Market Assessments. It is acknowledged that the Council is currently underway with HMA work, however, the HBF is concerned that until this work is complete the present policy is not founded on a robust and credible evidence base. The HBF is concerned that the split between rented and shared equity provision is broad brush and does not take account of the local requirements associated with each site as it comes forward and the changing circumstances of the area. Regard should be had to the needs of the local community.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support with conditions	The percentage for affordable housing should be higher
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Support	
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mrs S Murray	The Countryside Agency		Observations	Comments from option 4 equally apply to this option
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr M S Herbert	Brown & Co		Object	It is inappropriate to suggest that there should be a 50% affordable housing content to the larger sites. This is way above the norm and may be prejudicial to some of the larger developments where there will be substantial infrastructure and other associated costs. Much of the affordable housing need is outside the main towns and more active consideration should be given to exception sites to satisfy this demand. We contend that the allocation of affordable housing should not exceed 35% and it should be evidenced by need. It is also appropriate to say that if there had been a better supply of housing land both in previous and the current plan, affordability would not be such an issue. The price of housing has increased substantially, principally on account of the value of land. Prices have increased substantially because of the shortage of land to develop. The Council should, wherever they reasonably can, be innovative and expansive in their thinking to make sure that land does come forward to make sure there is a balance between supply and demand.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Barbara Robinson	Fulbeck Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Ms J Bateman			Support	
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mrs S Roberts			Support with conditions	as much housing as possible should be affordable, does provision need to be made for an ageing poulation. Bungalow-small houses also need to be built. Need to ensure enough affordable housing is built to prevent more houses being built just because the mix is wrong.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Support	
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr I Fuller			Observations	50% affordable homes is unrealistic in current residential market, suggests 25%
Preferred Option 5:	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Support with conditions	Through requiring a development as small as two plus dwellings in a rural area to include

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Providing for Affordable Housing					50% affordable housing may be excessive.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Marston Parish Council	Marston Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr J Judge			Support	
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr A Clark			Support with conditions	Pleased to see that, at last urban and rural developments are treated differently, in view of option 4 would like to see how this will work in practice for the rural areas.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Councillor J Judge	Stamford Town Council		Support with conditions	Affordable housing? providing RSLs can fulfil any application to provide what is really affordable either for renting or purchase, I accept this option.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr S Pease	Ancer Spa	Ancer Spa	Support with conditions	This policy objective is more likely to be achieved through the planning and delivery of large town extension schemes. Such schemes would also ensure that this higher level of affordable housing is served by a comprehensive range of education, health, community and transport facilities, thereby ensuring that the affordable housing becomes integrated into a sustainable community. If only 100 new houses are allocated in Stamford in the period 2006-2021 (according to policy H3 in the Housing and Economic DPD), then this will only generate some 30 affordable housing in 15 years which will make an insignificant contribution towards target of 643 affordable homes per annum in the District identified in the Housing Needs Survey. Further clarification is needed of the requirement for affordable homes in Stamford and housing allocations should be set to help deliver this target.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr J Easter	Humberts	Humberts	Object	Proposed increase from 31% to 50% is punitive, will discourage release of land, and, quite probably, render the redevelopment of brownfield sites uneconomic.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr J Easter	Humberts	Humberts	Object	Proposed increase from 31% to 50% is punitive especially if other abnormal costs have to be borne.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr A Evans	CgMs	CgMs	Observations	In respect of the Preferred Option 5, the provision of Affordable Housing is supported, however it is necessary to incorporate reference within the draft Policy to include the impact of viability of the provision of affordable housing. For example, National, Strategic and Local policies dictate that new development should be directed in the first instance to previously developed land, however often such sites require greater levels of remediation work in order to bring forward development. Accordingly, in some cases it may not be viable to provide 50% affordable on particular residential schemes that are proposed on previously developed sites. In respect of the Preferred Option 5, the provision of Affordable Housing is supported, however it is necessary to incorporate reference within the draft Policy to include the impact of viability of the provision of affordable housing. For example, National, Strategic and Local policies dictate that new development should be directed in the first instance to previously developed land, however often such sites require greater levels of remediation work in order to bring forward development. Accordingly, in some cases it may not be viable to provide 50% affordable on particular residential schemes that are proposed on previously developed sites. In such instances it is necessary to consider the economics of provision and it is appropriate to alter the draft policy in this respect. It is therefore recommended that an additional paragraph is inserted into Preferred Option 5 that allows for a reduction in the 50% affordable housing provision on sites where this cannot be viably achieved. Retaining the policy at a 50% level of provision, and the impact that this has on the viability for particular sites, could potentially be detrimental to the Councils targets for overall affordable housing provision. The additional paragraph should state: - 'On certain sites it may not be economically viable to provide 50% affordable housing provision, particularly where there are specific site remediation issues. Accordingly, the Council will consider a reduced level of

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					affordable housing provision when assessing individual planning applications for residential development. In such instances it is necessary to consider the economics of provision and it is appropriate to alter the draft policy in this respect. It is therefore recommended that an additional paragraph is inserted into Preferred Option 5 that allows for a reduction in the 50% affordable housing provision on sites where this cannot be viably achieved. Retaining the policy at a 50% level of provision, and the impact that this has on the viability for particular sites, could potentially be detrimental to the Council targets for overall affordable housing provision. The additional paragraph should state: - On certain sites it may not be economically viable to provide 50% affordable housing provision, particularly where there are specific site remediation issues. Accordingly, the Council will consider a reduced level of affordable housing provision when assessing individual planning applications for residential development.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mrs J Gardener	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Object	Allison Homes strongly object to a requirement that 50% of the dwellings to be provided will be classified as affordable homes. It is noted that the Council's justification for this excessively high target is the findings of its Housing Need Survey and the identification of a need for "643 affordable homes in the district per annum". Not only is this figure totally unrealistic against an annual structure plan requirement of 460 dpa but it also has no regard to the findings of the Housing Market Assessment which is yet to be undertaken. This could identify a demand for, say, 1000 additional market dwellings per annum (and this is probably an under-estimate in view of the expressed desire for market housing) which again, although not achievable would indicate that a 40:60 split between affordable and market housing would be more appropriate. It is therefore essential for this matter to be informed by the results of the HMA.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mrs J Gardener	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Object	Allison Homes and Stamford Homes strongly object to a requirement that 50% for the dwellings to be provided will be classified as affordable homes. It is noted that the Council's justification for this excessively high target is the findings of its Housing Needs Survey and the identification of a need for "643 affordable homes in the district per annum". Not only is this figure totally unrealistic against an annual structure plan requirement of 460dpa but it also has no regard to the findings of the Housing Market Assessment which is yet to be undertaken. This could identify a demand for, say 1,000 additional market dwellings per annum (and this is probably an under-estimate in view of the expressed desire for market housing) which again, although not achievable would indicate that a 40:60 split between affordable and market housing would be more appropriate. It is therefore essential for this matter to be informed by the results for the HMA (which must contain specific consideration of Grantham's housing market).
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr P Frampton	Framptons	Framptons	Object	The provision of 50% affordable housing on new housing sites is considered too onerous when considered in the context of other planning obligations. The problem of the shortage of affordable housing is in part a consequence of the planning system failing to make available sufficient land for housing. If the planning system now endeavors to remedy its failure by overly burdening new housing sites with planning obligations, land may not come forward for devleopment. The housing supply situation will be made worse and the affordability gap aggravated. Provision of affordable housing at a rate of between 30% and 40% would be more reasonable as part of a housing strategy.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr M E Hendry	Bidwells	Bidwells	Object	The words "average ration of 50% affordable and 50% market housing" should be dropped in favour of a "minimum of 40% affordable housing should be provided, as long as this does not effect the financial viability of the scheme and its delivery".
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr J Parmiter			Object	An average ratio of 50% is too high; at this level it will act as a disincentive to new housing development. For regeneration and other brownfield sites, the economic of development need to take priority over affordable housing targets.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr J Boyd	JB Planning Assocaites Limited	JB Planning Assocaites Limited	Object	We object to the requirement for 50% of new housing development to be for affordable homes on the grounds that such a high percentage of affordable provision will have a serious impact on the economic viability of housing development in the District and in particular in Grantham. Further, we consider that Preferred Option 5 is inconsistent with national plannig guidance contained in Circular 6/98 in that there is no acknowledgement that the economics of development should be properly taken into account when



## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					determining the most appropriate percentage of affordable homes to be provided on a site by site basis. As a consequence of this objection, objections are made to Paragraph 3.24 of the Core Strategy DPD Preferred Options. PROPOSED AMENDMENT Amend Paragraph 3.24 to delete '50%' before the word affordable and delete '50% market' so that the amended paragraph reads: 'On sites that qualify for affordable housing, a percentage of affordable housing will be required'.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr N Gough	Bigwood Associates	Bigwood Associates	Object	If you are not providing any new housing for Bourne you will not be making provision in that Town for Affordable Housing for 15+ years. The proposed new employment provision will require complementary Affordable Housing so provision needs to be made. Unachievable policy - will not meet the objectives.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Object	It is inappropriate to suggest that there should be a 50% affordable housing content to the larger sites. This is way above the norm and may be prejudicial to some of the larger developments where there will be substantial infrastructure and other associated costs. Much of the affordable housing need is outside the main towns and more active consideration should be given to exception sites to satisfy this demand. We contend that the allocation of affordable housing should not exceed 35% and it should be evidenced by need. It is also appropriate to say that if there had been a better supply of housing land both in previous and the current plan, affordability would not be such an issue. The price of housing has increased substantially because of the shortage of land to develop. The Council should, wherever they reasonably can, be innovative and expansive in their thinking to make sure that land does come forward to make sure there is a balance between supply and demand.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Object	In light of the Objection to PO4, it is considered that changes to the overall level of housing provision will clearly also affect the proportion of affordable housing development requirement required. Thus, on the assumption that the estimated annual requirement for affordable housing of 643 dwellings is needs led and will not therefore change if the overall level of housing provision is increased, it is likely that in the latter event, the proportion of affordable housing required will fall. 50% affordable housing is an extremely high proportional requirement, which will have a direct impact on the cost and viability of housing developments, especially when other development overheads and community obligations are taken into account. This may in turn affect whether some housing sites are brought forward at all and/or the timing of the bringing forward of sites. It is axiomatic that since most affordable housing provision will be made on the back of market housing, affordable housing supply will also be choked off, leading to a deterioration of the affordable housing situation if market housing delivery is inhibited. It is essential therefore, that the proportion of affordable housing should be realistic and reasonable and to this end PO5 should be reviewed in the light of the changes to PO4 advocated above. There is also a need also to revisit the data and assumptions underlying the Housing Needs Survey, a number of which are questioned.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr I Smith	Smiths Gore	Smiths Gore	Object	There are a number of objections to this option: *The rural threshold of 2+ dwellings is far too low. There are significant practical problems in the delivery of affordable housing on the basis and we question whether RSLs have endorsed this approach. How does this relate to PO1 which appears to prevent virtually all development in settlements below Local Service Centres? The effect will be no affordable housing in the rural areas at all; * The unit cost of providing an affordable dwelling on a site of two houses is much higher than providing larger sites. This means that RSL resources are not cost effectively spent in acquiring individual dwellings; * Housing management by RSLs is also far more costly and onerous when managing single unit sites; * A level of 50% is unjustifiably high and is akin to that set out in the London Spatial Development Plan. We do not think that affordability in South Kesteven is on a par with the capital. A level of 50% will act as a significant disincentive to invest in the borough and there is a danger that this will have a distinct effect on the delivery of all housing requirements; * Specific affordable housing allocations do not work as landowners will simply not make their land available for development because there is no point in them doing so. We have direct experience of recent Local Plan inquiries where such policies have been comprehensively dismissed

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					by inspectors as unworkable except where land is already owned by sympathetic parties. There is no support for this type of approach in national guidance.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	David Bainbridge	Bidwells	Bidwells	Object	I object to the 50% figure and to paragraph 3.24 on the same grounds as Spatial Objective 7. Indeed it should be noted that this option conflicts with Spatial Objective 7 which states "a need for up to 50% affordable and local-need housing in the district", whereas this preferred option states "an average ratio of 50% affordable and 50% market housing will be required". The preferred option is of course potentially more onerous and hence the percentage of affordable should be made to the emerging SPD, site specific characteristics and local context.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Support with conditions	Rural exception sites should seek to provide a mixture of types, sizes and tenures of dwellings. Promotion of 100% affordable housing sites should be avoided since they are often unviable for developers.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Antony Aspbury Associates			Object	In light of the Objection to PO4, it is considered that changes to the overall level of housing provision will clearly also affect the proportion of affordable housing development required. Thus, on the assumption that the estimated annual requirement for affordable housing of 643 dwellings is needs led and will not therefore change if the overall level of housing provision is increased, it is likely that in the latter event, the proportion of affordable housing required will fall. 50 % affordable housing is an extremely high proportional requirement, which will have a direct impact on the cost and viability of housing developments, especially when other development overheads and community obligations are taken into account. This may in turn affect whether some housing sites are brought forward at all and/or the timing of the bringing forward of sites. It is axiomatic that since most affordable housing provision will be made on the back of market housing, affordable housing supply will also be choked off, leading to a deterioration of the affordable housing situation if market housing delivery is inhibited. It is essential, therefore, that the proportion of affordable should be realistic and reasonable and to this end PO5 should be reviewed in the light of the changes to PO4 advocated above. There is also a need to revisit the data and assumptions underlying the Housing Needs Survey, a number of which are questioned. Notwithstanding the above, it is considered that the threshold for rural developments of "2+" dwellings is far too low. It is not clear, furthermore, whether this means "two or more" or "more than two". Secondly, it is not clear whether the policy will relate just to new build or to conversions as well. Nor is it clear whether, as has been found with some local planning authorities, the affordable provision itself contributes to the housing total for the purposes of the application of the affordable housing proportion, thereby progressively inflating the requirement. Setting so low a threshold as two dwellings will inhibit needed small-scale development in rural areas by rendering the smallest schemes unviable and/or by deterring certain developments, thus defeating the object of the Policy. The Objectors Propose, therefore, that the threshold should be set at 'more than 5' dwellings and with the ratio of market to affordable housing starting at not more than 25% for schemes of less than ten dwellings and 30-355 for 10-14 dwellings.
Preferred Option 5: Providing for Affordable Housing	Mr E Banks			Support with conditions	See comment on option one - we would welcome some 'exception' sites for meeting identified local needs.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mrs C Curtis			Support with conditions	I would like to see Bourne Woods included in the protected sites, although this is ancient woodland - ie is not SS1, forest enterprise might be persuaded to sell. Bourne woods should be preserved for leisure and wild life and future generations.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Support with conditions	We see little evidence of a positive approach to identify and protect open areas within Bourne and its environs. (it is worth noting that much of the valuable open space in the town is owned and maintained by Bourne United Charities INCLUDING two of the three areas listed!)
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the	Mr N Pike	English Nature		Support with conditions	English Nature supports this option as it is compatible with the sequential approach. Policy will need to define "important habitat" (bottom paragraph)

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Character of the District					
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mrs A M Bell			Observations	Please will you tell me why designated recreational sites are specified in Bourne and Grantham but none in Stamford?
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Support with conditions	Foston Parish Plan working group are currently working on a village design statement with the view of having adopted as an SPD
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr M Richardson			Support	Very important the best design principles learnt over developments in the country should be considered including making any derelict eyesore look appealing. Do not be too timid to allow new views to be framed by visionary architects/developers.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr T Bladon			Support with conditions	In considering this option the statements at paragraphs 3.31 and 3.34 should be taken into account (Tree Preservation Orders and Conservation of the quality of the countryside). It is the experience of the writer that the provisions of the Local Plan (Policy EN1 para ii) have been disregarded in the past by the Planning Authority on a number of occasions; in particular the conservation and enhancement of trees and hedgerows associated with development applications. Applicants have stated on their applications that no trees or hedges would be removed or felled, but they have not abided by their statement and have ignore their undertaking by felling those trees and removing hedges from a developoment site. On the occasions that this has occurred, complaints have been made to the Council, and have been rebutted by the statement that there is no justification for the complaint, as the trees or hedge were not the subject of a preservation order. This is not what policies EN1, PPS7 and PPG3 state. In order to protect the rural character of villages it is essential to retain trees and hedges wherever possible. it is considered that greater emphasis and penalties should be imposed upon developers in this respect to achieve this objective.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Councillor D Nalson			Support with conditions	Land between Tinwell Road and Empingham Road Stamford should also be protected from development
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Ben Hunt	Sport England West Midlands		Observations	Sport England welcomes the approach of this policy to protect open land with amenity value, including recreational land as well as the open countryside. We recommend that the Council carefully considers the Regional Assembly-funded Green Infrastructure study, and how the Core Strategy can integrate with that approach. In particular, when identifying significant amenity areas for protection, it is recommended that the document makes it clear that this includes areas for sport and active recreation.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr C Blackman	Cambridgeshire County Council		Object	The Natural Environment. Although Objective 12 is to enhance the natural and built environment, there is no Preferred Option on landscape, biodiversity or other aspects of the natural environment. In adjoining Cambridgeshire the Structure Plan has a policy for countryside enhancement (P7/3), where local plans will identify areas for quiet recreation, biodiversity and landscape enhancement. Coupled with this are identified target areas for habitat creation (Fig 7.1). Part of the area adjoining South Kesteven is identified as an area of chalk and limestone grassland, and there may be opportunities to develop cross-border schemes with Peterborough, leading to better care of local landscape and biodiversity features and a greater sense of continuity.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support with conditions	Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District: agreed, the contribution which open land makes to the townscape cannot be overstated and we welcome the inclusion of land between Tinwell Road and the River Welland form the A1 trunk road to the Bridge including allotment gardens and the Town Meadows. We also urge the

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					inclusion of other green spaces for protection, such as the Recreation Ground.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Jacob Newby	Environment Agency		Observations	We welcome the recognition of several pieces of land along rivers as being important to the character of areas. We would encourage the SKDC to consider whether this position could be strengthened by restricting the type of development within the Environment Agency's 9m byelaw distance from main rivers. This would meet the requirements of enhancing and preserving the character of these areas, help encourage bio-diversity, provide amenity space and ensure that the rivers can be effectively maintained by the EA. We note that the Option proposes to identify specific areas of open land. It is unclear at what stage this is to be carried out and whether it will be subject to consultation. More detail regarding this should be included.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Support with conditions	better late than never
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr C J Townson			Support	
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Cllr A Pelling			Support with conditions	Concern over recent examples of residents 'annexing' public open space to extend their gardens / parking areas. One recent example of this (31 Pawlett Close, DSJ) with SKDC approval. Adherence to and enforcement of this option is urgently required.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support	
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Support with conditions	But urban overdevelopment of alleged brownfield land is mitigating against this being achieved. Also the refusal of SKDC to have a design policy for Stamford is to be deplored
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Ms J Young	Heritage Lincolnshire		Support with conditions	It is important to also take into account the setting of Scheduled Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings and Historic Parks and Gardens when identifying specific areas of open land, as well as proposed development. Setting includes what can be seen and heard, to and from the monument. Sites The area around St. Leonards Priory (both Scheduled and unscheduled), Stamford should also be added. Has landscape character assessment been undertaken for the District? (Policy 30 of RSS8) When identifying specific areas of open land, the historic environment should be taken into account
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Ann Plackett	English Heritage		Observations	Clearly the policy could have beneficial effects in terms of protecting historic landscape character. However, it does not address historic townscape character. The specific proposal for the Witham valley would seem to bring benefits for protecting the setting of Belton Park. However, consideration could be given to the inclusion of a setting policy, including an area defined on the Proposals Map. Work undertaken for the National Trust has resulted in the inclusion of such a policy/ defined area in the recently adopted local plan for Amber Valley for Kedleston Hall, near Derby.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Ann Plackett	English Heritage		Observations	Objection: Although English Heritage generally welcomes the policy, it should be made clear that it refers to landscape and not townscape character as well. We consider that the policy could be revised to cover townscape character, although this could also be achieved by strengthening Policy 32 as proposed below. The second paragraph lacks clarity. It is not clear if the reference to protected areas' refers to open countryside, allotments etc or to the designated sites, including registered historic parks and gardens referred to in paragraph 3.31. Grammatically, the term protected areas' does appear to refer to open countryside etc, in which case, the use of the term seems misleading, as they are not formally protected areas. Historic parks and gardens are an important characteristic of the area and PPG15 states that Local Planning Authorities should protect Registered Parks and Gardens in preparing development plans.

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					Recommendations: That your Council considers whether this policy should be amended to address townscape character; That if the policy only addresses landscape character this should be made clear in the title. The second paragraph of the policy should be amended for clarity. That there should be reference to historic parks and gardens in the policy. In view of the importance of parks and gardens in the District, we would recommend that an additional policy is added to the Heritage section of the Core Strategy (or any Development Control Policies DPD). The following wording is suggested: "The preservation or enhancement of Historic Parks and Gardens, and their settings will be secured by: (a) Safeguarding features which form an integral part of the special character or appearance of the Park or Garden; and (b) Ensuring that development would not detract from the enjoyment, layout, design, character, appearance or setting of the Park or Garden, or prejudice its future restoration; and (c) Encouraging the preparation of conservation statements or management plans and the implementation of appropriate enhancement schemes".
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mrs S Murray	The Countryside Agency		Support with conditions	The accompanying text with this option is supported by LAR, particularly the references to protection of the open countryside, the role of landscape character in the desirability and identity of the area, the value of open spaces for health and open air recreation and the protection and enhancement of biodiversity. These paragraphs could be further enhanced by stronger commitments to landscape and biodiversity enhancement as well as protection. The preferred option is supported by LAR, and will make an important contribution to the area in its capacity to protect important open spaces. The protection of riverside land, green spaces within villages and towns and the protection of allotments, is particularly noted in the specific list of sites. As suggested by the SA Report at paragraph 16.6.4, the option would benefit from more specific reference to Landscape Character Assessments (LCA). LCA is a critical part of the environmental baseline and should play a key role in land protection and land allocation decisions. It is expected that more specific policies for the conservation, enhancement and management of landscape, biodiversity and geological diversity will be included in future development plan documents, and it would be helpful if the local authority could confirm this. The Sustainability Appraisal Report does not offer any further comfort or clarification. Paragraph 15.6.3 of the SA Report states that 'It is unclear whether the LDF will include a policy to protect wildlife and biodiversity and, hence, unclear whether these greenfield sites will be protected in the event that they are of value".
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr M S Herbert	Brown & Co		Object	We feel the first paragraph should be reworded to say something along the lines of: "New development should protect and not diminish the character of the district." It will undoubtedly be extremely difficult to say that new development contributes positively to that character. Almost certainly any form of development could be prejudicial. Minimisation of the impact is the key issue.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Barbara Robinson	Fulbeck Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Ms J Bateman			Support with conditions	New development should contribute positively to existing character and not be a blot on the landscape, but sympathetic to its surroundings. Please add river Welland east of Stamford to list.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mrs S Roberts			Support with conditions	An additional area to be protected is Bourne Wood and the surrounding fields - ensuring a belt of land around the area as a buffer zone, this is an important area of land for recreational use and wildlife should be protected by specific mention.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Object	A specific commitment should be made to enhance biodiversity as part of new developments. There is no consideration of the historic dimension of landscape character, the bullet points should be supplemented accordingly. Land in the vicinity of Woolsthorpe Manor should be included in the list of protected sites in accordance with the Trust's submissions on the Issues and Options paper (Nov 2005).

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Marston Parish Council	Marston Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr J Judge			Support	Stamford has a mass of allotments, many not in use although a waiting list is available, through applicant being selected. I feel these could be considered although some tenants would have to be reallocated another plot or allotments made smaller.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr A Clark			Support	
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Councillor J Judge	Stamford Town Council		Support with conditions	Allotments in Stamford are underused many will never be used because of size. This is land that voluntary organisations could use to fill their commitment to the people they serve. I would certainly support liason with the Town Council and planning.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr P R Tame	National Farmers Union		Support with conditions	Support provided that land owners and occupiers are properly consulted on the specific areas of open land: where they are and the extent. If there is no need for consultation then we would oppose this option.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr S Pease	Ancer Spa	Ancer Spa	Support with conditions	The identification of specific areas of open land whcih are significant to the form and character of the towns and villages within the district is an important initiative that is supported. This process will clarify which areas are inappropriate for future development and which areas may be appropriate for future town extensions. This process will contribute to the proper positive planning of towns in the district. The protection of the land at Stamford comprising area between Tinwell Road and the River Welland from the A1 Trunk Road to The Bridge and including Town Meadows, is supported.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr J Easter	Humberts	Humberts	Object	Paragraph 2 of this option is inconsistent with the inclusion in the key diagram of A1 corridor opportunity areas.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr J Easter	Humberts	Humberts	Object	Preferences to 'open areas of land' are implicitly restrictive when they should imply only that special regard will be exercised. the subject land is so effected.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr A Evans	CgMs	CgMs	Observations	Further clarification is needed in respect of the part of preferred option B in relevance to only development which is necessary and appropriate will be allowed within the open countryside and on sites used for recreational activities or on land currently used as allotments. Reference to current demand needed. The general objective of Preferred Option 6 ' to protect and enhance the character of the District ' is welcomed. However further clarification is needed in respect of reference to open countryside and allotments. Where the Policy currently states “Only development which is necessary and appropriate will be allowed within the open countryside and on sites used for recreational activities or on land currently used as allotments” further clarification is necessary in terms of the precise use of such sites, and that redevelopment proposals for each should be determined on a case-by-case basis. The Preferred Option, as worded, gives a blanket restriction on the potential redevelopment of many sites within the District, which is to the detriment of achieving economic and sustainable development objectives. Crucially, the restriction on redevelopment of such sites will potentially lead to a lack of housing provision or employment floorspace, to the detriment of established targets to meet demand for such uses. While it is recognised that many of the sites referred to within the

# Report of Consultation Responses

## Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					Preferred Option are of nature conservation, landscape or amenity importance within the District, there is a requirement to ensure that any open countryside, recreational activity land or allotment sites that do not contribute in such a manner and which are therefore of minimal or no importance, are considered as suitable for potential redevelopment. This obviously requires analysis on an individual site basis and, therefore, it is recommended that further clarification in this regard is inserted into the Policy. In particular, a reference to the current use of such sites is required within the Policy in order to assess this against the amenity, landscape or nature conservation value of a site. Also, reference to the current demand for such sites is required in order to assist in the determination of whether or not they are of nature conservation, landscape or amenity importance. Accordingly, an additional paragraph, after the second paragraph of the Policy as it is currently worded, should be inserted that reads: - "Development proposals on sites that are currently open countryside, sites used for recreational purposes and allotments will be assessed on the following criteria: - (1) Their contribution to nature conservation, landscape or amenity importance; (2) Their current use; and (3) The level of demand for the site in its current use. On sites where this assessment demonstrates that they are of no nature conservation, landscape or amenity importance, alternative uses will be considered appropriate, as referred to above, and in accordance with other Policies in the plan". It is also pertinent to note that Opportunity Area 3 within the Housing & Economic Development DPD (Bourne Core Area (OA3)) includes land currently in allotment use that is allocated as being appropriate for mixed-use redevelopment.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr M E Hendry	Bidwells	Bidwells	Support	
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr J Parmiter			Support	
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Object	PO6 lacks clarity, is too generalised in its approach and probably too broad in its scope. The title of the PO refers to the 'character' of the District, but it appears to encompass, in addition to the protection of landscape character, protection of the countryside, protection of habitats/species and the promotion of bio-diversity, and protection of recreational land, which do not necessarily correspond to landscape character. On the other hand, there is no reference to the protection of agricultural land and development. It is felt that there should be separate Preferred Options concerned with development in the countryside (including agriculture), with habitat/species protection and biodiversity and with land in 'recreational' use. The rest of the comments on this PO should be read in the light of this latter suggestion. This PO should follow more closely the approach in PPS7, PPS9 and PPG17. It is not clear from the current drafting of the PO how national and local protective designations will be treated and reconciled. There also appears to be confusion between the approach to protection of the open countryside away from settlements and that around settlements and urban areas. There is no reference in PO itself to the promotion of sustainable development, which is a key underlying principle of Government Policy as set out in PPS7. The PO needs to spell out in general terms how the 'necessary and appropriate' qualification in paragraph 2 is to be interpreted and what considerations should inform the interpretation. But in any event, the necessary and appropriate qualification is too narrow, and should be extended to also admit development that produces demonstrable benefits by reference to other legitimate objectives. The PO needs to make clear how 'open countryside' will be defined. (Thus for example, some local planning authorities tend to define the (open) countryside 'by default' as all land outside defined settlement limits. However, such limits are necessarily flexible over time in order to accommodate needed development, and this has led to confusion through a failure to distinguish between land on the edge of settlements, that is for the time being open, and the genuinely open countryside that should be protected

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					both for its own sake and pursuant to certain clearly defined policy objectives. The application of the 'necessary and appropriate' qualification to land merely 'used' for recreational activities or as allotments is too restrictive. Firstly, 'recreational activities' is too broad a term and needs to be more precise and be related to public/community interest/benefit. Secondly, reliance on current use alone neglects whether the 'recreational' or allotment space is actually needed by the community by reference to appropriate criteria. Finally in relation to Paragraph 2, as foreshadowed above, it is not clear how the matters it encompasses are concerned with the protection and enhancement of the character of the district. The PO needs to contain a clear commitment to assessing landscape and visual quality on the basis of recognised objectives and appropriate and transparent criteria consistently applied. There needs to be a clear understanding of the essential differences between policies concerned with the regulation of the form and extent of settlements and with the protection of landscapes and views of intrinsic quality. The list of bulleted criteria in Paragraph 3 appears to highlight a confusion in the drafter's mind as to this distinction and they have been driven in an ad hoc and somewhat eccentric fashion is incomplete. It is not at all clear how these criteria will be defined and applied, and how they will be translated into appropriately framed policies. There is a danger that there will be too many overlapping protective designations, resulting in unnecessary proscription of development, in duplication and in confusion. In light of the foregoing, whilst the discrete areas listed in the final paragraph of the PO may well represent a starting point as candidate areas for some form of protection, to avoid pre-empting a comprehensive exercise based on clearly defined criteria it is felt that it would be better to delete reference to these specific in the PO.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr I Smith	Smiths Gore	Smiths Gore	Object	We are unsure what the difference between Bullet Point 1 and the Bullet Points 4 and 5. What other forms of 'important open area which separates distinct groups of buildings' might there be?
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr D Crofts	RPS Planning	RPS Planning	Support with conditions	The trust supports this approach in principle. However, it considers that if some of the identified employment sites were to be developed, this could be detrimental to the objectives of this Preferred Option. Specifically, the Council should reconsider the proposed allocations E1(b), E1(c), E1(e) and RE1 in this context.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	David Bainbridge	Bidwells	Bidwells	Object	The protected sites within the four towns should be identified within the Key Diagram to ensure the spatial strategy takes these into consideration. This is recommended at paragraph 4.30 of Planning for Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - A guide to Good Practice, which complements PPS 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. However, the identification of these sites should be based on survey work and independent assessment.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Support with conditions	Developments on the edge of urban areas and on the edge of settlements in the countryside require special attention due to their potential visual impact (be it positive or negative) on the landscape and wider views. Development on the edge of urban areas and settlements should have particular regard to creating sensitive and attractive roofscapes and skylines.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Antony Aspbury Associates			Object	PO6 lacks clarity, is too generalised in its approach and probably too broad in its scope. The title of the PO refers to the 'character' of the District, but it appears to encompass, in addition to the protection of landscape character, protection of the countryside, protection of habitats/species and the promotion of bio-diversity, and protection of recreational land, which do not necessarily correspond to landscape character. On the other hand, there is no reference to the protection of agricultural land and development. It is felt that there should be separate Preferred Options concerned with development in the countryside (including agriculture), with habitat/species protection and biodiversity and with land in 'recreational' use. The rest of the comments on this PO should be read in the light of this latter suggestion. This PO should follow more closely the approach in PPS7, PPS9, and PPG17. It is not clear from the current drafting of the PO how national and local protective designations will be treated and reconciled. There also appears to be



**Report of Consultation Responses**  
**Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)**

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					confusion between the approach to protection of the open countryside away from settlements, and that around settelements and urban areas. There is no reference in PO itself to the promotion of sustainable development, which is a dey underlying principle of Government Policy as set out in PPS7. The PO needs to spell out in general terms how the 'necessary and appropriate' qualification in paragraph 2 is to be interpreted and what considerations should inform that interpretation. But in any event, the necessary and appropriate qualification is too narrow and should be extended to also admit of development that produces demonstrable benefits by reference to other legimate objectives. The PO needs to make clear how 'open countryside' will be defined. (Thus for example, some local planning authorities tend to define the (open) countryside 'by default' as all land outside defined settlement limits. However, such limits are necessarily flexible over time in order to accommodate needed development and this has led to confusion through a failure to distinguish between land on the edge of settlements, that is for the time being open, and the genuinely open countryside that should be protected both for its own sake and pursuant to certain clearly defined policy objectives). The application of the 'necessary and appropriate' qualification to land merely 'used' for recreational activities or as allotments is too restrictive. Firstly, related to public/community interest/benefit. Secondly, reliance on current use alone neglects whether the 'recreational' or allotment space is actually needed by the community by reference to appropriate criteria. Finally, in relation to Paragraph 2, as foreshadowed above, it is not clear how the matters it encompasses are concerned wiht the protection and enhancement of the character of the district. The PO needs to contain a clear commitment to assessing landscape and visual quality on the basis of recognised objectives and appropriate and transparent criteria consistently applied. There needs to be a clear understanding of the essential differences between policies concerned with the regulation of the form and extent of settlements, and with the protection of landscapes and views of intrinsic quality. The list of bulleted criteria in Paragraph 3 appears to highlight a confusion in the drafter's mind as to this distinction, and they have been derived in and ad hoc and somewhat eccentric fashion,and it is incomplete. It is not at all clear how these criteria will be defined and applied and how they will be translated into appropriately framed policies. There is a danger that there will be too many overlapping protective designations, resulting in unnecessary prescription of development, in duplication and in confusion. In light of the foregoing, whilst the discrete areas listed in the final paragraph of the PO may well represent a starting point as candidate areas for some form of protection, but to avoid pre-empting a comprehensive exercise based on clearly defined criteria, it is felt that it would be better to delete reference to these specific criteria in the PO.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Savills	Savills	Savills	Object	We consider that the Policy should refer to the unique role that Grimsthorpe Estate has. In this regard special consideration should be given to proposals which relate to the public use of the estate. i.e. visitor attractions and potential re-use of building(s) which are currently vacant or better suited to alternatvie uses which protect their character.
Preferred Option 6: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District	Mr E Banks			Support	
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mrs C Curtis			Support with conditions	Use of solar panels etc. a good idea but will make properties expensive. I think the government or Council's should contribute to this.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Support with conditions	There is very limited evidence that developers are currently being influenced in the way intended.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr N Pike	English Nature		Support with conditions	We support this option and welcome the specific references to the opportunities to enhance biodiversity through high quality development design.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Support with conditions	same as option 6
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr M Richardson			Support	Yes use best practice and proven use of renewables.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr T Bladon			Support with conditions	In considering this option the statements at paragraphs 3.31 and 3.34 should be taken into account (Tree Preservation Orders and Conservation of the quality of the countryside). It is the experience of the writer that the provisions of the Local Plan Policy EN1 para ii) have been disregarded in the past by the Planning Authority on a number of occasions, in particular the conservation and enhancement of trees and hedgerows associated with development applications. Applicants have stated on their applications that no trees or hedges would be removed or felled, but they have not abided by their statement and have ignore their undertaking by felling those trees and removing hedges from a development site. On the occasions that this has occurred, complaints have been made to the Council and have been rebutted by the statement that there is no justification for the complaint, as the trees or hedge were not the subject of a preservation order. This is not what policy EN1, PPS7 and PPG3 state. In order to protect the rural character of villages it is essential to retain trees and hedges wherever possible. It is considered that greater emphasis and penalties should be imposed upon developers in this respect to achieve this objective.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Councillor D Nalson			Support	
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support with conditions	Design of New Development: agreed. All schemes promoted by Stamford Vision which impact on the townscape have as a fundamental consideration the quality of design. We have produced a townscape hierarchy so that these decisions can be reviewed in context of their potential to impact on the visual amenity of the place.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Jacob Newby	Environment Agency		Observations	PO7 We recommend that this Option includes wording to make it clear that the points listed should be presumptions for all new developments. If development intends to deviate away from any of these it should be justified by a statement outlining the material considerations behind the decision. We consider that this is an excellent opportunity to set a high standard for development within the district that will contribute to the sustainability of future development.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Miss E C Biott	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust		Support with conditions	The Trust supports the promotion of measures which use natural resources efficiently, the use of sustainable drainage systems, the use of renewable energy and the incorporation of wildlife/biodiversity features. This option could be improved by making reference to 'green infrastructure' as incorporated in the Milton Keynes Sub Regional Spatial Strategy.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Support with conditions	Better late than never.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr C J Townson			Support with conditions	Is it possible to include a % figure as a minimum for builders to contribute either through design or finance to contribute to energy reduction besides the norms of double glazing/cavity wall etc?
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Cllr A Pelling			Support	
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Miss H Mawson	The Home Builders Federation		Object	The HBF believes that energy efficiency/conservation in new homes will be best achieved through the Building Regulations. Experience has shown that the established system of building control in England and Wales provides a reliable framework for the control of health, safety and energy efficinecy/conservation matters within buildings. With very few exceptions, national rules are applied consistently. The Federation cannot see that there are likely to be any legitimate considerations relating to energy efficiency/conservation, which would benefit from exposure to the planning system, or by the imposition of alternative requirement to those contained within the Building Regulations. The Federation, on behalf of the industry, works closely with Government, BRAC, BRE and others, regarding Building Regulation changes, in order to agree changes that can be achieved without unduly constraining design or introducing unacceptable technical risks. Changes to standards / requirements in construction need to be made with detailed consideraton so that the cost of achieving the requirement does not outweigh the benefit obtained by the change. For this reason we would ask that the

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					requirement for dwellings is to achieve a high level of energy efficiency, without stipulating a specific criteria to be met. In terms of Preferred Option 14, the HBF considers that the requirement for 'large scale developments to be constructed so as to meet level 5 of the emerging national Code for Sustainable Buildings' as unacceptable, particularly as the criteria for achieving Level 5 is yet to be confirmed. In addition, an initial analysis has identified that the cost implications involved in achieving level 5 would be vast and would result in the development being unviable. The HBF wholly agree that homes must be built to high environmental standards to manage their energy usage and water consumption. However, the methods for doing so must be robust, consumer friendly and cost efficient. Under the latest revision of building regulations, new homes will be 40% more energy efficient than those built five years ago, and they are as much as six times more energy efficient than their Victorian and Edwardian counterparts.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support	
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Support with conditions	But urban overdevelopment of alleged brownfield land is mitigating against this being achieved. Also the refusal of SKDC to have a design policy for stamford is to be deplored. Meaningless rubbish in 3.51 unless a clear design policy for Stamford.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Ms J Young	Heritage Lincolnshire		Support with conditions	In line with Policy 4 of RSS8
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Ms J Young	Heritage Lincolnshire		Support with conditions	In line with Policy 4 of RSS8
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Ann Plackett	English Heritage		Observations	Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development Objection English Heritage generally supports this policy, but considers that it could be strengthened with respect to conserving the character of historic settlements, such as Stamford. It is important that new development does not prejudice key views of a settlement or views of important areas of townscape within an historic settlement. Recommendations We propose the following amendments to the policy: Spelling mistake on line 3 'compliment' should be complement'. That an additional bullet point is added after the first bullet point: conserving the overall character of historic settlements by protecting key views of and within the settlement.' Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas Objection English Heritage welcomes the inclusion of this policy but would like to propose a few minor changes. With respect to the third bullet point we are concerned that there are no criteria to define what is meant by necessary'. The policy should reflect PPG 15. Paragraph 4.27 of PPG 15 indicates that proposals to demolish such buildings should be assessed against the same criteria as proposals to demolish listed buildings', unless the building makes little or no contribution to the character of the conservation area. Paragraph 4.29 of PPG 15 advises that a condition should be included in the grant of consent for demolition requiring that demolition should not take place until a contract for the carrying out works of redevelopment has been made and planning permission granted. Recommendations That the following words are added to the second sentence: This includes specific features, structures, street patterns, open spaces, views and vistas and boundary treatments. At the end of the second paragraph we should like to see your Council committing to the preparation of Conservation Area Statements and Management Plans for all of the District's conservation areas. There is a word missing in the first line of the third paragraph. The third bullet point is amended as follows: ..unless it has been demonstrated that the proposed demolition meets the criteria set out in PPG 15 and any replacement building will preserve or enhance the character of the area. It should also take account of the advice set out in paragraph 4.29 of PPG 15.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mrs S Murray	The Countryside Agency		Support with conditions	The accompanying information to preferred option seven is welcomed by LAR, as is the preferred option itself. LAR commends the list of sustainable requirements given within this option, particularly the first bullet point which is existing form, natural features and characteristics of a site and its surroundings.' LAR would also hope to see features that encourage walking and cycling included in the list. LAR looks forward to contributing to the proposed SPD on residential design, and is also particularly pleased to see village design statements encouraged. Village design statements should make an important

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					contribution to the LDF process, and are fundamental tools for community engagement, retention of local distinctiveness, protection and ownership of built assets, enhancement of local biodiversity and promotion of local business.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr M S Herbert	Brown & Co		Object	Economically it is not always possible to design to the "highest quality". It would be more appropriate to say that new development should be of a good quality and we accept the statement that this should incorporate sustainable building techniques wherever reasonably possible.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Barbara Robinson	Fulbeck Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Ms J Bateman			Support with conditions	Strongly support this especially the reference to scale/layout, renewable resources, landscaping and hope it reduces the toy town developments in areas of Stamford and Bourne which are not in keeping with their surroundings.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mrs S Roberts			Support with conditions	Council should encourage and perhaps even insist that new houses are built with such panels water saving towns etc at a minimal cost to purchasers especially for expensive family homes which will require many resources.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Support with conditions	This is generally all very good advice and is welcomed. To quibble it would be helpful to refer to the concepts of water, waste and energy minimisation in the fourth bullet point. Fundamentally the importance of design in addressing climate change should be stressed rather than leaving this solely to the section on energy. Landscaping should also have regard to habitat changes relating to the unavoidable impacts of climate change.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Marston Parish Council	Marston Parish Council		Support with conditions	We consider insufficient consideration is given to design, particularly of individual properties in the village which are too often based as a modern template with no real consideration for the local character or street scene. All resoned and considered comments on external design and appearance are routinely ignored.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr J Judge			Support	
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr A Clark			Support	
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Councillor J Judge	Stamford Town Council		Support with conditions	For Stamford our Conservation of such a fine town needs to be addressed to the Secretary of State to ensure planning at district has more say in developments that are controversial and not allow developers appealing in the manner they have done and by passing the views of town and district.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mrs J Gardener	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Object	Allison Homes is concerned to note that the suggested SPD's are the Lincolnshire Residential Design Guide which is now rather out of date and Village Design Statements and Parish Plans which must not be adopted purely on the basis that they are locally generated, without first being the subject of full and effective consultation with other interested parties. there is a wealth of recent national design guidance such as By Design (DETR/CABE, 2000), Places, Streets & Movement (DETR 1998), Urban Design Compendium (English Partnerships/Housing Corporation, 2000), and the forthcoming Manual for Streets (Consultation Draft, 2006), as well as planning policy such as PPG3 and the draft PPS1, which reflects current thinking and best practice, and it is essential that any SPD should be in line with this national guidance and policy. The Linconshire Design Guide predates all this guidance and much of its content is inconsistent with it; it is also likely to be the case that Village Design Statements and Parish Plans may not comply with the national guidance.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mrs J Gardener	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Object	Allison and Stamford Homes are concerned to note that the suggested SPDs are the Lincolnshire Residential Design Guide which is now rather out of date and village design statements and parish plans which must not be adopted purely on the basis that they are locally generated without first being the subject of full and effective consultation with other interested parties. There is a wealth of recent national design guidance such as By Design (DETR/CABE, 2000), Places, Streets & Movement (DETR 1998), Urban Design Compendium (Enlish Partnerships/Housing Corporation, 2000) and the forthcoming

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					Manual for Streets (Consultation Draft, 2006), as well as planning policy such as PPG3 and Draft PPS1, which reflects current thinking and best practice, and it is essential that any SPD should be in line with this national guidance and policy. The Lincolnshire Design Guide predates all this guidance and much of its content is inconsistent with it; it is also likely to be the case that village design statements and parish plans may not comply with the national guidance.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr M E Hendry	Bidwells	Bidwells	Support	
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr J Parmiter			Support	
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr J Boyd	JB Planning Assocaites Limited	JB Planning Assocaites Limited	Object	Objections are made elsewhere to the proportion of affordable homes to be sought in a new housing development. Therefore, for consistency, objections are made to Objective 7 in so far as this stipulates the perentage of affordable homes sought, that being 'upto 50%' are deleted
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr N Gough	Bigwood Associates	Bigwood Associates	Support	
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr N Gough	Bigwood Associates	Bigwood Associates	Support	
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Object	Economically it is not always possible to design to the "highest quality". It would be more appropriate to say that new development should be of a good quality and we accept the statement that this should incorporate sustainable building techniques wherever reasonably possible.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co		Suggest that additional bullet points should be: "The efficient use of land"; "the protection of sites and artefacts of cultural (archaeological) value"; protection or enhancement of the historic environment"; "the protection or creation of open space of benefit to the community"; "the provision of public art". Also eighth bullet point should be amended with the substitution of "avoid" for "minimise" in relation to air, water and soil pollution and "minimise" for 'reduce' in relation to light and noise pollution and the impact of ambient noise. Support with conditions
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr I Smith	Smiths Gore	Smiths Gore	Object	The planning system does not operate to control 'building techniques'. The use of energy, water, building materials and so forth can only be properly controlled through the system of building regulations. It cannot be monitored or controlled via the planning system. It is also important that, however desirable these objectives maybe, there is a cost associated with this which fall on consumers largely through higher house prices. There are also conflicts between certain aims. We have recently been discouraged by a local authority from providing gravel drives unless they are bitumen bond so as to allow easier wheelchair access. The result of that objective is that the surface is impermeable and piped surface water drainage is required.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Support with conditions	New development should be built to high quality design and environmental specifications. It should be inclusive in terms of design and layout and be informed by its wider context. This does not mean that new development should replicate its surroundings, but it should be in character with its surroundings. Landscaping should aim to complement the setting of new developments, rather than aim to screen it.
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Antony Aspbury Associates				Suggest that additional bullet points should be: "The efficient use of land"; "the protection of sites and artefacts of cultural (archaeological) value"; protection or enhancement of the historic environment"; "the protection or creation of open space of benefit to the community"; "the provision of public art". Also eighth bullet point should be amended with the substitution of "avoid" for 'minimise' in relation to air, water and soil pollution and "minimise" for 'reduce' in relation to light and noise pollution and the impact of ambient noise. Support with conditions
Preferred Option 7: Design of New Development	Mr E Banks			Support	
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mrs C Curtis			Support	

# Report of Consultation Responses

## Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Support with conditions	same comment as last option
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Sir Simon Benton-Jones			Support with conditions	Excellent, one for one replacement dwellings should improve the appearance of South Kesteven without adding to the need for services.
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mr M Richardson			Object	Allow people to have individuality with gardens and encourage community spirit through open spaces for recreation-football, cricket, tennis.
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mr T Bladon			Support	
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Councillor D Nalson			Support with conditions	One building should not be replaced by several small ones
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support	Protecting Neighbourhood amenity: agreed
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mr C J Townson			Object	Need to go further new builds should have enough space for a garage to discourage car theft. A distance apart should be specified to prevent overlooking/overshadowing expressed as a ratio on build site.
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Cllr A Pelling			Support	
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support	
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Support with conditions	Why then such dense developments recently approve in Stamford. This policy (enforced) would strengthen skdc via developers
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Ms J Young	Heritage Lincolnshire		Support	
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Barbara Robinson	Fulbeck Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Ms J Bateman			Support	
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Support with conditions	Generally the approach is supported, but it is suggested that the first two bullets should include the words 'an unacceptable...' - some overlooking and overshadowing is inevitable with most new development. In the fifth bullet point given that car parking standards should now be maxima (PPG3) there need to be special reasons to resist the loss of car parking spaces, core policies should not seek to prevent a reduction.
Preferred Option 8:	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Support	

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity					
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mr J Judge			Support	
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mr A Clark			Support	
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Councillor J Judge	Stamford Town Council		Support with conditions	Unfortunately the acceptable or not acceptable number of homes government will allow per hectare ie 50 does not give a home owner the pleasure he should be enjoying from his property each bullet point is overridden by crowding.
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mr P R Tame	National Farmers Union		Object	We actually support this option but would like to see an addition. New housing should not be sited near existing noisy or smelly farm or other buildings, to prevent nuisance being caused to new householders and existing businesses being closed down by suffering abatement notices resulting from complaints.
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mr N Gough	Bigwood Associates	Bigwood Associates	Support	
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support	
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support	
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Support with conditions	Space about buildings policies should continue to be used to ensure the expected degree of privacy in private residential dwellings. Most of the points included in Preferred Option 8 can be achieved through the Development Control process and the use of appropriate Supplementary Planning Documents.
Preferred Option 8: Protecting Neighbourhood Amenity	Mr E Banks			Support	
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mrs C Curtis			Support	
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Support with conditions	Demolition is being permitted before details of replacement are submitted.
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mr M Richardson			Support	The system works well at present. Continue and improve with sensible planners and allow "old" buildings to continue to be with the times and be modern. Allow extension if Economic benefits.
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mr T Bladon			Support	
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Councillor D Nalson			Support with conditions	Development in Conservation Areas should be very closely controlled.
Preferred Option 9: Development in	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support with conditions	Development in Conservation Areas: agreed, as Stamford is the first urban Conservation Area it is most imperative that this amenity be preserved.

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Conservation Areas					
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Support with conditions	Care should be taken not to 'over develop' Conservation Areas
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mr C J Townson			Support	
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Cllr A Pelling			Support with conditions	Would prefer more stringent controls for conservation areas.
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support	STRONGLY AGREE
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Support	
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Ms J Young	Heritage Lincolnshire		Support with conditions	A level of building assessment or recording may be required prior to alteration demolition, (PPG15). The Preferred Option is in line with Policies 27 & 31 of RSS8 The Preferred Option is in line with National Policy PPG15Correction required spatial objectives 1,11 & 12
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mrs S Murray	The Countryside Agency		Support with conditions	LAR fully supports this option, particularly references to the contribution that open spaces and boundary features make to a conservation area, and the protection afforded to boundary walls, trees and hedgerows, all of which provide wildlife habitat as well as contributing to the character of a place.
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Barbara Robinson	Fulbeck Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Ms J Bateman			Support with conditions	Control of development in Conservation Areas is extremely important, especially in Stamford where its uniqueness needs to be protected.
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mrs S Roberts			Support	
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Object	This section should be titled 'Development affecting Conservation Areas' and specific consideration given to the impact of development upon settings in accordance with PPG15 and RSS8 policies 27 and 31. The second sentence and the first and second bullet points in particulr need amending to address setting issues.
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mr J Judge			Support	
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mr A Clark			Support	
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Councillor J Judge	Stamford Town Council		Support with conditions	This option has been ignored in many cases ie Stamford and needs to follow option 9 in the future.
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mr N Gough	Bigwood Associates	Bigwood Associates	Support	
Preferred Option 9: Development in	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support	



## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Conservation Areas					
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mr I Smith	Smiths Gore	Smiths Gore	Object	A number of comments; * The designation of a Conservation Area is not predicted on visual characteristics. The Statue make it clear that an area must be of historic or architectural interest rather than 'visual characteristics'; * PPG 15 sets out a statement of Government Policy - detailed controls are found in the statue; * In considering the removal of forms of enclosure (e.g hedges) it is important to acknowledge what may be convered by permitted development rights.
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Support with conditions	The maintenance and enhancement of the character and setting of Conservation Areas, and views both into and out of such Areas is supported.
Preferred Option 9: Development in Conservation Areas	Mr E Banks			Support	
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mrs C Curtis			Support with conditions	I support this to a certain extent but in some cases Listed Buildings are ugly i.e the waterhouse at the end of Wherry's Lane, Bourne! In my view this will spoil the new town centre and should be demolished.
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Support with conditions	The option follows the requirements of PPG15 however we are concerned that a number of valuable old buildings in Bourne are suffering from neglect and no positive measures are in hand to assist with their retention.
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mr M Richardson			Support with conditions	same as option 9
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mr T Bladon			Support	
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Councillor D Nalson			Support	
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support	Listed Buildings: agreed
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Support with conditions	Listed Buildings should be preserved
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mr C J Townson			Object	There should be inclusion that the Council will consider complusory purchase under powers that it already has. For 7 years SKDC has seen the deterioration of Buildings in Colsterworth take place, taking no action apart form safety maintenance.
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Cllr A Pelling			Support	
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support	
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Support	
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Ms J Young	Heritage Lincolnshire		Support with conditions	A level of building assessment or recording may be required prior to alteration demolition (PPG15). There is currently no protection for those unlisted, locally historic buildings unless they lie within a conservation area. The Preferred Option is in line with National Policy PPG15The Preferred Option is in line with Policies 27 & 31 of RSS8Correction required spatial objectives 1,11 & 12.
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mrs S Murray	The Countryside Agency		Support with conditions	LAR supports this option
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Barbara Robinson	Fulbeck Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Ms J Bateman			Support with conditions	Strongly support - control of listed buildings is important especially in Stamford to retain uniqueness.
Preferred Option 10: Listed	Ms J Bateman			Support	

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Buildings					
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust		Support with conditions	We are also pleased to see Objective 10 on page 12 which will ensure the provision of developer contributions for leisure and arts facilities which relates to Preferred Policy 16 on page 23 although arts facilities are not mentioned in the accompanying list. For clarity we suggest that the wording of the fourth bullet point be amended to read provision of cultural and community buildings
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Object	The second sentence should refer to '...Listed Buildings and their settings...' The approach taken does not accord with RSS8 Policy 31 and specific consideration needs to be given to defining the setting of Belton in accordance with the Trust's submissions on the Issues and Options paper (Nov 2005) - the failure to identify the setting of the historic asset of Belton is a significant comission in the Council's LDF, especially as it has proceeded to identify specidfic allocations in advance of such an assessment.
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Marston Parish Council	Marston Parish Council		Support with conditions	Work to Listed Buildings seems to be able to be done withouth prior sanctions, and not subsequent effective enforcement procedures when the action is discovered and reported.
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mr J Judge			Support	
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mr A Clark			Support	
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Councillor J Judge	Stamford Town Council		Support with conditions	
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mr N Gough	Bigwood Associates	Bigwood Associates	Support	
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support	
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mr I Smith	Smiths Gore	Smiths Gore	Observations	Some of the statements are superfluous. 'Listed buildings within South Kestven will be protected by the Council' and 'the Council will ensure that it continues to meet its statutory duty with respect to listed buildings'. The council has no choice in these matters - the statements do not need to be said. The second paragraph again does not make sense (words missing?). Again, PPG 15 sets out Government Policy while the statutes define detailed controls.
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Support with conditions	Listed buildings often add character to an area and their retention and enhancement is supported. The maintenance of listed buildings and structures adds value to areas, in terms of perception, amenity value, and in terms of the economic benefits derived from their presence, such as property values/rents this is of benefit to local communities. Policy guidance on the constraints placed upon the development of listed buildings (and development within their curtilage) is contained in PPG15, the General Permitted Development Order 1995 and in case law.
Preferred Option 10: Listed Buildings	Mr E Banks			Support	
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mrs C Curtis			Support	
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Support with conditions	In line with PPG16 and national policies. good.
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mr M Richardson			Support with conditions	Organised archaeological surveys most important often developments allows such work to be undertaken.
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mr T Bladon			Support	
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Councillor D Nalson			Support	
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support	Archaeological and Historic Sites: agreed
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mr C J Townson			Support	
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Cllr A Pelling			Support	
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support	
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Support	
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Ms J Young	Heritage Lincolnshire		Support with conditions	In principle the preferred option is supported. However, slight alterations to the wording of the text will be required - the following is suggested:Archaeological remains provide a window into our past and are represented by scheduled ancient monuments of national and international importance, and undesignated archaeological remains of local, regional and national importance. National planning policies in PPG16 set out detailed controls over development which would affect Scheduled Ancient Monuments, known archaeological sites and sites of archaeological potential. The Council will ensure that it continues to meet its statutory duty with respect to all archaeological and historic sites within the district.The Council will endeavour to ensure that sites which are known to contain or considered likely to contain archaeological remains, are assessed and mitigation measures applied where necessary. Where the condition and importance of remains is uncertain, planning permission will not be granted until preliminary investigations have established the extent and nature of the remains. Appropriate measures will be required to protect and preserve archaeological remains. Preference will be given to preservation in-situ. Where this is not feasible, conditions on planning permissions will be required to ensure that provision is made for archaeological investigation and recording in advance of or where necessary, during development. The preferred option is in line with Policy 27 & 31 of RSS8 The Preferred Option is in line with National Policy PPG16 Correction required spatial objectives 1 &11.
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Ann Plackett	English Heritage		Observations	Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites Objection English Heritage welcomes the inclusion of this policy but would like to propose a few changes. Since the policy deals only with archaeology, it is unnecessary to refer to historic sites. There seems to be some confusion in the first sentence between the significance of scheduled monuments and other nationally important archaeology and the role that archaeology generally has in telling us about our past. In the final paragraph, while preservation in situ is preferred, it is not always justified or feasible. There are also some changes needed to reflect the terminology and procedures set out in PPG 16. Recommendations That the policy is re-titled 'Archaeological Sites' That the first sentence is amended as follows:

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					Scheduled monuments and other archaeological sites provide a window into our past. Planning permission will not be granted for proposals which would adversely affect a scheduled monument or other nationally important archaeological site or its setting. That the third paragraph is amended to reflect the wording in these standard policies: Planning permission will be granted for development which affects other sites of archaeological significance only where:- (a) The archaeological remains will be preserved in situ through careful design, layout and siting of the proposed development, or (b) When in situ preservation is not justified or feasible, appropriate provision is made by the developer for excavation and recording before and/or during development, and for post-excavation analysis, publication, and archive deposition of any findings. Appropriate protective and mitigation measures will be secured by planning condition and/or legal agreement. Where development proposals affect sites of known or potential archaeological interest, an archaeological assessment or, if necessary, a field evaluation will be required to be submitted as part of the planning application. Planning permission will not be granted without adequate assessment of the nature, extent and significance of the remains present and the degree to which the proposed development is likely to affect them. Objection: Built and Natural Environment map In view of the number and importance of registered parks and gardens in the District, it is recommended that they are included on the map
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mrs S Murray	The Countryside Agency		Observations	LAR supports the general principal of this option, but advice should be taken from appropriate specialists regarding its content.
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Barbara Robinson	Fulbeck Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Ms J Bateman			Support with conditions	Such sites should not be threatened by the effects of development.
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Ms J Bateman			Support with conditions	Planning permission should only be granted on archeological and historical sites if no other areas are available and if absolutely necessary.
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust		Observations	Your own Cultural Strategy has identified in the Introduction that there is a growing recognition of the importance of the cultural sector in improving the quality of life. The Office of the Deputy Prime Ministers publication Sustainable Communities: People, Places and Prosperity (ODPM 2005) states that a sense of place, good quality community and cultural facilities are essential components in the development of sustainable communities. We therefore suggest that the cultural assets element of Objective 11 is incorporated into Preferred Option 6 on page 29 to include existing assets as well as potential new ones. We look forward to being consulted on the next stage of the process.
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Object	The second sentence should refer to SAMs and their settings in accordance with PPG16 and RSS8. The Core Policy should also contain a statement to the effect that proposals that would harm a SAM or other known archaeological sites or its setting will not be permitted.
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Support with conditions	PROVIDED that the requirements for surveys do not become unduly burdensome.
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Marston Parish Council	Marston Parish Council		Support with conditions	Same comments apply as 10
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mr J Judge			Support	
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and	Mr A Clark			Support	

# Report of Consultation Responses

## Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Historic Sites					
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Councillor J Judge	Stamford Town Council		Support	
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mr N Gough	Bigwood Associates	Bigwood Associates	Support	
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support	
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mr I Smith	Smiths Gore	Smiths Gore	Object	It is incorrect to say that ancient monuments and archaeological findings 'are nationally and internationally important.'. Ancient monuments are of national importance and, if they are World Heritage Sites are probably of international importance. There is no basis for suggesting that archeological findings are of national importance. This is not supported by PPG 16.
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Support with conditions	The maintenance of an up-to-date record of sites of known or potential archaeological importance is supported. During pre-application discussions developers should be made aware of the requirements on them in terms of preliminary site investigations and detailed mitigation measures. This is of benefit to all parties in terms of safeguarding cultural heritage and minimising risk to development schedules.
Preferred Option 11: Archaeological and Historic Sites	Mr E Banks			Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mrs C Curtis			Support with conditions	I support this. I do not like to see streams and water courses diverted underground to make way for building.
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr N Pike	English Nature		Support with conditions	English Nature supports this option and welcomes the reference to sustainable drainage systems.
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr M Richardson			Observations	Managed water use is very important, and continued understanding of why South Kesteven is as it is, ie fenland and upland due to drainage and the importance of drainage, fen and agriculture.
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr T Bladon			Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting	Councillor D Nalson			Support with conditions	There should be no building on flood plains

**Report of Consultation Responses**  
**Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)**

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Water Resources					
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support with conditions	Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources: agreed
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Jacob Newby	Environment Agency		Observations	<p>PO12 We consider that this Option should be separated into two separate options, one to address the issue of flood risk, and one to address the issue of water resources. The purpose of ensuring that development is not placed at risk of flooding or causes increased flood risk elsewhere is not principally a matter of water resources. The impacts of flooding are mainly economic and social. It would be more appropriate, therefore to classify any option under the banner of 'Sustainable Development' rather than 'Water Resources'. The majority of the wording in this section is supportive of the aims of reducing the amount of development at risk of flooding, and we welcome and encourage this. We do have concerns, however, that the wording of the policy in its current form may result in inappropriate development within the floodplain. We therefore ask that the policy emphasis be 'negative' (i.e. development will not be permitted in areas at risk of flooding) rather than the current 'positive' format. Where exceptional development is proposed it should then be subject to Flood Risk Assessment etc. It should also be made clear that mitigation measures may not always be adequate to address the risks of flooding to a development, and that in these cases permission will not be granted. We consider that the policy should also refer to the Category Zones as identified by the SFRA rather than the PPG25 flood zones as they represent a more detailed assessment of risk in the district. We request that the supporting comments make it clear that the Environment Agency's powers to build and maintain defences are permissive and that the presence of defences should not be used to encourage inappropriate development in areas at high risk of flooding, such as those identified as Category 3 in the SFRA. We also request that the Agency's 9m Byelaw distance is referred to in the supporting statements and that it is made clear that we are unlikely to support any development within this area that may compromise either the integrity of any defences or our ability to gain access. This should be considered when applying the sequential test to the layout of development within a site. Land within this byelaw distance can, for example, be more appropriate for amenity space than buildings. The option to address flood risk must also incorporate the following points: A flood risk assessment (FRA) should be carried out for all proposed site within areas identified as being at risk of flooding. The FRA must demonstrate that the PPS25 sequential and exception tests have been applied where necessary to both the principal of use and the proposed layout of development within the site. This may require more detail in the policy to identify how this will be applied. Any necessary mitigation measures identified in the FRA must be put in place to ensure flood risks are properly managed to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency. Development should result in a betterment in terms of surface water run-off. Where possible this should be reduced to the greenfield run off rate, but as a minimum run-off from redeveloped sites should be reduced compared to the existing situation. A separate policy regarding water resources should address the following issues: All new development should include measures to achieve a 25% improvement in water efficiency. It should be ensured that the requisite water and drainage infrastructure should be available or be provided for any new development in accordance with the findings of a water cycle study that identifies the capacity of existing infrastructure and the expected costs of any necessary improvements and works. Development that will have a detrimental impact on the natural features of river and stream corridors, ponds, wetland habitats or any controlled waters will not be permitted. We recommend that a district wide Water Cycle Study should be commissioned as early as possible so that its findings can be included as constraints in any site specific allocations, and so inform developers of any investment that may be required in infrastructure provision. We do accept, however, that the timescales involved in the preparation of the Water Cycle Study may not accord with LDF timescales. The effects of increased flows on the existing</p>

# Report of Consultation Responses Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					sewerage catchment need to be assessed by Anglian Water as part of the Water Cycle Study. Any sewer improvements needed to prevent the deterioration of water quality need to be in place before the new development areas are connected to Anglian Water foul sewers. Facilities to drain new development should be designed as an integrated part of the overall centralised urban wastewater system. In cases where the sewerage system is overloaded the situation must be improved prior to development taking place, so that the sewerage system is sufficient to cope with the development without being overloaded, and complies with water industry standards. The importance of adequate sewage infrastructure in protecting the quality of rivers and streams for the benefit of people and wildlife should be noted in the supporting text. It should also explain that although new developments will have separate surface and foul drainage systems, if the new foul flows join sewer sections carrying combined flows more storm spills (the discharge of foul water from the sewers into controlled waters) can occur. We would encourage a meeting between SKDC, Anglian Water and ourselves prior to the commencement of any Water Cycle Study to discuss and agree the scope for the study. This will ensure that the study is focused on areas that may be of concern and does not become overly complicated or expensive. It should be noted that within certain areas of the district drainage to soakaways may not be appropriate as they would provide a pathway for contaminants to enter into the underlying aquifer. Where there is an outcrop of the Lincolnshire Limestone and within the Environment Agency's Groundwater Source Protection Zone 1 an assessment will be required to demonstrate that soakaways will not present a risk to groundwater sources and to put forward alternatives if this is not the case. We would also request that paragraph 3.53 is amended to include the requirement for developers to put forward alternate drainage solutions that do not have an adverse impact on the environment prior to development. We request that any proposed amended options are written in consultation with the Environment Agency as these have a direct affect on areas of concern to us.
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Miss E C Biott	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust		Support with conditions	The Trust supports this option which will not permit development likely to have a detrimental impact on the natural features of river and stream corridors, ponds or wetland habitats.
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr C J Townson			Object	With changing wather patterns and recognising national acceptance of increased flooding why even consider bulding when we have few new houses to build on Risk land!
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Cllr A Pelling			Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support with conditions	Independent studies to be commissioned where the development is reasonably large.
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Support	

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Ms J Young	Heritage Lincolnshire		Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Ann Plackett	English Heritage		Observations	Option 12: Reducing the risk of flooding This could bring benefits to historic buildings and areas, but the design of flood management measures needs to be sensitive to historic character.
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mrs S Murray	The Countryside Agency		Observations	LAR supports this option, but would want to see the requirement under paragraph 3.53 for sustainable drainage brought into the policy itself. Protection of natural wetland features is very much supported. LAR would expect to see flood mitigation measures that restore and enhance the natural floodplain, therefore contributing to landscape and biodiversity restoration, and local biodiversity action plan targets. LAR would not expect new developments to include hard defences. If hard defences are the only option, alternative solutions, such as consideration of a different site, should be sought for the development.
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr M S Herbert	Brown & Co		Support with conditions	We support the principles and the proposal that due regard shall be taken of PPG 25.
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Barbara Robinson	Fulbeck Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Ms J Bateman			Support with conditions	Particularly support the last sentence of this option - if in relation to ponds and wetlands
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Ms J Bateman			Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Marston Parish Council	Marston Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr J Judge			Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr A Clark			Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting	Councillor J Judge	Stamford Town Council		Support	



## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Water Resources					
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr P R Tame	National Farmers Union		Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support with conditions	We support the principles and the proposal that due regard shall be taken of PPG25.
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support	
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr I Smith	Smiths Gore	Smiths Gore	Observations	It might be better to turn this approach around so that the Option is phrased as development will not be permitted in areas of flood risk unless...etc. We note that the policy addresses matters which are wider than its title suggests i.e. water supply.
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Support with conditions	Consider the requirement for areas of hardstanding to be of a porous nature e.g. grasscrete which can be The proposals for reducing flood risk in areas identified as being at risk of flooding are supported. In addition to the comments in Preferred Option 7 (Design of New Development) the Council should sownwith grass seed, and other porus materials. Wetland/damp areas could be created as receptors for and as slow releasers of run-off. These have the benefit of supporting numerous wildlife habitats.
Preferred Option 12: Reducing the Risk of Flooding and Protecting Water Resources	Mr E Banks			Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mrs C Curtis			Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Support with conditions	This is an essential consideration but the type of energy source and its location require careful research and consideration.
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr N Pike	English Nature		Support with conditions	English Nature broadly supports this policy as it refers to the need for compliance wih other core policy documents.
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr M Richardson			Support with conditions	If certain developments can provide more than the base requirement this should help with deferred locations for developments.
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr T Bladon			Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Councillor D Nalson			Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	bwea	The British Wind Energy Association		Observations	Renewable Energy The District Council will grant planning permission for proposals to generate energy from renewable sources, subject to the proposals according with the other core policies and complying with the following criteria: BWEA welcome the

**Report of Consultation Responses**  
**Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)**

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					inclusion of a renewable energy policy in the core strategy, however object to the policy in its current form. It is unreasonable and unrealistic to expect renewable energy proposals to comply with the other core policies given that most would not be applicable due to the nature of renewable energy developments and the factors involved. A criteria based policy for renewable energy would need to include some specific criteria against which to assess planning proposals. These should include reference to landscape, amenity and residential amenity. BWEA strongly recommend the Council delete the requirement for renewable energy proposals to comply with the other core policies. The proposal can be connected efficiently to existing national grid infrastructure, unless it can be demonstrated that energy generation would be used on-site to meet the needs of a specific end user; BWEA consider this criterion to be unclear, what does the Council mean when it refers to proposals being connected efficiently and by what criteria will the Council assess whether or not a proposal will be connected efficiently. Issues relating to grid connection are important in relation to renewable energy proposals and will be investigated by developers at the early scoping and planning stages of any renewable project. Details of exactly how a proposal will be connected to the grid should be included within a detailed EIA or Environmental Statement and will provide details for the Council to assess whether or not the proposed grid connection raises any significant adverse amenity issues. BWEA considers that the criteria detailed below in the example policy would adequately address the concerns raised by the Council in relation to grid connection issues; we therefore consider that this criterion should be deleted from the proposed policy. In the opinion of the BWEA the policy also fails to address any of the benefits of renewable energy proposals. The following wording is highlighted as an example of how the policy could be revised in light of our concerns: The District Council will grant planning permission for proposals to generate energy from renewable sources, subject to the proposals complying with the following criteria: The proposal does not have any unacceptable adverse effect on landscape, townscape, natural, historical and cultural features. The proposal does not have any unacceptable adverse effect on the amenity of nearby residents, by way of noise, dust, odour and increased traffic generation Provision is made for the removal or re-use of the facilities and reinstatement of the site, should the scheme cease to be operational The wider environmental, economic and social benefits of the scheme outweigh any unacceptable adverse effects.
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support	Generating Renewable Energy: agreed
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Jacob Newby	Environment Agency		Observations	If the decision is taken to broaden Spatial Objective 13 these two Options can be shown as linking to that Objective.
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Support with conditions	Should be given priority
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr C J Townson			Support with conditions	Para I. The DC will grant? surely will consider granting. Siting of wind farms for example needs public consultation we have potential local sites. Push for development but through consultation.
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Cllr A Pelling			Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Object	Too vague, could be proposals totally out of scale for a town site.
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable	Ms J Young	Heritage Lincolnshire		Support	

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Energy					
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Ann Plackett	English Heritage		Observations	Renewable energy The impact on individual historic assets or their setting and historic landscapes could be highlighted.
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Ann Plackett	English Heritage		Observations	Developer contributions The examples listed in paragraph 3.70 of the Core Strategy, Preferred Options include reference to the historic environment. Thus the implementation of the policy could bring benefits, such as the enhancement, restoration or improved management of the resource or better access.
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mrs S Murray	The Countryside Agency		Support with conditions	LAR supports the general principle of renewable energy, but the required structures should not be detrimental to landscape, recreation and biodiversity. The policy could be strengthened by specific references to protecting natural assets.
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr M S Herbert	Brown & Co		Support with conditions	It is essential to provide enabling policies and to accord with PPS22. We would encourage the Council now, or in subsequent papers, to be more specific on policies that will prevail linked to wind farm developments.
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr D Parratt	Stamford Town Council		Support	We welcome the options outlined in this section
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Ms J Bateman			Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Ms J Bateman			Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Support with conditions	This is an important stance to take in ensuring that the District seeks to address some of the impacts of climate change in a sustainable manner.
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Marston Parish Council	Marston Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr J Judge			Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr A Clark			Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Councillor J Judge	Stamford Town Council		Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr P R Tame	National Farmers Union		Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr J A Templeman			Object	To adopt this option because the government has "very strong positive stance" is not a credible evidence base for the wishes of the community upon which such development will be imposed. Remove option
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr N Gough	Bigwood Associates	Bigwood Associates	Support	
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support with conditions	We support this because it is in line with Government Policies.
Preferred Option 13:	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support	

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Generating Renewable Energy					
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr I Smith	Smiths Gore	Smiths Gore	Object	There is no requirement for proposals to be connected to National Grid infrastructure as connections can be made to the regional electricity distribution system. National Grid is only concerned with the transmission of electricity at high voltages (275 and 400kV). These are not relevant to small scale renewable schemes.
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Support with conditions	Whilst the development of energy from renewable sources is supported, any development should be considered against design, landscaping and other appropriate policies.
Preferred Option 13: Generating Renewable Energy	Mr E Banks			Object	This policy is considered to be so open-ended and permissive as to be almost worthless. We have studied many Regional, Structure and LDF Documents and have seen none that is so unselective as the policy proposal for SKDC. Its important in terms of potential wind farms is likely to be very damaging to the landscape of the district.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mrs C Curtis			Support	
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Support with conditions	Desirable but we see little evidence of adoption by developers
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr N Pike	English Nature		Support with conditions	English Nature broadly supports this policy
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Support with conditions	Not sure how can be practically implemented.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr M Richardson			Support with conditions	Same as option 13
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr T Bladon			Support	
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Councillor D Nalson			Support	
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	bwea	The British Wind Energy Association		Observations	BWEA support the inclusion of a policy for the mandatory requirement for onsite renewables in new developments, however would question what is meant by in accordance with Policy, is this referring to a particular policy or all other policies in the core strategy? If the latter, then our comments in paragraph one of this response would equally apply here.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support	Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development: agreed

# Report of Consultation Responses

## Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Jacob Newby	Environment Agency		Observations	If the decision is taken to broaden Spatial Objective 13 these two Options can be shown as linking to that Objective.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Miss E C Biott	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust		Support with conditions	The Trust supports this option which requires development proposals over a certain size to include renewable energy technology.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Support with conditions	Should be given priority
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr C J Townson			Support	
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Cllr A Pelling			Support	
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Miss H Mawson	The Home Builders Federation		Object	The HBF believes that energy efficiency/conservation in new homes will be best achieved through the Building Regulations. Experience has shown that the established system of building control in England and Wales provides a reliable framework for the control of health, safety and energy efficiency/conservation matters within buildings. With very few exceptions, national rules are applied consistently. The Federation cannot see that there are likely to be any legitimate considerations relating to energy efficiency/conservation, which would benefit from exposure to the planning system, or by the imposition of alternative requirement to those contained within the Building Regulations. The Federation, on behalf of the industry, works closely with Government, BRAC, BRE and others, regarding Building Regulation changes, in order to agree changes that can be achieved without unduly constraining design or introducing unacceptable technical risks. Changes to standards / requirements in construction need to be made with detailed consideration so that the cost of achieving the requirement does not outweigh the benefit obtained by the change. For this reason we would ask that the requirement for dwellings is to achieve a high level of energy efficiency, without stipulating a specific criteria to be met. In terms of Preferred Option 14, the HBF considers that the requirement for 'large scale developments to be constructed so as to meet level 5 of the emerging national Code for Sustainable Buildings' as unacceptable, particularly as the criteria for achieving Level 5 is yet to be confirmed. In addition, an initial analysis has identified that the cost implications involved in achieving level 5 would be vast and would result in the development being unviable. The HBF wholly agree that homes must be built to high environmental standards to manage their energy usage and water consumption. However, the methods for doing so must be robust, consumer friendly and cost efficient. Under the latest revision of building regulations, new homes will be 40% more energy efficient than those built five years ago, and they are as much as six times more energy efficient than their Victorian and Edwardian counterparts.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support	
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Object	Prove it is practicable!
Preferred Option 14:	Ms J Young	Heritage Lincolnshire		Support	

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development					
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mrs S Murray	The Countryside Agency		Support with conditions	LAR fully supports this sustainable stance.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr M S Herbert	Brown & Co		Object	We feel renewable energy technologies should be encouraged but not specified to the extent it is within the policy. In some locations the only technologies which may be immediately available are wind and sun. Wind turbines and solar panels, etc. can be visually obtrusive. We contend that policies should be encouraged to look proactively at the issue but not be so prescriptive. It may not be deliverable and economically viable in some locations.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Ms J Bateman			Support with conditions	Support, but the target of 'at least' 10% should be higher.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Ms J Bateman			Support with conditions	The council must ensure that development proposals are concentrated on providing renewable energy.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Support with conditions	The overall stance is supported, but it would be helpful if the Core Strategy was clear that it was also supportive of renewable energy projects for smaller developments, including the encouragement of micro-regeneration, even if it is considered that specific requirements cannot be insisted upon.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Object	This seems increasingly prescriptive
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Marston Parish Council	Marston Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr J Judge			Support	
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr A Clark			Support with conditions	Would need convincing as to how this would work in reality.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Councillor J Judge	Stamford Town Council		Support	
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr P R Tame	National Farmers Union		Support with conditions	We support this preferred option which will to support local business production and use.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr A Evans	CgMs	CgMs	Object	The principle of this is acceptable, however reference to the viability of providing technology for renewable energy is required. Otherwise the policy becomes onerous and may have a negative impact on the supply of housing and employment uses in particular. The principle of this Policy is accepted, however reference to the viability of provision of technology for renewable energy is required. Furthermore, the Policy provides a threshold, requiring that any development proposal with a floor area greater than

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					1,000sq.m or 10 or more dwellings will include technology for renewable energy, to provide at least 10% of their predicted energy requirements. It is recommended that the thresholds are removed and that the Policy is worded in a more general manner whereby negotiation between the Council and the developer takes place, identifying sites that are capable of providing energy equipment and technology relative to each sites individual circumstances, and in particular to the viability of providing such equipment.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr J Boyd	JB Planning Assocaites Limited	JB Planning Assocaites Limited	Object	While accepting the principles of incorporating renewable energy in new development schemes generally we are concerned that Preferred Option 14 is overly prescriptive and as such inflexible in being able to respond to changing circumstances on a site by site basis. The grounds for this objection are that the draft wording of Preferred Option 14 is inconsistent with the guidance in PPS22 in so far as applying a minimum requirement that 10% of the predicted energy requirements should be from renewable energy sources. This does not take into account the viability of development and in our view could place an undue burden on developers rendering new development schemes uneconomic. Preferred Option 14 is therefore directly in conflict with Paragraph 8 of PPS22. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO PREFERRED OPTION 14 We proposed that the words 'at least' are deleted and a new sentence added at the end of Preferred Option 14 stating: 'The requirement for renewable energy technologies in new developments is the subject of economic viability taking into account the type of development proposed, it's location and design'.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Object	We feel renewable energy technologies should be encouraged but not specified to the extent it is within the policy. In some locations the only technologies which may be immediately available are wind and sun. Wind turbines and solar panels, etc. can be visually obtrusive. We contend that policies should be encouraged to look proactively at the issue but not be so prescriptive. It may not be deliverable and economically viable in some locations.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support with conditions	Reword policy to state: "All development proposals with a floor area greater than 1,000 square metres or for more than 10 dwellings will include measures to reduce energy consumption and renewable energy measures to provide at least 10% of their predicted energy requirements. The District Council will support and encourage all developments that incorporate measures to reduce energy consumption and/or generate their own energy needs with renewable energy and thereby reduce their dependence on off-site and non-renewable energy provision."
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr I Smith	Smiths Gore	Smiths Gore	Object	Our objection to this Option is based on a number of concerns: How is this to be measured and monitored? This is not a matter which the planning system is designed to control; How can this be addressed at the outline application stage? Is the Council going to insist on this for developments in Conservation Areas (Solar Panels or micro wind-energy schemes) and in connection with developments involving listed buildings? Presumably the policy is to apply to all developments including affordable housing? It must be acknowledged that there are cost implications here which will have an effect; The threshold is far too low. A more appropriate approach would be to reserve this for major developments i.e. 50+ houses when renewable technologies become much more practical and economies of scale will arise; In the light of the above we do not believe that this approach is practicable.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Support with conditions	Such technologies should be incorporated into the overall design of a development, rather than being a bolt on both in terms of physical appearance and in terms of the design concept. Combined heat and power (CHP) and local heating schemes can supply developments as a whole, whilst micro-production technologies can serve individual premises.
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Antony Aspbury Associates			Support with conditions	Reword policy to state: "All development proposals with a floor area greater than 1,000 square metres or for more than 10 dwellings will include measures to reduce energy consumption and renewable energy measures to provide at least 10% of their predicted energy requirements. The District Council will support and encourage all developments that incorporate measures to reduce energy consumption and/or generate their own energy needs with renewable energy and thereby reduce their dependence on off-site

# Report of Consultation Responses

## Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					and non-renewable energy provision".
Preferred Option 14: Renewable Energy Technologies in New Development	Mr E Banks			Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mrs C Curtis			Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Support with conditions	Sound policies!
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr N Pike	English Nature		Support with conditions	English Nature broadly supports this policy
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr M Richardson			Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr T Bladon			Support	Whilst this is an essential requirement, it is felt that guidance should be given to developers as to what constitutes pollution or that all application forms should require the applicant to provide evidence to confirm that no pollution exists on the relevant site.
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Councillor D Nalson			Support with conditions	Any contamination or pollution should be rectified by the person reasonable or at his expense.
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support	Pollution Control: agreed
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Jacob Newby	Environment Agency		Observations	PO15 Developers should be encouraged to resolve as much of this at a pre-application stage as possible. The Environment Agency are likely to object to individual applications where insufficient detail is submitted in relation to land contamination, so it is in all parties interest to ensure that the matter is satisfactorily addressed prior to the formal submission of applications. We would request that this is made clear in any supporting comments for this policy. It should be made clear within this Option itself that these details will be required as part of the application prior to any permission being granted. This is necessary to ensure that full account is made of this important issue during the application stage and that it is not left to the discharge of conditions.
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr C J Townson			Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Cllr A Pelling			Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Ms J Young	Heritage Lincolnshire		Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mrs S Murray	The Countryside Agency		Support with conditions	LAR supports this option, which reinforces national legislation, policy and guidance.
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Barbara Robinson	Fulbeck Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Ms J Bateman			Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Object	The LDF is proposing a significant amount of new development and in accordance with the sequential approach to development this should be concentrated on brownfield sites. There is a synergy here with the need to deal with contaminated sites and the



## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					opportunity to ensure that the legacy of previous development is addressed. In this sense the policy approach to contaminated sites should be more positive, whilst still ensuring that proper remediation is secured. A phasing policy for the release of sites that concentrated on dealing with contaminated recediation is secure. A phasing policy for the release of sites that concentrated on dealing with contaminated sites first could be considered.
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Marston Parish Council	Marston Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr J Judge			Support with conditions	This action has been ignore re bullet point 5 off Belvoir Close by altering such development to be approved. (Stamford).
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr A Clark			Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr P R Tame	National Farmers Union		Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr N Gough	Bigwood Associates	Bigwood Associates	Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support with conditions	We support this policy
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support	We support this policy
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support	We support this policy
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support	We support this policy
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support	
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Support with conditions	The proposed Option meets the requirements of existing policy.
Preferred Option 15: Pollution Control	Mr E Banks			Support	
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mrs C Curtis			Support with conditions	It would be ok if this were true, from what I have seen in the past - developers do what they like - perhaps it might be an idea to insist they build schools, community centres etc first before they are allowed to build houses.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Dr R Fuller	Bourne Civic Society		Support with conditions	These have been very limited in the past and more should be done to achieve a greater contribution for the benefit of the community.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr N Pike	English Nature		Observations	English Nature neither objects nor supports this policy. We would be broadly supportive IF the examples of contributions inlcuded reference to BAP and biodiversity. We recognise that the list below is indicative and not exhaustive, however our concern is that including such a list, there will be an inevitable focus on these issues. We would therefore wish to see biodiversity on this list as it represents a direct way in which your authority can undertake its natural environment and rural communities act duites. We are extremely concerned about monitoring and the SA/SEA conclusions relating to this document. Comments on this and an objection on these grounds is included in a separate letter.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr J Lucey	Foston Parish Council		Support with conditions	Would go further than proposed. Would want some criteria as in option 4 for a contribution ie 2+ houses. Don't forget a small contribution to a village can make more significancethen a large one in a urban environment.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr J L Jellett	Wagon & Horses		Support	
Preferred Option 16:	Mr M Richardson			Support with conditions	Both private and public developments should work to create a more sustainable

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Developer Contributions					environment for the future.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr T Bladon			Support	
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Councillor D Nalson			Support with conditions	The Council should be energetic in getting developers to provide or contribute to community benefits
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Ben Hunt	Sport England West Midlands		Observations	Following on from the above, Sport England welcomes reference to sport and recreation in paragraph 3.69. We would suggest that when this is translated into the text in paragraph 3.70 (accompanying Preferred Option 16), a minor amendment is made to the wording, as follows: Improvements to and provision of community buildings and green spaces for sport, recreation. We would also recommend that the document at least refers to the need for robust and up to date evidence on which to base requirements for open space and built recreational facilities, even if these matters are to be dealt with in Supplementary Planning Documents. Sport England considers this would be appropriate in light of PPG17 and RSS8 policy 32. Sport England would prefer an approach that introduces that protective element, as it is not clear from the document that this would be achieved through Preferred Option 6. In Sport Englands view, the approach to both character, securing community benefits and the protection of open spaces should be integrated with the outputs of the regional Green Infrastructure studies.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Catherine Hammant	Stamford Vision		Support with conditions	Developer Contribution: agreed, although point 4 of the requirements of a planning obligation might be slightly widened to remove the directly to allow a greater number of projects which will benefit the town to be considered.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr D C Hamilton-Hinds	Colsterworth Parish Council		Support with conditions	Developments should be balanced with amenities
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr C J Townson			Observations	3.70 please include 'The council, in collaboration with the parish council will pursue through planning obligations. This will ensure p.c's are considered early in the planning process as a matter of procedure.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Cllr A Pelling			Support	
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Miss H Mawson	The Home Builders Federation		Object	The Core Strategy should detail how expenditure of any contributions resulting from the policy would be identified and related to specific projects. Circular 05/05 requires that where contributions are required to be pooled local authorities should demonstrate the direct relationship between the development and the infrastructure and the "fair and reasonable scale of the contribution being sought". In addition there should be a clear audit trail between the contribution made and the infrastructure provided.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mrs N Jacobs	Bourne Town Council		Support with conditions	"directly related to the proposed development" this item is very much appreciated.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr J Plumb	Stamford Civic Society		Support	
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Ms J Young	Heritage Lincolnshire		Support with conditions	In reference to : resources and time for archaeological investigations and rescue this is nowadays normally secured by condition, not by a S106 agreement Provision for archaeological interpretation would be advised on those sites identified as archaeologically sensitive
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mrs S Murray	The Countryside Agency		Observations	LAR supports this option with an amendment to insert the word “environment” after infrastructure so that the many environment related examples listed in the supporting text are covered as well as social benefits. The amended policy would then state “to secure the provision of (or financial contribution towards) infrastructure, environment and community benefits”
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr D Parratt	Stamford Town Council		Support with conditions	We welcome the proposals outlined in this option. We would ask that Councils are provided with comparisons of the scale of financial contributions imposed by a range of authorities to ensure that we are in parity with other authorities.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mrs G M Foster			Observations	Am particularly delighted with this option as it will assist what is needed for people of all age groups with physical / sensory disabilities and parents with prams and young children, in particular the following items from 3.70:- Items 1,2,4,9 and 13 although the wording "creche facilities" might be more understandable for young mums if it were

## Report of Consultation Responses

### Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
					changed to "baby changing facilities". but they are all excellent in this list and I thank you very much on behalf of all the people i've tried to help over the years. And the alternative formats and languages on the last page are excellent, but I also suggest British sign language (BSL) should be added as I am trying to get primary schools to also teach signing and have had great success with Gonerby Hill Foot CE Primary School as all the children who attend the signing club, for the rest of their lives they will be able to communicate with anyone they meet who is profoundly deaf and was born unable to hear anything, and by conversing with them by sign language will make their lives much happier. I can let you have a copy of RNID's Basic Signs leaflet which I got enlarged for children to look at when signing. And because I wear glasses for reading, please send me copies of the Grantham maps in the Housing & Economic Development DPD Preferred Options document in a more dense black print as I cannot ascertain where the allocated areas are as I cannot read the names of the streets. No need to enlarge the maps, it is just very black print that is needed on white, lightweight copier paper
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Ms J Bateman			Object	I am not happy about SKDC taking financial contributions from developers, too often the schemes developers want to fund are not priorities for the area.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Ms J Bateman			Support with conditions	Planning obligations are a good idea the council needs to be sure the developers actually do what they promised to do in the plans and all of the community ideas seem appropriate.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Alan Hubbard	The National Trust		Object	The overall approach is supported but one of the key issues to be addressed through developer contributions is the poor position in the Region in terms of levels of biodiversity compared with the rest of the country. The provision of new habitats to improve the range of flora and fauna in the District should be a key aim of the community benefits sought from new development.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr M Brebner	Greatford Parish Council		Support with conditions	PROVIDED community infrastructure includes car parking for those travelling from the villages without public transport.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Marston Parish Council	Marston Parish Council		Support	
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr J Judge			Support with conditions	Again community benefits have been ignored on 3 applications of Belvoir Close and Little Casterton Road, i.e. Lack of amenities for general use of all age groups. (Community Hall) Bullet point 4.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr A Clark			Support with conditions	Need to adopt similar approach as in option 4 ie different rules for urban and rural areas. A small village may not need a new road or CCTV but a small contribution to a village amenity would help villages significantly. Can developers be asked to negotiate locally.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Councillor J Judge	Stamford Town Council		Support	
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr S Pease	Ancer Spa	Ancer Spa	Support with conditions	Town extension schemes of a sufficient scale are more likely to be able to afford to provide the range and quality of facilities that will not only serve the residents of the new development, but also benefit the existing residents of the town. Such a scale of development will ensure the proper planning of facilities so that the new development is fully integrated and enhances the town.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr J Easter	Humberts	Humberts	Support with conditions	Strongly support contention that all contributions must be relevant, reasonable, necessary and directly related to the proposed development.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr A Evans	CgMs	CgMs	Support with conditions	The principle of this policy is supported, however reference to ODPM Circular 05/05 Planning Obligations should be made, in the interest of clarity.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mrs J Gardener	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Object	Allison Homes is willing to consider the provision of, or contributions to, infrastructure and community benefits which are necessary in conjunction with development. However this must take account of the economic viability of the development which will be severely affected if a high proportion of affordable housing is required.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mrs J Gardener	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Smith Stuart Reynolds	Object	Stamford Homes and Allsion Homes are willing to consider the provision of, or contributions to, infrastructure and community benefits which are necessary in conjunction with development. However this must take account of the economic viability of the development which will be severely affected if a high proportion of affordable housing is required.

**Report of Consultation Responses**  
**Core Strategy Preferred Options (Summer 2006)**

Preferred Option Number	Consultee Name	Organisation	Agent (Where applicable)	Object or Support	Representation
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr P Frampton	Framptons	Framptons	Object	This policy is simply a re-statement of national planning policy and is otiose for the purpose of a Core Strategy.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr N Gough	Bigwood Associates	Bigwood Associates	Support	
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support with conditions	Generallyly we support the policy and appreciate the need to look for planning obligations under Section 106 Agreements linked to major forms of development.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr M Herbert	Brown & Co	Brown & Co	Support	
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr I Smith	Smiths Gore	Smiths Gore	Support with conditions	We broadly support the option. We would, however, question the inclusion of various training matters (under paragraph 3.70) as to meeting the five key requirements set out under PO16.
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr T Hobday	Scott Wilson Ltd	Scott Wilson Ltd	Support with conditions	The proposed Option meets the requirements of existing policy and Government circulars
Preferred Option 16: Developer Contributions	Mr E Banks			Support	