

AGENDA



For a meeting of the
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
to be held on
TUESDAY, 4 JANUARY 2011
at
<u>1.00 PM</u>
* PLEASE NOTE TIME OF MEETING *
(THE LATE REPORT WILL BE AVAILABLE IN THE MEMBERS' ROOM FROM 12 NOON)
in the
COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, ST PETERS HILL, GRANTHAM
Beverly Agass, Chief Executive

Committee Members:	Councillors Parkin (Chairman); Adams (Vice-Chairman); Cook; Exton; Mrs Gaffigan; Helyar; Higgs; Holmes; Howard; Sam Jalili; Mrs Jalili; Mrs Kaberry-Brown; Vic Kerr; Scott; Mrs Smith; Turner and Avril Williams
Committee Support Officer:	Malcolm Hall Tel: 01476 406118 m.hall@southkesteven.gov.uk

(PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE WILL BE A COMFORT BREAK AT 3.30PM FOR TEN MINUTES)

Members of the Committee are invited to attend the above meeting to consider the items of business listed below.

1. PLANNING MATTERS

Late report Manthorpe addendum reasons for refusal corrections

Agenda Item 5

COMMITTEE: 4 JANUARY 2011

NO	PAGE	PROPOSAL AND LOCATION	REC
PWM1 10/1946	1	Partial demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of four dwellings, Land Adjacent to 47 Pond Street, Great Gonerby	R
PWM2 10/2338	7	Application under section 73 of the TCPA 1990 for variation of condition 6 of S09/0488 (removal of caravans), Pickworth Hall, Folkingham Road, Pickworth	AC
NB1 10/2390	13	Erection of bio mass boiler including 4 kilns, woodchip store and associated hardstanding, Sewstern Timber Services Ltd, Gunby Road, Sewstern	AC
NB2 10/2559	18	Mixed use development incorporating 1 house, 2 flats and 2 shops (alterations to permission S10/0701), R/o 4 St Pauls Street, Stamford	AC
JJ1 10/1923	24	Discharge of planning obligation relating to the payment of £25,000 towards affordable housing in relation to S106 agreement dated 30 November 2000 attached to p/p S99/1172 and linked to p/p S02/0173/75 by supplemental S106 agreement dated 27 May 2002, Manor Farm & Walnut Farm, Main Road, Tallington	R
CM1 10/0142	30	Sustainable urban extension to Grantham comprising at least 1000 dwellinghouses; a continuing care retirement community; a neighbourhood centre (incorporating a primary school, primary healthcare and community assembly facilities (UCO Class D1) and small scale (maximum 750 sq.m) convenience shopping (UCO Class A); Public House/Lodge Hotel; ancillary (formal playing field/ play areas) and information open space, including structural landscaping and biodiversity enhancement areas; and access works (including alterations to the A607/Belton Lane junction), Land to the north of Grantham (bounded by the East Coast main railway line, by Belton Lane and High Road (A607), Manthorpe	R

AGENDA ITEM

Development Control Committee
4 January 2011

PWM1 S10/1946/OUT

Target Decision Date: 01-Dec-2010

Applicant	Mr P Eaton C/o Agent
Agent	Richard Willows, MCS Plan It Design Ltd 27, Roseland Business Park, Long Bennington, Newark, NG235FF
Proposal	Partial demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of four dwellings
Location	Land Adjacent To 47 Pond Street, Great Gonerby
App Type	Outline Planning Consent
Parish(es)	Great Gonerby

REPORT

Application Category

This application is categorised as a minor application for outline planning permission.

Reason for Referral to Committee

This application has been referred to the committee at the request of the Lead Professional as it is considered to be locally controversial.

The Proposal

The proposal involves the erection of four detached dwellings on garden land adjacent to number 47 Pond Street and also includes the part demolition of this property. The application is in outline form but with matters of layout and access included for consideration. All the dwellings would front onto Pond Street and off road parking would be provided. Plots 1-3 would have accesses from Pond Street whilst plot 4 would be accessed from Belvoir Gardens. The stone boundary wall along Pond Street would be retained but with openings created for vehicular and pedestrian access and a reduction in height to 600mm.

The application site and its surroundings

The site is broadly rectangular in shape and currently forms part of the combined garden of no 47/49 pond Street. No 47 was until 1998 part of the adjoining grade II listed Elms

Farmhouse. However there appears to be no formal subdivision of the plots – no 47 sitting within the wider curtilage of Elms Farmhouse (no 49). The site is generally flat with part of no 47 and the current access to both properties (47 & 49) at the eastern end and a number of evergreen and willow trees towards the western end. There is a stone boundary wall fronting Pond Street of between approx 1m – 1.8m in height. This pre 1948 section of wall encloses part of the historic curtilage of Elms Farmstead and as such it is a curtilage listed structure which requires listed building consent for demolition or alteration. A modern unlisted brick continuation of this wall with railings fronts Belvoir Gardens. The site sits on the edge of the historic village which consists of historic cottages and more modern infill. To the west and south beyond Elms Farmhouse are more modern lower density housing estates. Together with the rest of the combined garden of no 47 and no 49, it forms an open area between the historic village core and modern residential development on the edge of the village.

Site History

Up until relatively recently the site was part of the curtilage of no 49 Pond Street (Elms Farmhouse). Permission was granted to subdivide the dwelling and plot into two separate dwellings (47 & 49 Pond Street) in 1998 (SK.98/0492). Both remain in the same ownership.

The erection of an extension to no 47 was granted (S00/1266) in 2001.

Representations Received

The Community Archaeologist: The proposed development does not affect any known archaeological sites.

The Highways Authority: Have requested further information which was submitted 16 November 2010 and forwarded on to them for consideration. No comments have yet been received from the Highways Authority at the time of writing this report. Any comments will be reported in the late background papers.

Great Gonerby Parish Council: (comments summarised)

- No objection in principle to residential development
- The number of plots should be reduced to three with plot 3 deleted to preserve existing group of mature trees which contribute to character of Pond St.
- Plot 1's access should also serve Plot 2, thus the stone wall can be almost entirely preserved without lowering.
- The boundary wall forms an intrinsic and important part of the village's heritage and character and should be retained at height of no less than 1.5m. It is important as the original boundary wall of the Elm's farmstead (Grade II Listed building) also affecting the approach to the village conservation area.
- A date stone incorporated into the building to be demolished should be preserved.

Representations as a result of publicity

Eight neighbour objections at the time of writing this report. The issues raised are summarised below:

1. Visually intrusive.
2. Out of character with this part of the village.
3. Development would have “urban appearance” in rural setting.
4. Loss of open area.
5. Loss of trees and biodiversity.
6. Drainage issues – area is prone to flooding.
7. Loss of greenfield site - “Garden grabbing”.
8. Loss of view.
9. Impact on conservation area.
10. Impact on setting of listed Elms Farmhouse.
11. Highway safety/parking/congestion issues.
12. Wall should be retained – stone boundary walls form part of character of village.
13. Overlooking.
14. Loss of light
15. Devaluation of property.
16. Concerns that the developer will build something different to what is approved.
17. Houses could become “affordable” and bring down area.
18. No need to demolish existing dwelling.

Policy Considerations

National Policy

Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1): Sustainable Development

Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3): Housing

Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5): Historic Environment

East Midlands Regional plan (RSS8)

Policy 1: Regional Core Objectives

Policy 2: Promoting Better Design

Policy 3: Distribution of New Development

Policy 26: Protecting and Enhancing the Region’s Natural and Cultural Heritage

Policy 27: Regional Priorities for the Historic Environment

South Kesteven Core Strategy

Policy SP1: Spatial Strategy

Policy SP2: Sustainable Communities

Policy EN1: Protection and Enhancement of the Character of the District

Policy H1: Residential Development

Officer Evaluation

Key Issues

This is an outline application with matters of layout and access to be considered. The key issues to be considered in this case therefore are:

- The principle of development (sustainability)
- The impact on the form and character of the settlement including the impact on the settings of the conservation area and grade II listed Elms Farmhouse.
- Highway safety
- Drainage
- Neighbours' residential amenities

Sustainability

The application site is within the village of Great Gonerby which is classed as a Local Service Centre under the SK Core Strategy and therefore in principle a sustainable location. The thrust of national and regional policy as well as the Core Strategy is that preference should be given to development on brownfield land wherever possible. However, given that there is not likely to be any available brownfield land in Great Gonerby and no allocated land remaining it is considered that notwithstanding the recent reclassification in PPS3 of garden land as greenfield land, development of residential garden sites is acceptable in principle subject to other policy considerations. Taking the above into account it is considered that the proposal in principle, broadly complies with national, regional and local policy on the location of sustainable development. However, there are other material considerations which outweigh this.

Impact on Form and Character of the Area

Although not within the conservation area, the application site is part of an important open area forming a buffer zone between the historic village core and modern residential development to the south and west. Furthermore, it forms part of the setting of grade II listed Elms Farmhouse, being historically an orchard and part of its curtilage. It is considered that the applicant has not demonstrated an understanding of the significance of the heritage asset of Elms Farmhouse or carried out a proper assessment of the impact of the development on the special architectural or historical interest of that asset as required by policy HE6 of PPS5 (Historic Environment).

It is considered that by virtue of the location, layout and density, the proposed development would be detrimental to the open semi-rural character of this part of the village and would intrude onto the setting of grade II listed Elms Farmhouse. Elms Farmhouse is the most prominent building in this part of the village and its setting in the wider village context goes some way beyond its curtilage. In particular, the proposal would block views of Elms Farmhouse from the northern part of Pond Street as well as those areas immediately adjacent to the site. Elms Farmhouse would also be seen against the backdrop of the rear elevations and rear gardens of the proposed dwellings when viewed from the south or southwest. Although not within the conservation area, the development would be

detrimental to its setting by virtue of its close proximity and intrusion into the views into and out of it mentioned above.

Although matters of appearance and scale are not part of this application, the scale parameters and site layout drawing clearly show the dwellings to be two storey and fronting Pond Street. The layout appears to show standard house types more appropriate to a suburban environment than a historic village setting. The position of the dwelling on plot no 4 would result in a prominent gable end facing directly onto the junction of Pond Street, Spring End and Belvoir Gardens which given that this junction is a focal point, would be visually intrusive and out of character with the streetscene. Furthermore, the close proximity of the proposed dwellings to the road, particularly at the western end of the site does not relate well to the development on the opposite side of Pond Street and Belvoir Gardens which is generally well set back from the road. Plots 3 & 4 and to a lesser extent plot 2 would be highly prominent in the streetscene and detrimental to its character.

The stone boundary wall along Pond Street is a curtilage listed structure associated with Elms Farmhouse which forms part of the overall historic character of the building and its curtilage. Furthermore, walls of this type are a locally distinctive feature, which contribute positively to the character of the area. The application proposes multiple new openings in this wall and a reduction of its height to 600m to allow for adequate visibility (as shown on the amended plans received 16 November 2010).

It is noted that listed building consent has not been sought for the alterations for this wall. However for the purposes of this planning application, it is considered that the alterations to this wall would erode the continuity of enclosure and historic semi rural character of the area as well as the setting of the grade II listed building.

Neighbours' Amenities

There are adequate separation distances between the proposed dwellings to ensure that the development would not be detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of adjacent properties.

Highways/Traffic

No comments have yet been received from the Highways Authority at the time of writing this report. Any comments will be reported in the late background papers.

Drainage

Concerns have been raised about drainage on the site. It has been claimed by objectors that the junction of Pond St and Belvoir Gardens regularly floods during heavy rainfall. There is also a Well towards the west end of the site. These concerns have been reported to both the applicant and the SK Drainage Officer. Any comments or further information relating to this issue will be reported in the Late Background Papers.

Other Considerations

Concerns have been raised about the removal of trees from the site. A request has been made by a neighbour to look into the possibility of putting a Tree Preservation Order on

one of these trees. The SK Arboriculturalist does not consider any of the trees to be of worthy of a TPO. The trees are a pleasant feature of the streetscene, and although not protected, their loss as part of a development would be detrimental to the character of the area. The issues of loss of views and devaluation of property are not material planning considerations and have not been taken into account when making a recommendation.

Crime and Disorder Implications

The application will not raise any significant issues.

Human Rights Implications

Articles 6 (Right to fair decision making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) of the Human Rights Act have been taken into account in making this recommendation.

It is considered that no relevant Article of that act will be breached.

RECOMMENDATION: That the development be Refused for the following reason(s):

1. It is considered that by virtue of the layout, density, and substantial alterations to the historic stone boundary wall, the proposed development would be detrimental to the open semi-rural character of this part of the village and would intrude into the setting of grade II listed Elms Farmhouse. Although not itself within the conservation area, the development would be detrimental to its setting by virtue of its close proximity and intrusion into the views both into and out of it.

Taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposal would be contrary to national planning policy given in PPS1 (Sustainable Development), PPS3 (Housing), PPS5 (Historic Environment), policies 1, 2, 3, 26 & 27 in the East Midlands Regional Plan and policies SP1, SP2, & EN1 of The South Kesteven Core Strategy.

* * * * *

Applicant	Mrs Diane MUNDIN, Exors of Harold Pugmire (Dec'd) 8, Main Street, Aunsby, Sleaford, NG34 8SZ
Agent	Mr Michael Thompson, Richardson Richardson, Sheep Market House, 3, Sheep Market, Stamford, PE9 2RB
Proposal	Application under section 73 of the TCPA 1990 for variation of condition 6 of p/p S09/0488 (removal of caravans)
Location	Pickworth Hall, Folkingham Road, Pickworth, Sleaford, NG34 0TJ
App Type	Full Planning Permission
Parish(es)	Pickworth

REPORT

Application Category

This application is categorised as a minor application.

Reason for Referral to Committee

This application has been referred to the committee at the request of the Lead Professional as it involves development without complying with a condition on a previous scheme which was determined by committee.

The Proposal

This is an application made under Section 73 of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to allow for the development to proceed without complying with condition 6 of the previously granted outline planning permission S09/0488 (replacement of four static caravans with four small detached cottages). Condition 6 of this permission is as follows:

All the existing mobile homes / caravans shall be removed from the site within one month of the occupation of the first dwelling hereby approved, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the District Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the existing mobile homes / caravans are removed as Pickworth is not considered to be a sustainable settlement. The development is only considered to be acceptable as it relates to the replacement of residential accommodation on a one for one basis. This accords with the requirements of the adopted South Kesteven Interim Housing Policy.

The proposal is to allow for a phased removal of each caravan within one month of the occupation of each new dwelling rather than the removal of all caravans within one month of the occupation of the first dwelling. The applicant has stated that one of the caravans (caravan D as shown on drawing 1440.A.1b) is unlikely to become vacant in the

foreseeable future. Such a variation would allow occupation of 3 the dwellings before removal of caravan D.

The application site and its surroundings

The application site consists of the grounds of a large C19 country house which are currently occupied by 4 static caravans. The site is within the village of Pickworth and partially surrounded by a mixture of historic properties and more modern infill. There is open countryside to the east and southeast.

Relevant Planning History

S09/0488 – Outline planning permission was granted 17 November 2009 for the replacement of the 4 static caravans with four small detached cottages. This permission is still extant although no reserved matters application has yet been submitted.

Representations Received

The Community Archaeologist: advises that the proposed development does not affect any known archaeological sites.

The Highways authority: No observations.

Pickworth Parish Council: No comments received at the time of writing.

Representations as a result of publicity

One neighbour letter: Concerns about overlooking and loss of privacy from plot 4. Also notes that it would not be possible to build plot 4 before removing the caravan.

Policy Considerations

National Policy

Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS1): Sustainable Development

Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3): Housing

Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5): Historic Environment

East Midlands Regional Plan (RSS8)

Policy 1: Regional Core Objectives

Policy 2: Promoting Better Design

Policy 3: Distribution of New Development

Policy 26: Protecting and Enhancing the Region's Natural and Cultural Heritage

Policy 27: Regional Priorities for the Historic Environment

Officer Evaluation

Key Issues

Section 73 of The Town and Country Planning Act 1990, states that for this type of application, only the conditions subject to which planning permission has been granted should be considered.

There have been no significant changes to policy, or developments on or adjacent to the application site, since the granting of the extant permission – S09/0488. On that basis, the key issue to be considered in this case is whether a suitably worded condition can be attached to a new permission that would protect the residential amenities of the occupiers of any static caravans that may remain on the site once development has begun, whilst ensuring that a situation cannot arise where which would increase the number of dwellings on site in this “less sustainable” village.

The applicant has requested that permission be granted for the development with a condition that would require each static caravan to be removed from the site within one month of the occupation of each new dwelling. The applicant’s agent has also stated that it is envisaged that the plots will be developed in the following order 4, 3, 1 and 2 and the caravans would be removed in the following order A, B, C and D (plots and caravans as annotated on drawing 1440.A.1b)

Condition 6 of the previously granted permission S09/0488 was intended to prevent any increase in the number of dwellings on the site as Pickworth is a “less sustainable” settlement where new dwellings would not normally be allowed. The wording of the condition as requested by the applicant would not be possible as the position of the caravans does not correspond exactly with the location of the proposed dwellings. Apart from referring to The SK Core Strategy rather than the Local Plan, it is considered that the other conditions on the new permission should remain the same as the extant permission and suitably worded additional conditions would allow the plots to be developed in phases without requiring all the caravans to be removed beforehand as well as ensuring that there will be no increase in the number of dwellings. Furthermore, there would be sufficient separation distance from a new dwelling on plot 1 to ensure that the residential amenities of the occupiers of caravan D are protected if plot 2 is developed at a later date.

It is recommended therefore that 2 new conditions be worded as follows:

Caravans A, B & C (as shown on drawing 1440.A.1b received 07 December 2010) shall be removed from the site within one month of the occupation of the first dwelling on plots 1, 3 & 4 hereby approved.

The dwelling hereby approved on plot 2 shall not be commenced before all the caravans have been removed from the site.

Crime and Disorder Implications

The application will not raise any significant issues.

Human Rights Implications

Articles 6 (Right to fair decision making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) of the Human Rights Act have been taken into account in making this recommendation.

It is considered that no relevant Article of that act will be breached.

SUMMARY OF REASON(S) FOR APPROVAL

It is considered that the proposal to allow the phased development of the site without having to remove all the caravans beforehand would (subject to conditions) preserve the residential amenities of the occupiers of the static caravans as well as ensuring that there is no increase in the number of dwellings in this 'less sustainable' settlement. There has been no significant change in policy or nearby development which would indicate against the proposal.

The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with national planning policy given in PPS1 (Sustainable Development), PPS3 (Housing), PPS5 (Historic Environment), policies 1, 2, 3, 26 & 27 of The East Midlands Regional Plan and policies SP1, H1 and EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy. There are no material conditions that indicate otherwise although conditions have been attached.

RECOMMENDATION: That the development be Approved subject to condition(s):

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission or two years from the approval of the last of the reserved matters, whichever is the later.

Reason: To comply with Section 92 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Details of the reserved matters set out below shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval within three years from the date of this permission:

- (a) layout;
- (b) scale;
- (c) appearance;
- (d) access; and
- (e) landscaping.

Approval of all reserved matters shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority

in writing before any development is commenced.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail and to comply with Section 92 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. No development shall commence until final details of the materials to be used in the construction of external walls and roofs have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the agreed materials shall be used in the development.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

4. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected. The boundary treatment shall be completed before the buildings are occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To provide a satisfactory appearance by screening rear gardens from public view and in the interests of the privacy and amenity of the occupants of the proposed dwellings and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

5. No development shall take place before the detailed design of the arrangements for surface water drainage has been agreed in writing by the local planning authority and no building shall be occupied before it is connected to the agreed drainage system.

Reason: To ensure that surface water run-off from the development will not adversely affect, by reason of flooding, the safety, amenity and commerce of the residents of this site.

6. Caravans A, B & C (as shown on drawing 1440.A.1b received 07 December 2010) shall be removed from the site within one month of the occupation of the first dwelling on plots 1, 3 & 4 hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure that the existing mobile homes / caravans are removed as Pickworth is not considered to be a sustainable settlement. The development is only considered to be acceptable as it relates to the replacement of residential accommodation on a one for one basis. This accords with the requirements of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy.

7. The dwelling hereby approved on plot 2 shall not be commenced before all the caravans have been removed from the site.

Reason: To ensure that the existing mobile homes / caravans are removed as Pickworth is not considered to be a sustainable settlement. The development is only

considered to be acceptable as it relates to the replacement of residential accommodation on a one for one basis. This accords with the requirements of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy.

8. Unless otherwise agreed the scheme to be submitted pursuant to Condition 2 above shall be in accordance with the design and principles set out on the indicative drawings 1440.A.2C and 1440.A.1B

Reason: To ensure that the development takes the form envisaged by the District Planning Authority when determining the outline application in accordance with Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy.

Note(s) to Applicant

1. This road is a private road and will not be adopted as a Highway Maintainable at the Public Expense (under the Highways Act 1980) and as such the liability for maintenance rests with the frontagers.

* * * * *

Applicant	Sewstern Timber Services Ltd Sewstern Timber Services Ltd, Gunby Road, Sewstern, Grantham, NG335RD
Agent	Mr S Limb, Cynergie Ltd 6, Lamb Close, Newark, Notts, NG24 4RT
Proposal	Erection of bio mass boiler including 4 kilns, woodchip store and associated hardstanding
Location	Sewstern Timber Services Ltd, Gunby Road, Sewstern, Grantham, NG335RD
App Type	Full Planning Permission
Parish(es)	Gunby & Stainby

REPORT

Application Category

This application is categorised as a minor application.

Reason for Referral to Committee

The application is to be determined by the Development Control Committee with it considered to be locally controversial.

The Proposal

The proposal is to erect a bio-mass boiler along with 4 kilns, woodchip store and associated hardstanding. All produce that would be burnt on site would come from the existing timber yard and any power generated utilised by the firm.

The application site and its surroundings

The application site lies between Gunby and Sewstern in the west of the District. Between the two villages there is a small industrial estate that includes the timber yard to the north of Gunby Road and a number of smaller units to the south.

On the application site are a number of existing kilns that sit close to Gunby Road with a number of larger industrial and office buildings set further back within the site. There is a relatively large area of open storage to the east of the main buildings which is where the proposed buildings would be sited.

Boundary treatments around the site are primarily hedging with an element of fencing at the access points.

Site History

None

Policy Considerations

PPS 1: Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth
PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
PPG13: Transport
PPS22: renewable Energy

East Midlands Regional Plan – policies 1, 2, 24, 31, 39, 40

Core Strategy – EN1, EN3

SKDC Landscape Character Assessment

Representations Received

Melton Borough Council does not object to the application.

Lincolnshire Heritage raises no concern to the application with regard to possible archaeology in the area.

Lincolnshire County Council, as highway authority, does not object to the application subject to conditions.

Planning policy note that the application site falls within the Kesteven Uplands Character Area, as defined in the SKDC Landscape Character Assessment, which is considered to range from medium to high sensitivity to development proposals. Policies EN1 and EN3 of the core strategy are also relevant to the determination of the application. The former identifies that development must have regard to the character of the landscape in which it is sited, particular regard should be had to the chimney. Broadly, the proposal would comply with policy EN3 relating to Renewable Energy Generation.

Colsterworth Parish Council raise no objection to the application but request that the observations of a local resident, whose comments are summarized below, be taken into account.

The Environmental Health Department notes that there would only be a marginal increase in noise from the biomass boiler to the nearest sensitive receptors and, therefore, have no comments to make on the application. With regard to the possible dust/fume, this will be regulated by an Environmental Permit.

Representations as a result of publicity

The application has been advertised in accordance with the Councils adopted statement of Community Involvement, the closing date for representations being the 30 November 2010.

One letter of representation has been received and expresses a number concerns about the application. Visually the development may be intrusive within the open countryside. Furthermore, the noise that would be generated from the bio mass boiler would be detrimental to amenity. Trusts that there will be benefits to the environment rather than negatives e.g. atmospheric pollution.

Amended plans were received by the applicant showing parking provision within the site. Consultation was undertaken on the amended plans with the closing date for representations being the 16 December.

Officer Evaluation

The application site is brownfield and the parcel of land where the buildings are proposed to be erected is currently used as open storage with hedging to the front. The kilns would have a maximum height of 6.06m and are similar in scale and location to those which already exist on the site. The boiler house would be taller with the main mass of the building some 7.6m in height with 2 chimneys 9.01m tall. Given that there are similar buildings on the site and that the land is currently used for open storage it is not considered that the buildings would be visually intrusive or inappropriate, subject to the approval of materials. Trees to the front of the existing units help to screen the development and similar landscaping is proposed in this scheme. Appropriate conditions to secure the planting is recommended.

The principle of the development is also supported. Making use of onsite waste material to generate energy would comply with core strategy policy EN3 along with guidance contained in PPS22. However, conditions should be added to ensure that only on-site waste materials are used and that it does not, in the wider sense, become a commercial bio mass fuel burner that has the potential to generate additional vehicle movements.

A noise assessment has been submitted in support of the application and identifies that the nearest sensitive noise receptor is 6 Gunby Road, some 344m from the application site as the crow flies. The bio mass burner would generate noise from the fans etc; however, it is indicated in the night time assessment that a noise level of +4db is likely to be generated and this would fall within acceptable measures to ensure that complaints are unlikely. This is a view shared by the Environmental Health Department and it is considered that the isolated nature of the site would ensure that any noise generated would not be detrimental to residential amenity.

Having regard to the above and subject to appropriate conditions to ensure that amenity, environmental considerations and only waste from the site is utilised, it is recommended that the application be granted permission.

Section 106 Heads of Terms

No section 106 is required for this application.

Crime and Disorder Implications

The application will not raise any significant issues.

Human Rights Implications

Articles 6 (Right to fair decision making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) of the Human Rights Act have been taken into account in making this recommendation.

It is considered that no relevant Article of that act will be breached.

SUMMARY OF REASON(S) FOR APPROVAL

The proposed buildings would not be unduly prominent, subject to appropriate conditions, and given that the application site falls within an established industrial site the principle of the development is supported. Utilising existing waste materials on site to generate energy is also supported. It is not considered that the development would be detrimental the environment through pollution nor would it be detrimental to residential amenity through noise that would be generated or highway movements. The application is therefore deemed to comply with core strategy policies EN1 and EN3 along with guidance contained in PPS1, PPS4, PPS7, PPG13 & PPS22; with no other material planning considerations to indicate that the application should be determined otherwise.

RECOMMENDATION: That the development be Approved subject to condition(s):

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. No development shall take place until samples of the materials (including colour of render, paintwork or colourwash) to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

3. The bio mass boiler shall only utilise waste material from the existing timber yard and no external waste material shall be brought for processing in the bio mass boiler.

Reason: To ensure that extra vehicle movements are not generated and that it does not become a 'commerical' bio mass boiler and to comply with guidance contained in PPG13 and PPS22.

4. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed with the local planning authority.

Reason: Hard and soft landscaping and tree planting make an important contribution to the development and its assimilation with its surroundings and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

5. The parking arrangements shown on the approved plan '030 - 81', dated 01 December 2010 for the parking/turning/manoeuvring/loading/unloading of vehicles shall be available at all times when the premises are in use.

Reason: To ensure adequate parking provision is retained within the application site and to allow vehicles to enter and leave the highway in a forward gear in the interests of highway safety and to comply with policy EN1 of the Core Strategy.

6. This permission relates solely to the application as amended by plans received on 1 & 9 December 2010.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that adequate parking provision is retained within the scheme and to comply with guidance contained in PPG13..

Note(s) to Applicant

1. You are advised that the application site falls within an area affected by Radon. You are asked to contact the Council's Building Control section (telephone number 01476 406187) to ascertain the level of protection required and whether a geological assessment is necessary.
2. Please note that this grant of planning permission does not override the need for an Environmental Permit.

* * * * *

Applicant	Jon Gibbison, Hereward Homes Limited The Old Barn, 27B, Crocket Lane, Empingham, Rutland, LE15 8PW
Agent	T D Musgrove, Iplan Architectural 22, Cambridge Road, Stamford, PE9 1BN
Proposal	Mixed use development incorporating 1 house, 2 flats and 2 shops (alterations to permission S10/0701)
Location	R/o 4, St. Pauls Street, Stamford
App Type	Full Planning Permission
Parish(es)	Stamford

REPORT

Application Category

This application is categorised as a other application.

Reason for Referral to Committee

The application is to be determined by the Development Control Committee with it considered to be locally controversial. A previous application on site was also determined at Committee.

The Proposal

The proposal is to erect a mixed use scheme that would front Star Lane. This would include two shop front units on the ground floor along with a residential property close to the corner with St Paul's Street. Two flats would also be erected above the shop units. Vehicle access would be from Star Lane and share the drive currently used to access Star Lane Mews. Three parking spaces would be provided, one for each residential unit.

The application site and its surroundings

The application site is currently empty following the grant of consent S04/CA/6229, referred to below. To the east of the application site a number of residential properties have been erected, Star Lane Mews. To the immediate east of the proposed residential property, and part of the flats, is a courtyard which is used to access residential properties above/to the rear of 3 St Paul's Street. These properties are accessed via an external stair case that runs adjacent to the application site. A number of the properties have what appear to be habitable room windows orientated toward the application site. A two-storey stone building, in commercial use, is sited to the north of proposed parking spaces and set some

11m back from Star Lane. The parking spaces proposed to be used by the flats are currently used by the business.

In the immediate locality the majority of buildings are two or three-storey, many of which are listed. The only single storey building is a barbers on the corner of Star Lane and Broad Street, a building which makes no contribution to the character of the Conservation Area.

The application site falls within Stamford Conservation Area and the defined Town Centre.

Site History

Application S03/CA/6139 for the 'demolition of unlisted buildings in a Conservation Area' was refused permission on the 13 May 2005. The reason for refusal is reproduced below;

It is considered that, in the absence of an acceptable scheme of redevelopment, the demolition of the existing buildings would result in an undesirable gap in the streetscene to the detriment of the character and appearance of this part of the Stamford Conservation Area and the setting of the adjoining listed building, no. 4 St Paul's Street.

Application S03/1627 for the 'erection of 3 flats and two-storey dwelling' was also refused permission on 13 May 2005. The two reasons for refusal are reproduced below;

1) It is considered that the proposed new building to be erected on the Star Lane frontage would, by reason of its excessive overall length, and height at the eaves and ridge, be overbearing on the scene not only to the detriment of the character and appearance of this part of the Stamford Conservation Area but also the setting of the adjoining listed building, no. 4 St Paul's Street, and on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties.

2) It is further considered that the projecting central gable to the front elevation of the proposed building would constitute an incongruous and ill-fitting feature in the context. In view of the foregoing it is considered that the proposed development would be contrary to Policies C5 and C9 of the South Kesteven Local Plan.

Two revised applications were submitted to address the previous reasons for refusal. The application for the 'demolition of unlisted outbuildings in a Conservation Area' was granted consent on 16 August 2004 (ref; S04/CA/6229).

Application S04/0949 for the 'erection of three flats and a two-storey dwelling' was granted permission, subject to conditions, on 11 January 2005. Both of the later applications (ref; S04/CA/6229 & S04/0949) were determined at Committee. However, permission S04/0949 was later challenged in the Courts, through a process called Judicial Review and the decision quashed. The application was then re-determined by the Development Control Committee and permission refused for the reasons reproduced below;

1. It is considered that the proposed new building to be erected on the Star Lane frontage would have an adverse visual impact, because its gallimaufry of architectural features creates a series of discordant fenestration elements designed to meet the design requirements of the internal accommodation. This is considered to be contrary to Policies

H6, C5 and C9 of the South Kesteven Local Plan and Policy BE3 of the Lincolnshire Structure Plan.

2. It is considered that the overall length, and height at the eaves and ridge, creates a domination of outlook leading to a sense of enclosure and that the unscreened balcony creates overlooking into opposed habitable rooms. It is considered that these have an adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties contrary to Policies H6 and EN1 of the South Kesteven Local Plan.

The most recent application determined on the site was heard at the Development Control Committee in August of this year (ref; S10/0701). It was granted permission subject to a number of conditions.

Policy Considerations

PPS 1: Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth
PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment
PPG13: Transport
PPG16: Planning and Archaeology

East Midlands Regional Plan – policies 1, 2, 3, 27

Core Strategy – EN1, E2

Representations Received

The observations of Stamford Town Council have not yet been received and these will be reported to Members in a late items paper.

English Heritage recommends that the application be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.

Lincolnshire Heritage recommends that a condition be added requiring an archaeological investigation of the site given its central and historic location. Such a condition was recommended on a previous application.

Lincolnshire County Council, as highway authority, does not object to the application subject to conditions.

Environmental Health makes no observation on the application.

Representations as a result of publicity

The application has been advertised in accordance with the Councils adopted statement of Community Involvement, the closing date for representations being the 10 December 2010.

As a result of consultation no representations have been received.

Officer Evaluation

The principal of development is supported in that it is within one of the Councils four most sustainable settlements, on a brownfield site. The mix of uses, primarily with shops in the ground floor and flats above, with the exception of one dwelling, is supported in this central location. A view shared by Planning Policy. There is also an acknowledged need to develop the site which is in a prominent location within the town centre and currently detracts from the character of the Conservation Area.

An important material planning consideration is the planning history attached to the site. As noted above application S04/0949 was granted permission; however, the decision was quashed on the grounds that the planning history of the site was not accurately summarized in the Committee report and was a material planning consideration in the outcome of the application. It should be noted that no observations were made on the merits of the case in the judgement. The application was subsequently re-determined at Committee and refused permission, as was recommended by the Planning Officer. The reasons for refusal are contained in this report.

However, subsequent to this planning permission has been granted for a redevelopment of the site and this application looks to make amendments to the approved scheme. The alterations are summarized below;

In the front elevation 2 dormers are to be inserted to make use of the roof space. In addition a rooflight is to be inserted in the residential unit closest to St Paul's Street.

There have also been slight alterations to the fenestration layout to the rear, along with two additional rooflights.

The planning history to the application site is important and it is not considered that the scheme as amended is significantly different to that which already has permission. There are others dormers in the front elevation such as that proposed in this scheme and they would not be out of character with the area. Alterations to the rear are relatively minor and no less appropriate than what already has permission.

In all other aspects the application is considered acceptable and would, subject to conditions, be appropriate in terms of respecting residential amenity and the character of the Conservation Area and setting of adjacent Listed Buildings. Adequate parking and turning provision would also be provided within the application site.

Section 106 Heads of Terms

No section 106 is required for this application.

Crime and Disorder Implications

The application will not raise any significant issues.

Human Rights Implications

Articles 6 (Right to fair decision making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) of the Human Rights Act have been taken into account in making this recommendation.

It is considered that no relevant Article of that act will be breached.

SUMMARY OF REASON(S) FOR APPROVAL

The proposed scheme is not significantly different to that which already has permission (ref; S10/0701) and the scale, design and detail of the development would enhance and respect the character of the Conservation Area and not be detrimental to the setting of adjacent Listed Buildings. Furthermore, subject to appropriate conditions about screening the development would not be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring properties through a dominating or overlooking impact. Adequate parking and turning provision would also be provided within the application site. The application is therefore deemed to comply with core strategy policy EN1 and guidance contained in PPS1, PPS4, PPS5, PPG13, PPG16 and PPS23; with no other material planning considerations to indicate that the application should be determined otherwise.

RECOMMENDATION: That the development be Approved subject to condition(s):

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no window, dormer window or rooflight other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed without planning permission having first been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties and in accordance with the guidance contained in national Planning Policy Statement PPS1.

3. No development shall take place within the application site until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to provide a reasonable opportunity to record the history of the site and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

4. No works shall take place until full details of the all proposed joinery works including 1:20 sample elevations and 1:1 joinery profiles have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in strict accordance with the agreed details and maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: As insufficient information has been submitted the condition is imposed to ensure the satisfactory preservation of the building and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the adopted South Kesteven Core Strategy (July 2010).

5. A sample panel of the proposed materials shall be constructed on site, and shall be subject to the approval of the district planning authority prior to work commencing on site. The panel shall show the proposed method of construction including the type of natural stone and its finish, the mortar mixture and the method of coursing to be used in the development. The approved development shall be constructed in accordance with the sample panel as may be approved.

Reason: These details have not been submitted and the district planning authority wish to ensure that the colour and type of materials to be used harmonise with the surrounding development in the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy.

6. The arrangements shown on the approved plan '2009/59 – 3 B', dated 12 November 2010 for the parking/turning/manoeuvring/loading/unloading of vehicles shall be available at all times when the premises are in use.

Reason: To enable calling vehicles to wait clear of the carriageway of Star Lane and to allow vehicles to enter and leave the highway in a forward gear in the interests of highway safety and to comply with policy EN1 of the Core Strategy.

7. The screening to the rear terrace of flat 1 shall be erected prior to the occupation of the property and shall be retained thereafter in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that the amenity of neighbouring properties is respected and to comply with guidance contained in PPS1.

* * * * *

Applicant	Mr Jonathan Gibbison, Hereward Homes The Old Barn, 27B, Crocket Lane, Empingham, Rutland, LE15 8PW
Agent	
Proposal	Discharge of planning obligation relating to the payment of £25,000 towards affordable housing in relation to S106 agreement dated 30 November 2000 attached to p/p S99/1172 and linked to p/p S02/0173/75 by supplemental S106 agreement dated 27 May 2002
Location	Manor Farm & Walnut Farm, Main Road, Tallington, PE9 4RF
App Type	Modify or discharge planning obligation
Parish(es)	Tallington

REPORT

Introduction

This application was reported to the Development Control Committee on the 7 December 2010. At the meeting Members resolved to refuse the application. However the Agent for the application turned up just after the application had been debated with some additional information and following discussions with the Acting Lead Professional and Chairman and Vice Chairman it was agreed that the application would be reported back to the next available meeting on the 4 January 2011 with the additional information.

The Agents comments are copied in full below:

“Clearly the Council Legal Department do not feel that confident on their recommendation as they have not outright refused our application but have passed it to the Committee to make the difficult decision.

Had we been able to build the 21 units at Manor Farm and Walnut Farm Tallington as the outline original planning consent in 2000, we would have no objection to paying the £25,000 Section 106 fee.

The problem arose in that the planning policy changed after we constructed the first phase of 12 houses and we could not therefore obtain Reserved Matters consent for the remaining 9 houses on the site.

It should be noted that despite what has been presented to you in the Relevant History section by your legal department, the application S02/01733 in May 2002 for the 12 houses built does not have any specific Section 106 condition within the document. Plus in the supplemental Section 106 Agreement with this consent, the payment of the £25,000 Section 106 is only mentioned in the recitals and not in the operable part of this agreement. So on the checking further these was actually no legal obligation to pay this fee.

Hereward Homes paid the £25,000 to the Council in June 2002 on the expectation of constructing the 21 houses as the outline consent.

Had our application for 12 houses been presented in 2002 in isolation of the Outline Consent for 21 house no Section 106 would have been requested or would have been due as the trigger level as confirmed by your legal department was the construction of 15 houses.

Your legal department have also confirmed that the £25,000 Section 106 payment made in 2002 has not been expended even though it is now 8 years later.

It is not reasonable for the Council to continue holding onto £25,000 plus interest.”

Application Category

This application is categorised as an other application.

Reason for Referral to Committee

Cllr Ian Stokes has requested that the application be referred to the Development Control Committee as the application relates to S106 obligations.

The Proposal

This application seeks to discharge the S106 obligations relating to the payment of £25,000 towards affordable housing that was required in connection with planning application S99/1172/75 and subsequently linked to application S02/0173 by way of a supplemental Agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

The obligation states:

“1. In recognition of Policy H8 the South Kesteven Local Plan 1995 the Owner covenants with the Council to pay a single commuted sum of £25,000 to the Council which will be applied by the Council to Affordable Housing Schemes within the Council’s area which are to be provided either by the Council or a Registered Social Landlord.

2. The said commuted sum of £25,000 to be paid to the Council by the Owner upon the occupation of three residential units of accommodation on the Land or within 12 months of the Commencement of Development whichever event occurs the earliest.”

The Applicant’s Agent has submitted the following letter in support of the application:

"We act for Hereward Homes Limited, the Developers of the above site. Outline Planning Permission was granted under the above reference number on 21 November 2000 for the erection of 21 dwellings and 4 small workshop units. A Section 106 Agreement dated the 30 November 2000 required a financial contribution of £25,000 to be paid to the Council "in recognition of policy H8 of the South Kesteven Local Plan 1995".

Policy H8 deal with the provision of affordable housing on small sites to meet a proven local need. This policy does not justify the payment of a financial contribution from the above development.

We assume that the Council justified its request for a financial contribution under National Policy. In particular PPG3: Housing and Circular 6/98: Planning for Affordable Housing. National Policy at that time was to seek affordable housing in respect of housing developments of 25 or more dwellings or residential sites of 1 hectare or more, irrespective of the number of dwellings. In rural areas with a population of 3,000 or fewer, local authorities were generally recommended to seek to adopt thresholds of 15 dwellings or 0.5 of a hectare.

Although the outline planning permission referred to above was for the erection of 21 dwellings, the development was constructed pursuant to reserved matters applications and only comprised 12 dwellings. No further dwellings would be permitted due to a policy change since the outline application was granted. On the basis that 12 dwellings would not have triggered an affordable housing contribution and that there was no Local Plan justification for it at the time, please treat this letter as a formal request for the repayment of the financial contribution (plus interest) paid under the Section 106 Agreement. This was paid on behalf of Hereward Homes by way of a cheque from this firm on 13th December 2002.

Please acknowledge safe receipt of this letter and confirm that the arrangements for the repayment to be made to our client. At the same time, we propose that the Section 106 Agreement is discharged on the basis that it no longer serves a useful purpose."

The Application Site and its Surroundings

The site to which this application relates is split in to two halves. The 1st part of the site is located to the north of Main Road Tallington and comprises Manor House Farm and the whole of the Searson Close development. The second part of the site is located on the southern side of Main Road and comprises Walnut Farm.

The application site is located on the eastern edge of Tallington village.

Relevant Site History

S99/1172 – In November 2000 outline planning permission was granted for the erection of 21 dwellings and 4 small workshop units at farmyards to Manor and Walnut Farm, Main Road, Tallington. The application was subject to a Section 106 Agreement which required:

“1. In recognition of Policy H8 the South Kesteven Local Plan 1995 the Owner covenants with the Council to pay a single commuted sum of £25,000 to the Council which will be applied by the Council to Affordable Housing Schemes within the Council’s area which are to be provided either by the Council or a Registered Social Landlord.

2. The said commuted sum of £25,000 to be paid to the Council by the Owner upon the occupation of three residential units of accommodation on the Land or within 12 months of the Commencement of Development whichever event occurs the earliest.”

S02/0173 – In May 2002 planning permission was granted for the conversion of barns to 3 dwellings and the erection of 9 dwellings at Manor Farm Yard, Main Road, Tallington. The application was the subject of a S106 Agreement linking the development to the requirements of the S106 provided under the earlier application S99/1172.

S06/0954 – In July 2006 a reserve matters application to develop the remaining part of the site at Walnut Farm was withdrawn as it became evident that the outline application had lapsed.

Policy Considerations

PPS3: Housing

Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations

South Kesteven District Council: Reviewing the Housing Needs Situation (2002).

Core Strategy Policy H3: Affordable Housing

Representations Received

Heritage Lincolnshire: No issues

Representations as a Result of Publicity

No comments received.

Officer Evaluation

Under the terms of the S106 Agreement dated 30 November 2000, signed by the then Owners of the development, there is no requirement for the commuted sum to be refunded if a lesser number of residential units are developed.

Application S02/0173 was in fact a full application and the application only related to the erection of nine dwellings and the conversion of an existing barn into three dwellings. The then developers were prepared to enter the required S106 at that time and accepted the requirement to provide £25,000 towards affordable housing provision. There have been no

material changes in circumstance and it is therefore recommended that this application be refused. The S106 contribution is still required and the council are currently seeking to bring forward affordable housing on a site to the east of Tallington which the contributions would help to fund.

Notwithstanding the above the applicants have argued that the threshold for the requirement to provide affordable housing under the now superseded PPG3 (15 dwellings) has not been reached.

At the time the supplemental agreement was entered into in relation to application S02/0173 there was no specific local plan policy in relation to Affordable Housing for developments of 10 or more dwellings in rural areas.

The guidance contained in PPG3 Housing and Circular 6/98 Planning and Affordable Housing (both of which have now been superseded) was to seek affordable housing in respect of housing developments of 25 or more dwellings or residential sites of 1 hectare or more. In rural areas with a population of 3,000 or fewer, local authorities were recommended to seek to adopt thresholds of 15 dwellings or 0.5 of a hectare. If however a local need could be demonstrated a lower level could be considered.

In 2002 the Council undertook a review in relation to the housing needs situation. This review indicated in the summary that "overall target levels of 36% of affordable housing would be justified, as would a site threshold of 15+ dwellings/0.5 ha (or 2+ dwellings in areas with a population of 3,000 or less)."

Following on from the housing needs survey, the Council were at that time reviewing the local plan and in view of the housing need situation one of the policies being carried forward in the local plan review was that the threshold in relation to Affordable Housing in rural areas be ten or more dwellings. This information was contained within the first stage deposit which was later aborted.

The most up to date policy relevant to this proposal is Policy H3 of the adopted Core Strategy 2010 which indicates that an affordable housing contribution will be required on all sites comprising 5 or more dwellings.

The applicant's agent has submitted some additional comments reproduced in full in the introduction to this report. It should be noted that the application has been reported to the Development Control Committee because the requirements relate to S106 contributions requested by the Development Control Committee not because as the Agent suggest that Officers have passed over a difficult decision to be made.

It is also relevant to note that when the original application S99/1172 was determined the affordable housing requirement at that time was for 25% of the total dwellings to be affordable. This would have equated to 5 affordable dwellings. This requirement was however significantly reduced due to the environmental and conservation benefits of the scheme to a £25,000 commuted sum. It is therefore relevant to note that the total level of contribution was already significantly below the level that would usually be required for a development of this nature.

The agent has emphasised that the Council has not spent this money and that it was collected 8 years ago. The money was collected in 2002 and the Council have since this time been working with RSL's to provide affordable housing in the area. Most notably an application was submitted on land to the east of the application site and was later withdrawn. The Council are however still pursuing affordable housing on this site and hope to resolve this in the near future.

Section 106 Heads of Terms

Original requirement on S99/1172 and S02/0173

1. In recognition of Policy H8 the South Kesteven Local Plan 1995 the Owner covenants with the Council to pay a single commuted sum of £25,000 to the Council which will be applied by the Council to Affordable Housing Schemes within the Council's area which are to be provided either by the Council or a Registered Social Landlord.
2. The said commuted sum of £25,000 to be paid to the Council by the Owner upon the occupation of three residential units of accommodation on the Land or within 12 months of the Commencement of Development whichever event occurs the earliest."
3. £2000 to be paid to the Parish Council for contributions towards the upgrading of play equipment on the existing play area at Mill Lane Tallington.

Crime and Disorder

This application raises no crime and disorder implications

Human Rights Implications

Articles 6 (Right to fair decision making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) of the Human Rights Act have been taken into account in making this recommendation.

It is considered that no relevant Article of that act will be breached.

RECOMMENDATION: That the development be Refused for the following reason(s):

1. It is the District Council's opinion that the evidence provided by the applicant does not justify the discharge of the S106 requirements relating to affordable housing in this case. The off-site contribution of £25,000 was required in connection to a full application for 12 dwellings and was requested on the bases of the then housing need situation. The applicants were fully aware and prepared to enter the agreement at that time and there has not been a material change in circumstances since as there still remains a requirement to provide affordable housing in Tallington. Although the policy situation has changed recently the Core Strategy only strengthens the affordable housing requirement by requiring developments of 5 or more dwellings to provide a contribution of 35% towards affordable housing.

Applicant	Larkfleet Homes, R & S Pask, Namulas Pension Trustees Ltd, Trustees, A J Snarey, HPC Homes Ltd, Larkfleet Ltd C/o Agent
Agent	Mr A Aspbury, Antony Aspbury Associates Limited 20, Park Lane Business Centre, Park Lane, Basford, Nottingham, NG6 0DW
Proposal	Sustainable urban extension to Grantham comprising: at least 1000 dwelling houses; a continuing care retirement community; a neighbourhood centre (incorporating a primary school, primary healthcare and community assembly facilities (UCO Class D1) and small scale (maximum 750 sq m) convenience shopping (UCO Class A); Public House/Lodge Hotel; ancillary (formal (playing field/play areas) and informal) open space, including structural landscaping and biodiversity enhancement areas; and access works (including alterations to the A607/Belton Lane junction). Land to the north of Grantham (bounded by the East Coast main railway line, by Belton Lane and High Road (A607), Manthorpe), Lincs
Location	Land north of Grantham bound by railway, Belton Lane/High Road (A607), Manthorpe, Grantham
App Type	OL Environmental Impact Assessment
<u>Parish(es)</u>	Belton & Manthorpe Grantham Great Gonerby

REPORT

Application reference S10/0142/EIAOL – Registered 22 January 2010

Land to the north of Grantham at Manthorpe (bounded by East Coast main railway line, Belton Lane and High Road (A607))

Application Category

This application is categorised as a large-scale major development application requiring an Environmental Impact Assessment.

Reasons for Referral to the Development Control Committee

The scale of the proposed development, conflict with the Council's Core Strategy, potential significant environmental impacts, wide public interest and concerns and requests from Councillors R. Wootton and G. Wheat.

The primary reasons for the delay in reporting the application to the Development Control Committee are: its scale and complexity; the fact that the South Kesteven Core Strategy was not adopted until 5th July; discussions with applicants about issues such as traffic (a

new traffic survey and further analysis of the highway network have been carried out and have been considered by the Highway Authority); the potential impact of the development on the setting of Belton House has been the subject of further submissions by the applicant; a change of officer dealing with the application (the original case officer left the Authority); recent work being carried out on the Development Management process.

General Note

The application and most of the information provided by the applicant and also the great majority of comments from consultees and local residents were submitted before the many changes to the relevant policy context that have occurred over the last year or so. Nevertheless, the greater part of all the comments made remain valid and the reporting of most of the comments below, whether in full or in summary have not been amended to reflect these policy changes. However, in some of the representations of a specialist, technical, expert nature, where comments relating to documents that are out of date or have formally been replaced by more recent adopted or approved documents and where, effectively, incorrect information could be confusing, some sentences and paragraphs have been amended or omitted. For the avoidance of doubt such amendments have not been made in respect of representations by individuals or non-technical bodies; also amendments have not made if it would interfere with the basic meaning of a comment or the overall nature and thrust of a representation.

The Proposal

This is an Outline Planning Application for a Sustainable Urban Extension to Grantham, covering 55.9 hectares, requiring an Environmental Impact Assessment. All matters, except 'means of access' (principally via the new roundabout junction formed with Belton Lane and the A607 High Road), are reserved for subsequent approval.

The application site is located at the northern edge of Grantham, bounded to the north by Belton Lane, to the west by the East Coast Main Line Railway, to the south primarily by modern residential estates and to the east by High Road (A607) and Manthorpe village.

The application is for: at least 1000 dwellings; a continuing care retirement community; a neighbourhood centre (incorporating a primary school, primary healthcare and community assembly facilities [Use Classes Order Class D1] and small scale [maximum 750 square metres] convenience shopping [Use Classes Order Class A1]; public house/lodge hotel; ancillary (formal [playing fields/play areas] and informal) open space, including structural landscaping and biodiversity enhancement areas; and access works, including alterations to the A607/Belton Lane junction.

In addition to the application form, certificates, plans, drawings and a Design and Access Statement, the submitted application was accompanied by the following documents: a letter in support of the application, an Environmental Impact Assessment, a Town Planning Statement, a statement of Community Involvement, an 'Illustrative Master Plan', Draft Heads of Terms – for Section 106 Agreement, a Transport Assessment, A Flood Risk Assessment, a Landscape Framework and an Arboricultural Survey. Prior to the application submission a Bat Survey Report was submitted on behalf of the applicants.

Since the submission of the documents listed above, further information has been submitted dealing with transport/traffic issues (September/October 2010) and the impacts of the proposed development on the surroundings (October 2010), particularly Belton House and Park and Manthorpe Conservation Area. The transport information comprises analysis of town centre junctions and a further survey in the form of queuing/turning counts on the A607. This additional information has been considered by the Highway Authority and their response is set out below under the heading 'Officer Evaluation'. The 'impact' documents comprise a 'Revised Illustrative Masterplan' and a 'Supplementary Design Report'; these have been the subject of additional consultation with selected bodies (see below). The applicant's agent has sent a letter, dated 15 November 2010 outlining the current policy context for consideration in the light of the Secretary of State's decision to revoke the East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy being judged unlawful by the Courts after Judicial Review.

The supporting letter submitted with the application

The letter submitted in support of the application describes and explains the background and context of the application and the proposal. It sets out the broad social, economic and environmental aims underpinning the choice of the proposed location and general scale, composition and form of the development. The concept is summed up in the following statement in the letter: "The development will, through a high quality, comprehensive, integrated, innovative, socially inclusive, and very sustainable design, provide a range of needed housing (including affordable housing), recreational facilities (including open space) on a site that is immediately adjacent to and well-related to the built-up area of Grantham."

The letter goes on to describe the site and its surroundings, sets out how the proposal would accord with principles of sustainable development and refers to and describes briefly the general contents and of other documents submitted with the application and the purpose they serve in making the application proposals acceptable in terms of physical impact, infrastructure provision, planning policy, development viability, etc.. The latter part of the letter addresses the key elements of the proposed development and important issues relating to them, these are: Access; Housing, Neighbourhood Centre; Open Space; Landscape; Ecology and Biodiversity; Community Involvement; Planning Policy; Section 106 Agreement.

In the letter the applicant's state that the planning considerations material to this case include the provisions of the development plan, in which context the principal issues for the Local Planning Authority are: "... whether the development is needed in order to ensure an adequate level of housing is achieved within the Grantham Growth Point; whether the application site is an appropriate one for the development proposed, including whether it can be regarded as sustainable; and, whether such marginal impacts as the development would have, can be satisfactorily mitigated." The applicant considers that it would be justified to grant permission for the proposed development and that this is demonstrated in the documents submitted in support of the application.

The Design and Access Statement (DAS)

The purpose of the DAS is to illustrate that the application is based on a good understanding of the local character and context and of the brief. It is structured to show how, through analysis of the strategic planning and site issues and considerations, the brief and proposed design responses have been arrived at. The 'Outline Brief', 'Vision', 'How the Brief Evolved' are then set out. The analysis carried out under these heads leads on to a 'masterplan' comprising the following site uses:

Residential (maximum 3 storey) - not less than 1,000 units - 2, 3, 4 and 5 bed houses in a mix of detached, semi detached, terraced and townhouses and apartments. Zones of different building densities: 25/30/40/45/50 units/hectare, higher densities at neighbourhood centre. (Note: Environmental Statement states that up to 1310 dwellings are proposed)

Continuing Care Retirement Community (maximum 3 storey) - 110 apartments in Extra Care Village; 40 bungalows and assisting living houses; 60 bed Nursing Home.

Neighbourhood Centre (maximum 3 storey): local convenience store (380m²); small retail/service sector units (up to 5 No., 80m² each); Live/Work units (up to 12 No.); - Doctors Surgery and Pharmacy (although the application states subject to PCT demand and support); Primary School - single form entry, approx. 1 ha site; Nursery ("Surestart") up to 35 places; Community Hall (90m²); "Market Hall" style covered shelter (bus drop-off, meeting point).

Open space and recreation: Full size football pitch; Cricket pitch; Tennis courts, 3 No. all weather; Bowling Green; Centrally accessible NEAP, LEAP and LAP in close proximity to neighborhoods; Areas of informal open space and woodland.

Infrastructure: pedestrian and cycle routes – green routes; services and infrastructure works including the removal of the overhead power lines; Sustainable Urban Drainage systems (SUDs); new highway works; landscaping and associated works.

Hotel and public house (2 storeys): located to the north of the site close to the proposed new roundabout entrance

The DAS then deals with 'Involvement' (see Statement of Community Involvement below); it is stated that the application team carried out a wide ranging series of studies, discussions and consultations with stakeholders and local residents. Manthorpe residents carried out a survey (June 2008), and sent observations about concerns about the local area and facilities/services they would 'like to see' provided locally. Two public exhibitions were held (see SCI), many questionnaires were completed and email comments received. Comments arising from these were fed into the developing 'masterplan'. These resulted in more traffic survey work being carried out and fed into the 'masterplan' presented at the second public exhibition (6 November 2009). Consultations with various bodies were undertaken and discussions held with the Local Planning Authority.

The next five sections of the DAS deal, respectively with: "Understanding the Context", "Constraints", "Design", "Sustainable Development" and "Phasing". The first two of these sections present detailed description and analysis of matters such as: site orientation and

topography, vistas, historic patterns of local development, conservation and design, access and connectivity and development constraints. The Design Section contains an outline 'illustrative masterplan' and matters such as design principles, some detail of proposed land uses, scale and intensity, movement (including pedestrian, cycle and bus routes), landscaping framework. The sustainable development section covers such matters as: the capability and commitment of the applicant company to sustainable development, energy, CO2 emissions, sustainable water management and drainage, flood risk, pollution, transport, biodiversity, waste, health, sustainable use of materials, involvement with the local community. These matters will not be dealt with in detail here, bearing in mind that the application is in Outline and the consideration of the application by this Council is mainly to do with matters of principle and overall design and impact issues. However some of the wider issues described and analysed in the DAS, in relation to design and layout principles, the overall nature and range of the proposed development, the impacts of the proposals on the wider setting of the site, traffic matters and critical policy issues, will be addressed in the body of this report below.

Statement of Community Involvement

Refers to pre-submission consultation with local residents, including reference to 2 public exhibitions:

a) 18/9/09 (233 visitors) as well as press releases, an article in the Journal and web site information. The SCI includes a long list of issues raised including concerns about: traffic, need for the development, impact on Belton House, access link to Manthorpe estate, coalescence with Manthorpe, and where residents would work. Support was also given for retirement community, proposed roundabout, new facilities proposed such as shops, community and medical facilities.

b) 6/11/09 9 (64 visitors) as well as press release etc, when similar issues were raised as at the first exhibition. In addition a consultation meeting was held to discuss the continuing care retirement community.

The SCI also refers to a petition of some 410 signatures with 4 main reasons for objection: increased highway congestion, single access point, waste/sewage, Belton House impact.

Town Planning Statement (TPS)

The TPS addresses the applicants' stated principal planning considerations: provisions of the development plan; national planning policy; provisions of Grantham Growth Point; sustainability; "The extent of any harm to interests of acknowledged importance and whether such harm, if it exists, can be satisfactorily mitigated".

The conclusions in the TPS are in summary as follows.

- The proposal accords with national policy (PPS1, 3, 4, 9, and 25, and PPG 13, 17, 22, and 24).
- The proposal accords with the East Midlands Regional Plan and "... would not compromise or undermine the underlying objectives of the Core Strategy." (Note at the time the TPS was written the Core strategy was not adopted).
- The proposal accords with the saved policies of the Local Plan.
- The proposal, " ... as a whole" will be highly sustainable, and cornerstones include making the most of existing infrastructure and economic and social capital of the town;

sustainable transport measures; efficient use of land; mixed use development; renewable and low carbon energy generation technologies and a phased development; and substantial planned and managed enhancement of biodiversity and new wildlife habitats.

- The ES demonstrates that all potentially adverse impacts are mitigated and no harm results to interests of acknowledged importance.

Environmental Impact Statement (EA)

The EA has been submitted with application following a Scoping opinion issued by the District Council on 19 June 2008. The EA incorporates appendices, associated documents and drawings and, as required by statute, a non- technical summary. The EA covers a wide range of topics as outlined below; the views expressed are as set out in the EA,

a) Landscape and visual assessment

The location of the proposed development minimises landscape and visual impacts and the landscape proposals would help to reduce these impacts further. The proposals include the enhancement of the local landscape with additional tree planting to compliment the parkland landscape within the neighboring Belton Park. There would be a woodland buffer between the existing urban edge and the Running Furrows stream, to the south of the site. The Landscape Framework report states that account has been taken of the local landscape character and relevant landscape policy together with the settings of Belton house and Park and Manthorpe Conservation Area.

b) Ecology and nature conservation

The proposed development site is dominated by arable land and supports a number of habitats which include hedgerow, mature trees and streams. The stream and associated woodland strip, to the south of the site and a number of hedgerows are considered to be of high ecological value. There are no protected sites within the site boundary. There are two locally designated Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCIs) within 2km of the site boundary. The proposed development will not have a direct impact upon these SNCIs. There may be some short term, temporary noise impacts during construction but this will not cause any significant disturbance. Mitigation measures will include the retention of habitats of the highest ecological value and the creation of new habitats through a landscape scheme

c) Archaeology and cultural heritage

It has been established with the Lincolnshire Heritage Trust that no further pre-determination work will be required. However, an earthwork survey of the surviving ridge and furrow located to the east of the Running Furrows Brook will be required as mitigation. With regard to the settings of the Manthorpe Conservation Area, the Grade I Listed Registered Park at Belton and the Listed Buildings within the search area, the proposed development has been assessed to have an impact of neutral or slight adverse significance in all cases. To mitigate any adverse impact upon the settings of these designations the development should be screened where possible with appropriate planting.

d) Noise and vibration

During construction, the development will have the potential to generate short term, temporary increases in noise levels and vibration at sensitive locations nearest the site. Predictions have been made to determine the noise level of the site following construction; the results indicate that mitigation measures will be required to maintain the required daytime and night time noise levels. A noise mitigation scheme will be produced which will set out specific mitigation measures.

e) Air quality and dust

Traffic emissions during the construction phase of the development will not exceed air quality standards; therefore mitigation measures would not be necessary. During construction dust could be generated, to mitigate any potential impacts, a best practice dust mitigation plan would be implemented.

f) Soil and land use

Development of the site will result in the permanent loss of Grade 3b agricultural land, this is not considered to be “best and most versatile” for agricultural production. However, loss of this land is assessed as having a moderate adverse impact. This loss cannot be mitigated.

g) Hydrology, drainage and flood risk assessment

Following assessment, the proposed development is not considered to be at significant risk from flooding. As a result of the increase in impermeable area, the site has the potential to increase surface water runoff which could cause surface flooding. To mitigate this effect, Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) will be used to hold the surface water and allow it to drain back into watercourses and into the ground, thus preventing flooding. A separate flood risk assessment document was also submitted.

h) Geology and hydrogeology

The assessment confirmed that impacts upon ground and surface water, during the development, would be of negligible to medium significance. General pollution prevention measures will be adopted, these will include following best practice codes and ensuring good site working practices and procedures. In addition, all mitigation measures will be set out within a Construction Method Statement and an Environmental Management Plan prior to works starting on the site.

The Landscape Framework (Note: In the ‘Supplementary Design Report’ dated 23 October 2010, submitted by the applicant in response to representations on the likely impacts of the proposed development on Heritage Assets in the area around the site, a ‘Landscape Framework Enhancement’ is put forward and the enhanced landscaping framework is shown in the ‘Revised Illustrative Masterplan’)

The Landscape Framework proposed for the site takes account of the local landscape character and relevant landscape policy and takes account of the settings of the Belton house and park and of Manthorpe Conservation Area.

The proposal is to retain most of the landscape features and vegetation on the site, to include significant areas of planting within and at the edges of the site. The intention is to create over 20 hectares of open space/planting and provide quality green areas and corridors for recreation, improved wild life habitats, green settings for new development, screening and softening views into the site from surroundings. Sustainable Drainage will enable the use of drainage corridors to enhance informal open space and movement corridors for pedestrians and cyclists. The playing fields and play space provision will meet local authority standards and recreational open spaces and existing rights of way will enable inclusive access and will be connected by the pedestrian and cycle path network allowing future residents of the site and of adjoining residential areas convenient access to all parts of the site and its facilities. Provision of a robust landscape framework would be secured through a landscape and habitat management plan.

Transport Assessment (TA)

The TA provides an overview of relevant planning and transport policy; outlines traffic and transport current conditions on the local highway network ; describes the proposed development in terms of access, road layout, pedestrian and cycling facilities, parking and servicing; analyses predicted impacts of the development on the highway network in central Grantham and on local junction capacity; sets out proposed Sustainable Transport measures, including an outline Travel Plan; describes likely construction traffic impacts.

In the TA it is stated that traffic generated by the development proposals has been estimated using trip rates generated by the industry standard TRICS database. The traffic distribution on the local highway network has been based on the distribution of the existing residential development to the south of the site and input into the LCC SATURN traffic model to distribute flows onto the strategic highway network. SATURN was also used, together with the ARCADY programme, for nearby junctions. The results showed improvements would be required for 2 junctions – the A607/Longcliffe Road and A607/Sandcliffe Road junctions.

Fully classified traffic surveys were undertaken on 13th March 2008 at the following junctions located in close proximity to the development site: A607 / Belton Lane; A607 / Longcliffe Road; A607 / Sandcliffe Road; Belton Lane / Newark Hill.

It is proposed that a new shuttle bus would link the site to the town centre. A pedestrian / cycle only access would connect with the existing NCN route 22. A Travel Plan would be provided for the main land uses on site. Car and cycle parking would be provided in accordance with LCC standards. The general layout of a new '4 way roundabout' site access, estate roads, cycle paths, pedestrian routes are shown in the 'Illustrative Masterplan' recently revised (November 2010)

In response to the Highway Authority's recommendation of refusal the applicant's transport advisers have carried out further work analysis of Town Centre junctions, whilst new traffic surveys were carried out 14 September 2010 (counting vehicle queuing at junctions along the A607 from Belton Lane to Hill Avenue) and 5 October 2010 (counting Peak Hour 'Turning Movements' at the same junctions; the HA's response is set out below in the section headed 'Officer Evaluation'.

Draft Heads of Terms for the Section 106 Obligation Agreement:

The following matters were included in the draft submitted with the application: physical highway improvements (site access roundabout); travel plan (including pedestrian and cycle access to the site) and shuttle bus service; on site primary school facilities and contributions to secondary school provision off site; affordable housing based on current local and national planning policy standards; recreational facilities and recreational open space; health and community facilities.

In connection with the Section 106 Agreement Heads of Terms, the applicant has stated, in communications with the Council's officers that, studies by development specialists have indicated that delivery of the full range of planning gain/community benefits set out in the Draft Heads of Agreement and the DAS would not be feasible. More detailed treatment of this issue set out in the Officer Evaluation section below.

Supplementary Design Report and Revised Illustrative Masterplan (Addendum)

The application site and its surroundings

The site is located to the south of Belton Lane, to the west of the A607 road and the village of Manthorpe and to the east of the East Coast Mainline Railway. To the north of the site is the Belton Woods golf course and Brickkiln Plantation and to the east are Belton House and Park. To the south is a modern residential estate forming the urban edge of Grantham. Manthorpe Grange, St John's Church and the Old Rectory lie just outside the application boundary in the south eastern corner of the site.

The application site covers an area of about 55.9 hectares of generally agricultural land at the northern edge of the built-up area of Grantham. The land is laid down predominantly to arable crops with a small area of pasture. The submitted Arboricultural Survey shows that there are no significant areas of trees on the site, those that have been identified, are predominantly located in or close to the many hundreds of metres of managed hedgerows on the site and along much of the site boundary.

The high point of the site is at about 68 metres AOD and is located near the northern boundary formed by Belton Lane, whilst the low point is at about 45 metres AOD near the north west corner of the site, where the Running Furrows stream crosses the western site boundary next to the A607. The land generally tends to fall gently from the high point southwards towards Gonerby Stream on the southern boundary and south east to the Running Furrows. The River Witham lies about 180 metres to the east of the site at the edge of Belton Park, and flows in a northern direction. The Running Furrows is a tributary of the River Witham and flows in a north eastern direction through the site. Gonerby Stream flows east along the majority of the southern boundary and links with the Running Furrows in the eastern part of the site.

A high voltage 132kv overhead line runs diagonally across the northern part of the site; there are three pylons within the confines of the site.

Site History

The development of the site for a mixed use was discussed prior to the submission of the planning application under consideration (PRE/07/0145.; Screening/scoping exercises were undertaken to determine whether the development was whether the application would be subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (See above – Statement of Community Involvement). The Manthorpe site has been considered for development through various stages of the Local Development Framework (This will be dealt with in more detail in the policy considerations section below), including as a possible Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) in Draft Core Strategy. It was rejected in favour of the North West Quadrant (including Poplar Farm) and the Southern Quadrant at the Preferred Options stage. The site was considered by the Inspector at the Examination in Public of the Core Strategy; the Core Strategy was adopted on 5th July 2010.

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

Case Officer Notes:

As stated above some of the responses from organisations have been amended to reflect significant changes in planning policy, e.g. adoption of South Kesteven Core Strategy and some out of date policies, e.g. South Kesteven Local Plan have in some cases been omitted. Many of the longer sets of comments have been summarised in parts, but care has been taken to ensure that no matter of substantive fact, view or opinion has been misrepresented. The full text of all responses from organisations and individuals are available on the planning file.

These comments were made prior to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government's letter to LPAs on 27th May 2010 to advise that: "...decisions on housing supply (including the provision of travellers sites) will rest with Local Planning Authorities without the framework of regional numbers and plans. ..." they were also made prior to the subsequent revocation of the East Midlands Regional Plan. The revocation of the EMRP has been found unlawful by the Courts; hence the EMRP policies are again part of the Development Plan and thus directly relevant to this application. The SOS's letters to LA's purporting to undermine the Court's decision reinstating Regional Strategies were also challenged through Judicial Review and the Court found, in effect, in favour of RSS' being given their full weight. Notwithstanding the changes in the policy context just mentioned, it is considered that the adoption of the South Kesteven Core Strategy, which is in accordance with the EMRP, means that the relevant strategic planning policy framework is not materially affected in this case.

East Midlands Regional Assembly (EMRA)

The EMRA refers to the following policies of the EMRP published in March 2009 as relevant considerations:

- The Regional Vision, Policy 1 (Core Regional Objectives), Policy 2 Promoting Better Design provide the overarching context for achieving sustainable development.
- Policies 3 and 4 provide for the concentration of development in urban areas, including Grantham and that for the Eastern Sub-area the agreed Growth Point Programmes of delivery at Grantham is to be achieved both in overall numbers of dwellings and in the agreed phasing of development; the Sub-Regional Centre of Grantham is to be consolidated and where appropriate strengthened.
- Policy 13a (Regional Housing Provision) makes provision for 13,600 dwellings in South Kesteven between 2006 and 2026, at an annual average rate of 680 dwellings. The management of housing supply is principally a matter for local development frameworks; local authorities can test higher housing provision numbers through their DPD's, provided they are consistent with the principles of sustainable development set out in PPS1 and tested through sustainability appraisal.
- The EMRA considers that the Core Strategy process is the appropriate place for consideration of the merits of development of this site bearing in mind work which has been carried out on the evidence base for the Core Strategy including the Urban Capacity Study, the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, sustainability appraisal, and infrastructural requirements and the current 5 year housing land supply.

SKDC Planning Policy (the original comments have been adapted to reflect the adoption of the South Kesteven Core Strategy)

The proposal does not provide for any employment land although there will be some job opportunities created through the CCRC, retailing and commercial uses on the site if these aspects of the proposal are brought forward. It is also noted that no information has been submitted with the application to support the proposed CCRC either in terms of need for such a facility or suitability of location.

The East Midlands Regional Plan policies relevant to the application are referred to (see above) and in addition to the policies referred by EMRA, it is noted that in the EMRP it is stated that new developments must take account of climate change and encourage sustainable construction. The impacts of development are to be fully considered through Policy 26 (Protecting and Enhancing Natural and Cultural Heritage), Policy 27 (Priorities for Historic Environment) which include the principle that damage to historic assets or their settings should be avoided wherever possible (this would include in particular Belton House and its setting and the Manthorpe Conservation Area) and Policy 29 (Biodiversity) about creating, protecting and enhancing semi-natural green spaces in urban areas and wildlife corridors.

(Note: The Saved SK Local Plan is referred to in the Policy comments; however, this is of limited relevance now that the Core Strategy has been adopted, the saved policies are listed below – see the Policy Considerations section).

As a sub-regional centre and also one of the identified Growth Point towns, Grantham is identified in the Core Strategy (Policy H1 – Residential Development) to accommodate in the region of 7680 additional dwellings between 2008 and 2026 (including dwellings under construction or with planning permission. The housing figures in the EMRP are minima and not ceilings (Policy 13a), although there is a proviso that delivery of higher housing numbers in a District should be tested through the LDF process; in the Core Strategy housing numbers are based on those set out in the EMRP.

The Core Strategy (Policy H2 - Urban Extension Sites (Grantham)) identifies strategic locations on the edge of Grantham to accommodate a significant proportion of the dwelling allocation. During the preparation of the Core Strategy the principle of Manthorpe as a strategic location for an urban extension was considered in the Preferred Options Core Strategy (published in May 2007) but discounted. This was on the basis that in the Sustainability Appraisal assessment it did not perform as well as the other two strategic locations for growth (now known as the North West and Southern Quadrants) on the basis of traffic congestion and environmental impacts (heritage assets, landscape impact).

The applicants made a number of representations at publication stage (January 2009) that the Core Strategy was unsound. One of these was that it did not make adequate provision for the delivery of housing land supply in Grantham in the early part of the plan period, which the Manthorpe site could provide for. These representations were considered by the Inspector during the examination hearing sessions and in her report she concluded that the site it was not appropriate or necessary to include it as a direction for growth and that there was no strong imperative to do so, given the reasonable prospect of delivery from the two identified urban extensions. The Inspector considered that this view was reinforced by the

environmental impacts arising from the Manthorpe site, specifically the impact on Belton House and Park and traffic congestion on the A607.

The Inspector did, however, indicate that this did not rule out development completely. Consideration, as part of the Grantham Area Action Plan, which is currently under preparation, would allow detailed assessment of the environmental impacts of development and the most appropriate and sustainable balance of housing sites to be struck in the light of anticipated delivery from the two strategic urban extensions.

Notwithstanding the above comments, other relevant planning policy considerations would be the requirement, under PPS3, for the Council to give favourable consideration to granting planning permission for sites where it does not have a five year housing land supply (the site would of course have to be suitable in all respects). Our most recent assessment of housing land supply (as at 1st April 2009) stood at 4.8 years supply.

In the light of the conclusions in the Inspector's Report it is considered that there is no overriding strategic policy justification for the Manthorpe site to come forward for development at this time and that the Core Strategy should be given more weight than any other material consideration.

There a number of Core Strategy policies that would be relevant to the consideration of this application. These would include SP1 (Spatial Strategy); SP3 (Sustainable Integrated Transport); SP4 (Developer Contributions); EN1 (Protection and Enhancement of Character of District); EN2 (Reducing Risk of Flooding); EN4 (Sustainable Construction); and H3 (Affordable Housing).

The Core Strategy at Policy H3 (affordable housing) sets a target for on site affordable housing provision of up to 35% of the capacity of the scheme with the mix of socially rented and intermediate dwellings being determined in accordance with local need. The actual level of affordable housing provision on a site will be negotiated having regard to overall viability.

SKDC Grantham for Growth

Grantham Growth Point Strategic Board considers that this site is not a strategic priority identified in the Growth Point Programme of Development (POD) or the Local Investment Plan (LIP) which has been approved by the Growth Point Strategic Board and agreed with the Homes and Communities Agency. The current POD was approved by members of the Strategic Board in October 2008 and the document forms the basis of the £6 million funding allocation awarded to the Growth Point.

The POD and LIP both identify the South Quadrant and North West Quadrant as preferred locations for two sustainable extensions which have capacity to provide circa 7,500 new dwellings. The South and North West SUE's are considered suitable to deliver most of Grantham's housing needs. These two sites are identified in the South Kesteven Core Strategy, as providing the opportunity to provide significant benefits to Grantham, including a reduction in traffic congestion as both sites are expected to deliver road links which will take through traffic away from the town centre. Planning consent has already been granted for the first tranche of development comprising 1,800 dwellings at Poplar Farm which is part of the North West Quadrant, subject to completion of the s106 agreement.

The Housing and Economic DPD Preferred Options (June 2006) did not identify the Manthorpe site as a location for residential development. The Manthorpe site was one of three sites considered for their suitability as an urban extension but it was discounted as a preferred option on the following grounds:

- Impact on Manthorpe Conservation Area
- Impact on surrounding sensitive landscape (it is within an area defined as medium sensitivity to development and to the north east of the site is the Grade I listed Belton House and the Grade I Registered Historic Park and Garden)
- Significant Infrastructure requirements – no existing access roads, services, water infrastructure
- The size of the site provides limited opportunities for a major mixed use scheme i.e. provision of on-site education/healthcare facilities or employment.
- The location of the site would result in significant additional car movements on Manthorpe Road and through the town centre with no opportunity for significant new highway infrastructure to mitigate this impact.

In conclusion, the Grantham Growth Point Strategic Board does not consider that the Manthorpe site represents a viable alternative SUE compared with the two existing sites that have been identified to the North West and South of Grantham respectively. These sites are considered to be deliverable as can be evidenced by the recent planning application for 1,800 dwellings at Poplar Farm. Both of these sites create opportunities to improve the infrastructure in the town which will significantly improve the public realm of Grantham town centre. If the Manthorpe site receives planning consent there is a grave risk that the deliverability of the two SUE's identified in the Core Strategy submissions will be adversely affected.

LCC Planning Policy

The proposed urban extension was not identified as one of the two sustainable urban extensions (SUE's) in the Sub-Regional Centre in the Core Strategy Submission in 2009. The proposed development is located on a site to the north of Grantham and this is not included with the Submissions Proposal Map. This consultation only identified two sustainable urban extensions to Grantham (at Poplar Farm and the South Quadrant) and therefore the proposed development does not comply with the sustainable urban extensions to Grantham. Also, the Core Strategy identified Grantham as suitable for 51% of new housing growth up to 2026 across the District and this is consistent with Grantham's growth Point status. Therefore, any significant proposed development in Grantham should comply with urban concentrations identified and this proposal if combined with those two quadrants already acknowledged would not be considered suitable.

The Town Planning Statement submitted by Antony Aspbury Associates quotes the Draft Planning Policy Statement 4 (Planning for Sustainable Economic Development), but this has now been replaced with an adopted PPS4. Therefore, this should be taken into account and given that Policy EC1 (Using Evidence to Plan Positively) in PPS4 states that wherever possible, economic land reviews should be merged with housing land availability assessments. Given that South Kesteven currently has a contractor in place looking at economic issues, this should also be taken into account with this proposal.

Also the site for this urban extension is located in relatively close proximity to Belton House, which is identified as a Grade 1 Listed building with associated buildings and registered historic parkland.

LCC Highway Authority

Recommends refusal

In response to the information submitted with the application the local highway authority, in checking the submitted detail to determine the impact on the safety and convenience of users of the public highway and the capacity of the existing road infrastructure to cope with the additional traffic arising from the proposed development on the north of and central to Grantham, LCHA considered that not enough information was provided to accurately determine its effects.

(Note: The response of Highway Authority to the revised traffic analyses and further traffic surveys, submitted by the applicant's transport advisors during September and October 2010 are dealt with below.)

English Heritage (Note: The applicants have submitted a 'Revised Illustrative Masterplan' and a 'Supplementary Design Report' in response to the sections of this representation concerned with the lack of information and assessment of the likely impacts of the proposal on the key 'Heritage Assets' in the area around the site – see below. These comments do not take account of the latest information in the 'Revised Illustrative Masterplan' and 'Supplementary Design Report' – these matters will be dealt with in Addendum to the main report)

Recommends refusal:

- 1) it does not comply with the district's development plan and regional/national planning policy.
- 2) There is a lack of information and assessment within the application documents with regards to the historic environment impact, with particular reference to the emerging setting study for Belton House and Park.
- 3) The proposals would have an adverse impact on the settings of Manthorpe Conservation Area and the Grade I Registered Park & Garden of Belton Park and would result in the increased suburbanisation of Grantham along the A607. Finally, we are not convinced that the proposals would have any benefit for Grantham town centre and its regeneration.

Compliance with the Development Plan and Regional/National Policy - The Preferred Options document (May 2007) rejecting an urban extension to the north-east at Manthorpe for various reasons including the impact on the historic environment (Note: confirmed in the Adopted Core Strategy). The statement contains no reference to PPG 15 and 16 or the draft Planning Policy Statement (PPS) on the Historic Environment, or any of the environment policies in the Regional Plan, which is a major omission given the surrounding historic environment. We feel that the proposed development is contrary to PPG15 and the draft PPS, as well as Policy 26 and 27 of the Regional Plan. With regards to the statement's discussion of PPS3 (paragraphs 3.18 to 3.34), we disagree that the site is "suitable", regardless of whether it or other sites are "available" or "achievable".

Lack of Information and Assessment - There is a lack of historic environment assessment throughout the application and its supporting documents. The impact of the proposed development on the setting of key historic environment features (including Manthorpe

Conservation Area, Belton Park and many listed buildings) is poorly considered by the ES and the Design & Access Statement. Setting is frequently confused with views and visual impact, when it is a distinct and separate concept. 'Setting' is an established concept that relates to the surroundings in which a place is experienced, its local context, embracing present and past relationships to the adjacent landscape.

It is unfortunate that the Belton Park and House Setting Study jointly produced by South Kesteven District Council and the National Trust has not been used to inform this development. It is also unfortunate that no reference is made to the Conservation Area Appraisals that exist for Manthorpe and Belton Conservation Areas and how these might have helped to inform the development.

Impact on the setting of Belton Park and Manthorpe Conservation Area - We have significant concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on the setting of Manthorpe Conservation Area, the Grade I Registered Park & Garden of Belton Park and a number of listed buildings. Of particular concern here is the incorrect assessment of Belton Park itself. As a Grade I registered park & garden it is of international importance based on English Heritage's designation criteria (not "national importance" as stated in paragraph 7.4.13 of the ES). It is therefore of "very high importance". The application therefore underplays the significance of the impact on Belton Park. Belton Park is of immense importance as a heritage asset. We recognise that there is unlikely to be any adverse impact on Belton House itself, but we are very concerned about the impact on the setting of Belton Park.

The proposed development would increase the suburbanisation of Grantham northwards along the A607, which has already been affected by unsympathetic development in places. The proposal would erode the sense of separation between Manthorpe and Grantham, which would harm the character, appearance and setting of Manthorpe Conservation Area and its listed buildings, encroach on the setting of Belton Park and harm the wider countryside around Belton. The inclusion of a new roundabout junction with the A607 on the north-east corner of the development could harm the setting of Belton Park, with the junction presumably illuminated at night. There will be an impact on key views looking in and out of Manthorpe Conservation Area and Belton Park.

Relationship of development with Grantham town centre - We are not convinced that the current proposals will deliver regeneration benefits for Grantham town centre. There is nothing within the development that would alleviate traffic congestion within the town centre (which detracts from the character and appearance of Grantham Conservation Area) and there are no opportunities to deliver regeneration of historic streets and buildings. There is also nothing within the Section 106 Head of Terms that would enhance the town centre, despite the likely increase in demand on services and infrastructure within the town centre as a consequence of this development.

National Trust (Note: The applicants have submitted a 'Revised Illustrative Masterplan' and a 'Supplementary Design Report' in response to the sections of this representation concerned with the lack of information and assessment of the likely impacts of the proposal on the key 'Heritage Assets' in the area around the site – see below - These comments do not take account of the latest information in the 'Revised Illustrative Masterplan' and 'Supplementary Design Report')

The National Trust requests that the application be refused.

It is considered that the proposed development fails in principle to comply with adopted Development Plan policy both in respect of the location of major new development and in terms of the adverse impacts upon the historic environment – in particular the range of important designations at Belton.

The scheme proposed would significantly and adversely impact upon the setting of important Listed Buildings and especially the Grade I Registered Historic Park and Garden contrary to PPG15, and to Regional and Local planning policies for the historic environment. The urbanisation of the application site would also adversely impact on the experience of visitors to Belton, especially in respect of detrimental impact upon views into the parkland. In summary:

Development Plan - The proposal is not identified in (the Core Strategy).

Submitted Town Planning Statement - It is noted that there are a number of omissions from the Statement. In particular there is no indication of how the proposed development relates to: PPS1 Annex A; Supplement to PPS1 –Climate Change; and there is no consideration of the national context provided by either PPG15 or PPG16 (or draft PPS15). The assessment of the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy is partial; it ignores the relevant environmental policies; especially relevant to the current application are Policies 26, 27, 28 and 31. More generally the assessment in the Statement is based upon stating what the Policy requirements are, rather than demonstrating how the proposed development would conform to and deliver those requirements.

Design and Access Statement - No reference to CABI design review process and no reference to the registered Historic Park and Garden, or its setting, or to other elements of the Belton estate such as Bellmount Tower. It does not give adequate consideration to the setting of Belton or the stables and listed buildings. It does not demonstrate that the proposal has had appropriate regard for the unique heritage resource at Belton and upon its intrinsic qualities and setting contrary to PPG15, Regional Spatial Strategy, saved Local Plan policies and the emerging policy in the Core Strategy.

Traffic Assessment - The assumptions set out in Annex E do not make reference to traffic associated with the Belton Estate. The popularity of the Estate has increased since the study was undertaken in 2008 with some 248,000 visitors in 2009 compared with a 5 year average of around 200,000. Traffic survey on 13 March 2008 when Belton was closed. TA does not follow advice in PPG13.

Environmental Assessment - It has only considered a limited range of alternatives and has not assessed alternative sites. Suggested parkland planting would add a confusing layer by extending parkland features onto land that was never part of the formal park. EA says there will be adverse impacts on the Registered Park and garden but is contradicted in the Planning Statement which says the contrary. The assessment of the impact on Bellmount Tower is taken from ground level. The trust's assessment is that the proposed development would be visible, intrusive and detrimental to the Grade II * Listed Building. Insufficient consideration of the impact upon the approaches to the Belton Estate. The Grade 1 registered park is of international and not just national importance and the impacts have been understated. The hinterland of the designated features, including key visitor

approaches, will be compromised by the development. The work commissioned but the Council and the National Trust has identified the whole of the application site as being within the setting of Belton, which also identifies part of the application as being “exceptionally sensitive” to major development and the reminder being “very sensitive”.

Landscape Framework - It is considered inappropriate to try and reflect the character of Belton parkland as the site was never part of the formal parkland.

Natural England (Note: The ‘Revised Illustrative Masterplan’ (23 October 2010) shows the amended the landscape and open space framework for the proposed development, as a result of the applicant responding to comments made by consultees about the likely impacts of the proposal on Heritage Assets in the area around the site – see below - These comments do not take account of the latest information in the ‘Revised Illustrative Masterplan’ and ‘Supplementary Design Report’)

In summary - on the basis of the information submitted natural England objects to the proposal because of the lack of clarity and detail about green infrastructure.

Policy 28 of the East Midlands Regional Plan makes clear the expectation that local authorities and developers should work to ensure the delivery, protection and enhancement of environmental infrastructure across the region and furthermore that Growth Points should integrate green infrastructure in the development process. Natural England point out the incorrect policy reference in the landscape document and request certain issues are addressed:

Green Infrastructure (GI) should be mentioned explicitly; clear assessment of existing GI assets and opportunities to enhance and link to off-site assets; reasons for the proposed GI e.g. how designed from outset and how opportunities such as watercourses can be maximised and integrated; explanation of habitats to be created and their quality and how they will be managed in the short and long term; and security of funding for their management.

Protected species - We note that the applicants identify possible impacts on bats using the site. We also note that page 79 states that mitigation and creation of features as part of the landscaping proposals will ensure that there is no residual impact. The information presented by the applicant does suggest that bats are foraging across the site from the south, indicating a) that there may be roosts to the south either within or outside the site boundary and b) that, particularly the drain which runs diagonally across the site is important for foraging (feeding) and as a corridor by which they access further foraging areas beyond. It will be necessary to ensure that any mitigation and creation of features for bats are designed to recognise the way bats use the site and ensure that features for foraging and accessing the countryside beyond are maintained. This must include the sensitive positioning of street and other lighting to maintain dark corridors for bats and other wildlife. The proposals will need to be incorporated in to the GI plan for the development.

SKDC Conservation (Note: The applicants have submitted a ‘Revised Illustrative Masterplan’ and a ‘Supplementary Design Report’ in response to the sections of this representation concerned with the lack of information and assessment of the likely impacts of the proposal on the key ‘Heritage Assets’ in the area around the site – see below. These

comments do not take account of the latest information in the 'Revised Illustrative Masterplan' and 'Supplementary Design Report')

The main historic built environment issues raised by this application are: impact on the setting of the Grade 1 listed Belton House and its Grade 1 Historic Park and Garden; impact on the character and appearance of Manthorpe Conservation Area; and impact on the setting Manthorpe Church.

The Environmental Assessment purports to address the impact of the proposed development on these heritage assets but unfortunately the analysis is flawed because the information base omits several significant documents that should have been taken into account and the importance of some assets has been incorrectly interpreted.

I note that at paragraph 7.4.13 of the EA the Historic Park is identified as being of Grade I status "...and therefore, of national importance." This is incorrect. The Grade I designation means that it is of International Importance and is in the top 10% of designed ornamental landscapes in England that are considered to be of 'special historic interest'. It is a concern that this error may have resulted in the significance of the park being understated in the EA. There also appears to be no mention in the EA of the Conservation Area Appraisals that have recently been undertaken for the nearby villages of Belton and Manthorpe (adopted in 2009). This is a significant omission, particularly in the case of Manthorpe, the village and Conservation Area most directly affected by the proposed development. The conclusions reached with regard to impact on heritage assets, as set out at Table 7.4 of the EA are, therefore, questionable to say the least.

A detailed analysis of the proposed development is somewhat inhibited by the fact that there are no drawings indicating the scale of development on various parts of the site.

The Belton House and Park Setting Study and Policy Development document, jointly commissioned by South Kesteven and the National Trust, identifies the contribution that the current rural nature of the approaches to Belton House and Park make to the setting the House and its grounds. Whilst the study acknowledges that the character of the approaches is of less significance than the designed views and other aspects of the Park's setting, they are nonetheless important to a general appreciation of the wider rural context in which the Park is situated. Much of the land to the west of the A607 and to the north and south of Belton Lane that is proposed for development has been identified as contributing to the rural character of the approach to Belton. Furthermore, the application site sits prominently in views across the Historic Park from both Belmont Tower and Londonthorpe village.

The application also proposes 'improvements' to the A607/Belton Lane junction, involving the formation of a roundabout to the south-west of the existing junction. Although the plans indicate that "The landscape treatment of the roundabout and realignment of A607 will create an attractive landscape buffer screening views directly into the site from the east" this remodelling will nonetheless introduce a degree of urbanity into the scene. The junction 'improvements', will no doubt necessitate increased levels of street lighting that will further reduce the rurality of the scene and, therefore, adversely affect the character and setting of the Historic Park. Indeed the general levels of lighting from the development as a whole will significantly erode the rural character and hence the setting of the Park and Manthorpe Church outside the hours of daylight.

Notwithstanding the deficiencies of the supporting information, I would nonetheless suggest that the proposed development represents the unwelcome encroachment of urban development on the setting of the Historic Park and Garden, Manthorpe Church, the effective absorption of the Conservation village of Manthorpe into the urban area of Grantham and will unduly compromise the rural character of the approaches to Belton House and its Historic Park and Garden to the detriment of their setting.

I would advise, therefore, that the proposals be resisted on the grounds that the analysis of the impact on nearby heritage assets does not take account of important documents and the conclusions reached in the EA are therefore fundamentally flawed. Furthermore, there is insufficient information included in the application to allow a proper detailed assessment of the impact on historic assets to be undertaken.

CABE (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment) (Note: The 'Revised Illustrative Masterplan' (23 October 2010) shows the amended the landscape and open space framework for the proposed development, as a result of the applicant responding to comments made by consultees about the likely impacts of the proposal on Heritage Assets in the area around the site – see below - These comments do not take account of the latest information in the 'Revised Illustrative Masterplan' and 'Supplementary Design Report')

We understand that the local authority has discounted Grantham North as a viable location for housing growth up to 2026. In this context, it is for the design team to put forward a robust case for the release of this site by demonstrating how the proposal qualifies as a sustainable urban extension that will positively contribute to the town. We see nothing in the proposed masterplan that either distinguishes it as a good place to live or as a sustainable development in social, economic or environmental terms. Whilst we welcome the design team's analysis of the site's qualities and its suggestion of how this could lead to a development that is rooted to its context, we are disappointed by the failure to translate this analysis into a credible masterplan. We acknowledge the sensitivity of its context, but the focus on creating an unobtrusive development is its biggest failing, producing an inward looking development disconnected from adjacent communities and a weak northern gateway to Grantham. We are unable to support this proposal in its current form.

Achieving a sustainable urban extension - For Grantham North to be regarded as a sustainable urban extension in the broadest sense, by creating cohesive communities, the design team will need to resolve two major shortcomings in the masterplan: firstly, it will need to adopt a more positive attitude towards neighboring communities, both in the physical connections it proposes and in the social and economic ties it promotes; secondly, it will need to use the physical attributes of the site in a more convincing way to shape the layout and to give it identity.

Integration with Grantham - Whilst we find the design team's analysis of the site's landscape character sound, we are not convinced by its analysis at the urban level which, in our view, has produced a strategy that fails to integrate the development with the town. We are concerned that the layout of the masterplan suggests the development is doing just that. This is reflected in the provision of only pedestrian and cycle links to the Manthorpe estate, where it would seem that a vehicular connection could be also established. Strengthening links in this way would also increase the viability of a future bus route through the development. Whilst the development adopts a surprisingly relaxed attitude to

the railway line, the priority for Grantham North to disengage with its surroundings can be observed in the landscape buffers to High Road and Belton Lane; and in the siting of the main access to the north-east, further discouraging links between Manthorpe and the development.

Local impacts

We have reservations about the appropriateness of a roundabout junction on arrival in Grantham, which would also have the disadvantage of inconveniencing all traffic on an otherwise straight road into the town. Perhaps the biggest lost opportunity is the failure to locate the neighborhood centre alongside Manthorpe Village, supporting the commercial viability of its facilities, whereas the isolated local centre placed in the heart of the scheme would, in our view, have little chance of success.

Masterplan layout - We are struck by the mismatch between the design team's stated aspirations for this development and the illustrative masterplan proposed.

Firstly, in our view, the plan suggests a larger scale of development than is actually being proposed. This calls into question whether this development represents an efficient use of land.

Secondly, it is not clear how the design team's analysis of the site has translated into a plan that makes best use of its features to create a distinguished place. For example, we are not convinced from the material submitted that the winding street pattern either responds to the change in levels across the site or affords the long views of the local and distant landmarks identified in the analysis. The local authority would need to assure itself that this is the case. It is also unclear how urban form across this undulating site would help create a bespoke settlement for a new type of community reflecting sustainable lifestyles in the 21st Century. In our view, the development risks repeating the mistakes of post-war housing estates which, like the adjoining Manthorpe Estate, turn in on themselves and bear no relationship to their context.

Thirdly, whilst we would support the principle of reinforcing existing landscape features, such as hedgerows, to provide biodiverse landscape corridors across the site, the alignment of roads beside them could create barriers between neighborhoods, undermining the potential for community cohesion. Further, whilst we welcome the consideration of green and blue infrastructure together, this does not come through strongly in the layout of the masterplan. For example the proposal for a wetland landscape along Gonerby Stream, illustrated by a series of isolated water bodies along the southern edge of the development, does not give a sense of a continuous landscape and ecological corridor. The local authority should seek advice from Environment Agency on this matter. It should also satisfy itself that the proposed phasing strategy makes adequate provision for green infrastructure to be delivered sequentially over the ten years or more that it will take to build-out the scheme.

Conclusion - In our view, the environmental standards achieved by greenfield development should be exceptionally high to compensate for the resulting loss of land proposed. We see nothing in this proposal that distinguishes it as a sustainable development or an exemplar edge of town scheme to justify the release of this greenfield land. The constraints on

developing this site are such that we would question whether an integrated and sustainable urban extension could be achieved.

In the absence of adopted local authority guidance for Grantham North, we think there would be value in the applicants producing a development brief for the site to build a more robust case for its development. This can bring together the results of the consultation process and help define key principles for the site, including how it should relate to the town. For the reasons set out above we are unable to support this proposal in its current form.

A response to the above objections has been submitted by the applicants to explain the background to the submitted scheme and why the application was submitted in its current form. The response letter concludes that the applicants and design team were generally deeply dissatisfied with the Design review process. They also consider that CABA do not appear to acknowledge the Masterplan has been produced following many consultations with key stakeholders. The applicants do accept that a Development Brief for the site has some merit but this would have to be a post decision exercise to assist in bringing forward detailed proposals and reserved matters in due course.

SKDC Environmental Protection - In response to the Air Quality Impact Assessment:

The report does not compare air quality with car usage, commercial vehicles etc. Whilst the report has modelled the proposed new development on existing sensitive receptors and the proposed new dwellings that are deemed sensitive, the report has not modelled the impact of the proposed development on the Air Quality Management Area of Wharf Road, Grantham where exceedances of air quality are deemed likely and where further investigations are taking place, these areas are: Brook Street/Manthorpe Road and Asda Roundabout.

A DMRB assessment is an approved screening model for air quality assessments, however, detailed dispersion modelling should be considered for the impact of the new development to queuing traffic and idling traffic, particularly in areas currently under review for air quality.

It is unclear on the justification of input what parameters have been used for the model: Vehicle emission data; Percentage of HGV; Meteorological data; and speed of vehicles?

The background air pollutant concentrations have been taken from NETCEN, grid ref 491500, 337500, which is a residential property, in Dovedale Close. No justification for this location has been given. Furthermore, Environmental Protection Services of SKDC monitors Nitrogen Dioxide using diffusion tubes at over 30 locations. The report does not include any validation of the model with local air quality data.

Concern over background Nitrogen Dioxide data used may under predict this assessment.

Concern that no changes to air quality have been predicted given the current use is agricultural and predicted use will be urban development.

The model has identified negligible impact for PM10 concentrations for both current sensitive and proposed on site locations. Query without any model validation. Concern that no future air quality monitoring is recommended.

The overall conclusions are: Mitigation measures for dust are recommended for construction phase but no mitigation measures for air quality are recommended post construction.

Conclusions: To reject the application on the basis of:

- No model validation
- Input parameters for the model are not clear
- Background Nitrogen dioxide concentrations requires clarification
- No account of the current AQMA and other sensitive areas

Environment Agency (EA)

The EA objected to the proposed development initially. As a result, for the following reasons:

The proposed development involves a connection to the main foul sewerage system which would pose an unacceptable risk to water quality. The EA considered whether a Grampian Condition in respect of foul sewerage, would be acceptable subject to further detail and certainty about what infrastructure will be needed, how it will be delivered and when. That information is not yet available and EA consider that it is premature to conclude that further capacity can be made available within the next 3 years. In line with the precautionary principle advocated in PPS 23, the EA maintains its objection until further certainty can be demonstrated.

The EA initially objected to the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) on the basis that it was not fully compliant with the requirements of Planning Policy Statement 25. Following the consideration of additional information submitted by the applicant, the objection has been withdrawn subject to various conditions

In addition, before development commences, the developer is required to produce a Site Waste Management Plan setting out a detailed account of how waste produced both during and prior to construction will be dealt with.

Anglian Water

There is sufficient water resource capacity but development should accord with Code for Sustainable Homes to ensure high water efficiency standards.

The foul sewerage system cannot accommodate flows from the development at present but further capacity is expected to be available in the lifetime of the application and request a Grampian style condition to ensure phased development accords with improvements in sewerage network.

Waste water would be dealt with at Marston Sewage treatment works which has capacity for these flows.

Surface water will be considered by the Environment Agency as it will not be disposed of by public sewer.

Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board

The site is partly within the Drainage District and the Running Furrows watercourse is under the control of the Board. As such the Board recommends that seven conditions are attached to any consent that may be issued and several informatives. The conditions

include a scheme for surface water drainage, flow regulated surface water discharges, access to the watercourses, temporary works, and landscape scheme. Informatives include requirements under the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the Boards Byelaws.

Lincolnshire NHS

The Heads of Terms submitted with the application refers to Health facilities in section 10 but this would be subject to Primary Care Trust Funding and section 10.3 states that in the light of the provision of the facility it would not be appropriate for the District Council to seek contributions towards health care facilities elsewhere. This is not considered acceptable and the NHS would oppose the development on the grounds that: a) the developer should contribute funding for the facility and not just the site given the expected population of some 2,500 residents; b) if the new population exceeds 3,000 patients it would justify a new build for 2 WTE GP's at a minimum of 450 square metres preferably at ground floor level; c) if the population did not exceed 3,000 then an option would be to extend existing facilities but these are located some distance away in the town centre. Ideally they would prefer to see the facility linked with other growth point developments such as Poplar Farm where they have already requested a 4GP practice. The NHS have also consulted Grantham District Hospital who may comment on transport and patient access issues.

LCC Children's Services

A Section 106 contribution towards direct provision for local schools is required to mitigate against the impact of development at local level. Although the final cost based on a recognised formula will be determined at the reserved matters stage, based on an hypothetical mix of housing for 1000 units, the proposal is estimated to produce the following figures:

Primary School - 206 primary school pupils at £12,130 per pupil = £2,498,780 plus free and accessible serviced site provision and opened at 250 pupils;

Secondary School - 228 secondary at £17,176 each = £3,916,128; and

Sixth Form - 46 sixth form at £18,628 each = £856,888.

Early Years - In addition a contribution of £300,000 plus a free serviced site would be expected for Early Years facilities, which would not be LCC owned and could also be used for community facilities.

Youth Service - LCC also has a statutory duty to provide adequate positive activities for young people and the cost of a shelter and meeting point would be £12,000 plus a shared use of floodlit play area or separate one which would cost another £12,000.

The issue of possible Building Schools for the Future (BSF) or Academies in Grantham would not alter this request since they do not provide extra funds for growth in population caused by housing.

LCC adult social care

The County Council predict a growth in individuals 65 and over in the South Kesteven District of over 80% by 2029. The proposal includes provision for a "Continuing Care Retirement Community" but the County request that an appropriate section 106 be agreed to meet the housing requirements of client groups within the responsibility of adult social care. Location and level of detail to be agreed at the appropriate stage.

LCC Library and Museums

There are currently proposals to rationalise existing museum and library services in Grantham and the strategy is to be part funded by LCC mainstream resources and part funded by 106 contributions so that one building can serve all the needs of larger Grantham for museums and Library services. Library contributions range from £170 for each one bed to £330 for a 4/5 bed and museums from £30 for each one bed and £55 for a 4/5 bedroom dwelling.

SKDC Housing Solutions

Affordable housing – Provision to be in accordance with planning policies (Note: Core Strategy says ‘up to 35%’); of which 60% affordable rent and the remainder intermediate housing; size, type, tenure, and location on site to be agreed prior to commencement/phases; registered housing provider to be agreed with SKDC; affordable housing to be indistinguishable from market housing; to meet Home and Communities Agency standards and code for sustainable homes; either fully serviced land plots transferred to registered housing provider for £1 or completed units transferred them at market value of the affordable units minus a reduction for its restricted use.

Sport England

Outdoor Sports facilities - PPG 17, Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation requires local authorities to develop local standards for the provision of open space and sports facilities and SKDC has agreed local standards in its Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study 2009. The standards indicate a need to provide a minimum of one hectare per 1,000 people for outdoor sports and 0.8 ha for other open space. For 1000 dwellings housing 2,300 people a min. of 2.3 ha outdoor sport and 1.84 ha. other open space. The illustrative master plan shows 2 areas for sport and active recreation – one with a football pitch and the other with a cricket pitch – and reference made to informal open space with some areas shown on the master plan. A primary school is also shown and the school facilities should be subject to public access, such sports facilities should be concentrated in one central location.

Indoor Sports - No information is provided and this Council’s Recreation Study includes minimum standards for pools, halls and synthetic turf pitches. Requirements include: 4 court sports hall for 14,000 people, 4 lane 25 metre pool for 23,000 people and STP for 20,000 people. Although development will not generate the need for these facilities but given that the study identifies a need for a new leisure centre to be built from pooled contributions from all development sites as well as additional funds from the County and District. Sport England’s assessment is that the development would generate a contribution of £750,000 towards new or improved indoor facilities i.e. based on a proportion of the cost of swimming pool, sports hall courts, indoor bowls and synthetic turf pitch.

Sport England refer to information relating to up-to-date facility cost list; checklist for planning obligations and community use agreements; design guide for sports facilities; and case studies of the sporting benefits that can be achieved through new development. It also recommended a maintenance requirement for at least 10 years although a longer period may be justified.

Conclusion – No objection subject to appropriate planning conditions, section 106 and community use agreement (in relation to school sports facilities) to meet needs of existing and new population for sport and active recreation.

SKDC Play provision

The proposed development will require 1 NEAP, 1 LEAP, and 1 DPS (aka LAP) in locations to be agreed. The cost of such provision would be £140,000 capital and £70,000 maintenance (Note: for Poplar Farm requirement is 1 NEAP, 3 LEAPS and 8 LAPS for 1800 dwellings, thus is it appropriate to provide 1 further LEAP and 3 or 4 DMS/LAPS?).

Ministry of Defence - Estates Safeguarding

Do not object to the 10 SUDS associated ponds provided they are designed so as not to attract hazardous birds specie (waterfowl, feral geese etc) and they identify certain design features such as no islands, planting on the banks, grass kept long and goose proof fencing.

Lincolnshire Police

Recommend that a condition is attached requiring measures to minimise the risk of crime and to meet specific security needs of the application site and development.

Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE Lincs.)

The application should be refused as it is fundamentally out of accord and at variance with the Core Strategy of the District Council's emerging Local Development Framework. CPRE had no objection in principle to the two SUE's proposed by SKDC and consider it would be logical to await the outcome of the Public Examination. In any event CPRE would object to the development of the bulk of the site because it would encroach upon an area of high landscape quality and historic importance, bringing urban development undesirably closer to Belton Park and impinging upon the distinctiveness of Manthorpe village and its conservation area.

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

Generally pleased with the extent and design of green infrastructure within the development. Pleased to see buffer around burial ground (SNCI). Not sure of intended treatment to south of church yard. Playing field lighting should avoid light spillage to church yard as it should for playing field to the north of church. Note no significant negative impacts on protected or important species and habitats and strongly support hedgerow retention and planting to enhance area for bats. Before any mature trees are felled they should be first surveyed by a licensed ecologist. Recommend enhanced vole habitats and additional newt surveys to provide a more accurate picture. Strongly support SUDs and recommend appropriate planting schemes. Also the development should incorporate bird and bat nesting/roosting features in the development, with information for householders.

Network Rail

Considers a contribution towards railway station facility improvements is appropriate.

Given the close proximity to an electrified railway request various conditions/requirements which include: drainage; fail safe use of crane and plant; consultation on any excavations close to the line; boundary treatment and security; noise and soundproofing; landscaping; and lighting.

Belton and Manthorpe Parish Council

Object to the proposal which does not meet the development plan or the proposed core strategy.

Traffic - totally disagree with Larkfleet's traffic report. The roundabout will not work but will distort the flow of traffic towards Grantham on the A607. Belton Lane up to Gonerby will not cope with the extra traffic with the narrow bridge and the "T" Junction at the B1174. The vast majority of traffic will have to travel through the town to get to the west and south of the town where the majority of the employment is and where the main traffic routes are out of Grantham.

Sewerage - the existing system will not cope and it seems that Anglian Water have nothing planned for the moment.

Environment - will impact on the Grade 1 listed property, Belton House, in its grade 1 listed setting which should be, as it is at present in a rural setting and not an urban one. Manthorpe is a conservation area which again is set in rural environment but will end up as part of an urban area. The extra traffic passing through the area from the development will increase the damage to listed buildings in the conservation area. It will impact on wildlife in a green field setting (bats and owls). In relation to employment in the area, extra housing is not needed.

Summary - The Design and Access statement not 100% accurate and Transport Assessment is flawed. No justification for further development but if further development is necessary it should be to the west of the town in accordance with the Core Strategy, to minimise the effect that the increased traffic will have in the town.

Great Gonerby Parish Council

Object: There is insufficient road capacity on Manthorpe Road and the town centre to take further extraneous traffic; will create unacceptable levels of congestion on Manthorpe Road and the B1174 into Grantham. Two major areas are earmarked by the local authority for development both of which bring road improvement benefits to the town and its centre e.g. Poplar Farm with its Pennine Way bridge link and the Southern Quadrant incorporating the E W bypass. These area should therefore receive priority and the application should be regarded as premature which if allowed will exacerbate traffic congestion in the town centre before other road improvements are carried out. The new 4 arm roundabout only provides one access into the new development and will induce more traffic to use Belton Lane Great Gonerby, (the junction with the B1174 is already busy and difficult for large vehicles and usage will increase when the Pennine Way bridge is completed) to the detriment of the village. Any increase in traffic will cause traffic to back up past the new roundabout rendering it useless and dangerous.

The full text of all consultations responses received can be viewed on the planning file.

Representations as a result of publicity

Manthorpe Residents' Association

Why Grantham north is unsuitable for development

Traffic - The key area of concern to residents is the increased traffic that will result from this development along Manthorpe Road adding to the already lengthy queues into town. The traffic analysis gives little mention of the real traffic problem which is the congestion along Manthorpe Road into town; only the rather trite suggestion that it's better than some of the other feeder routes! We would have expected to see a full analysis of the traffic at the Manthorpe Road/Belton Lane (Grantham)/Lodge Way junction. This is the junction that regularly causes traffic queues back as far as Longcliffe Road and not infrequently back to the village. The suggestion that expected AM/PM queue lengths for the junction are 44m/41m does not fit easily with the reality experienced by commuters.

The traffic analysis appears to be based on a single day's measurements. We have been told by LCC Highways that a minimum of six days' measurements are required. (Monday Friday am and pm peak periods and Saturday am). We would expect that this will cause you to rule the section as inadmissible.

There is no recognition in the report of the new Academy to be developed on the Central Technology College site. It is expected that the number of pupils on the site will double. This will result in a more than doubling of the school traffic since the wider catchment area will require more pupils to use motorised transport to get to school. Currently the only vehicular access to the school is via Sandcliffe Road. Any traffic analysis for the Grantham North area must take this new traffic stream into account.

The current version of the Grantham Growth Strategy selected other areas of the town in preference to Grantham North because of the difficulty of providing improved infrastructure to the north of the town. There is currently no traffic relief proposed for this area at all.

Belton Lane (Gonerby) is a fairly narrow road which currently has no housing near to it except within the village of Great Gonerby. There are no footpaths for most of its length. The bridge across the railway is barely wide enough for two cars and includes the novelty of a high speed chicane. It is difficult to see how pedestrians can safely cross the bridge. The presence of housing near to this road is likely to promote an increase in both vehicular and pedestrian traffic giving rise to significant increasing in the risk of serious accidents.

Access - There is only a single road access point to the new development. If this becomes untenable there is a concern that Longcliffe Road or Belton Lane (Gonerby) near to the northwestern corner of the area would be used which would be unacceptable.

Sewerage - There appears to be no mention in any of the documents of sewerage. Larkfleet said it was not a problem provided that the food processing plants stayed dormant! Has this shortage of capacity be thoroughly investigated?

Air Pollution - SKDC's recent air quality Update Assessment showed that Manthorpe Road required further detailed assessment in 2010 because of the existing NO2 levels generated by the current traffic levels. This could lead to the area being declared an Air Quality Management Area. We would like to see a more detailed assessment done on the impact of increased traffic on Manthorpe Road from the new development, The air quality is worse at the times when many school children are in the vicinity making the consequences even more serious.

Our concerns if this development proceeds

The keeping of promises - We would urge that the following constraints are put in place as a minimum.

- The road infrastructure around the entrance to the development should be in place before any housing is occupied.
 - The landscaping and community facilities should be formally specified before the development commences.
 - There should be a "residents and councillors" committee put in place to monitor the development.
 - The proposal assumes that "the market" will provide take up of the community facilities e.g. shop, surgeries, retirement village, bus route. The developer must be obliged to make strenuous efforts to market these facilities as part of his public commitment. The shops and community facilities should be commenced once 25% of the housing is completed and be fully in place by the time 50% of the housing is finished. No further housing starts should be permitted until this condition is met.
 - In order to ensure that the community facilities can be built even if the developer defaults we suggest that a community levy is collected for each house completed and placed into a fund that will be returned to the developer as his community obligations are fulfilled.
 - The landscaping of the open areas should be completed as each part of the development is finished, and all the open areas should be completed once 75% of the houses are finished.
 - SKDC should have in place a mechanism for adopting common land as soon as it is completed by the developer. We do not want a repeat of the Buttercup Meadow standoff.
 - Existing public footpaths should remain open and navigable throughout the development.
- Access to/from the Manthorpe Estate – It is already difficult, and sometimes dangerous, at peak times for traffic from Longcliffe Road and Sandcliffe Road to enter Manthorpe Road; we would expect improved traffic management at one or both of these junctions e.g. part-time traffic lights. The traffic risks are particularly high at the times when many school children are in the vicinity making the consequences even more serious.

Traffic Mitigations - The following potential traffic mitigations are suggested to which the developer might like to make a substantial contribution:

- Kings School Buses - The cause of much of the traffic queues during the peak hours are the buses which drop off and pick up students at Kings School. Alternative provision for this service would significantly improve traffic flows. There is a council owned car park between Watergate and Swinegate within a short walking distance of the school which might potentially be partly adapted for this purpose. The area would still be available for evening and weekend parking.
- Belton Lane (Gonerby) to Belton Lane (Grantham) Light Traffic Relief Road - In the absence of an A52 bypass, some traffic mitigation might be achieved by linking the

proposed new roundabout at Belton Lane (Gonerby)/High Road with Belton Lane (Grantham) near the Lion Gates of Belton House. This would reduce the number of vehicles having to use the strategic junction at Belton Lane (Grantham)/Manthorpe Road. It would also permit the National Trust to use the Lion Gates as its main entrance reducing the traffic nuisance in Belton Village.

- Belton Lane (Gonerby) Railway Bridge - As identified above, the use of this bridge by pedestrians is at best a risky affair. With the proposed siting of so many dwellings close to this road there will be a need at the very least to provide a pedestrian bridge over the railway.

- Cycle routes - Much is made of the importance of public transport, walking and cycling in the proposals. It is true that there is some cycle track provision towards the town centre. Unfortunately most cycle provision ceases at the town centre boundary, and there is no safe route for cyclists to get to the railway station. This needs rectifying if people are to use this mode of transport regularly. Nor is there any cycle provision along Manthorpe Road which would be used by many of the students going to and from the new Academy.

Access to new development - The developer must be required to specify a second acceptable vehicle access road into the proposed development. The use of Longcliffe Road for this purpose would seriously affect the nature of the existing housing area and is not acceptable to local residents. The road already becomes congested at peak times with cars picking up children from Cliffdale Primary School trying to access Manthorpe Road.

Parking Provision - The report suggests an average parking provision of around 1.5 cars per dwelling. This is considerably less than the maximum permitted. Arguments about walking, cycling and the use of public transport are all well and good, but this seems to have little effect on car ownership. One only has to walk around new estates, such as Sunningdale, to realise that even two parking spaces per dwelling is not enough. As the size of dwellings reduces even fewer people will use their garage for car storage. Also permission is readily given to convert garages into accommodation. We would expect to see a much more realistic provision for off street parking imposed on the development.

Construction Phase - Should the development proceed we have concerns during the construction phase. We note that the application mentions considerate constructor's codes but says that no restrictions on construction vehicle emissions are required. It is now common practice that, on major developments, planning authorities require developers to follow the GLA's Best Practice Guidance on the control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition see:

http://www.london.gov.uk/archive/mayor/environment/air_quality/docs/constructiondustbpg.pdf.

We hope adherence to this guidance would be required of the construction phase. We also wish to see restrictions on construction vehicle access so that no construction traffic is allowed to access the site from the existing Manthorpe Estate, i.e. Longcliffe/Rosedale Roads. The effect of the weight restriction on the Belton Lane (Gonerby) railway bridge will be that all construction traffic will need to use Manthorpe Road having come through the town centre road system. We trust that suitable time restrictions will be placed on the construction traffic to avoid exacerbating the peak hour flows.

Neighbours' letters: a summary of 60 individual letters of objection plus solicitors' letter representing residents from 2 properties

Policy: Contrary to Local Plan Policy and Core Strategy and no exceptional need Contrary to National policy. Would prejudice the matters being considered in the context of the Core Strategy and the scale and location of development in the district and should not be permitted in advance of the option of the Core Strategy and in advance of any Action Area Plan or allocations DPD that might follow.

There are several developments not yet completed without the need for this development and numerous empty properties and unsold low cost housing.

Other sites identified are better than this site, including development to the east.

New developments should assist current residents not worsen a bad situation.

Premature, should not be permitted in advance of any Action Area Plan or allocations DPD that may follow.

Growth point status should not give licence to uncontrolled development.

New housing should be well related to employment land and opportunities.

Traffic: Adverse traffic impact from increased volume in surrounding area - especially town centre and Manthorpe Road – gridlock congestion and highway safety.

Not truly sustainable since not located close to any major employment and public transport facilities and will require further travel to shops and other facilities.

Highway network not suitable to cater for extra traffic including the bridge over the railway and more HGV's trying to avoid the A607.

A607 cannot cope with the extra traffic.

Traffic into Grantham backs up to Manthorpe village at present and without significant improvements to the wider network the situation will be impossible.

Further delays to get into and out of Manthorpe Estate will result.

Traffic figures are too conservative.

No vehicular access of any kind should be made to the adjoining estate.

Will compromise access to the hospital.

One access would prove a problem for emergency access.

Highway safety issues for local school children.

Traffic from the new development will have right of way on the new roundabout thus delaying traffic coming into Grantham from the north.

T junction with the B1174 at Great Gonerby is so narrow it would be unsuitable for the increased traffic.

Traffic assessment submitted is incorrect in that the existing A607 is already congested and further traffic will exacerbate the situation.

Question the use of the traffic survey given it relates to one day in March 2008.

The traffic report is incorrect in its reporting of accidents, including unreported serious accidents at junction of Belton Lane and A607 junction.

Access and parking to the proposed recreation areas should be from within the site.

The applicant should be funding the full costs of a full east west bypass for the town. Traffic assessment wrong- including walk time to town centre – it takes 30 mins from Manthorpe church and likely 45 minutes from development and bus fares too expensive to discourage people from using the car.

Shuttle bus solution is laughable as an alternative transport solution and impractical to introduce any localised rail services.

Highway network and junctions will require an upgrade.

Development of an Academy School will exacerbate traffic congestion.

Object to emergency access to Rosedale Drive.

Heritage: Detrimental to: character and appearance of Manthorpe Conservation area - will swamp the village which will become an extension of the town; detrimental to setting of conservation area; detrimental to rural setting of Belton Park and Belton House; detrimental to Old Vicarage; detrimental to open countryside with the development of a dominant and oppressive development.

Pollution; Light pollution in this sensitive area to Belton Park and wildlife; omission of a detailed noise and air pollution assessment; extra traffic will result in extra noise, vibration and air pollution.

Miscellaneous: If despite residents' objections the proposal is approved – significant care should be given to phasing, design and landscaping etc.; will further reduce the attractiveness of Grantham as a place to live; represents urban sprawl; the higher central part of the site would accommodate the central community area which would overlook Manthorpe estate if higher than 2 storey; loss of views over countryside; query ownership of land along southern boundary of application site along boundary of existing houses; insufficient detail; only people who want the development are the developers and land owners; many occupiers of new homes will be commuters to Nottingham, Lincoln and Peterborough, using the car; reduced/insufficient car parking allocated to the church, which would also share with cricket club.

Implications for other services: Schools and public services struggling to cope with a rapidly growing town

Extra schools and services were promised when Barrowby gate development was built but never happened

During the pre application consultation residents were told that some funding for hospital provision would be provided, under current arrangements to the United Lincolnshire Hospital Trust - this is not dealt with in the application; hospital access restricted from extra traffic including construction traffic; there is increased ambulance traffic along A607 resulting from downgrading maternity and A&E facilities at Grantham Hospital, at peak times ambulances already experience delays and the development would exacerbate this.

Primary school provision will not result in all pupils from the new development attending given parental choice – distorts traffic assessment.

Existing sewerage system will not cope; discharge to River Witham will put area at risk of flooding.

On site facilities are to be applauded but in practice not all these materialise.

Town centre should be regenerated to provide work before further development.

Ecology: Wildlife surveys limited and dated and endangered species of bird have been recorded on the site; damage and loss of mature trees; loss of green space and wildlife.

Summary of letter from agent representing two land owner's for preferred SUE's

Emerging Development Plan: The site was considered at the LDF Core Strategy Examination in Public as an option considered and rejected by the Council in the Preferred Options document.

Grantham Growth Point: The Council's Growth Delivery Plan sets out how the town will develop over the next 20 years and complements the LDF Core Strategy but does not include the development of the application site. The Buckminster Trust Estate and Norwich Hub Ltd contests the statement in para. 4.17 of the Town Planning Statement submitted with the application that the 2 SUE's supported by the Core Strategy are "...not readily deliverable and actually compete with each other as they are partly under the same ownership." The Buckminster estate has already demonstrated significant commitment to ensuring that both SUE's are delivered in line with the Council's phasing strategy.

5 Year Housing Land Supply: Refers to PPS 3 and the need to demonstrate a 5 year rolling supply of housing land and consider this is still the case even with the increased annual housing requirement of the East Midlands Regional Plan in March 2009. paragraph 71 of PPS 3 states that LPA's should not refuse housing proposals solely on the grounds of prematurity but where major urban extensions are proposed certain appeal decisions establish that prematurity is a key consideration in advance of a proper debate through the emerging LDF Core Strategy. It would be premature to pre-judge the outcome of EIP by granting planning permission.

Landscape Character Assessment: The document prepared in January 2007 identifies the application site as falling within a "medium sensitivity" and surrounded by "high" and

“medium high” areas of sensitivity to development and there are more appropriate locations for SUE’s.

Role of Sustainable urban Extensions: The scale of development is insufficient to bring the full range of community benefits expected of a SUE. Both the North West Quadrant and Southern Quadrant set aside more employment land and will provide transport solutions - Pennine Way link and Southern By-Pass to benefit the town; in comparison the current proposal is little more than a large suburban housing estate.

Other Material Considerations: The constrained nature of the highway network to the north of Grantham; the Transport Assessment appears too narrow in focus for mitigating the effects of the proposed development, including Belton Lane / Gonerby Hill junction, and the impact on A1 Great Gonerby junction. Insufficient regard to the impact on Belton House and Park; the Town Planning statement ignores saved Policy EN7. The introduction of 1000 houses will delay the delivery of new homes as the plans for new infrastructure (especially roads and foul water treatment) will have to be fundamentally reviewed and there is no certainty such a review will come up with a deliverable plan.

Three letters in support have been received from building sub-contractors based on local employment opportunities and a welcome addition to the town.

Representations in responses to limited reconsultation on the Supplementary Design Report and Revised Illustrative Masterplan (23 October 2010 - Addendum)

A limited consultation exercise was undertaken on the ‘Supplementary Design Report’ and ‘Revised Illustrative Masterplan’, involving only those bodies that had made specific comments on the inadequacy of the original application documents in respect of the ‘impact’ issues relating the likely impacts of the proposed development on ‘Historic Assets’ in the area around the site, particularly Belton House and Park and the Manthorpe Conservation Area.

The details of these representations will be circulated to the members of the Development Control Committee in an Addendum to this report; this will be available at least 5 working days before the Committee meeting of 4th January 2011.

Full details of all representations received can be viewed on the planning application file (S10/0142).

Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Statements (PPS) and Guidance (PPG)

PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development
Planning and Climate Change - Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1
PPS 3: Housing
PPS 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth
PPS 5: Planning for the Historic Environment
PPS 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
PPS 11: Regional Spatial Strategies
PPS 12: Local Spatial Planning

PPS 22: Renewable Energy
PPS 23: Planning and Pollution Control
PPS 25: Development and Flood Risk

PPG 13: Transport
PPG 17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation
PPG 24: Planning and Noise

The Development Plan

The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (SOSCLG) wrote to LPA's on 27th May 2010 to advise that "...decisions on housing supply (including the provision of traveller's sites) will rest with Local Planning Authorities without the framework of regional numbers and plans ...". Subsequent to this announcement the East Midland Regional Plan was revoked by SOSCLG. However, the revocation of the EMRP has recently been found to be unlawful by the Court's. Hence, the EMRP policies are again part of the Development Plan and so are directly relevant to this application. The SOS sort to say that his letter continues to be a material consideration, in determining housing allocations and housing applications of significance in policy terms, despite the reinstatement of the Regional Plan. This appeared to be an attempt to undermine the Court's judgement, but in response to a further submission for Judicial Review the Courts seem to wish to make it clear that the standing of Regional Strategies, as components of the development plan was not to be set aside by his letters to Local Authority leaders. Notwithstanding the changes in the policy context just mentioned, it is considered that the adoption of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document for the South Kesteven District, in accordance with the EMRP, which again must be given full and substantial weight as a material planning consideration means that the relevant strategic and local planning policy framework is not materially affected to any significant degree in determining this application.

The East Midlands Regional Plan (RSS8) - 2009

Policy 1 - The Core Regional Objectives,

Policy 2 - Promoting better design

Policy 3 - Concentrate development in urban areas, primarily in and adjacent to the Region's five Principal Urban Areas, with significant levels of new development of a lesser scale should be located in the Sub-Regional Centres (including Grantham).

Policy 4 - (Development in the Eastern Sub-area) Blow the Lincoln PUA, development in the Eastern Sub-area should ensure that the agreed Growth Point Programmes of delivery at Grantham are achieved, both in overall numbers of dwellings and in the agreed phasing of development; and consolidate and where appropriate strengthen the Sub-Regional Centre of Grantham. Paragraph 2.4.4 reiterates this and refers to Grantham's Sub-Regional role.

Policy 13a - (Regional Housing Provision) makes provision for 13,600 dwellings in South Kesteven between 2006 and 2026, at an annual average rate of 680 dwellings. The management of housing supply is principally a matter for local development frameworks. Local authorities can test higher housing provision numbers through their DPD's, provided they are consistent with the principles of sustainable development set out in PPS1 and tested through sustainability appraisal.

It is noted that in the EMRP it is stated that new developments must take account of climate change and encourage sustainable construction. The impacts of development are to be fully considered through:

Policy 26 (Protecting and Enhancing Natural and Cultural Heritage);

Policy 27 (Priorities for Historic Environment) which include the principle that damage to historic assets or their settings should be avoided wherever possible (this would include in particular Belton House and its setting and the Manthorpe Conservation Area);

Policy 29 (Biodiversity) about creating, protecting and enhancing semi-natural green spaces in urban areas and wildlife corridors.

South Kesteven Local Plan (SKLP 1995)

With the adoption of the Core Strategy (SKDS), most policies of the SKLP are superseded. However, a few policies remain in use until the SAPDPD and GAAP have been adopted.

The saved policies of the SKLP, relevant to this application, to be superseded in part (partial replacement) by policies in the adopted Core Strategy, are summarised below. Those wholly superseded by the SKCS no longer form part of the Development Plan. Local Plan policies to be superseded by the 'allocations' DPD's rather than the Core Strategy will remain part of the Development Plan until the relevant DPD is adopted.

Relevant Saved policies of South Kesteven Local Plan

H1 Housing Allocation – Grantham - partial replacement - overall approach to housing is set out in SKCS Policy H1; site allocations and detailed criteria will be in Grantham AAP.

H5 Housing Allocation in the Rural Area outside the towns of Grantham ...; partial replacement - overall approach to housing is set out in SKCS Policy H1, allocations included in Site Specific Allocations and

Policies DPD

REC3 - Public Open Space and new Housing Development, REC4 - Playing Fields provision in new Residential Development of more than 100 dwellings or 4 Hectares and REC5 - Play Space provision in new Residential Developments of more than 50 dwellings or 2 Hectares - partial replacement - overall approach to securing open space/playing fields provision as part of new developments will be covered by Policy SP4 - policies providing settlement specific standards for open space provision will be included in the SSAP and Grantham AAP

South Kesteven Local Development Framework (LDF) (Core Strategy and other Local Development Documents)

The Core Strategy Development Plan Document (here referred to as the "Core Strategy" - Adopted 5th July 2010) is the key "umbrella" document of the Local Development Framework for South Kesteven District and a key part of the Development Plan for South Kesteven; it is the starting point for considering planning applications. The Core Strategy will inform the other policy and guidance documents included within the LDF. It provides the spatial policy framework for development and change in the District of South Kesteven for the period to 2026 and establishes the key principles that will guide the location, use and form of development. The Core Strategy does not identify specific sites for development; these will be brought forward in separate DPD's Site Specific Allocations and Policies.

The Core Strategy DPD policies material to the consideration of this application are:

SP1 (Spatial Strategy): “The majority of all new development should be focused upon Grantham to support and strengthen its role as a Sub-Regional Centre. New development proposals shall be considered on appropriate sustainable and deliverable Brownfield sites and appropriate greenfield sites (including urban extensions), sufficient to ensure the achievement of growth targets. Details of specific sites (including urban extension sites) will be included in a Grantham Area Action Plan. ... 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 there are other overriding material considerations. All cases will also be subject to all relevant policies within the remainder of the core strategy or other relevant development plan documents. ...”

SP3 (Sustainable Integrated Transport): “In considering development proposals within the District, the council will ensure that the objectives of the most recent local transport plan for Lincolnshire are met. As part of the growth agenda for Grantham the delivery of traffic relief, including heavy goods vehicles, from the town centre will be a priority and any major development proposals within these areas will be expected to contribute towards delivering these schemes. ... The Council will also encourage the creation of a sustainable, modern transport network across the district by: promoting the location of development in areas which are particularly accessible by public transport, cycling and walking, ... ; promoting a balanced mix of land uses and patterns of development which reduces the need to travel by car; promoting and assisting journeys by public transport, cycling, mobility aids and walking, by making them accessible, safe, convenient and as attractive as possible (this may be secured either through the use of conditions or planning obligations); securing transport statements and travel plans where appropriate and requiring the preparation of transport assessments for all developments that are likely to have significant transport implications to determine the measures required on the surrounding highway network to ensure adequate access by all modes of transport; encouraging the use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) for the purposes of businesses and for other service provision (this may be identified through travel plans); supporting the retention and enhancement of service provision in local service centres.

Where appropriate, developer contributions will be sought towards the provision of necessary improvements.”

SP4 (Developer Contributions): “The Council will enter into planning obligations with developers to secure the provision of (or financial contributions towards) infrastructure and community benefits which the Council considers are necessary in conjunction with development. Planning obligations will cover those matters which would otherwise result in planning permission being withheld and should enhance the overall quality of a development. The requirements of a planning obligation must be: necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

A Community Infrastructure Levy will be charged throughout the District. Most types of development will be liable to pay the charge, which will be based on a formula which relates to the size of the development. Different rates will be applied to defined zones

within the District. The charging schedule will include the rates, identify the charging zones and provide details of the processes involved.

Site specific requirements will be secured using dedicated Section 106 Agreements negotiated on an individual site basis. Facilities provided by such agreements will normally be located onsite but may, exceptionally, be provided nearby.”

EN1 (Protection and Enhancement of Character of District): “South Kesteven's Landscape Character Areas are identified on the map [following paragraph 4.1.10]. Development must be appropriate to the character and significant natural, historic and cultural attributes and features of the landscape within which it is situated, and contribute to its conservation, enhancement or restoration. All development proposals and site allocations will be assessed in relation to:

1. statutory, national and local designations of landscape features, including natural and historic assets
2. local distinctiveness and sense of place
3. historic character, patterns and attributes of the landscape
4. the layout and scale of buildings and designed spaces
5. the quality and character of the built fabric and their settings
6. the condition of the landscape
7. biodiversity and ecological networks within the landscape
8. public access to and community value of the landscape
9. remoteness and tranquility
10. visual intrusion
11. noise and light pollution
12. Conservation Area Appraisals and Village Design Statements, where these have been adopted by the Council
13. impact on controlled waters
14. protection of existing open space (including allotments and public open space, and open spaces important to the character, setting and separation of built-up areas)

EN2 (Reducing Risk of Flooding): “Planning permission will not normally be granted, nor sites allocated for development, in areas identified in the South Kesteven Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) as at risk of flooding from any source. Any proposals in these areas will need to demonstrate that there are not any suitable sites at a lower risk of flooding available. Exceptionally, where development is necessary in areas at risk of flooding, the developer will be required to demonstrate that all the requirements of Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk (PPS25) have been met, including the application of the sequential approach within the site. In addition to the requirements of PPS25, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) must be submitted with planning applications as required by the SFRA. All FRAs must take into account the SFRA's recommendations. All planning applications should be accompanied by a statement of how surface water is to be managed and in particular where it is to be discharged. On-site attenuation and infiltration will be required as part of any new development wherever possible. The long-term maintenance of structures such as balancing ponds must be agreed in principle prior to permission being granted. Development which is likely to have a detrimental impact on the natural features of rivers and stream corridors, ponds or wetland habitats will not be permitted.”

EN4 (Sustainable Construction): “Proposals for new development should consider and demonstrate how the design of buildings and site layouts use energy, water, minerals,

materials and other natural resources appropriately, efficiently and with care and take account of the effects of climate change in accordance with other core strategy policies. To meet these requirements: All new developments should maximise the use of energy efficiency and energy conservation measures in their design, layout and orientation on site to reduce overall energy demand. All developments should minimise mains water use and demonstrate that water conservation measures are incorporated so that predicted per capita consumption does not exceed the appropriate levels set out in the Code for Sustainable Homes or BREEAM standards. These requirements may be relaxed if it can be clearly demonstrated by the applicant/developer, that to require full compliance would not be economically viable for the specific scheme.”

H1: Residential Development: “New housing development in South Kesteven during the period 2006 – 2026 should be planned and phased to deliver the minimum level of housing development required by the Regional Plan. To achieve the proper distribution of development across the District during the plan period development targets have been set for each town, the Local Service Centres and the rural areas. Any additional housing growth proposed for the District throughout the plan period should be distributed in a similar manner following the framework set out below. Housing growth should be focused on Grantham to deliver the wider social and economic aspirations of Grantham Growth Point Partnership. ...”

In the preamble to Policy H1 it is stated that to assist in identifying sites for allocation SKDC (with Rutland CC and South Holland DC) prepared a Strategic Housing Land Assessment. This revealed considerable potential capacity and availability of development land in the towns and Local Service Centres.

All potential sites will be assessed against the following criteria:

- Availability.
- Ability to maximise the use of public transport, cycling and pedestrian links and/or to create opportunities for improved accessibility (as set out in policy SP3).
- Access to and capacity of appropriate existing services and infrastructure to support development.
- Potential impact on wildlife sites, protected species, biodiversity, historic assets, archaeology, water quality, landscape character, TPO's and open spaces (as set out in Policy EN1).
- Ability of existing built form to absorb/accommodate new development.
- Visual impact of development on the surrounding landscape.
- Known constraints to a sites development such as flood risk (as set out in Policy EN2); presence of underground utilities infrastructure.

In determining sites to be allocated, detailed regard will be given to the actual amount of land needed in each settlement, to the balance (in terms of numbers and locations of sites) and range of suitable sites available and to the cumulative impact that one or more sites may have on the settlement. Provision for residential development will be met by sites which already have planning permission and on allocated sites. Allocations will be identified in separate documents; the GAAP DPD will cover the town of Grantham and the SSAP DPD the remainder of the District. These documents will identify and allocate sufficient land to ensure that the level of development anticipated in Policy H1 is delivered. Appropriate phasing mechanisms will be incorporated to maintain a continuous and deliverable five year supply of housing land across the plan period. It is accepted that Grantham will need two Greenfield Strategic Urban Extension sites (SUEs) to meet the strategic housing requirement for the town; the broad location of these sustainable urban

extensions is identified by the Core Strategy. The GAAP will also allocate additional appropriate and sustainably located sites both within and on the edge of the built up area of the town to ensure that a range of sites is available throughout the plan period.

The Council monitors housing development rates across the District and each December issues an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). This contains 'housing trajectories' which show how actual housing delivery in the

District compares to the annual housing requirement set out in Policy H1. The trajectory shows the number of houses built each year and the expected rate of completions year by year for the remainder of the plan period (see, for example page 42 of the Core Strategy). To ensure that an on-going five-year housing land supply is available, sites which are allocated in the SSAP DPD and GAAP will be phased, showing how the allocations contribute year by year to meeting the housing requirement. If it becomes clear during the plan period that the overall housing requirement is not being achieved and that additional housing land is required to maintain a five year supply, the Council will re-prioritise the phasing of allocated sites. If there are insufficient allocated sites available to be brought forward the Council will undertake a partial review of the allocations included in the SSAP DPD or Grantham AAP. In such circumstances the Council will also consider granting permission for additional housing sites which meet the locational requirements of PPS3, the Spatial Strategy established by Policies SP1 and SP2 and the local criteria referred to above, against which allocated sites have been assessed.

H2: Urban Extension Sites (Grantham): "The detailed site boundaries for each of the sustainable urban extensions and the broad distribution of land uses within each site, based on the parameters outlined below, will be defined through the Grantham Area Action Plan. The Area Action Plan will also establish criteria to guide the preparation of masterplans for each site."

H2A North West Quadrant: The SUE is site located north of A52 Barrowby Road, south of Nottingham rail line; could yield 3500 dwellings. Development has been constrained for a number of reasons, but development could begin in 2009. Initially development rates on the site will be low, but are expected to increase. The site presents opportunities for sustainable, mixed use development incorporating housing, employment and local community facilities. Proximity to the town centre allows extension of cycle, walking, bus routes into the site. There is access to the A1, northbound and southbound, within easy reach, and to the A52. Development will need to include the road link between Pennine Way and Barrowby Gate and include a primary school, medical centre, local shops, formal and informal recreational space.

H2B Southern Quadrant: The SUE is located south of Grantham, spans the East Coast Main Line and includes land between the A1 in the west and the A52 in the east. Housing will be contained between the railway line and the A52; could yield up to 4000 new homes, employment development and community facilities. Access to the housing area is dependant on providing new road from the A52. Construction of homes is not likely until 2011/2012. Development will be expected to protect and enhance important features and characteristics of the site (e.g. land near River Witham at a high risk of flooding, Site of Nature Conservation Importance, archaeological remains, river corridor and woodlands for their biodiversity) and incorporate them fully into the design of development.

Grantham has been identified as a Growth Point, suitable for the location of a large amount of housing growth, in the form of Strategic Urban Extensions (SUEs) which are expected to enable significant commercial and economic growth. To deliver the amount of housing planned the two SUEs are allocated in the Core Strategy (see above). They will be

developed in phases over the plan period to 2026 and beyond, to deliver a steady increase in new housing (see the 'housing trajectory on page 42 of the Core Strategy). The two SUEs offer the opportunity to provide significant benefits to Grantham, including a reduction in traffic congestion, as both sites will be expected to deliver road links which will take through traffic away from the town centre.

Development of SUE's should achieve following:

- Minimise the amount of land required for development, but ensure sufficient land is available for a mixed-use development with a range of facilities and services capable of fostering a high degree of self-sufficiency.
- Preserve protected and locally important land and features, unless appropriate mitigation strategies can be implemented, or there are no feasible alternatives.
- Locate development around existing physical and social infrastructure to minimize the development of new infrastructure and ensure that existing residents benefit from new development.
- Implement sustainable urban drainage systems to minimize impacts on groundwater quality and quantity.
- Promote energy efficient layouts and buildings; encourage the harnessing of renewable energy sources.
- Ensure that new residential development is successfully integrated with existing residential areas.
- Enhance the local environment through the creation of wildlife corridors and refuges and through careful consideration of the landscape.
- Promote the use of active, overlooked streets and areas of open space to provide community safety.
- Ensure that development is based around existing good quality public transport links and improve the quality and frequency of public transport links where possible and ensure that there are safe, attractive, short and direct linkages for pedestrians and cyclists between housing areas and employment, retail, leisure and education facilities, and public transport links.

Grantham is identified in the East Midlands Regional Plan as the location more than half of the annual District housing requirement. This will strengthen the role of the town as a Sub Regional Centre. During the plan period (2006-2026) over 7,600 dwellings new homes will be built in Grantham. By 31st March 2008, 688 dwellings had been built and 1143 homes had planning permission, leaving land for about 5,850 dwellings to be identified. There is estimated to be capacity for about 430 new dwellings within the town to achieve these growth objectives, thus the two urban extensions have been allocated ensure that sufficient new homes are provided over the next 20 years and beyond to achieve the growth strategy.

If, despite best endeavours, the critical infrastructure required to support the delivery of housing on a SUE fails to come forward and deliver the housing requirement outlined in the Core Strategy, the Council will have to consider reviewing the Core Strategy. The approach to this would depend on which element of critical infrastructure does not come forward, for instance the lack of sewage treatment works capacity will impact on alternative housing development locations in the town. Any such review would need to be in the context that it is Grantham and not the District that has been identified as a Growth Point. A review of the Core Strategy would have to consider options for the delivery of growth in Grantham to a different timescale. Any alternatives, such as a redistribution of the quantum of housing

growth apportioned to Grantham to the rest of the District, would have to be robustly justified.

H3 (Affordable Housing): All developments comprising 5 or more dwellings should make appropriate provision for affordable housing within the development site. ... Where affordable housing is to be provided on site, a target of up to 35% of the total capacity of a scheme should be affordable. The affordable element will be expected to include a mix of socially rented and intermediate housing appropriate to the current evidence of local need. All units should be of an appropriate size and type to meet the need identified by the current evidence of housing need for that ward. To achieve this, targets for affordable housing will be set on every allocated site. ... In negotiating the level of affordable housing on sites, the Council will have regard to the overall viability of individual development schemes. An Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning

Document will set out in detail how these requirements will be calculated on a site by site basis.

E1: Employment Development: The policy is focussed on large employment sites and appropriate rural development, but the following extract is relevant to this application: "To meet the objectives of the Council's Economic Development Strategy and the Sustainable Community Plan the Council will ensure that a portfolio of land and buildings, with a range of sizes, uses and locations, with access to a good transport network is available to ensure a successful, competitive and well-balanced business environment."

E2: Town Centre and Retail Development: The policy is focussed on Town and Local Service Centres and larger retail development, but the following extract is relevant to this application: "Small local shops and retail parades will be provided as part of the comprehensive planning of large residential areas."

References to the Manthorpe site during the Local Development Framework process

During the preparation of the Housing and Economic DPD Preferred Options (June 2006), (which set a figure of 3800 dwellings to be built in Grantham 2001-2021), the Manthorpe site was identified as a possible location for residential development, but, was not considered suitable to be a preferred option. The North West Quadrant (Poplar Farm) and Southern Quadrant SUE were also not included as preferred option sites, but parts of them were identified as 'Reserved Sites for Mixed Use including housing'.

During the preparation of the Core Strategy the principle of Manthorpe as a strategic location for an urban extension was considered in the Preferred Options Core Strategy (published in May 2007). But the site was discounted because, in the Sustainability Appraisal assessment, it did not perform as well as the other two strategic locations for growth (the North West and Southern Quadrants), on the basis of traffic congestion and environmental impacts (heritage assets, landscape impact).

The applicants made a number of representations at publication stage (January 2009) that the Core Strategy was unsound. One of these grounds was that it did not make adequate provision for the delivery of housing land supply in Grantham in the early part of the plan period, which the Manthorpe site could provide for. These representations were considered by the Inspector during the examination hearing sessions. In her report she concluded that it was not appropriate or necessary to include the site as a direction for growth and that there was no strong imperative to do so, given the reasonable prospect of delivery from the two identified urban extensions.

With regard to the identification of sustainable urban extensions to Grantham, and particularly the site at Manthorpe, the Inspector concluded in her report that, based on the evidence presented to her, Manthorpe does not appear to have such significant advantages in terms of either sustainability or contribution to the overall spatial strategy as to outweigh the selection of the NWQ and SQ as preferred options for urban extensions. She expresses concern that to introduce another strategic location... "could deflect the current focus on delivering SUEs to the detriment of the wider benefits this would bring for the Growth Point." She also referred to the lack of assessment of the potential impact on Belton House and potential traffic congestion on the A607. The Inspector, however, indicated that she did not rule out the possibility of development at Manthorpe completely and suggested that it could still be considered as part of the Grantham Area Action Plan, currently under preparation. She stated that: "Consideration at this stage would allow detailed assessment of environmental impacts, striking the most appropriate and sustainable balance of sites in the light of anticipated levels of delivery from the SUEs."

In Planning Policy Statement: Housing - PPS 3: Housing (Paragraph 71) it states: "Where Local Planning Authorities cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites, for example where Local Development Documents have not been reviewed to take into account policies in this PPS or there is less than a five year supply of deliverable sites, they should consider favourably planning applications for housing having regard to the policies in this PPS including then considerations in paragraph 69 [the site would have to be suitable in all respects]." According to the most recent assessment of housing land supply stood at 4.8 years supply (as at 1st April 2010)

Local studies and guidance documents relevant to the consideration of the application proposal

The Belton House and Park Setting Study and Policy Development (January 2010 – SKDC and National Trust) It has been agreed that the document should be used to support the development of policy for the setting of Belton House and for interim guidance. The guidance identifies the element of setting and the degree of sensitivity of different types of development in the area around the House and Park. The application site is shown to impact on the 'Historic Assets' through various forms of adverse physical and perceptual effects; part of the site falls within a very or exceptionally sensitive area to the setting of Belton House.

South Kesteven Landscape Character Assessment (2007) – It recommends that new development in the area in which the site is located (Grantham Scarps and Valleys Character Area) should ensure that new development is managed to: protect and enhance woodlands and parkland, soften harsh urban edges by woodland planting, avoid built development on the higher scarp slopes, new planting to soften urban edges, retain/provide fringes of countryside extending into the town, protect gaps between Grantham and villages.

Manthorpe Grantham Conservation Area Appraisal and Amendment (August 2007) - The Appraisal indicates the location and context of the CA, its spatial character, the quality and character of buildings and concludes with some management opportunities and constraints. The only constraint of any direct relevance to this application relates to retaining the open character around the south junction of High Road and Low Road.

Lincolnshire Residential Development Guide (2000) - Produced as Supplementary Planning Guidance, the weight to be given to this guidance has been reduced in the light of changing planning policy. The guide deals with various aspects of design including design principles and its aims include that of seeking to reflect, where possible, the particular character of Lincolnshire and to protect and enhance landforms and landscape features.

A Green Infrastructure Strategy (April 2009) - Identifies green infrastructure assets across the District, including environmental (key habitats and ecological networks) and cultural (key destinations such as historic settlements and country parks, footpaths, cycleways and promoted routes) assets. The contribution made by accessible greenspace has been assessed and opportunities to remedy deficiencies have been identified. Principles for the development and management of the District's green infrastructure assets are set out and centre on giving priority to the conservation and management of all existing protected habitats and floodplains. Overall the aim should be to connect existing fragmented and isolated patches of habitat, enhancing the connectivity of the network and increasing their biodiversity value and ability to adapt to climate change. The Strategy will assist in the process of site allocation in the SSAP DPD and the GAAP and inform the more detailed Green Infrastructure Strategy being prepared for Grantham.

The Grantham Transport Strategy 2007-2021 and beyond - Formally approved by both the District and County Councils, in it are a package of measures to improve traffic management and reduce congestion in the town; improve sustainable transport in order to reduce dependence on the private car; improve accessibility for all; improve safety and air quality. There is insufficient public funding to deliver all of the improvements proposed in the Strategy; the District Council will work closely with the County Council and other partners to identify potential sources of funding. It is proposed that all large scale infrastructure proposals identified in the Strategy will be funded through developer contributions from the private sector, in accordance with Policy SP4 (Developer Contributions).

Officer Evaluation

Key Issues – Principal planning considerations material to the consideration of application

The Development Plan – National Policy and Sustainable Development

Principal parameters and Masterplan - still unclear

Housing Mix – affordable, retirement, etc

Employment

Developer Contributions – 106 Agreement Heads of Terms/Viability issues – Planning Gain/Community Benefits

Heritage considerations

Impact on Landscape ecology/biodiversity

Archaeology

Highway issues, implications

Air Quality

Impact on Utilities - EA

Sport and recreation

Residential amenity issues

In this section the issues material to the consideration and determination of the application are presented. There are three main sets of information, analysis and judgements that form the basis for the discussion and the recommendations that follow from it. These are the documents submitted by the applicant, the representations put forward by those who responded to consultations and publicity and the advice of your officers.

For practical purposes, where references are made below, in the officer evaluation section, to issues raised and/or views put forward by respondents or the applicants, much of the material presented is in brief summary form, also it is selective, in that on any particular issue many respondents may have covered the same ground. Reference can be made to the sections of the report above where fuller presentations of the applicant's submissions and the views of respondents are set out in more detail. The full text of all the documents submitted by the applicant and all representations are held on files in the Council's Offices, the applicant's documents are also available on the Council's web site.

An overview of the applicant's views on key issues and the suitability of the site for the proposed development

In the Town Planning Statement the applicants set out what they consider to be the principal planning considerations material to the consideration of application, these are: the provisions of the development plan, in which context the principal issues to be considered are whether the development is needed in order to ensure an adequate level of housing is achieved within the Grantham Growth Point; national planning policy; provisions of Grantham Growth Point; sustainability; the extent of any harm to interests of acknowledged importance and whether such harm, if it exists, can be satisfactorily mitigated.

In this context the applicant's conclude that the proposal: accords with national policy (PPS1, 3, 4, 9, and 25, and PPG 13, 17, 22, and 24); accords with the East Midlands Regional Plan; would not compromise or undermine the underlying objectives of the Core Strategy; accords with the saved policies of the Local Plan; will be highly sustainable, making the most of existing infrastructure and economic and social capital of the town, sustainable transport measures, efficient use of land, mixed use development, renewable and low carbon energy generation technologies, a phased development, substantial planned and managed enhancement of biodiversity and new wildlife habitats. The applicants are of the view that the ES demonstrates that all potentially adverse impacts are mitigated and no harm results to interests of acknowledged importance.

The applicant considers that it would be justified to grant permission for the proposed development and that this is demonstrated in the documents submitted in support of the application. In the applicant's opinion the main reasons for approving the proposed development: "The development will, through a high quality, comprehensive, integrated, innovative, socially inclusive, and very sustainable design, provide a range of needed housing (including affordable housing), recreational facilities (including open space) on a site that is immediately adjacent to and well-related to the built-up area of Grantham."

The views put forward by the applicant's agent in a letter dated 15 November 2010, concerning an updating of the spatial planning policy position since the application was submitted, have been outlined and commented upon in the Officer Evaluation of the report below..

The Development Plan – National Policy and Sustainable Development

In Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 it is stated: “If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.”

At the time of the determination of this application by the Local Planning Authority the parts of the Development Plan relevant to this application comprise the East Midlands Regional Plan, the Core Strategy for South Kesteven and the Saved Policies of the South Kesteven Local Plan. The National Planning Policy Statements and Guidance Notes referred to above are material considerations in the determination of this application, as are, with varying degrees of weight, the local planning related policy documents listed above.

Government Policy is that development should be located in the most sustainable locations and in the most sustainable ways possible. In Planning Policy Statements 1 and 3 mixed and sustainable communities located with good access to employment and community facilities are advocated, the EMRP and Core Strategy are consistent with this advice. In the EMRP Grantham has been identified as suitable for extensive growth and the town has been designated a Growth Point and is thus an appropriate location for large sustainable urban extensions.

It is also a basic tenet of Government policy in order to deliver sustainable development that decisions must be made within a ‘plan-led system’, that gives a high degree of certainty and predictability; with plans being drawn up with community involvement, to present a shared vision and strategy of how the area should develop to achieve sustainable patterns of development (PPS 1 - paragraphs 7 and 8).

Your officers agree with EMRA that the management of housing supply is principally a matter to be dealt with through local development frameworks. Local authorities can test higher housing provision numbers through their DPD’s (e.g. GAAP), provided they are consistent with the principles of sustainable development set out in PPS1 and tested through sustainability appraisal. Furthermore, the Core Strategy and Area Action Plan processes are the appropriate means for considering the merits of developing this site, using the evidence base underpinning the Core Strategy, including Urban Capacity Studies, Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments, sustainability appraisals, infrastructure requirements and the current 5 year housing land supply.

The site was considered as a possible Sustainable Urban Extension in the Council’s preparation of its LDF Core Strategy. The site was rejected as an option in the preferred Options document because of various concerns including significant additional traffic, and the impact on Belton House and Manthorpe conservation area. The applicants appeared in support of their proposal at the Examination in Public but the Inspector’s decision letter did not support the site as a strategic SUE based on the information available to her and hence the site was not included as a SUE in the adopted Core Strategy. In the light of the adoption of the Core Strategy it is considered that there is no overriding strategic policy justification for the Manthorpe site to come forward for development at this time and that the Core Strategy, which fully in accordance with the approved Regional Plan) should be given more weight than any other material consideration.

The Inspector expressed concern that to introduce another strategic location could deflect the focus on delivering the two SUEs to the detriment of the wider benefits this would bring for the Growth Point. She did not rule out development completely and suggested that the Grantham Action Area Plan DPD can still consider the site to meet housing targets, allowing detailed assessment of environmental impacts, striking the most appropriate and sustainable balance of sites in the light of anticipated levels of delivery from the SUEs.

The application site is not a strategic priority identified in the Growth Point Programme of Development (POD) or the Local Investment Plan (LIP) which has been approved by the Growth Point Strategic Board and agreed with the Homes and Communities Agency.

The POD and LIP both identify the South Quadrant and North West Quadrant as preferred locations for two sustainable extensions which have capacity to provide circa 7,500 new dwellings and are identified in the South Kesteven Core Strategy, as providing the opportunity to provide significant benefits to Grantham, including a reduction in traffic congestion as both sites are expected to deliver road links which will take through traffic away from the town centre

Development on each SUE is planned to progress according to agreed phasing, ensuring the delivery of new community infrastructure, such as schools, local shops, medical facilities and community halls at appropriate points within the development programme. Detailed master plans will be prepared for each site as Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD). It is intended that the master plans will result in each SUE achieve a new community, with a close relationship with existing communities in the town through strategic open spaces and pedestrian and cycle links.

In terms of the criteria for a sustainable urban extension, the application site is not considered to be large enough to provide the full range of infrastructure that should be expected from a SUE. Also it is also judged that the site is not in a good location in terms of sustainable transport. The proposed development would not provide for any employment land, although there will be some job opportunities created through the CCRC, retailing and commercial uses on the site if these aspects of the proposal are brought forward. If a significant element of 'employment land' were to be included in the development of the site, it is considered that there would be a greater likelihood that more would be caused to the local environment than the present proposal, particularly in respect of the likely impact on historic assets.

The latest update of Strategic Housing Land Assessment for the area shows that there is ample land available to deliver the housing growth figures identified for South Kesteven District. Also the two Sue's are considered to be deliverable, planning permission has been approved for about 1,800 dwellings at Poplar Farm, subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement. Both Sue's create opportunities to improve the infrastructure in Grantham which will enable significant improvements to the public realm in and around the town centre. If the Manthorpe site receives planning consent it is considered by many respondents (see above) that there would be a significant risk that the deliverability of the two SUE's identified in the Core Strategy submissions will be adversely affected.

However, there is evidence that there is marginally less than a 5 year supply of land that is deliverable for new housing across the District as a whole. Notwithstanding that there may also be a small shortfall, as measured against the housing growth trajectory for Grantham

(shown in the Core Strategy page 42); which, in the light of potential delays in the commencement of house building on the two SUEs, may result in the building rate needed to deliver the Grantham Growth point strategy falling short in the immediate future, it is not considered necessary to pre-empt decisions that should appropriately be made through the housing allocation policies to be set out in the GAAP DPD; particularly as that document is shortly to be consulted upon.

In his letter of 15 November 2010 the applicant's planning advisor seeks to present an update the spatial planning context for the application in the light of changes in the policy framework for the determination of the proposals for the site. He sets out some of the circumstances of the submission of the site for consideration as a third SUE within the Core Strategy process, for example the possibility of earlier delivery of housing than would be likely from the two SUEs that were designated.

He then refers to the concerns of the Inspector about the problematic transport and heritage assets issues associated with development of the Manthorpe site, but cites the work being done by the applicant to try and resolve these issues, noting that the Inspector did not rule out the consideration of the site in the GAAP, which should progress significantly towards adoption over the next year or so. Next it is asserted that the indications are that, allowing for the delivery of the SUEs in accordance with the Core Strategy growth trajectory, at least 1500 dwellings would need to be provided by site specific allocations in the GAAP; sufficient to absorb the Grantham North/Manthorpe development and still necessitate other allocations of housing land in Grantham. However, your officers, are clear that this is not an accurate figure and do not accept this figure; the indications are, through the work being done on the GAAP, that, assuming the SUEs are delivered in accordance with the Core Strategy Growth Trajectory, land considerably less than 1500 dwellings on land outside the two SUEs would be required over the Plan period to 2026.

The letter raises the issue of 'prematurity', mentioning the guidance in paragraph 72 of PPS 3, whereby it is stated that LA's should not refuse planning permission for housing proposals solely on the grounds of prematurity. It is also asserted in the letter, that significance of the reinstatement of the EMRP is the fact that the level of housing to be delivered through the Core strategy is a 'minima'. The reinstatement is also seen as directly relevant to the calculation of a five year housing land supply, which it is noted is not met at a District wide level; whilst the fact that the S106 for the NW Quadrant (Poplar Farm) has not been signed is said to mean that it is "... inconceivable that the dwellings projected to be constructed on this site during 2010 in the Adopted Core Strategy Housing Trajectory will now be deliver. In such circumstances the guidance at paragraph 71 of PPS3 is especially relevant."

Paragraph 71 is as follows: "Where Local Planning Authorities cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites, for example, where Local Development Documents have not been reviewed to take into account policies in this PPS or there is less than five years supply of deliverable sites, they should consider favourably planning applications for housing, having regard to the policies in this PPS including the considerations in paragraph 69." Paragraph 69 is as follows: "In general, in deciding planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should have regard to:

- Achieving high quality housing.

- Ensuring developments achieve a good mix of housing reflecting the accommodation requirements of specific groups, in particular, families and older people.
- The suitability of a site for housing, including its environmental sustainability.
- Using land effectively and efficiently.
- Ensuring the proposed development is in line with planning for housing objectives, reflecting the need and demand for housing in, and the spatial vision for, the area and does not undermine wider policy objectives eg addressing housing market renewal issues.”

The planning advisor’s letter concludes: “In summary, therefore the Applicant considers that the Application Proposals are entirely consistent with the adopted (EMP [RS] and SKDC LDF CS) and the emerging components (Grantham AAP) of the development plan and, accordingly, the requirement under Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 is met in this case. Moreover, if, as seems likely, there is not a 5-year housing land supply in the District, the guidance at Paragraph 71 of PPS3 clearly becomes a consideration to which considerable weight should be attached.”

In the opinion of your officers and some of the respondents (see above), notwithstanding the reasonable points made on behalf of the applicant, as just summarized, including the fact that weight must be given to the guidance in paragraphs 71 and 72 of PPS3: Housing, the approval of a housing site of the scale proposed in this application, i.e. in the region of a 1000 dwellings, contrary to the Core Strategy, at this stage in the LDF process would, it is considered by your officers and some objectors, undermine to a very significant degree the ability to consider a range of options, whereby the most sustainable sites for new housing development in Grantham can be identified and allocated in the GAAP, to achieve an overall sustainable pattern of development. In this regard the development of the North Grantham/Manthorpe site, is considered to be premature and should be refused. Such an approval would, furthermore, it is judged, undermine the ‘plan led’ process propounded in National Planning Guidance and the Development Plan as represented by the EMRP and the Core Strategy.

Heads of Terms/Viability issues

The following matters were included in the Draft Heads of Terms for the Section 106 Obligation Agreement submitted with the application: physical highway improvements (site access roundabout); travel plan (including pedestrian and cycle access to the site) and shuttle bus service; on-site primary school facilities and contributions to secondary school provision off site; affordable housing based on current local and national planning policy standards; recreational facilities and recreational open space (including landscaped areas); health and community facilities. The location scale and relationships between these uses and facilities and the main housing, transport and commercial elements of the proposal are shown on the ‘Illustrative Masterplan’.

In connection with such Section 106 Agreement Heads of Terms, as early as March 2010, in a letter to your officers in which it is stated; “Due to the current economic climate, the uncertainty about development finance and the impending change of government, Larkfleet [the applicants] is proposing to submit a financial viability exercise to accompany the application. ... we have proceeded ... formulate a baseline appraisal ..., and perhaps unsurprisingly it indicates a shortfall in meeting all the Council’s aspirational S106 requirements in the early years of the development.” The letter goes on to contain discussion about how the affordable housing aspects of the proposal can be maximised,

with indications that this would have knock impacts on the ability to deliver other elements of the S106 package.

In the judgement of your officers, the last point misses a crucial point, this being that it is not the Council's aspirations that are the issue. Rather, the level of community benefit expected to be delivered by a development of the nature and scale of Manthorpe, are essential requirements in order that a Sustainable Urban Extension delivered

Since that letter was sent the site has not been designated as a SUE in the Core Strategy, this has critical effects on the ability to attract outside funding for affordable housing through National Affordable Housing Programme grant aid from the Homes and Community Agency. However, in this regard, with the change of Government in May 2010, there must be a great deal of uncertainty in respect of the issue of how affordable housing will be funded. Furthermore, the long period over which development would take place (possibly 10-15 years) and the scope that is open for phasing the output of affordable housing within the overall programme of development, means that a downgrading of contributions at an early stage is entirely inappropriate and unnecessary at this stage; and not in the interests of achieving an optimal quality of sustainable development on the site, if were to go to be approved whether through a permission at this time or by means of another process, such as GAAP or some other future policy framework.

Development control officers met the applicant's representatives (19 August 2010) to discuss the 'development viability' of the proposals, as set out in the application submission. A presentation made on behalf of the applicant indicated that there were issues relating to meeting the full range of benefits and obligations referred to in the Heads of Agreement and as shown on the 'Illustrative Masterplan'. Matters highlighted included the need to reduce affordable housing requirements well below the policy requirements set out in the South Kesteven Core Strategy and possible reductions in the scale of other provisions. However, the current formal position is that the 'Revised Illustrative Masterplan' (submitted after the meeting on viability), does not indicate any significant changes to the physical infrastructure to be provided as part of the overall proposal as compared with the original submission.

The District Council was invited by the applicants to analyse and assess the 'viability assessment' put to officers. However, it was considered that, in the light of the basic problematic circumstances relating to the policy context, the issues relating to transport and traffic and those with regard to the impacts of the development on Belton House and Park and possibly the Manthorpe Conservation Area, an assessment of 'viability' by the Council would not be appropriate at this stage. It is likely that if the applicant's 'viability' analysis were to be taken at face value at present, a further reason for refusal would probably be recommended. However, taking the "Revised Illustrative Masterplan" and 'Supplementary Design Report' (both dated 23 October 2010 – see below) into account, there is no formal proposal by the applicant to deviate from the range and nature of the obligations set out in the submitted Heads of Terms.

In this report officers have not gone into detail about which particular elements of the Planning Gain/ Community Benefit mix needs to be addressed, because if Members were to be minded to approve the application, it will be necessary to look at the development proposals in detail through the Section 106/Masterplan process in the light of the planning gain/community benefits requirements and the issue of the viability of the development in

whatever final form it might appear, should planning permission be granted for the development of the site for housing.

Housing Mix – affordable, retirement, etc

In PPS3 at paragraph 20 it states: “ Key characteristics of a mixed community are a variety of housing, particularly in terms of tenure and price and a mix of different households such as families with children, single person households and older people.”

The Core Strategy at Policy H3 (affordable housing) states: “Where affordable housing is to be provided on site, a target of up to 35% of the total capacity of a scheme should be affordable. The affordable element will be expected to include a mix of socially rented and intermediate housing appropriate to the current evidence of local need. ... In negotiating the level of affordable housing on sites, the Council will have regard to the overall viability of individual development schemes. An Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document will set out in detail how these requirements will be calculated on a site by site basis.”

The residential mix in the proposals as submitted are: Residential (maximum 3 storey) - not less than 1,000 units - 2, 3, 4 and 5 bed houses in a mix of detached, semi detached, terraced and townhouses and apartments. Zones of different building densities: 25/30/40/45/50 units/hectare, higher densities at neighborhood centre (Note: Environmental Statement states that up to 1310 dwellings are proposed). Continuing Care Retirement Community (maximum 3 storey) - 110 apartments in Extra Care Village; 40 bungalows and assisting living houses; 60 bed Nursing Home.

The applicants have indicated (see above) that they cannot, in the present economic climate provide the mix of housing that the LA consider should be built, in order to meet National, Regional and Local policies for achieving mixed communities and sustainable forms of development, in particular in respect of Affordable Housing. This issue is discussed in detail above in the Officer Evaluation paragraphs dealing with the Development Plan and Heads of Agreement.

Design and Layout: achieving Sustainable Development

The Design and Access Statement deals with a number of matters relating to design and layout and related topics, they are under the headings: “Understanding the Context”, “Constraints”, “Design”, “Sustainable Development” and “Phasing”. The first two of these sections present detailed description and analysis of matters such as: site orientation and topography, vistas, historic patterns of local development, conservation and design, access and connectivity and development constraints.

The first two of these sections present detailed description and analysis of matters such as: site orientation and topography, vistas, historic patterns of local development, conservation and design, access and connectivity and development constraints. The

The Design Section contains an outline ‘illustrative masterplan’ and matters such as design principles, some detail of proposed land uses, scale and intensity, movement (including pedestrian, cycle and bus routes), landscaping framework. The sustainable development section covers such matters as: the capability and commitment of the applicant company to

sustainable development, energy, CO2 emissions, sustainable water management and drainage, flood risk, pollution, transport, biodiversity, waste, health, sustainable use of materials, involvement with the local community. These matters will not be dealt with in detail here, bearing in mind that the application is in Outline and the consideration of the application by this Council is mainly to do with matters of principle and overall design and impact issues. However some of the wider issues described and analysed in the DAS, in relation to design and layout principles, the overall nature and range of the proposed development, the impacts of the proposals on the wider setting of the site, traffic matters and critical policy issues, will be addressed in the body of this report below.

Much of this material indicates that there are some merits to the site as being physically suitable for development; also it is demonstrated, in general terms, that most of the identified constraints on development could be overcome and in many cases could be used to advantage to provide an attractive residential environment, as is subsequently demonstrated in the Illustrative Masterplan. However, as many respondents have shown and as is discussed elsewhere in this officer evaluation, there are some key constraints and impacts that have, either not been covered adequately or, it is considered have not been satisfactorily overcome. An acknowledgement by the applicants of some of the perceived shortcomings of the proposed outline/'illustrative' proposals, is evidenced in the submission of the Supplementary Design Report and Revised Illustrative Masterplan on 1 November 2010.

These matters are not to be dealt with in detail here, bearing in mind that the application is in Outline and the consideration of the application by this Council is mainly to do with matters of principle and overall design and impact issues. However some of the wider issues described and analysed in the DAS, in relation to design and layout principles, the overall nature and range of the proposed development, the impacts of the proposals on the wider setting of the site, traffic matters and critical policy issues, are addressed elsewhere in the Officer Evaluation section. If Members were to be minded to approve the application, as stated above and in the recommendations below, it will be necessary to consider and negotiate on a number of issues including: development viability; such development matters as overall housing numbers, housing mix, phasing; the general terms and detailed wording of the Section 106 Obligation Agreement; consequent changes to the Masterplan that would be necessary (it is considered by your officers a revised 'design framework' would have to be prepared to underpin and supplement the Masterplan); also several other matters that would be likely to stem from the extensive and detailed negotiations and discussions that would have to be undertaken by the District Council with the applicants and other interested parties.

Residential amenity issues

As the application is in outline residential amenity issues do not fall to be considered in detail, but an appraisal of the likely issues would need to be considered in the design framework application if Sections through site indicate that, due to the ground levels, involving some significant changes in relief, unless there were to be careful control exercised over the heights and relative locations and positions of buildings, problems relating to overbearing and overshadowing effects could arise. Particular attention would need to be given to this aspect of large retirement complex and the central community area more generally.

Heritage considerations

(Note: In the light of the fact that a considerable volume of new material has been received, including new information concerning the impact on Belton Park, in response to further concerns expressed by English Heritage this section of the Officer Evaluation will be amended and expanded with in an Addendum to this report to be submitted to Members of the Development Control Committee and made publically available several working days before the Committee meets on 4th January 2011.)

In the EIA, under the heading of cultural heritage, it is stated that with regard to the settings of the Manthorpe Conservation Area, the Grade I Listed Registered Park at Belton and the Listed Buildings within the search area, the proposed development has been assessed to have an impact of neutral or slight adverse significance in all cases. To mitigate any adverse impact upon the settings of these designations the development should be screened where possible with appropriate planting.

The impact that the proposed development would have, if built in accordance with the proposals submitted with the application, on the setting of key historic environment features (including Manthorpe Conservation Area, Belton Park and some listed buildings) has prompted strong objections including those from English Heritage, the Council's Conservation Officer and the National Trust and many other respondents, .

The application does consider the potential impact on these environment features, and the Landscape Framework takes account of the local landscape character and relevant landscape policy together with the settings of Belton House and Park and Manthorpe Conservation Area. To mitigate potential adverse impacts upon the settings of these designations, apart from the siting of the built development, it is proposed that the development would be screened wherever possible with appropriate planting.

The appraisals in the documents submitted with the application are considered, by your officers and various consultees (for example English Heritage and the National Trust), flawed because they do not provide a comprehensive assessment of all the relevant policy documents such as Conservation Area Appraisals and The Belton House and Park Setting Study and Policy Document; the significance of Belton House; because the significance of its park and garden is not correctly identified; because the plans and diagrams are not sufficient to assess properly the resultant impacts; and because the scale and nature of the likely adverse impacts of the development on these very important historic assets, as stated in the documents submitted with the application, are considered to be significantly understated.

The view of your officers and many respondents is that setting, character and appearance of the Grade 1 listed Belton House and Historic Park and Garden and Manthorpe conservation area and its listed buildings and to key views looking in and out of Manthorpe Conservation Area and Belton Park, would be adversely affected to a significant degree as a result of the development, by reason of the loss of rural character on the approach roads to Belton House, the landscape treatment that seeks to reflect Belton Park and Garden, the introduction of the roundabout at the Belton Road junction, and the adverse impact on the present views across and out of the park to the surrounding countryside. In addition there is a lack of information and assessment within the application documents with regards to the historic environment impact. Accordingly, as English Heritage stated the proposal does

not comply with relevant planning policies of Development Plan and Regional/National Policy. The Preferred Options document (May 2007) rejected an urban extension at Manthorpe for various reasons including the impact on the historic environment (Note: confirmed in the Adopted Core Strategy). The Town Planning Statement is said to contain no reference to PPG 15 and 16 or the draft PPS on the Historic Environment (now PPS5), or any of the environment policies in the Regional Plan, which is a major omission given the surrounding historic environment. EH feel that the proposed development is contrary to PPG15 and the draft PPS (now PPS5), as well as Policy 26 and 27 of the Regional Plan.

Impact on farmland, landscape and ecology/biodiversity

In the Environmental Impact Assessment describes the uses, character and appearance of the site in the section on ecology and nature conservation. The great majority of the site is used for intensive agriculture, though there are more attractive and ecologically richer parts of the site, for example: hedgerows (though most are flailed, mature trees and streams. The stream and associated woodland strip, to the south of the site and a number of hedgerows are considered to be of high ecological value. Mitigation measures will include the retention of habitats of the highest ecological value and the creation of new habitats through significant areas of landscaping, habitat creation and associated works.

Development of the site will result in the permanent loss of Grade 3b agricultural land, this is not considered to be “best and most versatile” for agricultural production. However, loss of this land is assessed as having a moderate adverse impact. This loss cannot be mitigated.

In the ‘Supplementary Design Report’ dated 23 October 2010, submitted by the applicant in response to representations on the likely impacts of the proposed development on Heritage Assets in the area around the site, a ‘Landscape Framework Enhancement’ is put forward and the enhanced landscaping framework is shown in the ‘Revised Illustrative Masterplan’ (the amendments put forward in these documents, as they affect the landscape and ecology, will be further dealt with in the Addendum).

The Landscape Framework is aimed at taking into account the local landscape character and relevant landscape policy and of the settings of the Belton house and park and of Manthorpe Conservation Area. The proposal submitted with the application is to retain most of the landscape features and vegetation on the site, to include significant areas of planting within and at the edges of the site. The intention is to create over 20 hectares of open space/planting and provide quality green areas and corridors for recreation, improved wild life habitats, green settings for new development, screening and softening views into the site from surroundings. Sustainable Drainage will enable the use of drainage corridors to enhance informal open space and movement corridors for pedestrians and cyclists. The recreational open spaces and existing rights of way will enable inclusive access and will be connected by the pedestrian and cycle path network allowing future residents of the site and of adjoining residential areas convenient access to all parts of the site and its facilities. Provision of a robust landscape framework would be secured through a landscape and habitat management plan.

On the basis of the information submitted Natural England objects to the proposal because of the lack of clarity and detail about green infrastructure.

The 'Revised Illustrative Masterplan' (dated 23 October 2010) shows enhancement of the landscape framework, particularly in response to the perceived need to meet concerns expressed by consultees about the adverse impacts of the development on Belton House and Park; these will be referred to in the Addendum .

Archaeology

It has been established with the Lincolnshire Heritage Trust that no further pre-determination work will be required. However, an earthwork survey of the surviving ridge and furrow located to the east of the Running Furrows Brook will be required as mitigation.

Air Quality and noise and vibration

During construction, the development will generate short term, temporary increases in noise levels and vibration at sensitive locations nearest the site. Predictions have been made to determine the noise level of the site following construction; the results indicate that mitigation measures will be required to maintain the required daytime and night time noise levels. A noise mitigation scheme will be produced which will set out specific mitigation measures. During construction dust could be generated, to mitigate any potential impacts, a best practice dust mitigation plan would be implemented.

SKDC Environmental Protection officers consider that the application should be refused on the following basis:

- No model validation
- Input parameters for the model are not clear
- Background Nitrogen dioxide concentrations requires clarification
- No account of the current AQMA and other sensitive areas

In the case of the Poplar Farm (NW Quadrant SUE) application it was suggested that this issue be dealt with through condition requiring monitoring of air quality during and after construction and through seeking developer contributions to enhancing the District Council's monitoring system; in the interests of consistency, it is suggested that the same approach would be appropriate here if planning permission were to be granted.

Highway implications

It is proposed that a new shuttle bus would link the site to the town centre. A pedestrian / cycle only access would connect with the existing NCN route 22. A Travel Plan would be provided for the main land uses on site. Car and cycle parking would be provided in accordance with LCC standards. The general layout of a new '4 way roundabout' site access, estate roads, cycle paths, pedestrian routes are shown in the 'Illustrative Masterplan' recently revised (November 2010)

The Transport Assessment provides an overview of relevant planning and transport policy, the scope and technical basis of the report is detailed above. Using recognized trip rate (TRICS), traffic distribution (LCC SATURN, ARCADY) models; fully classified traffic surveys were undertaken on 13th March 2008. The results showed improvements would be required for 2 junctions – the A607/Longcliffe Road and A607/Sandcliffe Road junctions. The general layout of a new '4 way roundabout' site access, estate roads, cycle

paths, pedestrian routes are shown in the 'Illustrative Masterplan' (recently revised November 2010). Car and cycle parking would be provided in accordance with LCC standards.

The Highway Authority(HA) recommended refusal of the proposal as submitted, as inadequate information was supplied to enable a reasonable judgement to be made about the likely impact of the proposal on traffic conditions in the vicinity of the site and beyond, particularly in and around Grantham Town Centre. It was notable that the traffic survey on which the Traffic Assessment was based was only undertaken on one day in the week, when it is understood that Belton House was closed.

The transport modelling underpinning the LDF Core Strategy found that a large urban extension at this location was likely to lead to severe congestion along the A607 corridor. Whilst the TA includes mitigation measures such as junction improvements, Travel Plan and a shuttle bus, the HA were unable to say that based on the information submitted, there will not be an undue adverse impact on the safety and convenience of users of the public highway or that the capacity of the existing road infrastructure can cope with the additional traffic arising from the proposed development.

To meet the concerns of the HA further data and analysis was submitted by the applicant's transport advisors. This information comprised detailed analyses of the performance of Town Centre junctions and the results of new traffic surveys carried out 14 September 2010 (counting vehicle queuing at junctions along the A607 from Belton Lane to Hill Avenue) and 5 October 2010 (counting Peak Hour 'Turning Movements' at the same junctions.

On considering the additional data and proposals provided, the HA found shortcomings in some of the analysis and concluded that the detail provided and mitigating measures proposed did not allay their concerns. Therefore, the HA still request refusal of the proposal, as it is considered that the traffic generated by the proposed development would have an adverse impact on through traffic in Grantham, its approaches and junctions and be a likely source of unacceptable danger to other users of the highway, particularly because of the heavy volumes of traffic.

The Highway Authority refusal reason is supported by your officers and many of the objectors to the proposal. The location of the site would result in significant additional car movements on Manthorpe Road and through the town centre with no opportunity for significant new highway infrastructure to mitigate this impact.

Employment

The application does not include a significant specific employment element and this is considered to diminish the value of the proposal as a 'mixed and sustainable' in the terms set out in PPS 1 and PPS 3. This point is discussed in the officer evaluation above under the Development Plan etc. heading, where it is argued that the Manthorpe site is probably not sufficiently large and not wholly suitable in terms of location and setting to meet the full range of requirements of a Sustainable Urban Extension.

However, there would be employment created on the site if the proposal was to go ahead in the submitted form; sources of employment would, if a the services and facilities in the

DAS were to provided, include: a neighbourhood centre; local convenience store (380m²); small retail/service sector units (up to 5 No. 80m² each); Live/Work units (up to 12 No.); Doctors Surgery and Pharmacy; Primary School - single form entry; Nursery ("Surestart") up to 35 places.

Community facilities, including Open space and recreation

The Community facilities, commercial and community run, proposed in the application as submitted comprise, as set out in the DAS: a neighbourhood centre: local convenience store (380m²); small retail/service sector units (up to 5 No., 80m² each; Hotel and public house; Doctors Surgery and Pharmacy (although the application states subject to PCT demand and support); Primary School - single form entry, approx. 1 hectare site; Nursery ("Surestart") up to 35 places; Community Hall (90m²); "Market Hall" style covered shelter (bus drop-off, meeting point); a new shuttle bus would link the site to the town centre. Open space and recreation: Full size football pitch; Cricket pitch; Tennis courts, 3 No. all weather; Bowling Green; centrally accessible NEAP, LEAP and LAP in close proximity to neighborhoods; areas of informal open space and woodland; a pedestrian / cycle only access would connect with the existing NCN route 22; a Travel Plan would be provided for the main land uses on site; community car and cycle parking would be provided in accordance with LCC standards.

The LCC Children's Services and Lincolnshire NHS, have set out the requirements for facilities and financial contributions, in relation to school, early years, youth service and Primary Health Care, that should be sought through any Section 106 Agreement. Lincolnshire NHS is in disagreement with the proposals of the applicant that no contributions should be sought for Primary Care facilities off-site; and, in principle, your officers agree with LNHS that it can be appropriate to provide such contributions. However, it is not considered that this should be a reason for refusal of the application at this stage and that this would be a matter for further consideration and negotiation should an approval be granted for developing the site for new housing

Your officers responsible for play provision state that. To meet the LA's standards for play provision, the proposed development would require 1 NEAP, 1 LEAP, and 1 DPS (aka LAP) in locations to be agreed. The cost of such provision would the requirement is 1 NEAP, 3 LEAPS and 8 LAPS for 1800 dwellings were to be implemented on the site, it could be appropriate to provide 1 further LEAP and 3 or 4 DMS/LAPS). This would be a matter for negotiation in the context of S106 Agreement.

Sport England has no objection to the proposal subject to appropriate planning conditions, section 106 and community use agreement (in relation to school sports facilities) to meet needs of existing and new population for sport and active recreation.

Infrastructure and Utilities:

The proposal would include a variety of services and infrastructure works over and above routine provision; these include: a number of pedestrian and cycle routes – green routes connecting with off-site locations; the removal of the overhead power lines and pylons; Sustainable Urban Drainage systems (SUDs); new highway works, including a new '4 way roundabout' site access, off-site junction works at two sites on the A607, Manthorpe road

Flood Risk and the water environment

Following assessment, the proposed development is not considered to be at significant risk from flooding. As a result of the increase in impermeable area, the site has the potential to increase surface water runoff which could cause surface flooding. To mitigate this effect, Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) would be used to hold the surface water and allow it to drain back into watercourses and into the ground, thus preventing flooding. A separate flood risk assessment document was also submitted.

The assessment confirmed that impacts upon ground and surface water, during the development, would be of negligible to medium significance. General pollution prevention measures will be adopted, these will include following best practice codes and ensuring good site working practices and procedures. In addition, all mitigation measures will be set out within a Construction Method Statement and an Environmental Management Plan prior to works starting on the site.

The Environment Agency objected to the proposed development because the proposed development would involve a connection to the main foul sewerage system which would pose an unacceptable risk to water quality. The EA considered whether a Grampian Condition in respect of foul sewerage, would be acceptable but the necessary information has not been provided and EA consider that it is premature to conclude that further capacity can be made available within the next 3 years. In line with the precautionary principle advocated in PPS 23, the EA maintains its objection until further certainty can be demonstrated.

The EA have withdrawn its initial objection on flood risk grounds, subject to various conditions. A Site Waste Management Plan would be required before development commencement.

Anglian Water state that it has sufficient water resource capacity, but development should accord with Code for Sustainable Homes to ensure high water efficiency standards. The foul sewerage system could not accommodate flows at present but further capacity is expected to be available in the lifetime of the application and condition is recommended to ensure phased development accords with improvements in sewerage network. Waste water would be dealt with at Marston Sewage treatment works which has capacity for these flows. The Running Furrows watercourse is under the control of the Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board and they recommend conditions and informatives are attached to any consent that may be issued.

Other material considerations and other any issues put forward in representations not already covered

These will be addressed as necessary in the Addendum to this report.

Crime and Disorder Implications

The application will not raise any significant issues, although the Lincolnshire Police recommends that a condition is attached requiring measures to minimise the risk of crime and to meet specific security needs of the application site and development. If this application were to be approved, this is an issue that would be dealt with in a detailed

Masterplan, which would be required before any Reserved Matters applications could be considered

Human Rights Implications

Articles 6 (Right to fair decision making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) of the Human Rights Act have been taken into account in considering this application and in making the recommendation. It is considered that no relevant Article of that the Human Rights Act have been breached in arriving at the recommendation or will be breached by the decision, whether that is to be for refusal or approval.

Recommendation/Decision Options

For the reasons discussed and set out above your Officers do not consider that they can reasonably recommend approval of the application. If Members are minded to approve the application, it will be necessary, subject to general guidance from Members at the meeting as to the reason(s) for approval, for the decision be deferred to allow for a report to be made to Members at the next appropriate Committee meeting, in order for your officers to prepare fully detailed reasoning and wording for the formal Reason(s) for Approval and to prepare a comprehensive set of Conditions for the approval of Members. Thereafter, if Members resolve that they are minded to approve the application, the issuing of the grant of permission would have to be deferred for negotiations with the applicant to prepare Draft Section 106 Obligation Agreement for Member approval, and other documents submitted in support of the application for example the Masterplan (Note in the case of the other SUEs, this document is to be in the form of an SPD) and possibly also to deal with a number of further issues relating to matters not addressed fully or sufficiently in the application as it has been submitted, including matters raised by consultees.

This is a very large and strategically important application, so it is vital that the decision is not rushed and is fully thought through in all respects. However, it is considered by your officers essential also that the application be considered and determined as soon as possible. A strong reason for urgency, is the stage that has been reached in the Local Development Framework process, in particular in respect of the Grantham Area Action Plan DPD. Therefore, though Reasons for Refusal are only outlined below, it is intended that fully detailed Reasons for Refusal be submitted in an addendum to this report.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be refused

That the development proposed at North Grantham/Manthorpe and the subject of the planning application reference No. S10/0142/EIAOL, be refused for the reasons set out in the Addendum to this report which will relate to the general outline terms relating to the material considerations set out below:

1. Planning Policy

Contrary to National Policy relation to the Plan Led System.

Contrary to the Development Plan: Regional Plan and Core Strategy policies on strategic housing growth.

Prematurity with regard to Grantham Area Action Plan DPD – notwithstanding possible marginal shortfalls in the 5-year housing land supply in the District.

2. Heritage

Detrimental to Grade I heritage assets at Belton Park and Belton House and their setting.

3. Highways/Transport/Traffic

On considering the additional data and proposals provided by the applicant it is considered that there are significant shortcomings in some of the analysis and that the detail provided and mitigating measures proposed do not meet concerns of the Highway Authority and it is considered that the traffic generated by the proposed development would have an adverse impact on through traffic in Grantham, its approaches and junctions and be a likely source of unacceptable danger to other users of the highway, particularly because of the heavy volumes of traffic.

* * * * *

Addendum to Report CM1 – S10/0142/EIAOL (North Grantham – Manthorpe)

Residential development for at least 1000 dwellings together with associated development on Land to the north of Grantham (bounded by the East Coast main railway line, by Belton Lane and High Road (A607), Manthorpe), Lincs.

Reasons for and matters covered in the Addendum report

This application is for a large, complex and controversial development. It has attracted a great deal of interest and comment from the public and is the subject of a large numbers of responses from a wide range of other interests, including statutory consultees. The reasons for the long period of consideration by officers before presenting the application to the Development Control Committee are outlined in the main report and the need for this Addendum is referred to in that report. In the Addendum five topics are focussed on, as follows:

Firstly, the Addendum deals with the submission by the applicants of information and views concerning the reasons for objection, by several consultation respondents, to the proposed development on grounds relating to the impact that it would be likely to have on its setting. It also seeks to remedy the fact that the applicants had not taken account of several policy documents relevant to these and related matters. This section of the Addendum summarises the key points addressed by the applicants in the Supplementary Design Report (SDR) and Revised Illustrative Masterplan (RIM) and the responses from various bodies consulted on these documents.

Secondly, the Addendum addresses the reassessments of the likely impacts of the proposal on the physical setting of the site presented in the SDR, which have led to revisions being made to the originally submitted Illustrative Masterplan. The RIM includes an enhanced landscape framework, Green Infrastructure Strategy and some rearrangement/relocation of land use elements, for example the neighbourhood centre and main playing fields area. Some respondents have made comments on this aspect of the new material.

Thirdly, the Addendum includes detailed Reasons for Refusal.

Fourthly, there are two letters submitted on behalf of the applicants attached as Appendix 1 and Appendix 2; one from Colin Buchanan

The Supplementary Design Report (SDR) and Revised Illustrative Masterplan (RIM)

(The full text of these documents are on the SKDC web site; all the other documents referred to the SDR can be accessed either through the SKDC website or others, such as the 'Communities and Local Government' site.)

The applicants state that the SDR and RIM constitute a comprehensive response to certain consultation responses, notably English Heritage, Natural England, The National Trust and SKDC's Conservation Officer. " ... Specifically they have sought to address the evidence base and analytical deficiencies of the material submitted with the Planning Application highlighted by these consultees." The applicants also state that the SDR and RIM are "... principally concerned with the issues of: place making; heritage (notably the setting of Belton House and Parkland and of Manthorpe Conservation Area); landscape and green infrastructure." The Report draws upon information and guidance in the

“Belton House Park Setting Study and Policy Development Study” (BHPS) January 2010 – SKDC and The National Trust), Planning Policy Statement PPS5: “Planning for the Historic Environment” (and the associated “Historic Planning Practice Guide”), Conservation Area Appraisals for the Manthorpe CA and the Belton CA, the Core Strategy for South Kesteven and other relevant documents relating to the historic environment.

In the SDR it is stated that: “... it is crucial to understand the difference between the Application Site and the extent of the proposed developed area within it as reflected in the Masterplan.” It is recognised: “... that in order to render major development in this location acceptable, great care is required in setting the amount and location of the built development and that extensive areas of (landscaped) open space are required both to integrate that development into the inherited landscape (specifically with reference to the local heritage assets and to meet the wider community’s need for open air recreation and leisure.”

The applicants state that though the RIM is ‘illustrative’ (reflecting the need to retain flexibility at the application stage, they: “... remain content to accede to a planning condition formalising the Masterplan as the basis of the subsequent development of the Site, supported by a Development and Design Brief (also secured by a planning condition) prepared in consultation with key stakeholders.”

The SDR goes on to deal with “*An Overview of the Heritage Issues*”; “*Additional Assessed Views*”; “*Landscape Framework/Green Infrastructure Enhancement*”; “*Revised Masterplan*”; “*Conclusion*”. These sections: “... augment the evidence base supporting the proposal and informed the amended Masterplan ... Specific concerns articulated by consultees have been explicitly addressed.”

“An Overview of the Heritage Issues”

“In the light of the consultee responses a full review of the heritage documentation ... has been undertaken and the conditions on the ground have been thoroughly re-examined.”

The applicants state that, though the various historic elements are assessed separately for ease of reference, the approach “... is in fact a fact a holistic one which recognises and accepts that the proposed urban extension is situated in an historical landscape where there are a significant number of heritage assets (undesigned as well as designated), the character and setting of which need to be respected.” They note that most green field development, including the two Sue’s in Grantham would have an impact on an historic environment; it is accepted as “undeniable” that the proposal would impact on the registered park, but so also “... would the proposed NW Quadrant ...” as stated in the BHPS.” The applicants cite guidance in PPS5 and “Capitalising on Inherited Landscape” (October 2009, an EH/HCA publication) “... to emphasise that the Application should not be rejected out of hand simply because it involves some change, as some of the Application consultees suggest.”

In dealing with the impact on the Conservation Areas, the applicants affirm that there is “... clearly no effect on the Belton CA”. They go on to note that the Manthorpe CA Appraisal “... pays little attention to the designated area’s wider setting...” and makes no reference “... the historic parkland ... “. “It is the considered professional view of the Applicants’ Design Team that ... “the revised proposal “... does not have a significant

impact on the character and appearance of the Manthorpe CA ... “and most certainly does not erode the sense of separation between Manthorpe and Grantham (as suggested by EH). It is acknowledged that the original proposal could impact visually on the open space between Manthorpe Grange and on Manthorpe Grange, St Johns church and Rectory, this has been addressed in the RIM by placing new built development further away, changing its character to lower density detached properties in extensive, well landscaped grounds adding new planting of individual trees and woodland. These measures are intended to enhance the setting of the village setting and ensure a distinct separation between the development and the village in a way that did not happen during past phases of Grantham’s expansion. The northern approaches to the CA would remain generally a rural one, with landscaping measures separating and screening the new development to the west.

The starting point for the SDR assessment of the impact of the proposal on the ‘The Registered Park’, is the wide definition of ‘setting’ adopted in PPS5 (Annex 2 and EH’s ‘Setting of Heritage Assets’). In this context and taking note of the detailed study in the ‘Belton House Park Setting Study and Policy Development Study’ (BHPS), the applicants express surprise at the lack of reference in consultee comments of “... the large visitor car park directly in front of the house, the extensive golf course in the south eastern part of the registered park or the clear views from Belmont Tower and its vicinity towards what ... “ is referred to in the BHPS “... as the ‘nearby hotel’ (Belton Woods Hotel Golf Club. ... This latter is an area of land dominated by a further golf course and series of holiday chalets dotting the slope of the hill up towards the tunnelled railway line to the west. ... Indeed even the [BHPS] is strangely reticent on all these aspects and the impact they have on the Grade I listed house, the registered park and the various other listed structures in the grounds, ... Another significant issue similarly ignored ... is the constant traffic noise from the A607 and the impact that this has on visitors’ appreciation of the western part of the park. ... all have a considerably greater adverse impact on the setting of the registered park than the proposed development. Importantly, though this clearly does not in itself mean that the SUE proposals are acceptable in heritage terms, these are, nevertheless, all material considerations in assessing the marginal impact of the proposed development on the setting of the Park”

“Additional Assessed Views”

A series of photographs, supplementing those already submitted, have been taken for the purposes of the SDR; they “ ... represent explicit *additional* analysis in response to key consultee comments and have been prepared to give greater clarity to the Design Team’s understanding of the specific relevance to the setting ... the development within the inherited landscape. This has, in turn, informed the amended Masterplan.” Necessarily, the views do not take account of enhancements to the landscape framework in the RIM, “... which are explicitly intended to screen, filter out, or reduce the impact of some of these views. Maps/Diagrams are included in the SDR to identify the viewpoints, the extent of visible ground, and features that contain views ...” For each view consideration is given to: “the setting of the proposed development area within the landscape and what parts of it can be perceived, understood and actually seen from Belton Park ...the setting of Belton park and what parts of the proposed development area cab be seen from the Park looking out.” A booklet of minor changes to the annotations for photographs and additional information on maps were submitted for the applicant on 9 December 2010 tom address some criticisms from EH and NT. The assessed views A-J, with short summarised comments are:

- A - Roof of Belton House and from Visitors entrance, looking south: no part of Site visible (note: no part of the Site is visible from the House – see view H).
- B - Belton Park, looking west towards the Site from half way down southern avenue: limited parts of Site visible, but only glimpsed from registered park through foreground mature vegetation.
- C - Base of Belmont Tower, 47 metres higher than Site high point, looking west towards Site: Site central ridge, central hedge (part), half lower field north seen.
- D - Corner of Brickkiln Plantation, Belton Lane, looking east towards Belton Park: representative of transitory serial views travelling along Belton Lane; little seen of Site through few gaps in boundary hedge.
- E - Belton Lane east edge of Great Gonerby, looking east towards Belton Park: again representative of transitory serial views travelling along Belton Lane; central hedge and NW quarter of Site glimpsed from upper part of road; small parts of Park visible.
- F - Great Gonerby, from public footpath 32 metres above Site high point, near south east edge of village, looking west towards Site and Belton Park; central hedge and most of west half of Site seen
- G - Within the Site (near middle/high point), looking west towards Great Gonerby; shows containing scarp and woodland features; housing area to south east...
- H - Within the Site, (near middle) looking east: clear views to St Johns Church, Belmont Tower just visible between containing wooded scarp; lower parts Belton Park not seen.
- I - South of St Johns Church, looking west towards Site, Manthorpe Grange centre of view; shows rural setting, small strip of Site visible below wooded horizon, housing frames view to south, Ryedale Close houses seen in the distance.
- J - East side of High Road at a Park entrance, looking north: strategic view of proposed Site entrance area, framed by mature vegetation, no views through to Belton Park, establishes rural setting north of Manthorpe CA; foreground views into Site (note: area to be landscaped) and above trees to east quarter of Site.

The aims of the assessment of views are: to show that a thorough appraisal has now been carried out and to that the implications for specific 'setting' (impact) issues have been considered. "Whilst it remains the considered view of the Applicant's professional team that ... the mixed use urban extension - would not cause harm to interests of acknowledged importance, including, heritage issues, consideration of the additional analysis **has** informed amendments to the Masterplan so as to mitigate the minimal impact of the development."

Later in the SDR the issue the likely impact on the Site setting of the proposed new roundabout junction to provide vehicular access to the Site from the A607, but which would also rearrange the A607/Belton Lane junction is dealt with. It is stated that there would be "...an opportunity to rationalise the present clutter of street furniture, including light columns associated with the existing junction. Modern, energy efficient street lamps will significantly reduce light spillage and glare along the A607 corridor, benefitting both Belton Park and Manthorpe Village heritage assets. New planting would be incorporated in the re-alignment of High Road and Belton Lane at the reconfigured roundabout junction, would screen roads, the new junction and development areas in views out of the registered parkland.

"Landscape Framework/Green Infrastructure Enhancement" "Revised Masterplan"
The amendments to the original Masterplan that have resulted in the RIM are:

Substantial woodland planting is added in several places on the Site; whilst providing screening and breaking up views into the Site from the registered parkland, this would also provide opportunities for informal recreation, including attractive additional links in the public footpath network for locals and visitors and habitat enhancements. Key areas of such planting are: along the northern boundary with Belton Lane, forming a strong 'defensible boundary to the setting of Grantham and channelling key views from the registered parkland; along the railway; an extensive block in the northeast corner associated with the principal vehicular access to the Site (an 'off-line' roundabout on a realigned A607) and between the proposed hotel and housing, would further break up views from the registered park to the east

- Relocation of sports/school fields to replace housing from higher parts of the Site, which is visible in long distance views from Belmont Tower. These predominantly open green areas, would display an apparently rural character when seen in long distance views. Within the Site these areas together with, woodland, a SUDS corridor and retention of a significant hedgerow, would form a strong green spine for public use, leading to the Neighbourhood Centre and pedestrian links to outside the Site.
 - To the west, another green SUDS corridor follows a mature hedgerow; this would help Breakup the scale of the development and provide another footpath link.
 - The significant utilisation and enhancement of water courses along the Running Furrows and Gonerby Brook would not only contribute to alleviation of flood risk, but would result in the creation of wet land and associated habitats and a diversity of green infrastructure accessible to and linking with housing areas within and outside the Site.
 - Planting in the proposed open space to the north of St Johns Church, bounded by the Running Furrows would be reinforced – two small woodland blocks and tree groups rather than individual 'parkland' trees. This would screen and soften views across the Site from the A607, would relate to other proposed planting north of Manthorpe Grange and to the north east and would ... develop the sense of place and enhance the setting of the Church and Manthorpe Conservation Area."
 - Single-storey development between Manthorpe Grange and Ryedale Close; large low-density detached houses, in well landscaped grounds next to Manthorpe Grange; reduced housing numbers by Running Furrows at site entrance to preserve rural setting.
- The RIM would provide a modest reduction in overall unit numbers as follows:
Family Houses - 850; Apartments (over commercial units in Neighbourhood Centre) 20; Dedicated Retirement/Bungalows - 40; CCRC Units - 105; Nursing Home - 60 beds;
Total Units - 1050

It is intended that the "... the informal and natural character of these new landscapes and enhanced habitats ..." would provide the basis for "... a series of Local Nature Reserves ..." that could be locally managed, involving local conservation groups and community. The new 'Green Infrastructure' and footpath/cycle network would constitute a significant improvement to this northern part of Grantham and "... should be contrasted with the existing land use – intensive arable farming – and with the present paucity of wildlife habitats, with the existing shortage of open space ... and with the limited access that the Site currently possesses." The SDR and the RIM are aimed at addressing the concerns of Natural England that the "... Green Infrastructure elements embodied in the proposal were not clear. This additional material, informed by the work outlined above on impact heritage assets and also an appraisal of the South Kesteven Green Infrastructure Strategy (April 2009) and the consequent Landscape Framework/Green Infrastructure proposals set out in the SDR and illustrated in the RIM are aimed providing that clarity.

“Conclusion”

The format of the ‘Conclusion’ is to respond to recommendations in the ‘Belton House and Park Setting Study’, as to the “way forward” for dealing with applications affecting the setting of Belton Park, to show how “... the revised Masterplan proposals satisfy the overriding issues.” The recommendations are used as headings in the “Conclusion”.

“intrude on key historical and designed views” - It “has been demonstrated through views taken and analysed in Chapter 3.0 that the proposed development would only have a minor impact on historic views and on the setting of the registered parkland, mainly from higher parts of the ...” [site] “(where views of the existing built-up area of Grantham and of the proposed North West Quadrant development are also available) and that there would be no intervisibility between Belton House and the development. At such locations, where it is visible, the Application Site is relatively remote from the parkland and visually separated by existing trees, revealing narrow strip views within mature landscape structures which will filter or completely screen views of the development.” Locating “... development away from more elevated/visible parts of the Application Site (which will be used mainly for open space or community facilities (e.g. school) and using structural landscaping and complementary building materials will mitigate visual impacts;”.

“degrade the open nature of key views” - the RIM “... takes account of open views within the site and retains these through the open public areas;”

“require the loss of important woodland areas” - “the proposal does not involve removal of woodland areas, rather it involves the creation of extensive new woodland areas comprised of native species as part of a planned and managed landscape enhancement;”.

“breach important ridge lines” - “from the topographic and photographic evidence shows that the development of the Site will not break above important ridge lines already identified for strategically important historic and designed views. ... such that the development will blend rather than intrude upon and dominate the wider setting;”

“visually dominate the setting” - Care “... has been taken through the assessment and design process ...: to locate new built development to minimise its perceived scale and impact; to provide extensive structural planting areas especially on the perimeter of the Site so as to provide visual containment and screening; within the Site to break development areas into smaller cells, contained by planted and landscaped buffer zones that also provide green corridors; and to optimise and enhance the existing natural assets of the Site;”. “The overall effect of the measures adopted will be to severely limit both views of the proposed built development and the ‘consciousness’ of urban development for those in the vicinity of the Site, including those within Belton House and the surrounding registered parkland and within the Manthorpe Conservation Area. Both of these factors will limit the impact of the development on the setting of these heritage assets.”

“significantly degrade the rural character of adjacent areas” – It “... is accepted that an area in rural land use will be replaced by urban development if planning permission were to be granted, but it is accepted that greenfield sites are needed to meet

development requirements. Even allowing for the full development of the two major SUEs provided for in the LDF Core Strategy, a significant number of houses still need to be provided (through the ... Grantham AAP). Moreover, apart from the quality of openness, the Application Site has little to commend it as an area of rural character worthy of protection against loss in its own right. ... the Site displays the typical characteristics of land subject to intensive monoculture ...” The SDR analysis “... shows that the development site makes use of natural topography, new structural planting and landscaping and enhance biodiversity to best effect”; it also shows that the “... rural character of adjacent areas is not degraded, this outcome being achieved mainly through the medium of providing open space in key locations within the Site where the rural character of adjoining land is most sensitive and noticeable and by new planting and landscaping to reinforce the character where it is weakest.”

Summary of material responses from various bodies consulted on the Supplementary Design Report (SDR) and Revised Illustrative Masterplan (RIM)

(Note: Comments that are simply repetitions of previous concerns/objections are not included).

List of respondents (abbreviations of their titles are in brackets)

Great Gonerby PC (GGPC)
Belton & Manthorpe PC (BMPC)
English Heritage (EH)
National Trust (NT)
Natural England (NE)
SKDC Conservation (SKCO)

Historic Setting/Heritage Assets

Pleased “that the applicants have now had regard to documents overlooked in the original submission, the adopted Belton House and Park Setting Study and Policy Development document and both Belton and Manthorpe Conservation Area documents.” Also “...note that regard has been taken of PPS5 and the Draft Guidance on Setting, both published since the application was originally submitted.

Despite the well conceived landscape proposals these cannot obscure that Manthorpe and the green open setting of Belton Park are compromised (GGPC). The amended plans have not addressed the issue of the impact on the environment. (BMPC)

The introduction of PPS5 and the accompanying Practice Guide, along with EH guidance on setting of heritage assets, strengthen the argument against this development. The registered park is now on EH’s Heritage at Risk Register (HAR July 2010) due to the expansion of Grantham to the south, with unresolved Core Strategy issues and a live planning application; the HAR emphasises EH concerns regarding the substantial harm that development could cause to Belton House/Park and its setting. (EH)

Note that the SDR and RIM seek to address representations made on the application regarding impact of the development on the Belton House and Park; The views analysis helps to clarify the intervisibility of the Site and from specific viewpoints. Welcome the additional assessment work and review of current planning guidance and policy and analysis of views that informs RIM. Acknowledge attempt to reduce harm on the historic environment in terms of layout, scale and landscaping. (EH)

"It is noted that at the time [of the the Views Assessment was undertaken for the applicants] the deciduous tree and hedges were still in full leaf. In terms of the inter-visibility between various parts of the Belton Estate (including its approaches and the application site, this is greater between autumn leaf fall and the next year's spring leaf opening. The Atkins study (BHPS) demonstrates the greater extent of inter-visibility having been based on several visits during the winter months." Examples are: View C from the viewing tower at Belmont – demonstrating "...that for much of the year there is in fact far greater intervisibility than" suggested in the SDR; similarly for "Views D and E [the SDR] suggests a more limited view for people approaching from Belton Lane from the east for much of the year. In the BHPS along this route "...there are views into much of the Park", contrastingly sharply with the "very narrow field of view into Belton Park" as suggested for Views D and E in the SDR. (NT)

"The assessment of additional views to those taken into account in the original submission adds to the thoroughness of the visual impact analysis but, as the photographs demonstrate, the assessment only presents the situation when deciduous trees and hedges are in leaf. Views are, of course, subject to seasonal variations and the development would, inevitably, be more readily exposed to view in winter months. "The development would be particularly prominent in views of the registered Historic Park and Garden from some of the assessed vantage points, particularly those from the higher ground to the west." (SKCO)

The SDR assessment is submitted "...based upon what ground was visible in late summer. Clearly development above ground level will also be visible in other areas, including during the summer months, as its height will result in it being seen above and through the existing tree and hedge cover from various vantage points. Accordingly the assessment of available views of ground level during the summer does not equate to the impact of the proposed development either during the summer or during the period when vegetation is not in full leaf." (NT)

The views analysis reveals visual impacts, with the development viewed from a number of locations within the park (e.g. Views B and C). There would also be views of the development from the west, e.g. the approach along Belton Lane (View E), a key visitor access route, also from public footpath south east of Great Gonerby (View F). The appreciation and understanding of Belton Park from these viewpoints would be harmed by the proposed development. (EH)

Despite RIM changes, the overall size, scale, layout and landscaping of the proposed development would harm the setting of the registered Belton Park and Garden. Acknowledge housing would be kept away from site high points, most notably by repositioning of open spaces and neighbourhood centre, but Views such as B, C, E and F, suggest that there would be an impact on significant views to and from Belton Park. Also repositioning of housing (e.g. Cell 11) closer to Belton Lane, (View D) suggests that proximity, height, scale and lighting of development here would probably impact on the setting and appreciation of the Park. (EH)

The proposed landscaping itself has the potential to cause damage the setting and impede views of the Park. (EH)

The SDR assesses primarily visual relationships rather than the harder to analyse impact on setting, in terms of factors such as noise, dust, vibration and lighting – but these are important, thus the development would affect the overall character of the locality, bringing urban development closer to the park to the detriment of its setting and significance.(EH)

The SDR refers to the impact of existing development on the setting of the registered park. While a number of developments in the Park surroundings are unsympathetic and have gradually eroded its setting, this does not undermine the Park's significance such that it requires deregistration or downgrading from its Grade 1 status. Do not agree that this existing development has a considerably greater adverse impact than the proposed development would have; rather, the proposal would have a greater adverse impact by virtue of its size, scale, layout and landscaping, which would exacerbate the erosion of the park's setting. (EH)

“Contrary to para. 6.3 of the [SDR] it has not been demonstrated that there would be only minor impacts on historic views and setting – in particular there has been no assessment of relative sensitivities of the application site in the context of Belton and no consideration of the scale and impact of the proposed building masses, e.g. the scale and resultant visibility of the public house element, or of the neighbourhood centre.” (NT)

“Overall it is considered that the latest assessment has failed to consider the full significance of the heritage assets at Belton and as a result has also failed to provide a proportionate response to the (understated) extent of the adverse impacts.” Whilst acknowledging the value of the BHPS, the SDR has not “... achieved the ambition of responding positively to its recommendations and criteria...”(NT)

“The comments [in the SDR] regarding the impacts of other developments and features upon the setting of Belton are noted.” Many are of long standing. “... the car parking at Belton is essential to enable people to visit, appreciate and understand the exceptional heritage resource as well as procure the means to conserve it .. significant steps have been taken this year to reduce the impact of car parking in accordance with planning permission S09/1841/MJNF ...” “it is neither the intention nor the expectation that the setting of Belton will somehow be ‘put back’ to what it was at some historic date; however, where opportunities occur to enhance the setting of Belton these will be pursued.” (NT)

“Mitigation relating to the A607 and its impact on Belton are noted, although the perceived benefits will be significantly reduced as a result of the increased traffic resulting from the proposed development.” (NT) (SKCO)

“The night time urbanising effect of lighting associated with the proposed development, not only from street lighting and the light from buildings within the site but also from lighting associated with the remodelled junction of Belton Lane and the A607, that is very close to the Park.” (SKCO)

In the context of PPS5 “...the impacts of the wider settings of heritage assets are relevant considerations ... whether or not they are open to the public. The fact that large parts of the Belton Estate are open to the public [approaching 250,000 visitors each year] add an extra dimension to the sensitivity of the potential impacts of new developments ...”

The additional analysis seems to indicate that the impact on setting of Manthorpe CA would be less than proposals submitted with the application. Further detail would be needed at Reserved Matters stage, but reduced scale of development in south east corner of Site and added landscaping shown in RIM would probably help limit harm to setting of CA. (EH)

The amendments the RIM make a significant effort to address concerns raised in the original consultation responses. Agree "...with the specialist's conclusion that Belton Conservation Area would not be impacted upon by the proposed development and ... acknowledge the impact on Manthorpe Conservation Area has been lessened by the reduction in the amount of development proposed for the part of the site nearest to the village and an increase in landscaping, albeit indicative at this stage." (SKCO)

If it is decided that the expansion of Grantham's urban area is acceptable in this area, it will be necessary to ensure that screen planting is implemented well in advance of the construction of roads and buildings so as to fulfill its purpose from the outset. (SKCO)

The Natural Environment

Amendments to the RIM and "the improved integration of Green Infrastructure within the development" and the reduced landscape impacts are welcomed and objections to the proposal (as revised) are removed subject to specified conditions. (NE)

Planning Policy

The proposal continues to be contrary to national policy and guidance. PPS5 and the Practice Guide strengthen the concept of 'setting', defined in Annex 2 as "the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. PPS5 Policy HE10.1 states "the greater the negative impact on the significance of heritage assets, the greater the benefits that will be needed to justify approval ". Paras 113 to 117 of the Practice Guide explain that setting is more than just visual aspects, i.e more than just the views to and from Belton House and Park - e.g. it includes spatial associations and historic associations.

PP5 Policy HE9.1 states that there should be a presumption in favour of conserving heritage assets, the more significant the designated asset the stronger the presumption; substantial harm to grade 1 and 11* registered parks and gardens should be wholly exceptional. Policy HE9.2, states that where the application would lead to substantial harm LA's should refuse consent unless substantial public benefits associated with the development outweigh the harm. Paragraph 91 of the PPS Practice Guide, is quoted, which refers to no other reasonable means of the public benefits being available e.g. through a different design or an alternative site. It is argued that the proposal would cause substantial harm to the Grade 1 registered Belton Park, that the public benefits associated with the proposal do not outweigh the harm to Belton Park and the public benefits of providing additional housing in Grantham can be delivered elsewhere. (EH) (SKCO)

Specific attention is drawn to relevant advice in PPS5 (March 2010) at Policies HE6.1, H7.1-HE7.5, HE9.1/9.2/9.4 and HE10. (NT)

The Core Strategy (CS) has been adopted since the application was submitted; the CS is silent regarding the Manthorpe Site and it would be contrary to the very recent up-to-date development plan. (NT) Adoption of SK Core strategy and publication of the Belton House and Park Setting Study are important considerations in assessing the application. (EH)

Expansion of Grantham well catered for with two SUEs, wrong to despoil another area prematurely. (GGPC).

Though the Site is to be included in a range of sites for new housing to be considered in the GAAP; this does not mean that the Site is acceptable as there are constraints to be overcome including the historic environment; with regard to criteria in PPS3 (Housing) the Site is not “suitable”, regardless of whether it or other sites are “available” or “achievable” (EH)

Core Strategy Policy E1 is relevant, whereby “development must be appropriate to the character and significant natural, historic and cultural attributes and features of the landscape within which it is situated, and contribute to its conservation, enhancement and restoration”. According to the criteria of the policy the proposal is contrary to Policy EN1. (EH)

Attention is drawn the references to historic assets,, visual intrusion, light pollution and protection of existing open space (including that important to the character, setting and separation of built-up areas; these “considerations are all directly relevant to the Manthorpe proposals, especially in the context of the impacts upon the designate heritage assets at Belton ... para 4.1.13 makes specific reference to the role of the setting study for Belton House and Park2. (NT)

As stated in the Core Strategy the Belton House and Park Setting Study (BHPS) is a material consideration in determining the application. In the BHPS the setting (in terms of views) of Belton Park is found to be exceptionally sensitive to major development of the Application Site and that the Site is unlikely to be suitable for the proposed form of development (Table 2). (EH)

The site is outside the core strategy plan for South Kesteven District. (GGPC)

The amended plans have not addressed the issues as regards traffic, sewerage or the environment; This level of development should only be considered when traffic is relieved by A1/A52 link road (GGPC).

Outline recommendations of respondents to the consultation on the SDR and RIM

Great Gonerby P.C. maintain their objection to the proposed development
English Heritage recommend that the application be refused based on its impact on the historic environment, particularly the setting of Belton Park. It would cause substantial harm to the setting and significance of Belton Park which should only be allowed in wholly exceptional cases (following Policy HE9.1 of PPS5). We do not believe that the substantial harm is outweighed by substantial public benefits (following Policies HE9.2 and HE10.1 of PPS5) and we believe that the proposed public benefits in terms of

providing additional housing for Grantham can be delivered elsewhere on other sites. The development is also contrary to Policy EN1 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy in terms of its impact on the character and historic environment of the district. recommend that the application.

The NT maintains its objections and remains of the view that the proposed development is contrary to the adopted Development Plan and to national planning policy for the historic environment, both of which have changed since the application was first submitted. Having regard for the significance of the heritage resources at Belton and the impact of the proposals upon them, the applicant has not demonstrated that the development would “deliver substantial public benefits” that outweigh the substantial harm to their significance including the changes to their setting (as per the tests in PPS 5 at Policies HE9.2 and HE10.1).

Natural England are happy to remove their objection subject to specific conditions relating to: A clear explanation of the long term management of each habitat being provided, including likely prescriptions and ownership; demonstration of security of funding in perpetuity for Green Infrastructure; a Method Statement detailing steps to be taken to protect and enhance the Site for protected species, during construction and after completion (including consideration for bats); no site clearance that destroys vegetation to be undertaken during the months March to August (protection of breeding birds. NE reserves its statutory discretion to modify advice in response to any changes related to this consultation.

SKPCO remains of the opinion that the proposal represents an undesirable and unwarranted expansion of urban development into an area where there will be a negative impact on heritage assets of international, national and local importance. It remains the case that there are other sites available for the urban expansion of Grantham in areas of the town where there would be significantly less impact on Belton House and its registered Historic Park and Garden and other designated and undesignated historic assets. The proposal should be resisted for its overall negative impact on the historic environment that would be contrary to central, regional and local government planning policies on the Historic Environment in PPS5, Policy 27 of the East Midlands Regional Plan, Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy of the South Kesteven Local Development Framework and the adopted Belton House and Park Setting Study.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be refused

That the development proposed at North Grantham/Manthorpe, the subject of the planning application reference No. S10/0142/EIAOL, be refused for the reasons set out in this Addendum below:

1. The application proposal is considered by the Local Planning Authority to be contrary to National Policy in respect of the advice in planning Policy Guidance Note PPS1 (including Paragraphs 7 and 8), that to deliver sustainable development decisions must be made within a ‘plan-led system, that gives certainty and predictability; with plans being drawn up with

community involvement, to present a shared vision and strategy of how the District should develop to achieve sustainable patterns of development; the Local Authority consider the appropriate means for considering the merits of developing this site is in the light of the evidence base underpinning the Core Strategy for South Kesteven, including Urban capacity Studies, Strategic Land Availability assessments, comparative sustainability appraisals, infrastructure requirements and the current 5 year housing land supply.

2. The Local Planning Authority consider that the application proposal is contrary to the Development Plan, comprising the East Midlands Regional Plan and the Core Strategy for South Kesteven, in particular the proposal is not in accordance with policies on strategic housing growth, in particular Policy *SP1 (Spatial Strategy)*, in which it is stated (*inter alia*): “The majority of all new development should be focused upon Grantham to support and strengthen its role as a Sub-Regional Centre. New development proposals shall be considered on appropriate sustainable and deliverable Brownfield sites and appropriate greenfield sites (including urban extensions), sufficient to ensure the achievement of growth targets. Details of specific sites (including urban extension sites) will be included in a Grantham Area Action Plan. ... 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 there are other overriding material considerations. All cases will also be subject to all relevant policies within the remainder of the core strategy or other relevant development plan documents. ...”. Furthermore it is considered that there is no overriding strategic policy justification for the Manthorpe site to come forward for development at this time and that the Core Strategy should be given more weight than any other material consideration.
3. It is considered by the Local Planning Authority that the development of the application site would be premature in the context of the fact that the Grantham Area Action Plan DPD is shortly to be consulted upon and is scheduled to be adopted within the next year; in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, notwithstanding the fact that weight must be given to the guidance in paragraphs 71 and 72 of PPS3: Housing, in respect of a potential marginal shortfall in a 5 year land supply for South Kesteven District (as measured against the housing growth trajectory for Grantham (shown in the Core Strategy page 42)), the approval of a housing site of the scale proposed in this application (in the region of a 1000 dwellings), would undermine to a very significant degree the ability to consider a range of options, whereby the most sustainable sites for new housing development in Grantham can be identified and allocated in the GAAP, to achieve an overall sustainable pattern of development. In this regard the development of the North Grantham/Manthorpe site, is considered to be premature and should be refused.
4. In terms of the criteria for a sustainable urban extension, set out in Policy *H2: Urban Extension Sites (Grantham)*, the Local planning Authority do not consider that the application site is not large enough to provide the full range of infrastructure that should be expected from a SUE. Also it is also judged that the site is not as a good location as the adopted SUEs in terms of sustainability, including in terms of transport issues. The proposed

development would not provide for any employment land, although there will be some job opportunities created through the CCRC, retailing and commercial uses on the site if these aspects of the proposal are brought forward; whilst if a significant element of 'employment land' were to be included in the development of the site, it is considered that there would be a greater likelihood that more would be caused to the local environment than the present proposal, particularly in respect of the likely impact on historic assets.

5. The Local Planning Authority consider that the development of the application site as proposed would be detrimental to the setting, character and appearance of the Grade 1 listed Belton House and Historic Park and Garden and Manthorpe conservation area and its listed buildings and to key views looking in and out of Belton Park and Garden and as such is contrary to policy *EN1 (Protection and Enhancement of Character of District)*: in which it is stated (inter alia) that South Kesteven's Landscape Character Areas are identified on the map [following paragraph 4.1.10]. Development must be appropriate to the character and significant natural, historic and cultural attributes and features of the landscape within which it is situated, and contribute to its conservation, enhancement or restoration. Furthermore, it is considered that the setting of the Grade 1 registered park, would be adversely affected to a significant degree as a result of the development, by reason of the loss of rural character on the approach roads to Belton House, the introduction of the roundabout at the Belton Road junction, and the adverse impact on the present views across and out of the park to the surrounding countryside. Accordingly, the proposal does not comply with relevant planning policies of Development Plan and Regional/National Policy, In particular Policies HE9.1, HE9.2 and HE10.1 of PPS5 and Policies 26 and 27 of the Regional Plan.
6. Notwithstanding the data and proposals submitted by the applicant, it is considered that there are significant shortcomings in some of the analysis and the detail provided and that the mitigating measures proposed are not sufficient. It is therefore considered by the Local Planning Authority that the traffic generated by the proposed development would have an adverse impact on through traffic in Grantham, its approaches and junctions and be a likely source of unacceptable danger to other users of the highway, particularly because of the heavy volumes of traffic.

* * * * *

Appendix 1

Addendum to report CM1Development Control Committee 4th January 2010

Letter from Asset Heritage Consulting on behalf of the applicant - Application Ref. No. S10/0142/EIAOL – Norht Grantham/Manthorpe



specialist independent advisers in the historic built environment

conservation & listed buildings | heritage planning matters | PPS5 advice and assessments | expert witness
listed buildings | conservation management and advice | archaeology | historic interiors | audits | research

Mr C Middleton
South Kesteven District Council
Council Offices
St Peter's Hill
Grantham
NG31 6PZ

16 December 2010

Dear Mr Middleton,

RE: LAND NORTH OF GRANTHAM: PLANNING APPLICATION S10/0142

I am writing to you in response to the comments made by English Heritage (EH) and the National Trust on the above application in their letters to you of 24 November and 6 December respectively.

The first point to make is that both letters were written without the benefit of first seeing the revised Supplementary Design Report, which was sent to EH on 24 November (a copy was also sent to the Trust on 9 December). This is regrettable as the revised version corrects some unfortunate omissions in the photomontages of the views contained in the Supplementary Design Report dated 23 October 2010 and therefore constitutes a much more accurate impression of the effect of the proposed sustainable extension (SUE) on the landscape around Grantham.

To begin with the NT's position, it remains clear that it will continue to object to any development in this area whatever form it takes, however fully it is justified and whatever measures are taken to mitigate its impact. This is evident from one of the concluding bullet points, which states that *'the overall effect of the development will be to replace the rural landscape with an urban development'*.

In fact, as even the quickest glance at the revised masterplan shows, the landscape proposed to be created by the SUE is far from entirely 'urban' in character and form. There are substantial green spaces within the proposed

development area, including all the way along the western side of the A607, along the southern edge of Belton Lane, on the eastern side of the railway line and along the boundary with the undistinguished modern housing development situated directly to the west and south-west of the Manthorpe Conservation Area.

There are also significant areas of green space within the core of the development area, while the few surviving important historic landscape features, such as the Running Furrows stream and hedgebank, are retained and enhanced. All of this will considerably reduce the impact of the proposals on the wider setting of Belton Park and certainly will not cause it undue harm.

To read the NT letter, along with its previous letter of 22 March, one might think that the land to the west of the A607 is currently a rural landscape unchanged since the 18th or 19th century. This is of course not the case, as the 1:2500 and 1:10,560/1:10,000 OS maps from the first edition of the late 19th century through to the present day (all notably absent from the Atkins Setting Study) graphically convey.

These maps are useful evidence for showing the extent to which the landscape of the development area changed considerably during the 20th century, the present large fields being entirely the result of the extensive removal of old field boundaries, a process that intensified in the last 30 years or so.

Indeed, it would not be going too far to say that much of the rural landscape within the development area today is the direct product of modern 'agribusiness' rather than traditional farming methods.

This must, one would think, surely have its own impact on the wider setting of Belton Park, as do the nearby golf courses, holiday chalets and the extensive visitors' car park directly in front of the Grade I listed house. Some of these features may well have been 'inherited' by the Trust when it acquired the Belton Estate but others were not, including of course the car park- actually established by the Trust itself- and which (whatever the need for it) has considerably more impact on the setting of the house and its surroundings than the proposed SUE.

The NT also makes play of the fact that the assessed views are based '*upon what ground was visible in late summer*'. There are two points to make in response to this. The first is that the effect would in fact be much the same in early summer and well into the autumn and the fact that the views show the situation in late summer is simply the result of this being when the exercise was undertaken. Likewise, it should be noted that even in the dead of winter the trees and other vegetation still provide screening in views looking from Belton Park towards the development area.

The second (and more important) point relates to that already made above- in that while it is obviously true that more of the development than just 'ground level' will be visible, the scale of development in terms of overall height and massing will be relatively modest (not even the '*public house element or neighbourhood centre*' will be massively tall buildings- and neither will the school, CCRC or nursing home). What is more, in addition to the substantial green spaces proposed along the boundaries of the site and within the core of the development area, additional spaces between the dwellings, along with those created by roads, gardens etc will provide further horizontal and vertical 'articulation' within the development area.

As EH acknowledges in its letter, '*residential development is kept away from the high points of the site, most notably through the repositioning of playing fields/open space and key buildings such as the nursing home and CCRC*'. Also, these buildings, together with the school and neighbourhood centre, are situated at the less sensitive, southern end of the site. This all means that, as stated above, the environment created by the SUE is most definitely not densely 'urban' in character and form.

EH also acknowledges that both the additional analysis provided in the Supplementary Design Report and the revisions to the masterplan, reducing the scale of development in the site's south-east corner and increasing the amount of landscaping, help to dispel their previous concerns over the impact of the proposals on the setting, character and appearance of the Manthorpe Conservation Area. Significantly, they do not recommend to your Council that impact on the conservation area should form a refusal reason on the application.

Two further fundamental points need to be made. First, the environment created by the SUE will provide a far better northern 'edge' to Grantham than currently exists (here I note that EH's previously expressed concern about a perceived coalescence between Grantham and Manthorpe has been abandoned-presumably in recognition of the observations made at paragraph 2.3.8.2 of the Supplementary Design Report).

This is because the existing extensive modern residential development to the west and south-west of the Manthorpe Conservation Area is of extremely poor design quality and is badly integrated with its surroundings. Certainly, it does not provide a good introduction to the wider Grantham area.

Extending well designed and planned development northwards cannot be seen as establishing a precedent for more development in this direction at a later stage, both Belton Lane and the land occupied by Belton Woods Hotel Golf Club providing a 'natural barrier' to additional growth in this direction, development which would (if it were ever to take place) clearly have an adverse impact on the setting of Belton Park.

Finally, it is certainly not the applicant's claim that the proposed SUE would have no impact at all on the setting of Belton Park- simply that this impact is considered to be acceptable and appropriate (see paragraph 2.4.1 of the Supplementary Design Report).

Moreover, even should your Council consider that harm is caused to the setting of Belton Park, this is not necessarily conclusive, not least because as policies HE9.2 and HE10.1 of PPS 5 both acknowledge, there are cases where harm (even of a '*substantial*' nature) can be accepted as a result of '*public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss*'.

There is nothing in these policies (or anywhere in the PPS) to suggest that these benefits need to be heritage related, while the public benefits that would accrue from the proposed SUE have of course been fully set out elsewhere.

I hope you find these comments helpful in preparing your report for committee.

Yours sincerely

Dr Nicholas Doggett, MIFA, IHBC
Director

Email: nicholas.doggett@assetheritage.co.uk
Tel No. 01865-310563

Appendix 2

Addendum to Report CM1Development Control Committee 4th January 2010

Letter from Colin Buchanan and Partners on behalf of the applicant -
Application Ref. No. S10/0142/EIAOL – North Grantham/Manthorpe

16 December 2010

Dear Mr Middleton

Grantham North

I am writing to set out our position with regard to feedback that has been received from Lincolnshire County Council with regard to the transport impact of the proposed development. Other than verbal requests for further information, which we have provided, the only formal responses received to date are letters dated 19th October and 7th December 2010 (the latter received by e-mail).

The first of these include a number of detailed points regarding the modelling of town centre junctions. We have responded to this letter and are seeking to meet with Lincolnshire County Council to try to resolve the outstanding detail of the town centre junction modelling. In the second letter, mention is again made of the town centre junction modelling. It is also stated that 'no solution has been provided for the deficiencies with both the Belton Lane / B1174 junction and the bridge on Belton Lane, despite this being raised at an early stage in discussion and within the Transport Assessment'. It therefore appears to us that the three areas of contention with regard to the impact of the proposed development are:

- Impact on the town centre traffic network;
- Impact on the capacity of the Belton Lane / B1174 junction; and
- Impact on the bridge on Belton Lane.

CB therefore assume that all other elements of the proposals are acceptable to the Highway Authority and this letter therefore focuses on these three outstanding areas.

Town Centre Traffic Network

The modelling for the town centre network was undertaken separately from the Transport Assessment following a verbal request from LCC. The extent of the assessment was based on the data for critical junctions from the SATURN model that was supplied by LCC's consultants. The assessment shows that a number of the junctions within the town centre are at or over capacity during the weekday peak hours even without the proposed development in place. The impact of traffic associated with the development proposals is relatively small.

You will be aware that the adopted SKDC LDF Core Strategy provides for significant development in and on the edge of Grantham as part of the Growth Point initiative. The development the subject of the Application is intended to contribute to the minimum development levels provided for in the Core Strategy and is not additional to it. In this context, if development does not occur on the Application Site, provision will need to be made for a similar amount of development in one or more alternative locations in and on the edge of the town, principally under the forthcoming Grantham Area Action Plan, which, you will know, is in preparation by SKDC at the moment. I am sure you would accept that *any* development on the edges of Grantham will impact on the town centre road network, irrespective of its location. In fact development in other parts of Grantham could have more significant impacts as the routes into the town centre from other directions are more congested. This can be seen from the output of the SATURN model that was provided by LCC's consultants with and without the development at Grantham North. The following table sets out a comparison on the V/C ratios for junctions on the approaches to the town centre with and without the Grantham North development in place.

V/C Ratios on the Routes in and out of Grantham Town Centre

	2018 Do Min		2018 With Dev	
	AM	PM	AM	PM

North Parade	111	104	116	107
Barrowby Road	112	98	114	84
Harlaxton Road	73	90	102	78
London Road	118	107	125	107
Manthorpe Road	93	50 (although the right turn into Belton Lane is over capacity)	114	62 (although the right turn into Belton Lane is over capacity)

V/C ratios of over 100 show that the traffic flow is higher than the capacity of that turning movement. If we look firstly at the AM peak Do Minimum information, it can be seen that Manthorpe Road is one of the few approaches to the town that operates within capacity., with London Road and Barrowby Road being over capacity. The development at Manthorpe would push the Manthorpe Road approach to town over-capacity (up to 114), but would be similar to the London Road and Barrowby Road approaches without any development. The same applies in the evening peak.

From this I would conclude that development in Manthorpe would have no worse an impact that further development in other quadrants of the town and is likely to have less than development that would access the town centre from London Road or Barrowby Road.

A coherent strategy for dealing with the increased traffic as a result of the growth of the town is required, to which developments such as Grantham North could contribute through S106 Agreements. In this context no doubt you would agree that major developments, such as the Application Proposals, are likely to have a greater capacity to contribute to comprehensive integrated transport measures for the Town Centre than would smaller developments and developments, such as on brownfield sites, with high development overheads and it will be easier to secure such contributions. Having examined the SKDC SHLAA it is clear to us that this latter scenario would be the most likely alternative development option in the GAAP. We are keen to discuss this further with LCC and are confident that a strategy for the town centre that will accommodate the growth aspirations of the town can be found.

Belton Lane / B1174 Junction

Table 7.4 of the TA has been reproduced below.

Existing Belton Lane/ Newark Hill Junction - PICADY results summary

	DM				DS1			
	AM		PM		AM		PM	
	RFC	Q	RFC	Q	RFC	Q	RFC	Q
Belton Lane – Left and right turn	0.750	3	0.536	1	0.905	6	0.715	2
High Street – Right turn	0.887	9	0.378	1	0.905	9	0.680	4

This indicates that in the DM scenario (i.e. without the development proposals), the junction would be operating with RFC's over 0.85 in the AM peak. In particular, there is a queue of 9 vehicles on High Street (S) which are waiting to turn right into Belton Lane. With the development proposals, there is a marginal increase in the RFC, with an increase of 3 vehicles in the queue on Belton Lane in the AM peak, and 1 vehicle in the PM peak. The right turn into Belton Lane experiences a queue increase of 3 vehicles in the PM peak.

We State within the TA that we are of the view that these increases are not significant and do not warrant any further improvement to the junction. The letter received on the 7th December was the first indication that this conclusion was not shared by LCC. We consider that the conclusions in the TA are still valid and correct.

Belton Lane Bridge

It has been suggested by LCC that the TA identifies a problem at the bridge on Belton Lane. This is not the case. It is accepted within the review of existing conditions that there are constraints on forward visibility at this bridge and that pedestrian facilities are limited. However, we do not consider that the proposed development will have any significant impact on this bridge. The site access junction has been designed to join Manthorpe Road, therefore encouraging people to use this route. The SATURN model traffic flow output shows the following increase of 30 and 28 two-way vehicle trips on Belton Lane over the bridge as a result of the development proposals. Therefore the increase in traffic across the bridge as a result of development is minimal.

We do not foresee any significant pedestrian demand along Belton Lane arising from the development proposals. There are no significant trip attractors within close proximity to the west of

the site and an alternative public footpath route that passed through the site and across the railway to the south of Belton Lane is available and is more suitable for recreational walking.
In conclusion, CB are of the view that the outstanding concerns of LCC can be addressed with further discussion between CB and LCC.

Yours sincerely

Jenny Baker

Technical Director

jenny.baker@cbuchanan.co.uk

cc Chris Tidswell

Brian Thompson

LCC

LCC

Late Item - Development Control Committee, 4th January 2011

Report CM1 re Application No. S10/0142/EIAOL – Land at Manthorpe, North of Grantham

Amendments to the Conditions recommended in the Addendum Report

RECOMMENDATION:

(Corrections presented at the Committee meeting)

That the application be refused (subject to advice in note attached to the highway reason for refusal)

That the development proposed at North Grantham/Manthorpe, the subject of the planning application reference No. S10/0142/EIAOL, be refused for the reasons set out in this Addendum:

1. The application proposal is considered by the Local Planning Authority to be contrary to National Policy in respect of the advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note PPS1 **Delivering Sustainable Development** (including Paragraphs 7 and 8), that to deliver sustainable development decisions must be made within a 'plan-led system, that gives certainty and predictability; with plans being drawn up with community involvement, to present a shared vision and strategy of how the District should develop to achieve sustainable achieve sustainable patterns of development; the Local Authority consider the appropriate means for considering the merits of developing this site is in the light of the evidence base underpinning the Core Strategy for South Kesteven, including Urban capacity Studies, Strategic Land Availability assessments, comparative sustainability appraisals, infrastructure requirements and the current 5 year housing land supply.
2. The Local Planning Authority consider that the application proposal is contrary to the Development Plan, comprising the East Midlands Regional Plan and the Core Strategy for South Kesteven, in particular the proposal is not in accordance with policies on strategic housing growth, in particular Policy *SP1 (Spatial Strategy)*, in which it is stated (*inter alia*): "The majority of all new development should be focused upon Grantham to support and strengthen its role as a Sub-Regional Centre. New development proposals shall be considered on appropriate sustainable and deliverable Brownfield sites and appropriate greenfield sites (including urban extensions), sufficient to ensure the achievement of growth targets. Details of specific sites (including urban extension sites) will be included in a Grantham Area Action Plan. ... 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 there are other overriding

material considerations. All cases will also be subject to all relevant policies within the remainder of the core strategy or other relevant development plan documents. ...". Furthermore it is considered that there is no overriding strategic policy justification for **this North Grantham/Manthorpe application** site to come forward for development at this time and that the Core Strategy should be given more weight than any other material consideration.

3. It is considered by the Local Planning Authority that the development of the application site would be premature in the context of the fact that the Grantham Area Action Plan DPD is shortly to be consulted upon and is scheduled to be adopted within the next year; in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, notwithstanding the fact that weight must be given to the guidance in paragraphs 71 and 72 of PPS3: Housing, in respect of a potential marginal shortfall in a 5 year land supply for South Kesteven District (as measured against the housing growth trajectory for Grantham (shown in the Core Strategy page 42)), the approval of a housing site of the scale proposed in this application (in the region of a 1000 dwellings), would undermine to a very significant degree the ability to consider a range of options, whereby the most sustainable sites for new housing development in Grantham can be identified and allocated in the **Grantham Area Action Plan DPD** to achieve an overall sustainable pattern of development. In this regard the development of **this North Grantham/Manthorpe application** site, is considered to be premature and should be refused.
4. In terms of the criteria for a sustainable urban extension, set out in Policy *H2: Urban Extension Sites (Grantham)*, the Local Planning Authority do not consider that the application site is not large enough to provide the full range of infrastructure that should be expected from a SUE. Also it is also judged that the site is not as a good location as the adopted SUEs in terms of sustainability, including in terms of transport issues. The proposed development would not provide for any employment land, although there will be some job opportunities created through the CCRC, retailing and commercial uses on the site if these aspects of the proposal are brought forward; whilst if a significant element of 'employment land' were to be included in the development of the site, it is considered that there would be a greater likelihood that more **harm** would be caused to the local environment than the present proposal, particularly in respect of the likely impact on historic assets.
5. The Local Planning Authority consider that the development of the application site as proposed would be detrimental to the setting, character and appearance of the Grade 1 listed Belton House and Historic Park and Garden (**Note: omit "and Manthorpe conservation area and its listed buildings" from the Reason for Refusal**) and to key views looking in and out of Belton Park and Garden and as such is contrary to policy *EN1 (Protection and Enhancement of Character of District)*: in which it is stated (inter alia): (**Note: omit "that South Kesteven's Landscape Character Areas are identified on the map [following paragraph 4.1.10]."**) "Development must be appropriate to the character and significant natural, historic and cultural attributes and

features of the landscape within which it is situated, and contribute to its conservation, enhancement or restoration.” Furthermore, it is considered that the setting of the Grade 1 registered park, would be adversely affected to a significant degree as a result of the development, by reason of the loss of rural character on the approach roads to Belton House and Historic Park and Garden, the introduction of the roundabout at the Belton Road junction, and the adverse impact on the present views across and out of the Park to the surrounding countryside. Accordingly, the proposal does not comply with relevant planning policies of Development Plan and Regional/National Policy, In particular Policies HE9.1, HE9.2 and HE10.1 of PPS5 and Policies 26 and 27 of the Regional Plan and Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy for South Kesteven.

6. Notwithstanding the data and proposals submitted by the applicant, it is considered that there are significant shortcomings in some of the analysis and the detail provided and that the mitigating measures proposed are not sufficient to demonstrate that the traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development can be accommodated satisfactorily on the highway network. It is therefore considered by the Local Planning Authority that the traffic generated by the proposed development would have an adverse impact on through traffic in Grantham, its approaches and junctions, in particular in the vicinity of the site along the A607 and the roads around the town centre and would be a likely source of unacceptable danger to other users of the highway, particularly because of the heavy volumes of traffic.