

Draft Southern Quadrant Masterplan SPD

Draft Southern Quadrant Masterplan SPD

Consultee

715696 National Federation of Gypsy Liason

Agent

Section of SPD

General

CommentID: SQD33

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

The Southern Quadrant Masterplan makes no provision for Gypsies and Travellers. Provision for Travellers also appears to be absent in the Site Allocations and Policies DPD. We therefore question how the Council intend to comply with the requirements of Policy H14 of the Adopted Core Strategy (setting aside this policy is no longer compliant with the more recent national guidance). At what stage and how will the Council seek to provide the necessary pitches.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The identified need for Gypsy and Traveller sites up to 2017 has been met through the granting of planning permission for sites across the District, A scoping reiew of the Core Strategy to consider matters arising from the NPPF and Planning Policy for Travellers is planned for 2013.

No change required.

Consultee

716471 Mr Gerald Dickinson

Agent

Section of SPD

General

CommentID: SQD52

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

No more building new house or factory units until empty ones are filled. We need the bypass to ease congestion in the town. Hospital cannot cope.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Farmland we need for cope growing for food. Not imports, to keep out own farming and farmers in business.

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The level of future housing provision in Grantham has already been established through the Core Strategy including the Southern Quadrant as a location for a significant proportion of that growth.

The Southern Relief road cannot be delivered without support from the proposed development as public funding to do so is not available .

No change required.

Consultee

716468 Mrs M B Dickinson

Agent

Section of SPD

General

CommentID: SQD51

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Please check that there is a need for any of this development while premises remain empty. Housing and industrial. More people in the Grantham area very much require the hospital to be upgraded.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

We need agricultural land for crops etc has provision been made to allow enough farming land to remain for this.

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The level of future housing provision in Grantham has already been established through the Core Strategy including the Southern Quadrant as a location for a significant proportion of that growth.

No change required.

Consultee

712974 Mr Neil Gadsby

Agent

Section of SPD

General

CommentID: SQD5

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

As a concerned local resident, I am wondering how this southern quadrant scheme can possibly get the go ahead. If I am correct the east-west bypass will be built using funding from the proposed building of 4,000 new homes. Surely you have this the wrong way round. How can you build new homes when you do not have adequate infrastructure in place to start with?

The roads system in Grantham is complete chaos at peak period. The roads need to be in place first. 4,000 new homes must equate to at least that amount of cars on the local roads. This will result in complete grid lock in Grantham, because you seem to think we don't need a better road structure in place to start with.

Also ho about the local facilities/amenities? Hospital struggling to cope with local population, lack of NHS dentists, shortage of doctors surgeries and inadequate local transport.

Your also proposing a doctors surgery for this new scheme, is it really going to be capable of taking 8,000+ new patients? I very much doubt it.

Where are these 4,000+ people going to work? Surely not on the newly planned industrial estate? I guess you are hoping that loads of new businesses will come to Grantham. The same Grantham that has high street shops shutting on a regular basis. I know why don't we just encourage a few 1,000 more charity shops to move here and employ everyone.

I can see that this scheme has not been thought out or planned well at all, which is typical of Grantham council.

How can a town as small as Grantham give planning permission for a McDonald's restaurant to be built on one of the towns busiest junctions (A52) when one already existed in the town centre? This was a few years ago I know, but it was a highly dubious decision in my opinion.

To conclude, Grantham council is hoping to have around 8,000+ more people living in Grantham (and upwards of 6,000 more cars), with no increase to the current roads system apart from the east-west bypass, which is designed primarily to bypass Grantham. So all you are succeeding in doing is causing more chaos for the council tax paying people living here.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The Southern Relief Road is being forward funded by Lincolnshire County Council which will enable the road to be constructed in advance of the development of the Southern Quadrant.

The provision of the Southern Relief Road will alleviate the large amount of HGV and other through traffic which currently travels down the A52 and B1174 through Grantham. This will release some capacity for development traffic to travel on these routes. In addition, the development is intended to enable extensions to bus service provision to encourage the use of public transport as well as providing new walking and cycling routes into the town centre such as the extension to the Riverside Walkway. Furthermore the provision of on

site facilities such as schools, local shops, GP practice and employment space within the site reduces the need for residents to travel.

Provision is made for new employment space within the Southern Quadrant enabling the potential for residents to live and work on the site, a number of other schemes aimed at creating additional employment opportunities in the town are proposed including Station Approach.

No changes required.

Consultee

Agent

Section of SPD

712613 Mr Paul Martin

General

CommentID: SQD4

Nature of Response: Objecting

Reasons:

I strongly object to the entire process. I am seriously concerned that the people of Grantham are being ignored in favour of the biased viewpoints of the local business community and South Kesteven District Council.

I struggle to find anyone in the town who actually agrees with these plans. In fact the majority cannot believe that building 8000 new homes will result in better traffic flow and services. A grid locked nightmare seems to be the consensus.

The council seem to imply that the new housing will pay for the A52 bypass and relieve the weight of traffic flowing through the town. They conveniently ignore the huge increase in local traffic this will cause, which will somehow have to negotiate the awful road layouts we already have - which are the result of the councils past errors. I have zero confidence in this entire process and with to know how many people have objected.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

For changes of this magnitude the council should hold a local referendum giving the people of the town the choice between a remaining fairly quiet market town or increasing into a much busier town.

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The principal of development at the Southern Quadrant has already been established through the adoption of the Core Strategy in July 2010 which was subject to consultation and independent examination.

The provision of the Southern Relief Road will alleviate the large amount of HGV and other through traffic which currently travels down the A52 and B1174 through Grantham. This will release some capacity for development traffic to travel on these routes. In addition, the development is intended to enable extensions to bus service provision to encourage the use of public transport as well as providing new walking and cycling routes into the town centre such as the extension to the Riverside Walkway. Furthermore the provision of facilities such as schools, local shops and employment space within the site reduces the need for residents to travel.

Grantham is a Growth Point area with the potential to accommodate significant growth over the course of the plan period, including on the Southern Quadrant. However, public funding to deliver the road alone is not available and development of the Southern Quadrant will pay towards the delivery of the Southern Relief Road.

No changes required.

Consultee

Agent

Section of SPD

168726 Miss Rachael Bust
The Coal Authority

General

CommentID: SQD7

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

We have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Noted.

Consultee

Agent

Section of SPD

315708 Health & Safety Executive
Health & Safety Executive

General

CommentID: SQD37

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

When consulted on land-use planning matters, the HSE where possible will make specific representations to ensure that compatible development within the consultaion zones of major hazard installations and major accident hazard pipelines (MAHPs) is achieved.

We have concluded that we have no representation to make on this occasion. This is because the land allocation in your consultation document does not encroach on major hazard installations of MAHPs and their assocaied consultation zones.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Noted.

Consultee

Agent

Section of SPD

517670 Natural England
Natural England

General

CommentID: SQD6

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Natural England is pleased to note that the SPD has taken on board many of the comments made in our earlier response and has incorporated these into the masterplan.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Noted.

Consultee

Agent

Section of SPD

715698 Mr & Mrs Sentance

General

CommentID: SQD34

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

After viewing the final stage of the plan at Grantham Library in November of this year we wish to put forward the following for very careful consideration by yourselves:

1) We oppose to a footbridge being placed at the bottom left of our property of which being No 18 Fircroft to cross the river. The reason for this is, at the bottom of the lane servicing Papermill Farm there is already a crossing in situ that we believe could be used instead. Therefore this would alleviate the problem of having youths congregating that would most likely be drinking and possibly drug taking from being in very close proximity to our property.

Please bear in mind that the back gardens to Fircroft are very small in comparison to those along Dudley Road and we would feel that this was an infringement on our privacy.

2) The Wetland / Marshland that runs alongside Fircroft acts as a substantial habitat to lots of species of wildlife and flora, we believe that this should be left alone to continue to evolve.

3) The wetland/ Marshland also acts as a floodplain and also contains several natural springs that come down from the hillside. During the course of 22yrs of living at this address, have seen it on numerous occasions become flooded when the river becomes too high for its banks.

Therefore we don't see how you could possibly create an area like this into something that could be used all year round, it just wouldn't be feasible.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

1) The the concerns regarding the proximity of the footbridge to properties on Fircroft are acknowledged and it is proposed that footbridge crossing the River Witham will be moved southwards to allow for a greater degree of separation between the footbridge and the properties at Fircroft.

2) The Masterplan does not intend for development to occur in the Wetland/ Marshland alongside Fircroft. There is an intention to provide pedestrian and cycling links through this area though this is not considered to be likely to have major detrimental impacts upon the flora and fauna in this area.

3) The Council is aware that the piece of land adjacent to the existing play area behind Fircroft is functional floodplain and therefore would not be appropriate for built development. The area of land in question will be retained as functional floodplain, with pedestrian and cycling links crossing it utilising appropriate materials and finishes given its floodplain status.

Proposed Change

The layout plans on pages 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43 and 59 are amended to show the location of the proposed footbridge further southwards to allow for a greater degree of separation between the footbridge and the properties at Fircroft.

Consultee

710556 Mrs Elizabeth Thomas

Agent

Section of SPD

General

CommentID: SQD2

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Concerns re amount of traffic generated by the new site that exits onto A52 Somerby Hill/Bridge End road and Spitalgate Level - all creating a bottle neck at the junction at the bottom of Bridge end Road. On a daily basis traffic is backing up the hill to the Barracks another 4000 houses with their cars is just too much for the town. Comments that the "Village" will be self contained with its own school and centres is dubious as future residents will want the choice of other institutions. Concerns re site mud on A52 from lorries and other site traffic and residents cars/general traffic creating dangerous conditions on the hills, whilst we are assured site traffic has "wheel washes" all other traffic wont have - there has been a problem demonstrating this issue when a house up the hill was having an extension with the result that much debris washed down the road and blocked road drains and

deposited gravel stones at the entrance of Somerby Grove proving a hazard. Concerns that Green Spaces such as parks and dog walking areas have not been marked on the plan. Whilst we realise that the long term plan is to generate growth for Grantham - the relief road alone may well be enough for businesses to pick up as the town will be more easily accessible so do we really need this many houses up on this quadrant along with the other building points in Grantham?

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The provision of the Southern Relief Road will alleviate the large amount of HGV and other through traffic which currently travels down the A52 and B1174 through Grantham. This will release some capacity for development traffic to travel on these routes. In addition, the development is intended to enable extensions to bus service provision to encourage the use of public transport as well as providing new walking and cycling routes into the town centre such as the extension to the Riverside Walkway. Furthermore the provision of facilities such as schools, local shops and employment space within the site reduces the need for residents to travel.

Whilst the Council accepts that future residents will be able to choose other educational institutions should they so wish, the prospect of a new school is considered to offer a significant draw to new residents and consequently a significant number of pupils arising from development are anticipated to attend the schools provided on-site.

Issues arising from construction traffic is a detailed matter that would be more appropriately dealt with at planning application stage.

There are a number of green spaces shown on the plan and the masterplan itself sets out the Green Infrastructure Framework for the development illustrating the green corridors and links between open spaces and sports pitches throughout the site.

Grantham is a Growth Point area with the potential to accommodate significant growth over the course of the plan period, including on the Southern Quadrant. However, public funding to deliver the road alone is not available and development of the Southern Quadrant will pay towards the delivery of the Southern Relief Road.

No changes required.

Consultee

Agent

Section of SPD

705491 Mr Mark Hastings

General

CommentID: SQD1

Nature of Response: Supporting

Reasons:

The Masterplan is a fantastic opportunity for Grantham to fulfil it's potential as a very important commuter town, bringing with it jobs and prosperity to the local area. A small minority of local residents will object but their objections will relate to the past not the future. Grantham must do this ... not just to prosper, but to survive.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

none

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Support noted.

Consultee

Agent

Section of SPD

26318 Mr Cyril Day
Highways Agency

General

CommentID: SQD11

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

The Highways Agency have no comments on this consultation. We will however, be continuing our cooperation with you and Hampton Brook regarding delivery of the new A1

junction at Spittlegate.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Noted.

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
26376 Mr P Armstrong Londonthrope & Harrowby Without Parish Council		General

CommentID: SQD9

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Any roads coming from the estate that join Bridge End Road should be above Somerby Hill i.e. Beyond the Main Barracks entrances and the hill (for road safety reasons).

Secondary school entrance as above.

Sufficient public open spaces be provided. Sufficient play area be provided (via Section 106 monies).

All public rights of way to be protected for future generations.

Civic/Business Centre to be just that, i.e. in the centre of the estate. Primary school to be situated near to the centre of the development.

No roads to enter onto Saltersford Road (footpaths and cycles would be acceptable).

What thought has been given to the extra traffic congestion which will occur on the A52/A1 junction?

An agreement/guarantee that the Bypass will be built giving access to the estate as each developer starts in the early stages i.e. no access from Somerby Hill side of the development.

The Bypass is completed before the first 10% of homes are built.

Sufficient sound dampening measures put in place between the Bypass road and the dwellings.

A good proportion of affordable housing should be built.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The Masterplan provides indicative position of the proposed junctions onto Somerby Hill/Bridge End Road but their precise location will be agreed during the planning application stage.

Open space provision has been incorporated into the development layout and is in line with the Council's requirements. Play area provision will be a matter for determination during Section 106 negotiations.

One Public Right of Way is affected by the development and will need to be diverted slightly in order to take account of the Southern Relief Road.

The Masterplan makes provision for the Local Centre to be located in the centre of the development, with primary school provision also made within the centre of the site.

No vehicular access is proposed onto Saltersford road. The masterplan does however make provision for walking and cycling access to be made.

The provision of the Southern Relief Road will alleviate the large amount of HGV and other through traffic which currently travels down the A52 and B1174 through Grantham. This will release some capacity for development traffic to travel on these routes. In addition, the development is intended to enable extensions to bus service provision to encourage the use of public transport as well as providing new walking and cycling routes into the town centre such as the extension to the Riverside Walkway. Furthermore the provision of facilities such as schools, local shops and employment space within the site reduces the need for residents to travel.

Its is likely that access to development will be required from Somerby Hill in the early stages of development as the initial phases are expected to occur adjacent to existing dwellings in order to enable connections to existing water, gas, electricity and sewerage infrastructure.

It is intended that the Relief Road will be operational prior to the completion of more than 200 dwellings which equates to less than 10% of the overall total number of dwellings. Measures will be required to mitigate the noise impacts of the Southern Relief Road but the precise details of this will be determined at the planning application stage. The Council's Policy on affordable housing provision requires up to 35% of a development to be affordable but the precise level of provision will be dependant upon local need and viability and determined negotiation of the Section 106 package. No changes required.

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
26470 Mr Roger Stafford Buckminster Estate	260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd	Purpose of the Masterplan

CommentID: SQD12

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend wording of paragraph 2 (on page 2) to provide greater clarity.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Add following text to the end of the paragraph:

"The development of the SQ also includes the Southern Relief Road that will help to relive town centre congestion in Grantham."

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Agree the proposed amendment will provide greater clarity on the purpose of the Masterplan SPD.

Proposed Change

Add to end of second paragraph: "The development of the SQ also includes the Southern Relief Road that will help to relieve town centre congestion in Grantham"

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
26470 Mr Roger Stafford Buckminster Estate	260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd	Sustainable Communities

CommentID: SQD13

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend wording of paragraph 2 under Sustainable Communities (on page 3) to provide greater clarity.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Amend text of first sentence beneath the bullet points to read:

"...attributes which any sustainable urban extension should adopt or strive..."

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Agree the proposed amendment will provide greater clarity.

Proposed Change

Amend first sentence to read: "The list shown above is not exhaustive, however it should be used as a guidance list of the fundamental attributes which any sustainable urban extension should adopt or strive to achieve once physical implementation is completed...."

Consultee

26470 Mr Roger Stafford
Buckminster Estate

Agent

260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks
Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd

Section of SPD

Growth Point Status

CommentID: SQD14

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend wording of paragraph 3 under Growth Point Status (on page 5) to provide greater clarity.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Amend text to read:

"...new community services, solving Grantham's congestion problems, providing protection..."

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Accept that tackling the town's congestion problems is a key challenge and amending the text to include this provides greater clarification of this.

Proposed Change

In first sentence of third paragraph amend wording to read:

"...delivering new community services, tackling Grantham's congestion problems, providing protection for biodiversity, ..."

Consultee

26470 Mr Roger Stafford
Buckminster Estate

Agent

260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks
Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd

Section of SPD

Development of the Masterplan SPD

CommentID: SQD15

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend wording of paragraph 2 under Development of the Masterplan SPD (on page 5) and paragraph 4 (on page 7) to correct spelling/grammatical errors and in paragraph 1 (on page 7) to provide clarity.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Amend text of paragraph 2 on page 5 to read:

"...are set out below and over:"

Amend text of paragraph 1 on page 7 to read:

"...and dislikes for both options, which showed alternative routes for the relief road, and to advise..."

Amend text of paragraph 4 (on page 7) to read:

"Concerns were expressed about..."

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The Council agrees that these proposed amendments correct typographical errors and, in case of the amendment to paragraph 1 (on page 7) clarity.

Proposed Changes

At end of first sentence of paragraph 2 (on page 5) add "below and".

In second sentence of first paragraph on page 7 amend to read:

".... to let SKDC know their likes and dislikes for both options, which showed alternative routes for the relief road, and to advise"

In the first sentence of the fourth paragraph on page 7 delete "Once again"

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan		Other Relevant Guidance

CommentID: SQD36

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

The Wildlife & Countryside Act - and associated provisions are not referred to.

Disability Discrimination Act - which defines appropriate street and new building design is not referred to. This key legislation has far reaching design impacts on buildings and streetscene and access ways.

Lincolnshire County Council Street Design plan, which takes into account the Disability Discrimination Act, has not been referred to but is meant to be applied across the County.

ISSUE - Development Policy Gap Identified - Street scene SPD - SKDC

Given the introduction of the Disability Discrimination Act Street Scene SPDs have become common across local authorities but SKDC does not appear to have such an SPD.

The Governments Document Inclusive Mobility & LCC Streetscape Design Manual should be referred to and are attached for your reference when considering the Masterplan.

These documents should be referred to when considering all new development or improving existing street scene.

An SKDC Street Scene SPD should be provided and would inform the development on our new sites and protect, enhance existing street scenes.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It would be appropriate to refer to the Lincolnshire County Council Streetscape Design Manual and the Inclusive Mobility guidance.

However, it is not considered necessary to make reference to Acts as their status means that there is a legal requirement to comply with them.

It is not appropriate for this SPD to address any perceived policy gap in relation to the development of a Streetscene SPD for SKDC.

Proposed Change:

Add reference to the following documents:

"Lincolnshire County Council Streetscape Design Manual" and "Inclusive Mobility Guidance"

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
26470 Mr Roger Stafford Buckminster Estate	260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd	Other Relevant Guidance

CommentID: SQD16

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend wording of paragraph 1 (on page 10) to provide greater clarity.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Amend text of last sentence of paragraph 1 to read:

"Relevant documents which have been taken account of in the production of this masterplan include:"

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is agreed that the proposed amendment provides greater clarification of the documents have been taken into account in developing the SPD.

Proposed Change:

Amend last sentence to read:

"The relevant documents which have been taken account of in the production of this masterplan include:"

Consultee

26470 Mr Roger Stafford
Buckminster Estate

Agent

260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks
Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd

Section of SPD

Site & Context - Character

CommentID: SQD17

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend wording of paragraph 4 (on page 13) to provide greater clarity.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Amend text of first sentence to read:

"...units at the former Invictas Works..."

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is accepted that the proposed amendment this clarifies that the units are no longer occupied by Invictas.

Proposed Change

In first sentence add "former" to amend sentence to read:

"The existing industrial units at the former Invictas Works (Aveling Barfords)"

Consultee

517670 Natural England
Natural England

Agent

Section of SPD

Site & Context - Views and Visual Analysis

CommentID: SQD55

Nature of Response: Supporting

Reasons:

We are satisfied with the view and visual analysis.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Noted.

Consultee

26470 Mr Roger Stafford
Buckminster Estate

Agent

260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks
Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd

Section of SPD

Site & Context - Archaeology & Heritage

CommentID: SQD18**Nature of Response:** Commenting**Reasons:**

Amend wording of paragraph 3 (on page 20) to provide greater clarity.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

At end of paragraph add:

"The wall is in the ownership of the land owner to the south."

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Agree that the amended wording provides clarification over ownership of the drystone wall that defines the boundary between parishes.

Proposed Change

At end of paragraph add:

"The wall is in the ownership of the land owner to the south"

Consultee

715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan

Agent**Section of SPD**

Site & Context - Archaeology & Heritage

CommentID: SQD73**Nature of Response:** Commenting**Reasons:**

Roman ruins exist along the River Witham leading upstream This area has not been properly explored and an archaeological assessment should be completed.

It could be worth investing in "dig" activity which may identify sufficient remains as to provide an educational/leisure attraction.

Any work should take into consideration the sensitivity of the area from an ecological perspective.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:**SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:**

A desk top archaeological study has been completed and prior to submission of a planning application the landowner/ developer would be required to undertake more detailed archaeological investigations which may include trial trenching.

Consultee372928 Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge
English Heritage**Agent****Section of SPD**

Site Context - Archaeology & Heritage

CommentID: SQD50**Nature of Response:** Objecting**Reasons:**

We welcome the identification of historic environment issues and features in the Site and Context chapter of the SPD (including references in the Character, Views & Visual Analysis and Archaeology & Heritage sections). Impact on views into and out of the centre of Grantham will be an important consideration for any development proposal, particularly given the landmark of St Wulfram's Church and the intervisibility between the town centre conservation area and the surrounding countryside. Impact on the setting of nearby

designated heritage assets will be another important consideration. Although the SPD identifies the scheduled bowl barrow and the listed officers' mess building (on page 20), there is no reference to other nearby heritage assets, including the group of listed buildings to the south at Little Ponton. Finally, impact on heritage assets within the site itself will be an important consideration, and we note the identification and assessment undertaken to date in terms of archaeology and historic buildings.

The SEA Environmental Report also identifies a number of historic environment issues and features and we welcome the amendments made following our comments on the Scoping Report.

Given the above recognition of historic environment issues, it is disappointing that the Masterplanning Principles, Masterplan Proposals and Urban Design chapters contain little reference to these issues. The chapters need to outline how any heritage assets within the site (including archaeological features and historic buildings) should be addressed by any development. They also need to outline how the setting of nearby designated heritage assets, including views to and from the town centre, should be respected and addressed. Policy SQ1 from the (withdrawn) Grantham Area Action Plan refers to the design and layout of the site responding to strategic views into and from the site, but the draft masterplan proposals give little guidance on this policy requirement. Policy H2 of the Core Strategy requires development to recognise and incorporate important features and characteristics of the site, with the investigation and protection (where appropriate) of archaeological features. Again, the draft masterplan proposals give little guidance on how to address heritage assets within the site.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Suggest SPD is amended to give historic environment issues greater coverage within the masterplanning sections of the document.

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is agreed that it would be appropriate to make reference to heritage assets to the south at little Ponton and to provide greater clarity in the Masterplan as to how the heritage assets (including archaeological features) and views be addressed by the development.

Proposed Changes:

After the second sentence in paragraph 2 add:

“To the south of the site there are a group of Listed Buildings at Little Ponton.”

In the “Urban Design” chapter add new section entitled “Views & the Historic Environment” to read:

“The key views to the town’s heritage assets should be reinforced wherever possible. The view corridors which pick up on the spaces which define these areas should be very carefully considered in future plans for development.”

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
517670 Natural England Natural England		Site & Context - Nature Conservation and Ecology

CommentID: SQD56

Nature of Response: Supporting

Reasons:

We are also generally supportive of the Nature Conservation and Ecology section which we acknowledge has informed the masterplan and we look forward to discussing the extent of further ecological studies as the masterplan process progresses.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Noted.

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
------------------	--------------	-----------------------

26470 Mr Roger Stafford
Buckminster Estate

260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks
Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd

Site & Context - Nature Conservation and Ecology

CommentID: SQD19

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Spelling correction

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Amend spelling of "Witham" under first image on page 22.

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Agree correction of spelling error.

Proposed Change:

In the title beneath the first image on page 22 correct spelling of "Witham".

Consultee

715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan

Agent

Section of SPD

Site & Context - Nature Conservation and Ecology

CommentID: SQD72

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

1. The Southern Quadrant is located on the edge of one of the most important local ecological sites and overlaps the River Witham Corridor. The Wildlife & Countryside Act requires the proactive management of local wildlife and wildlife habitat. New DEFRA accreditation makes the new Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership a required consultee with regard to such an extensive development.
2. It is extremely concerning that the Bridge Design document for the Relief Road states that EVERY design will have environmental impacts. Because no lower level surveys of ecology and wildlife in these areas has been completed proactively it is not possible to determine at this point how severely they will be affected. Low level surveys are recommended in the High Level Ecological Assessment Document provided for Buckminster Estate. It is vital that appropriate low level ecological assessments are completed BEFORE detailed plans emerge so that environmental impacts and areas of particular sensitivity are protected from inappropriate development.
3. The drainage plans for the site may also put local wildlife and the River Witham Corridor at risk. They must also be completed reflecting relevant low/detailed level ecological impact assessments.
4. The areas earmarked for business use could provide an opportunity to increase wildlife habitat as can the public areas of the new housing development. Landscaping with new native hedgerows rather than fencing, low level native shrubs and the use of wildflower planting in open green spaces could enhance the existing habitat. Building these requirements into the Masterplan will help inform developers.
5. The provision of an increased buffer zone from 20m to 30m (as used near Colsterworth) would create a small woodland edge to existing housing near Fircroft.
6. The fragmentation of existing hedgerows is not acceptable given the protection of rural hedgerows and the Wildlife Country side act which protects wildlife in non rural hedgerows.
7. The existing copse at the Barford Site should be retained and protected through TPOs. The existing hedgerow should be protected from gradual degradation over the development cycle of the site.
8. The provision of a public footpath along the River Witham should not be at the cost of local wildlife or wildlife habitat.

The existing ribbon habitat is extremely fragile along the River Witham particularly where it is sandwiched at the top of the steep river cliff face (unique to the area) and against the Barford site. A wide concreted footpath here would cause significant damage and result in the sterilisation of the wildlife in this key area. It would also result in the loss of trees which screen residents in Fircroft from the Barford site.

I would recommend a twisting narrow and naturalised footpath i.e. laide with bark that meanders between existing trees be provided for recreational use. There should be no further loss of trees in this area known to have an extensive range of wildlife which will be listed and sent separately.

The Buckminster Estate should reinstate the row of trees removed which would have provided a natural green corridor through the Barford Site to Dysart Park.

9. There is an opportunity for a communal asset through better access to marsh areas

The area of marshy land adjacent to the Barford Site along the River Witham could have boardwalk footpaths to provide a recreational facility whilst protecting existing habitat and wildlife. An example of this is the Salt Marsh boardwalk at Gibraltar Point provided by the Lincs Wildlife Trust.

This area is rich in important flora and fauna, particularly along the River Witham corridor and neighbouring woodland, therefore again a detailed ecological assessment should be completed prior to detailed plans being drawn up.

It should not be assumed that existing areas designated for business development are not of ecological interest. The Barford Site runs parallel to the River Witham and attracts a significant number of different species including bats, owls, badgers, fresh water crayfish and osprey and great crested newts have been seen in the ponds on site.

Much of the area earmarked for business development is surrounded by woodland which will result in wildlife using neighbouring land as well.

Therefore detailed ecological assessments must be completed prior to detailed plans being drawn up to identify the ecological "hotspots".

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

1. The SPD acknowledges the importance of the Witham Valley corridor and other significant ecological sites of value and seeks to protect these both during and following development.

The Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership is not a statutory consultee for SPDs. It is considered that given the Council has consulted with both Natural England and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (LWT), any issues would have been raised through these channels. It should be noted that Natural England did not raise any issues in their representation and the LWT did not make any representations during this consultation or the previous stage of consultation either.

2. The bridge design was not part of the statutory consultation on the Masterplan SPD, however, Lincolnshire County Council will be carrying out appropriate environmental investigations during their development of the bridge design prior to submission of a planning application (and accompanying Environmental Impact Assessment) for the Relief Road and bridge.

3. The drainage plans for the site are not expected to put local wildlife or the River Witham Corridor at risk. They utilise Sustainable Urban Drainage principles and are supported by Natural England.

4. The precise nature of the landscaping proposals will be drawn out through the planning application process and are too detailed for inclusion in this SPD. However, throughout the site existing hedgerows have been retained and will be reinforced to enhance and extend existing wildlife habitats. Provision is made for this in the masterplan under the "Landscape and Ecology" section.

5. The buffer zone has already been increased in the Masterplan from 20m to 25m as illustrated under the "Heights, Density and Form" section. This is considered to provide an appropriate buffer between existing housing and new development as well as providing new wildlife habitats.

6. It is considered that there is limited fragmentation of existing hedgerows on-site. Existing trees, hedgerows and woodland areas have been retained and augmented and included in the Masterplan layout offering protection to existing habitats.

7. The Council is in the process of assessing which trees within the Barfords site are appropriate for TPO. As this is not yet complete, it is not appropriate for inclusion within the Masterplan SPD.

8. This is considered to be too detailed for inclusion in this Masterplan SPD. The materials and finish of the footpath/cycleway will be detailed matters during the planning application determination process. Whatever is proposed will need to be appropriate for the setting.

9. The materials and finish of the footpath/cycleway alongside the River Witham will be detailed matters during the planning application determination process. Whatever is proposed will need to be appropriate for the setting. In preparing a planning application for the site, the landowner/developer will be required to undertake detailed ecological studies.

Any future planning application on the Barfords site would require detailed ecological studies to be undertaken prior to submission of a planning application.

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan		Site & Context - Access and Movement

CommentID: SQD82

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

An impact analysis on local routes should be completed in relation to the development and local roads and signs should be re-designed and upgraded accordingly. Suggest the Barford Site has an exit which avoids Houghton Road but joins up instead with the road network of the new business development -provided this can be achieved without fragmenting existing woodland or minimal fragmentation. This will improve the quality of life for Houghton Rd residents.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

In the preparation of a planning application, the landowner/developer will be required to undertake a Transport Assessment where the effects of the development on highway network will need to be looked at in detail with appropriate mitigation measures proposed. Given the topography of the site, it would be difficult to provide a vehicular link directly between the existing Barfords site, across the River Witham Valley and East Coast Mainline Railway Line, and the new business park and it is unlikely that such a link would be a viable proposition.

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
26470 Mr Roger Stafford Buckminster Estate	260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd	Site & Context - Access & Movement

CommentID: SQD20

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Spelling correction

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Amend spelling of "Dyke" in first sentence of paragraph 1 on page 23.

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Agree correction of spelling error.

Proposed Change:

In the first sentence of paragraph 1 on page 23 correct spelling of "Dyke".

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
710237 Western Power Distribution Western Power Distribution	710236 Ms Rhianon Boulton Turley Associates	Site & Context - Services & Utilities

CommentID: SQD10

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Western Power Distribution [may have] [has] a number of strategic electricity distribution circuits (which can operate at 132,000 Volts, 66,000 Vots and 33,000 Volts in some of the area's being considered for development. These circuits may run both underground and as overhead lines (on either towers/pylons or wood poles). WPD may also have electricity substations in these areas.

Generally, Western Power Distribution would expect developers of a site to pay to divert less startegic electricity circuits operating at 11,000 Volts (11kV) or below. This may include undergrounding some 11kV and low voltage overhead lines as necessary.

Western Power Distribution would normally seek to retain the position of electricity circuits operating at 132,000 Volts (132kV) and 66,000 Volts (66kV) and in some cases 33,000 Volts (33kV), particulalry if the diversion of such circuits placed a financial obligations on Western Power Distribution to either divert or underground them as WPD would not be party to any planning application and any such obligations would also go against the statutory and regulatory requirement on Western Power Distribution to operate an economic and efficient electricity distribution system. Assuming the required minimum statutory clearances can be maintained and WPD can access its pylons/poles, WPD does not generally have any restriction on the type of development possible in proximity to its strategic overhead lines but it would be sensible for planning guidance and layout of developments to take WPD's position into account and consider uses compatible with teh retenetion of overhead strategic lines, for example such as parking, estate roads, commercial uses or open space, within their immediate proximity. It is worth noting that any existing circuits crossing the proposed development areas in the document may run both overhead and underground. In any case WPD should be consulted on detail at an early stage and WPD are always keen to discuss larger sites with the local authorities at an early stage, so that constraints can be taken into account and sites planned in the most effective way.

Where WPD have substations on land being considered for development, WPD should be consulted on the detail of proposals in good time to ensure that the required access can be maintained and catered for and that other requirements for development in the vicinity of substations are taken into account.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The masterplan takes account of the overhead lines running across the western side of the site and proposes commercial uses, parking, road and landscaping to be the predominant uses in this area.

Diversions of any power lines or any impacts upon substations are detailed matters for pre-application discussions rather than being dealt with in this SPD.

No changes required.

Consultee

26470 Mr Roger Stafford
Buckminster Estate

Agent

260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks
Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd

Section of SPD

Site & Context - Services and Utilities

CommentID: SQD21

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend wording of paragraph 2 (on page 22) to provide greater clarity.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Amend text of second sentence of paragraph 2 (on page 23) under Services & Utilities to read:

"...trunk sewer network at a point in Inner Street, north of the A52 Bridge End Road near the junctions of the A52/B677/B1174."

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Agree that the proposed amendment provides clarification of Anglian Waters position with regards to foul drainage connections for the early phases.

Proposed Changes:

Amend the wording of the second sentence in paragraph 2 to read:

"... trunk sewer network at a point in Inner Street, north of the A52 Bridge End Road near the A52/B677/B1174 junction nearby."

Consultee

715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan

Agent**Section of SPD**

Site and Context - Services & Utilities

CommentID: SQD68**Nature of Response:** Commenting**Reasons:**

Given the reduce A&E services at Grantham Hospital and lack of Acute Stroke unit there SKDC should lobby the Commissioning Body to provide increased services at Grantham Hospital & Ambulance service to meet the needs of the increased population of Southern and Northern Quadrants including residents and workers.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:**SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:**

It is considered that the matters raised are detailed matters which fall outside the remit of the Masterplan SPD.

Consultee714592 Mr Phil Hughes
Lincolnshire County Council**Agent****Section of SPD**

Masterplan Proposals - Residential

CommentID: SQD84**Nature of Response:** Commenting**Reasons:**

The document is very positive and useful in setting out in general terms the requirements for two school sites and other infrastructure which may involve County Council services. However, whilst it is understood that the scope of the document is mainly to set out a vision and design principles, the apparent lack of any figures on the total quantity, phasing and mix of housing is unfortunate, as this information is essential to assist in the detailed planning and delivery of a range of infrastructure. The Residential section of the Masterplan is brief and unspecific compared to other sections and the Phasing section simply sets out the order of development, not its timing. It is appreciated that discussions with the developer will continue beyond adoption of the Masterplan and these observations are intended to alert the main stakeholders to the need for synchronised delivery of infrastructure.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:**SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:**

As acknowledged in the representation further discussion on quantum, mix and timing of development are part of ongoing discussions with the landowner.

Consultee517670 Natural England
Natural England**Agent****Section of SPD**

Masterplan Principles & Evolution - Landscape and Ecology

CommentID: SQD57

Nature of Response: Supporting

Reasons:

We are also glad to note that the key points for landscape and ecology include the conservation and enhancement of the character and ecological value of the River Witham corridor and that existing woodland individual trees and hedgerows will be retained as far as possible throughout the site

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Noted.

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
26481 Ms Jennifer Dean Anglian Water		Masterplan Principles & Evolution - Water & Drainage

CommentID: SQD35

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

A foul water drainage strategy will need to be completed in consultation with Anglian Water, Environment Agency, Local Planning Authority and the developer. This is to ensure an agreement is in place regarding the discharge of the foul drainage from this proposed development. There are potential solutions identified for the first phase of this site however an overall strategy will need to be agreed before commencement, and implemented in accordance with the strategy.

Under the Water & Drainage key points the document mentions adopting a Sustainable Drainage Strategy throughout the site. Anglian Water would encourage this as the National SUDS Standards and Building Regulations Part H set out a clear hierarchy for surface water management. Anglian Water are keen to see all new developments managing surface water through SUDS rather than connecting to the public system. Our key messages in relation to this would be:

- No new surface water connections to the combined or foul sewers.
- Removal of existing surface water connections from the combined or foul sewer, with evidence that shows the developer has followed the surface water management hierarchy. This will ensure infiltration is considered ahead of maintaining connection to our combined sewers.
- Early engagement with the developers is key in ensuring adequate surface water management measures are included and can also impact on the layout of the site.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is accepted that an overall foul water drainage strategy will need to be developed for the Southern Quadrant and a new paragraph is proposed to be added to the end of the "Sustainable Drainage Strategy (SuD's)" section on page 57.

As noted by AWS the Masterplan makes provision for surface water to be drained via a series of swales and infiltration features or ponds, with particular consideration given to the draining of the valley slopes and it is not considered that any changes are required to the draft SPD to address this part of this representation.

Proposed Change:

Add new paragraph at end of Sustainable Drainage Strategy section to read:

"An overall drainage masterplan (Including foul water drainage) for the site will be required and this will need to be agreed with all Flood Risk Management Authorities: South Kesteven District Council, Environment Agency, Upper Witham IDB, Anglian Water and Lincolnshire Highways Department"

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan		Masterplan Principles & Evolution - Water & Drainage

CommentID: SQD77

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Residents in Bridge End Road have raised concerns at the increased flood risk if the Southern Quadrant hill is built over. There is considerable concern that Flood Management initiatives may have a significant negative impact on the wildlife of the River Witham Corridor. No flood management work should be undertaken/planned prior to detailed ecological assessments and the approval of Natural England.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The development of the Masterplan SPD has been informed by a number of background studies, including a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Report. The development will utilise Sustainable Urban Drainage principles and the Council does not anticipate there being an increased flood risk to residents of Bridge End Road as a result of this. The flood management and drainage plans for the site are not expected to put local wildlife or the River Witham Corridor at risk. They utilise Sustainable Urban Drainage principles which are supported by Natural England.

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
521755 Mrs Laura Brackenbury Environment Agency		Masterplan Principles & Evolution - Water & Drainage

CommentID: SQD54

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Most of the area lies on unconfined Lincolnshire Limestone Principal Aquifer and a Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1) is located in the south-eastern section. This makes the area very sensitive with respect to groundwater (please see map attached). Much of the employment area appears to be located within SPZ1.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Add new text:

Employment development should not impact on controlled waters. Developers proposing schemes that pose a risk to groundwater resources, quality or abstractions must provide an acceptable hydrogeological risk assessment (HRA). Any activities that can adversely affect groundwater must be considered including physical disturbance of the aquifer. If the HRA identifies unacceptable risks then the developer must provide appropriate mitigation.

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Agree that where development could impact upon controlled waters there would be a need to provide appropriate mitigation against this.

Proposed Change:

Add new paragraph at the end of the "Water, Drainage & Geology" section on as follows:

"Development should not impact on controlled waters. Developers proposing schemes that pose a risk to groundwater resources, quality or abstractions must provide an acceptable hydrogeological risk assessment (HRA). Any activities that can adversely affect groundwater must be considered including physical disturbance of the aquifer. If the HRA identifies unacceptable risks then the developer must provide appropriate mitigation."

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan		Masterplan Principles & Evolution - Water and Drainage

CommentID: SQD81

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Ponds near the River Witham are proposed, however given potential drainage issues I recommend the consideration of public ponds in other areas further uphill both providing a diverse ecological habitat and recreational facility. An example of this exists on the neighbouring David Eatch Estate.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The ponds proposed near the River Witham are part of the Sustainable Urban Drainage system (SUDs) and will act as balancing pools to manage surface water run-off. The inclusion of other ponds further up the hill could jeopardise the effective operation of the SUDs and lead to increased flood risk.

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan		Masterplan Principles & Evolution - Access & Movement (Vehicles)

CommentID: SQD78

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Local residents in St Anne's Ward are particularly concerned that the impact of the SQ development will result in a significant increase in local traffic if adequate services are not provided to make the area self sufficient to a degree.

Whilst recognising the need to support Grantham's economy a careful balance is required and residents believe inadequate services are currently proposed.

The proposed site is NOT the equivalent of a small village. It is the equivalent of a small town.

The level of traffic along local roads e.g. Harrowby Road/St Vincents Rd/Harrowby Lane could increase significantly if there are delays on Bridge End Road and drivers seek alternative short cuts.

It is not felt that the by-pass will adequately mitigate against this. Measures need to be considered to prevent the overuse/misuse of local residential roads

Given the likely increase in car use residents should be provided with adequate parking facilities to reflect the number of bedrooms in each house.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The provision of the Southern Relief Road will drastically reduce the volume of through traffic and HGVs travelling along Somerby Hill and Bridge End Road, creating some capacity for trips from the Southern Quadrant.

Provision is made for a number of alternatives to the private motor vehicle for gaining access to the town centre such as improved and extended walking and cycling routes along Riverside Walk and provision for bus services to be extended into the site to encourage the use of public transport.

In addition to this, the inclusion of a range of services and facilities on-site including primary and secondary schools, local shops, leisure facilities and healthcare facilities reduce the need for residents of the scheme to travel and therefore seek to reduce the potential traffic impacts of the development.

The level of car parking proposed on site will be a matter for determination during the planning application process and is too detailed a matter for consideration in this SPD.

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan		Masterplan Principles & Evolution - Access and Movement (Vehicles)

CommentID: SQD71

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

There should be good bus services running throughout the estate with frequent services that meet the needs of commuters and people socialising.

Services into Grantham town centre and the new business development area and Railway Stationn should be provided.

Safe Cycle routes should be provided running throughout the housing development AND the business development

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The design and layout of the site makes allowance for the extension of bus services into the site from the two arterial routes running either side of the site. It is too detailed to set out the precise routes of such services in this SPD, but the principle of enabling bus service diversion and extension into the site is set out in the SPD under the "Access and Movement 1 – Vehicles" section.

The SPD makes provision for cycleways throughout the site (many of which travel along the green infrastructure corridors) providing access to the key destinations such as the local centre, schools and employment areas. In addition an extension to the Riverside Walkway is proposed through the SPD enabling traffic free walking and cycling routes into the town centre.

Consultee

711110 Mr. David J. Holmes
Old Somerby Parish Council

Agent

Section of SPD

Masterplan Principles & Evolution - Access and Movement (Vehicles)

CommentID: SQD3

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

I note that a second roundabout is planned that appears from the plan to impact upon the existing roundabout. This Parish Council spend many years obtaining sponsorships and getting support from the SKDC and the LCC for the renovation of this roundabout. The renovation was completed on 1st March 2010 and is maturing very nicely and enhances not only the entrance to our village but the town as a whole. Could you let me know what impact upon the roundabout the new road and the second roundabout will have?

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

A new roundabout would be constructed southwest of the existing roundabout to minimise disruption to the operation of the existing roundabout whilst the Southern Relief Road is constructed. The existing roundabout and road layout would then be altered so that traffic was moved onto the new roundabout. The existing roundabout would ultimately cease to exist once the new road is operational.

No changes required.

Consultee

26470 Mr Roger Stafford
Buckminster Estate

Agent

260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks
Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd

Section of SPD

Masterplan Principles & Evolution - Access & Movement 1 - Vehicles

CommentID: SQD22

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend wording of bullet points 2 and 3 and the layout plan to provide greater clarity and correct typographical errors.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Amend text of 2nd bullet point to read:

“...to link the existing A52 and proposed...”

Amend text of third bullet point to read:

“...on the existing A52 and B1174 for...”

On layout plan add vehicular access to the proposed allotments from the relief road roundabout.

In Layout Plan Key correct spelling of "Vehicular"

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is agreed that the proposed amendments provide clarification or correct typographical errors:

Proposed Changes:

Amend wording of 2nd bullet point to read:

“... the existing A52 and ...”

Amend wording of 3rd bullet point to read:

“... on the existing A52 and B1174 for”

Amend Layout plan to show vehicular access to the proposed allotments from the Southern Relief Road roundabout.

On layout plan key correct spelling of “Vehicular”

Consultee

26470 Mr Roger Stafford
Buckminster Estate

Agent

260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks
Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd

Section of SPD

Masterplan Principles & Evolution - Access & Movement (Pedestrian & Cyclist)

CommentID: SQD23

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend Layout Plan to provide greater clarity and correct typographical errors.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

On Layout plan show yellow arrow linking through Dysart Park to existing Riverside walkway north of the A52.

On Layout Plan Key amend spelling of “Vehicular”

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is agreed that the proposed amendments provide clarification of the intention to link the existing Riverside Walkway to the proposed new Riverside Walkway in the Southern Quadrant correct typographical errors:

Proposed Changes:

Amend layout plan to show the proposed footway and/or cycleway extending beyond the site through Dysart Park to link up with the existing Riverside Walkway.

On layout plan key correct spelling of “Vehicular”

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
517670 Natural England Natural England		Masterplan Principles & Evolution - Access and Movement (Pedestrian & Cyclist)

CommentID: SQD58

Nature of Response: Supporting

Reasons:

We welcome the intention to open up the River Witham corridor to pedestrians and cyclists with the creation of the River Witham Riverside Walk. This may also provide alternative recreational opportunities which will reduce the recreational impact upon the Woodnook Valley SSSI.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Noted.

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
26470 Mr Roger Stafford Buckminster Estate	260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd	Masterplan Principles & Evolution - Green Infrastructure Framework

CommentID: SQD24

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend layout plan to provide greater clarity and correct typographical errors.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

On layout plan show green buffer to existing pair of semi-detached properties on Somerby Hill.

In Layout Plan Key correct spelling of "Vehicular"

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is agreed that the proposed amendments correct and omission or correct a typographical error:

Amend Layout plan to show buffer planting to provide screening around the existing pair of semi-detached houses on Somerby Hill.

On layout plan key correct spelling of "Vehicular"

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
26470 Mr Roger Stafford Buckminster Estate	260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd	Masterplan Principles & Evolution - Development parcels

CommentID: SQD25

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend layout plan to provide greater clarity and correct typographical errors.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

On layout plan show green buffer to existing pair of semi-detached properties on Somerby Hill.

In Layout Plan Key amend spelling of "Diverted/realigned public right of way"

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is agreed that the proposed amendments correct and omission or correct a typographical error:

Amend Layout plan to show buffer planting to provide screening around the existing pair of semi-detached houses on Somerby Hill.

On layout plan key amend spelling of "Diverted/realigned public right of way"

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
26470 Mr Roger Stafford Buckminster Estate	260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd	Masterplan Principles & Evolution - Illustrative Masterplan

CommentID: SQD26

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend layout plan to provide greater clarity

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

The illustrative masterplan does not show the indicative SuDs ponds on the lower valley slopes immediately to the east of the River Witham, as illustrated on the plans shown on the preceding pages. It would appear that the illustrative masterplan needs amending to incorporate these features (also plans on pages 39/40, 41, 43 and 59/60)

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is accepted that this is an omission from the current layout plan on all the pages mentioned in the representation.

Amend the layout plans on pages 37/38, 39/40, 41 and 43 to include illustrations of the indicative SuDs ponds on the lower valley slopes to the east of the River Witham.

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan		Masterplan Proposals - Residential

CommentID: SQD66

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

A key requirement which came out of the Housing Strategy workshop is that SKDC has a shortage of 1 and 2 bed homes. These are going to become increasingly required in affordable housing when the Government benefit changes affect benefit recipients in under occupied houses. At present these residents are being charged extra for empty bedrooms but are unable to downgrade.

This should be a consideration in the new Northern and Southern Quadrant developments.

I understand that a budget may become available for new build of Council owned homes. In this case the Southern Quadrant development should include new Council homes as should the Northern Quadrant developments.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:**SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:**

The Council's Core Strategy makes it clear under Policy H3 that the starting point for provision of affordable housing is up to 35%. However it also sets out that in negotiating the

level of affordable housing, the Council will have regard to the overall viability of development schemes.

The precise level of affordable housing provision will be a matter for determination during Section 106 negotiations and it would not be appropriate to set them in this SPD.

Furthermore, the precise mix of housing types will be a matter for determination through the planning application process based upon housing need at the time.

The Council does not consider that any changes are required to address this part of the representation.

Consultee

Agent

Section of SPD

715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan

Masterplan Proposals - Residential

CommentID: SQD67

Nature of Response:

Reasons:

The development should include a mixture of housing so as to encourage social integration i.e. Detached, Semi detached, Terraced housing, Bungalows, Apartment blocks including one bed start up homes for younger people and retired people, Two and three bed apartments. Sheltered housing accommodation for both the elderly and younger people in need. Given the low average income locally the majority of housing should be "affordable" housing.

The area closest to the town centre/transport links/new mini hub should include housing for elderly/less mobile residents to enable access to the town and local facilities

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The Masterplan SPD states that residential areas will provide for a broad range of house types that cater for modern living and for a wide demographic, including affordable housing, homes for the elderly and potentially self-build plots. Its considered that this is appropriate for ensuring a mix of housing types.

The Core Strategy Policy H3 requires up to 35% affordable housing (subject to overall viability of development) therefore there is no policy basis for requiring the majority of housing to be affordable housing.

It is accepted that it may be appropriate to locate any provision of homes for the elderly in areas where they are best served by local facilities and reference to this is proposed through the inclusion of additional text in the "Local Centre" section.

Proposed Change

At end of second paragraph add:

"It may also be appropriate to locate any provision of homes for the elderly close to the Local Centre to enable ease of access to services."

At end of

Consultee

Agent

Section of SPD

517670 Natural England
Natural England

Masterplan Proposals - Green Infrastructure, Landscape and Public Open Space

CommentID: SQD59

Nature of Response: Supporting

Reasons:

We are strongly supportive of the approach that the masterplan takes to make the green infrastructure framework, landscape features and public open spaces integral to the development and will be a way to deliver a wide range of benefits for people and the natural environment together. We also note the advice set out in both the Grantham Green Infrastructure Strategy and Natural England's Green Infrastructure guide has been taken on board. We also welcome the proposal to enhance existing habitats by additional

planting to result in a connected framework of corridors and spaces throughout the site providing a strong landscape framework.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Noted.

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan		Masterplan Proposals - Green Infrastructure, Landscape and Public Open Space

CommentID: SQD76

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

The provision of allotments is welcome.

The allotment sites must be:

- a. maintained by SKDC to prevent issues of poor management which have emerged at almost all local allotments;
- b. secure
- c. serviced with water;
- d. located throughout the area given the extensive size of the development;
- e. with parking facilities

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The Council does not manage allotments in Grantham and this position is not intended to change. However, it is envisaged that the formulation of a Community Trust on the Southern Quadrant which will be responsible for the management and maintenance of such features.

It is considered that the current location of the allotments presents the best use of land and provides appropriately accessed and serviced allotment gardens.

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan		Masterplan Proposals - Green Infrastructure, Landscape and Public Open Space

CommentID: SQD65

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Note that the Southern Quadrant still lacks any informal play spaces despite the scale of the development. This does not comply with relevant Government National Planning Policy regarding sustainable communities.

A wide range of Council housing should be provided on this site given its size and the shortage of available council houses in Grantham.

There is little or no planned provision for informal recreation for local children/families.

The extensive size of the development should provide additional facilities for those residents living furthest from existing parks/recreational facilities.

Recreational facilities in existing neighbouring parks eg. Dysart Park and the small playing area near Fircroft should be extended to cater for increased use.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The SPD makes reference to the requirement for new formal and informal play spaces to be located throughout the development to provide safe and easy access to a variety of spaces. It is not appropriate to detail the location of these in the SPD as they will depend upon the precise housing and street layouts and are therefore detailed matters for determination during the planning application stage. The SPD does however make it clear that there is a requirement for such provision.

This section of the SPD clearly sets out the range of both formal and informal spaces across the site. Hedgerows and trees have been retained to create green corridors providing accessible informal public open spaces, furthermore the Witham Valley and its surrounding provide extensive informal areas of open space.

The SPD makes provision for the potential for the play area near Fircroft to be extended or improved. As a general principle, appropriate provision shall be made on-site to mitigate against increased use of existing facilities.

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
26470 Mr Roger Stafford Buckminster Estate		Masterplan Proposals - Green Infrastructure, Landscape and Public Open Space

CommentID: SQD27

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend wording of paragraph 1 (on page 43), layout plan and images to correct typographical errors and 4th paragraph (on page 45) to provide clarification.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

In last sentence of paragraph 1 replace "outlines" with "outlined"

On layout plan (on page 43) revise references.

Under middle image on page 44 correct spelling of "Witham"

At end of 1st sentence in paragraph 4 (on page 45) add "for the benefit of existing occupiers"

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Agree proposed amendments correct typographical errors or provide clarification.

Proposed Changes:

In last sentence of paragraph 1 replace "outlines" with "outlined"

On layout plan (on page 43) revise references as follows:

Where "7" is shown on the River Witham Corridor change to "1".

Where "5" is shown on the north-south and east GI spine change to "4".

Under middle image on page 44 correct spelling of "Witham"

At end of 1st sentence in paragraph 4 (on page 45) add "for the benefit of existing occupiers" to clarify reasoning behind maintaining access to Paper Mill Farm.

<u>Consultee</u>	<u>Agent</u>	<u>Section of SPD</u>
26313 Mr Philip Mould Lincolnshire Primary Care Trust		Masterplan Proposals - Local Centre

CommentID: SQD8

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

The PCT has been closely involved with the Growth Point development of Grantham from its inception and supports the overall plans and this representation is simply a restatement of the requirements previously submitted as part of the s106 contributions discussions to fund the facilities that will enable sustainable primary care health services (GPs, dentistry, pharmacy and community nursing) to be developed and maintained for the new population.

The Southern Quadrant plans to develop 4,000 new homes. An average of 2.4 people per dwelling equals 9,600 people. NHS good practice states that planning should be undertaken on the basis of 1,800 patients per whole time equivalent (WTE) GP which equates to 5.3 WTE GPs for the Southern Quadrant. A 6 GP surgery would therefore be needed, requiring 750 sqm across 2 storeys with at least 40 dedicated car parking spaces. At £2,000 per sqm capital cost, this equates to £1.5M plus car parking space, which would ideally be gifted to the NHS. We believe that this requirement fits in with calculations for Health suggested in the SKDC SPD.

In addition, however, we may require the funding of aspects of dental and pharmacy provision. In most cases the requirement for dental provision would be identified as one dental chair per 1,500 residents. However, capital aspects would usually be between the developer and a private dentist who wished to provide that service and would pay the developer for premises. We would ask that this be applied flexibly as there may be the need for us to provide NHS dentistry in which case looking at each case on its individual merits we may need to capitalise costs over 30 years if we contracted a private dentist to provide an element of NHS dentistry.

Similarly the development may give rise to a request to open a pharmacy. This incurs a fixed cost to us of around £30k per annum, so again following the principle to capitalise such costs over 30 years, even discounted, amounts to £571k. We should therefore consider a pharmacy contribution of say £500k unless it can be demonstrated that the development will not include pharmacy or that pharmaceutical needs can be met from existing provision, which seems unlikely when considering the scale of development and location.

Finally, at some stage during continual population growth there is bound to be a step change needed in hospital provision. We do not have a formula for measuring this impact but would very much welcome the opportunity to jointly consider this at some stage, [particularly as part of our ongoing Shaping Health for Mid-Kesteven process, that has a focus on the future use of Grantham hospital and which I know already has SKDC representation.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Noted.

It is considered that the matters raised are detailed matters for discussion during the negotiation of the Section 106 Agreement.

No changes required.

Consultee

715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan

Agent

Section of SPD

Masterplan Proposals - Employment

CommentID: SQD74

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

The business park development should be supported by public transport links as well as car links to enable a cross section of local people to be employed there.

The development should be attractive and reflect the historical and Victorian industrial past of Grantham - a meld of old and new.

Learning from other business parks it should contain points of interest e.g. public art and landscaped areas, which enable businesses to both work there and attract their customers to the site.

The business park can be landscaped with trees, bushes and hedgerows which both support local wildlife and provide a rich and pleasant environment for people to work. Learning from the former Barford Site employers the business park is large enough to sustain recreational green landscaped open space/s for workers i.e. park with benches/fountain etc to enable workers to enjoy short breaks in the open air.

The business park should include recreational facilities for workers alongside the provision of key services i.e. food supplies/cafe and a small mini store to prevent the need to travel

into town during short break periods which will have a significant impact on the towns traffic with minimum benefit to the town's economy.

Barford Site War Memorial

The Barford Site houses the Barford Aveling War Memorial representing the lives of people who worked on site and lost their lives both on site and in action.

I believe this memorial should be in a safe prominent position within any development on the Barford Site and ideally include the remaining original wall housing it.

A mixture of business units should be available including small start-up units available at low rent to large units for established firms and light to heavy industry.

Unattractive warehouse style business units should be avoided.

Businesses need to attract new customers and the design of buildings in the business park should reflect the potential mixed use of the site.

The provision of a core infrastructure and maintenance of that will provide employment itself in addition to that provided by the individual businesses.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The SPD makes provision for walking and cycling links to the business park from the development. The design and layout of the site makes allowance for the extension of bus services into the site from the two arterial routes running either side of the site. It is too detailed to set out the precise routes of such services in this SPD, but the principle of enabling bus service diversion and extension into the site is set out in the SPD under the "Access and Movement 1 – Vehicles" section.

The SPD makes provision for landscaping of the business park with new planting to provide wildlife areas as well as providing screening.

Whilst the Barford's site is included within the redline boundary for the Masterplan SPD, there is no development proposed at present on this element of the site. Discussions are underway with the landowner about the potential for relocating the War Memorial to a more appropriate location to safeguard it should development occur with a replica put in place on-site.

The Masterplan SPD establishes the principle of the western part of the site being a business park with office and business based buildings fronting the visible gateways and other industrial, distribution or general employment buildings on the less visible areas behind. This provides a mixture of business units for a range of business types.

The Council does not consider that any changes are required to address this part of the representation.

Consultee

26470 Mr Roger Stafford
Buckminster Estate

Agent

260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks
Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd

Section of SPD

Masterplan Proposals - Employment

CommentID: SQD28

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend wording of 3rd paragraph (on page 47) to provide clarity.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

At end of 3rd sentence in paragraph 3 add:

"is proposed subject to agreement with Network Rail."

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is agreed that the proposed amendment provides clarification that provision of a link to the housing east of the River Witham will be subject to agreement with Network Rail.

Proposed Change:

At end of third sentence in paragraph 3 add:

is proposed subject to agreement with Network Rail."

Consultee

Agent

Section of SPD

248935 Sainsbury's Supermarket Limited
Sainsbury Supermarket Limited

26013 Mr Andrew Astin
Indigo Planning Limited

Masterpan Proposals - Local Centre

CommentID: SQD32

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Indigo act on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd (SSL) who have an existing store on the edge of Grantham Town Centre on London Road.

The NPPF highlights at paragraph 157 that Local Plans should "allocate sites to promote development...and provide detail on form, scale, access and quantum of development."

In relation to the proposed Local Centre, the SPD notes that this will include A1 (shops) and a range of other uses. The SPD however still provides no indication as to the type (convenience or comparison goods) or the potential size of these shops.

Within the Grantham Area Action Plan DPD Submission version (October 2011), Policy SQ1 highlights that within the Southern Quadrant, the following will be included:

"A neighbourhood centre together with facilities to serve the new community delivered on site including new Primary and Secondary schools, community centre, health centre, retail facilities, sports pitches and play areas."

Paragraph 3.3.1.11 provides further details on retail development, it states:

"Opportunities for small scale retail development to serve local needs will need to be provided as part of the community hubs within the Sustainable Urban Extensions."

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

In order to fulfil the objectives of the Area Action Plan DPD and to comply with the NPPF, the SPD should be amendment to indicate that any foodstore provision included within the local centre is of a suitable size and scale in order to serve local needs.

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The principle that any shops on-site should be of sufficient size and scale to serve local rather than wider need is accepted.

Proposed Change:

Amend first sentence of second paragraph under the "Local Centre" section (on page 48) to read:

"It is envisaged that the centre could include shops (of appropriate size and scale to serve local need), healthcare/pharmacy, cafes, community facilities and potentially some residential uses over ground floor commercial properties".

Consultee

715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan

Agent

Section of SPD

Masterplan Proposals - Local Centre

CommentID: SQD69

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

The mini hub should be of sufficient size as to provide a cross section of facilities to meet the needs of a substantial new community.

Do not support the idea of a small hub which is not largely self sufficient. This will lead to an unacceptable increase in traffic on the roads leading into Grantham, or, out of town as desperate new residents, facing a long queue on the Bridge End Road, go elsewhere.

Sustainable development requires minimal travel for residents to access key facilities and should minimise ecological impacts as well.

Social needs should also be met through provision of a Community Centre; local pub/s and place/s of worship. Medical services should include: Doctors surgeries, Dentists Pharmacy. Other services to include Vets

The plans provided do not appear to allow adequate space to provide adequate facilities to meet the needs of the extensive population likely as a result of the development.

Having completed some research, the Southern Quadrant is the size of a small town.i.e the population of Bourne!

Therefore all of the facilities you would expect to see in a town the size of Bourne should be provided within acceptable distance for ALL residents. Therefore we should also look at the design which provides a single centralised source of services. The central mini hub should be split across the area so that more SQ residents can more easily access services.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is agreed that the services in the Local Centre should be of appropriate scale to adequately serve the new population arising from development and enable a degree of self sufficiency on-site and a proposed amendment to the text to reflect this is proposed (see representation **). Responses to earlier consultations on the Masterplan revealed a preference for local services to be centrally located in one location and the Masterplan SPD reflects this. It is considered that the matters raised relating to the provision of medical services are detailed matters for discussion during the negotiation of the Section 106 Agreement. The masterplan SPD does however set out the principle of requiring provision to be made for healthcare facilities in the Local Centre. It is not appropriate for the SPD to set out a requirement for Veterinary services as this will be a matter for the market to address.

Consultee

Agent

Section of SPD

715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan

Masterplan Proposals - Schools

CommentID: SQD70

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

The schools proposed should each have their own sports fields, and not be expected to share. The schools must have adequate parking for parents given the reality according to the RAC there in an increasing trend toward car ownership and also there is no guarantee that given the freedom of parents to send children to ANY school of their choice, that the children attending will be local. There should also be, given the size of the new development, adequate pre-school and after school care provision i.e. nurseries and after school clubs/facilities.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The school sites set out within the Masterplan SPD are based upon the requirements of Lincolnshire County Councils Children and Young Peoples Department. They make allowance for the required levels of sport and recreational facilities to be included within their site boundaries. The provision of appropriate parking/dropping off/pick up space for parents will be a matter for determination at planning application stage and is too detailed for inclusion in this SPD. The provision of appropriate pre-school and after-school care will be matters for discussion during the negotiation of the Section 106 Agreement.

Consultee

Agent

Section of SPD

714592 Mr Phil Hughes
Lincolnshire County Council

Masterplan Proposals - Schools

CommentID: SQD85

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

The quantity and mix of housing has a major effect on the number of children needing a school place and facilities needing to be provided. If the housing mix is predominantly larger homes than the average we would expect for Lincolnshire then we would have more pupils and require a larger land take than the areas shown. A clear commitment that the

playing fields next to the Community School would be dual purpose i.e. school use by day and community groups out of school times would be welcome. That would give the flexibility needed and make best use of scarce resources.

The County Council would refer SKDC to a model developed by LCC Early Years and Childcare services which predicts the impact housing developments have on the need/demand for childcare services. A development of this size would generate considerable demand for services. Currently in Grantham there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional demand for early years services, birth to pre-school age. For children of school age there are no providers suitably located to support the proposed schools. A new development would be required to support both schools; this would be best located on the integrated primary and secondary school site.

Finally, Children’s Services have asked that the title Community School not be used, but it simply be referred to as a "School Site" site providing secondary and primary facilities. Community schools have a specific status nationally which would not apply in this case.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The SPD refers to the playing fields adjoining the Community School being for community use.

The comment regarding use of the term Community School is noted and references to this in the SPD will be amended.

Proposed Change

Change references to Community School throughout the SPD to School Site

Consultee

26470 Mr Roger Stafford
Buckminster Estate

Agent

260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks
Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd

Section of SPD

Masterplan Proposals - Southern Relief Road

CommentID: SQD29

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend wording of paragraph 1 and text under 2nd picture (on page 50) to provide clarity.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Amend wording of paragraph 1 to read:

“...for the wider town. LCC are investigating the possibility of introducing town centre HGV restrictions once the SRR is open. In addition...”

Amend title under 2nd image to read:

“Whalebone Lane would be retained alongside the SRR only for local field and footway/cycleway access.”

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is agreed that the amendments provide clarification on the position with regard to HGV through traffic following completion of the Relief Road and access for agricultural traffic.

Proposed Changes:

After the first sentence of paragraph 1 add:

“Lincolnshire County Council are investigating the possibility of introducing town centre HGV restrictions once the SRR is open.”

Amend text beneath the 2nd picture to read:

“Whalebone Lane would be retained alongside the SRR only for local field and footway/cycleway access.”

Consultee

714592 Mr Phil Hughes
Lincolnshire County Council

Agent

Section of SPD

Masterplan Proposals - Southern Relief Road

CommentID: SQD83**Nature of Response:** Supporting**Reasons:**

The County Council Highways Division have been involved in all stages of the preparation of the Masterplan and have in fact used the consultation events held by SKDC to obtain views of the public on aspects of the proposed relief road. The final Masterplan shows the route of the relief road going around the perimeter of the development. The County Council fully support this alignment. We are also pleased to see recognition of the space required to deal effectively with sustainable drainage discharges. We look forward to working with the developer and the District Council to bring the Masterplan into fruition.

We recognise that the Masterplan includes the planned delivery of the southern link road, which when aligned with the permitted new access off the A1 into the KiNG31 (Big Sheds) development will create an alternative east west link around Grantham. This road is a long held aspiration of residents of Grantham and has the potential to unlock significant town centre improvements and economic growth. Lincolnshire County Council is working with the landowners with a view to agreeing a method of forward funding this road, with repayment to be through S106 as housing units are delivered.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:**SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:**

Noted.

Consultee

715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan

Agent**Section of SPD**

Urban Design

CommentID: SQD79**Nature of Response:** Commenting**Reasons:**

Garden plots should be of adequate size to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy and Government planning policy which require adequate space for the recreational use by children.

They should also be of sufficient size as to enable landscaping including trees to be provided.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:**SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:**

Neither the Core Strategy nor other policy document set standards for garden sizes. This is considered to be too detailed a matter for the SPD and will be dealt with through the planning application process.

Consultee26470 Mr Roger Stafford
Buckminster Estate**Agent**260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks
Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd**Section of SPD**

Urban Design - Streets

CommentID: SQD30**Nature of Response:** Commenting**Reasons:**

Amend wording of illustrative view notation to provide clarification

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Amend text of illustrative view notation (on page 51) to read:

“Proposed structural landscape buffer to adjacent residential development”

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is agreed that the proposed amendment more accurately reflects the position.

Proposed Change:

Amend notation on the illustrative view of the Primary Street and Local Centre will be amended to read:

“Proposed structural landscape buffer to adjacent residential development”

Consultee

26470 Mr Roger Stafford
Buckminster Estate

Agent

260782 Mr Andrew Russell-Wilks
Ancer Spa Midlands Ltd

Section of SPD

Urban Design - Heights, Density and Form

CommentID: SQD31

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Amend wording of paragraph 1 (on page 53) to provide clarification.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

In paragraph 1 amend wording to read:

“...with some single, 2.5 or 3 storey properties...”

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is agreed that the proposed amendment provides for greater flexibility in terms of housing types and styles.

Proposed Change:

In final sentence of paragraph 1 amend text to read:

“..with some single, 2.5 or 3 storey properties...”

Consultee

715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan

Agent

Section of SPD

Urban Design - Appearance

CommentID: SQD80

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

Grantham is a historic town with a mixture of stone and brick buildings.

A medieval town, the biggest expansion occurred during the Victorian era.

Grantham has a majority of homes no greater than 3 storeys.

It is recommended that the new developments reflect Grantham's historic past (and that of other neighbouring villages) whilst including the latest technologies to reduce living costs and minimise ecological impact.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The SPD draws reference from the Grantham Townscape Character Assessment where it states that the development offers an opportunity to create new neighbourhood identities, belonging to the town, but celebrating a positive new image. This should free development from the sterile cul-de-sacs of pastiches and promote contemporary architecture derived from a sense of place but addressing current cultural and technological issues.

Consultee**Agent****Section of SPD**

715711 Cllr Charmaine Morgan

Urban Design - Sustainability

CommentID: SQD75**Nature of Response:** Commenting**Reasons:**

All homes and units should be built, according to the requirements of the Core Strategy with the latest environmentally friendly technologies including ground source ground pumps and solar and wind power.

New homes and business buildings should include the latest water re-use/capture technologies.

All roads should be built to adoptable standards to minimise issues with road adoption further down the line.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:**SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:**

The Masterplan SPD sets out that all new housing will seek to reduce energy use by improving efficiency and embracing the latest sustainability standards for housing construction. Similarly, all other new buildings would be designed to the relevant approved standards which will include the use of a range of water saving devices.

Consultee**Agent****Section of SPD**521755 Mrs Laura Brackenbury
Environment Agency

Urban Design - Sustainability

CommentID: SQD64**Nature of Response:** Commenting**Reasons:**

Water Framework Directive considerations require a minimum of 3m width to gain any benefits as this would include channel and bank / vegetation. There may need to be adjustments to the design of the development to compensate for this. SUDS swales could potentially double up as Green Infrastructure too and access/ green transport routes. Locations of SUDS swales need to be keyed on the master plan and a minimum 3m width included.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Add "Water quality SUDS should be located next to any sports pitches etc, where drainage and the use of fertilisers could be needed."

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Agree it would be appropriate to make reference to the need for water quality SUDs in areas where the use of drainage and fertilisers may be required.

Proposed Change:

At end of the "Sustainable Drainage Strategy" add:

"Water quality SUDS should be located next to any sports pitches etc, where drainage and the use of fertilisers could be needed."

Consultee**Agent****Section of SPD**

521755 Mrs Laura Brackenbury
Environment Agency

Urban Design - Sustainability

CommentID: SQD63

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:**Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:**

Design of SUDS should consider Health & Safety Legislation and the future amendment to the Reservoirs Act 1975, by the Floods and Water Management Act 2010 to include all impoundments of water larger than 10,000m³ (currently it only includes impoundments larger than 25,000m³). This may be significant when designing large balancing ponds.

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

The Council considers that as SUDS design will statutorily need to be compliant with the Water Management Act and Water Framework Directive referred to in this representation, it is not necessary to include the proposed amendment within the SPD. Furthermore the precise details of the SUDs will be drawn out through the development of the overall drainage strategy.

Consultee**Agent****Section of SPD**

521755 Mrs Laura Brackenbury
Environment Agency

Urban Design - Sustainability

CommentID: SQD62

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

The drainage strategy should be in place and approved prior to any development taking place (including utilities and infrastructure). This site has extremely high permeability and so any development will need to use the SUDS in a creative and robust way to achieve no net increase in site runoff.

The drainage masterplan needs to contain information on the existing conditions, for example existing land drains, surface water drains, underground water springs and aquifer. There are already examples of springs on the west side of the Witham River Valley in this location, some of which are used for water supply. If underground tile drains are severed and left in place it can lead to flooding of gardens and properties, sometimes long standing. These need to be mapped and adequate provisions made to avoid impact on any proposed development.

The drainage masterplan should consider the temporary drainage of the site during the construction phase, and allow for impacts that construction may have on the temporary and long term drainage of the site.

Comment: we have had examples of where heavy machinery has compacted soils, causing infiltration techniques to be less effective.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Permanent design solutions should address the need to achieve good water quality as well as drainage. The SUDS management train should be used to achieve good water quality. Penstocks should be added to road drainage design to allow isolation of an affected area in the event of a road traffic accident or spillage.

SUDS should also be designed to ensure that routine maintenance, and future repairs or replacement can be easily undertaken (access and simplicity of design). The design life of the SUDS should be established, and provisions made within the drainage masterplan as to how repairs and replacement should be undertaken in the future.

The drainage masterplan should plan for an exceedance of capacity, designing into the site layout where extreme flows will run overland, so as to avoid risks to life and property.

SUDS are still preferred for use on the west side of the River Witham, although they should be designed to avoid contamination of the protected groundwater within the Source Protection Zone.

Use of LIDS (Low Impact Development) and WSUD (Water Sensitive Urban Design) techniques should be used. These include green roofs, rainwater harvesting, rain gardens etc.

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

Agree that reference should be made to what drainage measures should be addressed through the overall drainage masterplan. Proposed Change

At end of Sustainable Drainage Strategy add:

“Permanent design solutions should address the need to achieve good water quality as well as drainage. The SuDS management train should be used to achieve good water quality.

Appropriate mitigation should be added to road drainage design to allow isolation of an affected area in the event of a road traffic accident or spillage.

SUDS applications should also be designed to ensure that routine maintenance, and future repairs or replacement can be easily undertaken (access and simplicity of design). The design life of the SuDS works should be established, and provisions made within the drainage masterplan as to how repairs and replacement should be undertaken in the future.

The drainage masterplan should plan for an exceedance of capacity, designing into the site layout corridors where extreme flows will run overland, so as to avoid risks to life and property.

Where SuDS works fall within the Inner Source Protection Zone these will need to follow the EA’s requirements for protection of the groundwater within the SPZ.

Use of Low Impact Development (LIDs) and Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) techniques should be used. These include measures such as green roofs, rainwater harvesting and rain gardens.”

Consultee

521755 Mrs Laura Brackenbury
Environment Agency

Agent**Section of SPD**

Urban Design - Sustainability

CommentID: SQD61

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

The preferred option for drainage is the extensive use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS). There are enough SUDS techniques available (natural, manufactured and combined) to cope with any type of development.

Given the size of the site there must be a drainage masterplan in place for the whole development. Specific drainage parameters should be defined to avoid ambiguity and future drainage or flood risk problems as a result of poor design. All developers will need to conform to the principles of the drainage strategy.

The site should be an exemplar development, using SUDS to achieve not only effective rainfall runoff management but a host of other benefits making the development a more balanced, healthy and enjoyable place to live.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

A drainage masterplan for the site will be required and this will need to be agreed with all Flood Risk Management Authorities: South Kesteven District Council, Environment Agency, Upper Witham IDB, Anglian Water and Lincolnshire Highways Department.

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is agreed that the sustainable drainage of the site is critical to its delivery and that an overall drainage strategy will need to be agreed.

Proposed Change:

“The drainage strategy should be in place and approved prior to commencement of development. The Southern Quadrant site has high permeability across much of its area and so any development will need to use SuDS applications in a creative and robust way to achieve no net increase in site runoff.

The drainage masterplan should contain information on the existing conditions, for example existing land drains, surface water drains, underground water springs and aquifer.

There are examples of springs on the west side of the Witham River Valley in this location, some of which are used for water supply. If underground tile drains are severed and left in place it can lead to flooding of gardens and properties, sometimes long standing. These should be mapped and adequate provisions made to avoid impact on any proposed development.

The drainage masterplan should consider the phased drainage of the site as development progresses and incorporate outline details of how this will be managed against the phasing plan currently available.”

Consultee**Agent****Section of SPD**

517670 Natural England
Natural England

Urban Design - Sustainability

CommentID: SQD60

Nature of Response: Supporting

Reasons:

We are pleased to note that Sustainable Urban Drainage will be designed and managed positively to contribute towards wildlife and GI objectives.

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:**SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:**

Noted.

Consultee**Agent****Section of SPD**

26279 Mr David Connolly
Larkfleet Group

Timescale & Phasing

CommentID: SQD49

Nature of Response: Commenting

Reasons:

The Timescale and Phasing do not seem to indicate that the Southern Relief Road will be constructed and opened prior to the commencement of the housing and employment uses as identified in the outcomes of the September 2011 consultation responses (see page 05).

Can the Council please confirm that this is still the intention? can the Council also confirm how the SRR will be funded and the timescales for receiving funding, planning approval, necessary arrangements with Network Rail and other landowners and construction of the SRR please?

In other words please confirm when the SRR will be completed and when the rest of the development will be commenced and occupied?

Changes to the draft that you consider necessary:

Provision of a more detailed timeline showing the provision of the pre-commencement items, SRR and other necessary infrastructure, development timelines and dates for the provision of on-site infrastructure (schools etc).

SKDC Response and Recommended Changes:

It is the intention that Southern Relief Road will be delivered prior to the majority of housing on site. There is however capacity for around 200 dwellings to be constructed on-site prior to the completion of the SRR.

The Relief Road will be forward funded by Lincolnshire County Council, who have funding set aside within their Capital Programme and recouped over time as development is built out. A planning application for the road is planned for submission in spring 2013 with a projected start on-site of 2014 and completion in 2016. Discussions relating to the necessary arrangements with Network Rail, other landowners and the construction of the SRR are ongoing.