



The Planning Inspectorate

Report to South Kesteven District Council

by Roland Punshon BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Date: 27th February 2014

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004 (AS AMENDED)

SECTION 20

REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO SOUTH KESTEVEN SITE ALLOCATION AND POLICIES DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

Document submitted for examination on 31 January 2012

Examination hearings held between 6 and 9 November 2012, 13 and 16 November 2012 and 9 and 13 December 2013

File Ref: #### (not MWR ref)

Abbreviations Used in this Report

DPD	Development Plan Document
GAAP	Grantham Area Action Plan
ha	hectare
ICG	Internal Challenge Group
LDS	Local Development Scheme
LP	Local Plan
LSC	Local Service Centre
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
RS	Regional Strategy
SA/SEA	Sustainability Appraisal – Strategic Environmental Assessment
SAP	Site Allocation and Policies Development Plan Document
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SCOTC	Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
VoS	Voice of Stamford

Non-Technical Summary

This report concludes that the South Kesteven Site Allocation and Policies Development Plan Document (the SAP) provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the District up to 2026 providing a number of modifications are made to the Plan. The Council has specifically requested that I recommend any modifications necessary to enable the Plan to be adopted. All of the modifications to address this were proposed by the Council and I have recommended their inclusion after considering the representations from other parties on these issues.

The modifications can be summarised as follows:

- Those required to bring the content of the SAP up-to-date;
- Those made necessary by the Council's re-assessment of the Local Service Centre (LSC) and site selection processes;
- Those which are necessary to address areas where the SAP provisions need to provide clearer policy direction;
- Those which are necessary to give greater flexibility in the application of the SAP provisions; and
- Those which are necessary to enable the SAP to be properly monitored in order to provide a necessary early response to any failure in delivery.

Introduction

1. This report contains my assessment of the South Kesteven Site Allocation and Policies Development Plan Document (the SAP) in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). It considers first whether the SAP's preparation has complied with the duty to co-operate, in recognition that there is no scope to remedy any failure in this regard. It then considers whether the Plan is sound and whether it is compliant with the legal requirements. The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 182) makes clear that to be sound, a Local Plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.
2. The starting point for the Examination is the assumption that the local authority has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan.
3. The Plan should be in conformity with the Council's Core Strategy which was adopted in July 2010. The Council proposes, in the near future, to undertake an exercise to determine whether there is a need to review the Core Strategy. In the near future, the Council is also intending to bring forward a Development Plan Document (DPD) covering detailed planning matters in the Grantham and immediately surrounding area. This, together with the SAP, will provide detailed plan coverage for the whole district.
4. The Government revoked the Regional Strategy for the East Midlands (RS) on 12 April 2013. There is, therefore, no longer a requirement that the SAP should be in general conformity with the RS.
5. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published shortly after the Plan was submitted for Examination. The Council has undertaken a consultation exercise which sought views on the conformity of the SAP with the NPPF. Representations made have been taken into account in preparing my Report.
6. At the first set of Hearing sessions the Council proposed a number of Main Modifications to the version of the Plan originally submitted in January 2012. These were referenced SAPMM** and were detailed in a document entitled 'Site Allocations and Policies DPD Submission (Incorporating Modifications) June 2012'. These changes were consulted on in the middle of 2012. This document formed the basis for the Hearing sessions which were held in November 2012. However, in the light of Case Law which was brought to its attention at the end of those Hearing sessions, the Council decided to reassess the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) which supported the Plan. The Council undertook this exercise and re-advertised and re-consulted on both the SA/SEA and the Main Modifications which it considered arose from that exercise and which arose from discussions at the earlier Hearing sessions. These Main Modifications are referenced PHMM**.
7. The Council has produced a document entitled 'Sustainability Appraisal/ Strategic Environmental Assessment Addendum Report June 2013' and a document entitled 'Supplementary Evidence Document June 2013' which explain its revised methodology for the selection of locations for development.

It has also produced a document entitled 'Site Allocations and Policies DPD Submission (Incorporating Modifications) July 2013' which sets out all of the original Main Modifications (the SAPMM** modifications) together with the Main Modifications arising from the latest SA/SEA site selection reassessment exercise and from the earlier Hearings (the PHMM** modifications).

8. Inevitably, some of the PHMM** modifications make alterations to the earlier SAPMM** modifications and this causes some difficulty in following the changes and addressing the representations which have been made. However, the 'Site Allocations and Policies DPD Submission (Incorporating Modifications) July 2013' document provides a clear and readily understandable basis for examining the plan provisions. That document has been re-consulted upon and has been re-advertised. In these circumstances I will employ that document as the basis for my examination and my Report.
9. My Report deals with the Main Modifications that are needed to make the SAP sound and legally compliant and they are identified in bold in the report (**SAPMM**** and **PHMM****). In accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act the Council requested that I should make any Main Modifications needed to rectify matters that make the Plan unsound/not legally compliant and thus incapable of being adopted. The Main Modifications that are necessary for soundness and/or legal compliance all relate to matters which were discussed at the Examination Hearings. These Main Modifications are set out in Appendix A. All have been subject to public consultation and, where necessary, Sustainability Appraisal (SA). I have taken into account all of the representations made in respect of the originally submitted Plan and of the Main Modifications in coming to my conclusions in this Report.

Assessment of Duty to Co-operate

10. Section 20(5)(c) of the 2004 Act requires that I consider whether the Council has complied with any duty imposed on it by Section 33A of the 2004 Act in relation to the SAP's preparation.
11. The SAP was submitted for Examination on 31 January 2012 and, in these circumstances, the Council is required to comply with the duty to co-operate placed upon it by Section 33A. The SAP follows on from the adoption by the Council in July 2010 of the South Kesteven Core Strategy which was prepared under the strategic context of the, now revoked, East Midlands Regional Plan. As part of the formulation of the Council's Core Strategy and the Core Strategies of the adjacent councils of Peterborough, Rutland and South Holland, joint Strategic Housing Market Assessments and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments were undertaken. This has been taken forward in the Plan in that close co-operation with the neighbouring district of Rutland took place in identifying strategic development land options around Stamford.
12. There is clear evidence that the Council has co-operated with statutory authorities – notably the water, drainage and highways authorities – to develop an approach to development location and programming which ensures a co-ordinated strategy.
13. In these circumstances I am satisfied that the Council has effectively co-operated to plan for issues where there are strategic cross-boundary impacts

and has worked collaboratively with private sector bodies, utility and infrastructure providers. The duty to co-operate imposed by Section 33A has therefore been complied with.

Assessment of Soundness

Main Issues

14. Taking account of all the representations, written evidence and the discussions that took place at the examination Hearings I have identified 10 main issues upon which the soundness of the SAP depends.

Issue 1 – Are the provisions of the SAP up-to-date and in-line with the latest national guidance?

15. The SAP has been prepared over a long time frame and it has been necessary for the council to promote a number of Main Modifications to bring the document up-to-date with developments in matters such as the number of committed housing schemes and drainage issues and into line with the latest national guidance which has emerged since the document was submitted for Examination. Clearly it is important that the SAP should be based on information which is accurate and up-to-date. There is a legal requirement that it should be consistent with national guidance. To achieve these objectives I recommend that the following Main Modifications should be made:

SAPMM001, 003, 004, 011, 013, 016, 022, 027, 028, 047, 048

PHMM01, 02, 03, 06, 07, 08, 09, 010, 011, 024

Issue 2 – Does the Council's methodology for identifying appropriate locations and sites for development ensure that the most sustainable choices are made?

Background Issues

16. The Council's adopted Core Strategy specifies the number of housing units which will be built in particular settlements to meet the identified housing requirement in the 20 year period 2006-2026. It is intended that over half the total requirement will be met in Grantham and the immediately surrounding area and specific allocations in this part of the district will be identified in the forthcoming Grantham Area Action Plan (GAAP). The remainder will be allocated through the SAP. Overall, the Core Strategy requires that sites for 13,620 houses should be identified. Table 1 in the SAP indicates that, in the combined GAAP and SAP, sites with a capacity of 14,470 houses have been identified - about 6% more than the requirement.
17. The Core Strategy also identifies the general locations to which the housing requirement specified for the SAP area will be directed and apportions the quantum of housing which each location should deliver. Specific requirements are made for 2 of the 3 larger settlements - Stamford and The Deepings. No additional requirement is made for Bourne as a large number of new dwellings have already been permitted in and around that settlement. A requirement is

specified for settlements identified in the Core Strategy as Local Service Centres (LSCs). The Core Strategy identified 16 settlements as LSCs on the basis of their sustainability credentials. However, it made clear that not all would necessarily receive an allocation.

18. A large number of houses have been built in the District since 2006 and an equally large number have been granted planning permission. The size of these commitments means that sites for only relatively small numbers of houses need to be allocated in the SAP. The background to this situation is set out in some detail in proposed changes which add new paragraphs to the SAP (**PHMM07**). In my view it is important that the Council brings this information together in one place to ensure that the SAP is effective in delivering development. I therefore recommend that the changes should be made.
19. The SAP has been criticised on the basis that the housing requirement which informed the Core Strategy is now out-dated. However, the SAP is not the vehicle by which changes to the requirement should be made. I agree that a review of the Core Strategy is the proper planning stage to consider such matters and the Council is assessing whether such a review is necessary. The Council should take account of these criticisms in reaching its decision but will also need to be aware that the criticisms may re-surface when it is assessing planning proposals which are submitted ahead of any review taking place.

Site Selection Methodology - General

20. From the beginning of the Examination process I have had concerns about the methodology which the Council had employed to identify which LSCs would receive a housing allocation and which sites would be allocated. These concerns were raised at Exploratory Meetings and through the first set of Hearings sessions. At that stage my concerns were twofold: that there was no clear evidence to support the Council's decision to identify some LSCs to receive development in preference to other LSCs; and, that the assessment of individual sites appeared to be crude with no clear basis for objectively choosing one site over another.
21. In the light of case law which was brought to the Council's attention at the close of first set of Hearing sessions, the Council decided that it would be prudent to reassess the methodology which it had employed in preparing its SA/SEA and which formed the basis of its selection processes. In these circumstances, the Council sought a suspension of the Examination in order to undertake a review of the methodology and to make any necessary changes. In the light of the *Cogent Land LLP v Rochford District Council and Bellway Homes* judgement in the High Court, I agreed to this suspension.
22. As I made clear at the latest Hearing sessions, I am not required to assess the soundness of the SA/SEA. However, in order to be justified, the SAP should derive from a robust and credible evidence base which includes the SA/SEA. If the methodology for choosing the best locations for new development is soundly based, then it follows that the Council's decisions on which sites to allocate should also be sound.
23. Essentially the Council's selection process falls into 2 parts: firstly, the selection of LSCs which are best suited to receive a housing allocation; and,

secondly, the selection of the sites which are best suited for allocation.

Revised Methodology – Choice of LSCs

24. As I have already pointed out, the 16 LSCs were identified in the adopted Core Strategy. I cannot, therefore, add to that list. Employing the list of 20 objectives set out in the SA/SEA Scoping Report, the Council selected 6 which could be applied to settlements rather than individual sites. For each of these specified objectives detailed tests were consistently applied to allow performance against the objective to be measured. By applying consistent comparative criteria, the LSC settlements could be ranked from Tier 1 to Tier 4 with Tier 1 being the most sustainable and Tier 4 being the least sustainable. Development sites in Tier 1 settlements were sought first with recourse to Tier 2 settlements only where the necessary allocations could not be found in Tier 1 settlements.
25. In my opinion the Council's revised approach to the assessment of LSCs is a substantial improvement over the approach which it replaces. Although a similar 'traffic light' marking system is employed, the consistent application of objective tests to the matters which go to the heart of the sustainability of settlements makes understanding of the process much easier, provides a robust and credible approach and allows proper comparisons between settlements to be drawn. I am satisfied that the Council's concentration on performance against tests which are directed at ensuring that the need to travel is minimised is appropriate in the light of NPPF guidance.
26. I accept that some may argue that certain matters should have been greater weight in this process or that the assessment of some settlements has been either inconsistent and/or incorrectly carried out. I deal with some of these detailed criticisms in other parts of this Report. However, I have seen no clear evidence to suggest to me that the essential methodology is faulty. The revised methodology is described in new text set out in paragraphs 1.4.6, 1.6.6 and 3.4.2.3 and section 3.4.3 (**PHMM04, PHMM05, SAPMM030 and PHMM25**). I recommend that these Main Modifications be made in order to ensure that the Council's choices are properly justified.

Revised Methodology – Choice of allocation sites

27. The Council has considered a large number of potential allocation sites through the SAP preparation process. Many of these are promoted by owners and potential developers but others have been suggested from within the Council, by Parish and Town Councils and by others. A number of sites which were identified in the earlier Hearings sessions have now been brought into the process. In total this amounts to over 300 sites. All have been assessed by the revised methodology, the details of which are set out in the 'Supplementary Evidence Document June 2013'. Paragraph 4.3 of the document makes clear that the SA/SEA exercise is only part of a 5 stage process employed to make choices between sites. Given that the Core Strategy directs development to the major towns and the 16 LSCs, only sites in these locations were assessed. Stage 1 of the process involved the collection of base data on all sites. Stage 2 involved a sift of the sites to exclude those which did not comply with other policies, were poorly related to the built form of the settlement, were too small to allocate, were already being developed or were subject to a 'show-stopper'

constraint such as flooding. Stage 3 involved the application of the SA/SEA methodology to the remaining sites. Again the 20 objectives drawn from the SA/SEA Scoping Report were employed. Some of these dealt with detailed design issues and were not applied. Those which only had relevance to employment development were only employed in the assessment of employment sites. A series of specific tests was employed to assess each site against these objectives.

28. From the Stage 3 exercise, the sites which had the least harmful effects on the SA/SEA objectives were taken forward to Stage 4. In this stage each site was assessed against a set of questions to establish issues of access, topography, neighbouring uses, landscape, existing use and relationship to patterns of development. Answers were marked in a consistent manner. Stage 5 involved an assessment of the deliverability of the sites.
29. An Internal Challenge Group (ICG) made up of Council officers unconnected with preparation of the SAP together with representatives of the Planning Advisory Service and the Planning Officers Society considered all sites assessed at Stage 4 and came to a final assessment of which sites to allocate in the main towns and the Tier 1 and Tier 2 LSCs.
30. The detail of any site selection process can be criticised. It could be argued that local opinion played too little part in the final selection process but I consider that the Council made considerable efforts to consult local residents and Parish/Town Councils. Whilst there may be scope to re-examine the methods involved in the future, I am satisfied that the local community had sufficient opportunity to make representations.
31. The Council consulted the relevant bodies on the effects of development on nature conservation assets. Again the approach has been criticised but I am satisfied that, had these bodies had objections to the development of a particular site, they had been given the opportunity to make representations. I have seen no evidence to persuade me that the methodology adopted has led to the allocation of any land which would be undevelopable because of its nature conservation qualities.
32. Some may criticise the ICG's input to the process. However, given the make-up of the body, I have no reason to conclude that its decisions were made in anything other than a genuinely balanced manner.
33. It can also be argued that some SA/SEA objectives should not have been scoped out, that the ready deliverability of sites was given insufficient emphasis in the process and that some other factors by which the sites were assessed were given undue weight. However, I am satisfied that the Council's methodology is both logical and coherent and has been applied consistently. I have no reason to conclude that it is essentially flawed.
34. Given the amount of data which informed the process, it is inevitable that some minor inconsistencies and mistakes will creep into the process. I will deal with some of these elsewhere in this Report. However, in general terms I am satisfied that none have had a fundamental effect on the outcome of the process.
35. In overall terms I am satisfied that the application of the Council's revised

SA/SEA and site and LSC selection processes has been a proper and genuine exercise aimed at ensuring that the most sustainable options are chosen. This has resulted in some changes to the choices made in earlier documents. However, I do not consider that the essential strategic thrust of the document has been fundamentally changed. In my opinion the exercise has not resulted in a re-writing of the SAP. I am also satisfied that the exercise has not simply been an attempt to 'retro-fit' justification to choices which had already been made. Understandably, some of the original choices made have been confirmed by the revised processes whilst others have not and, where this has occurred, changes have been made. The fact that these changes have been made suggests to me that the process has been genuinely undertaken.

36. The Council's revised site assessment methodology is briefly detailed in a proposed Main Modification (**PHMM08**). I recommend that this change is made to ensure that the plan provisions are clearly justified.
37. In the light of the above, I conclude on the second main issue that, subject to the recommended Main Modifications, the Council's methodology for identifying appropriate locations and sites for development is sound.

Issue 3 – Does the Council's approach to the phasing of delivery of housing properly reflect the Government's commitment to boost significantly the supply of housing as set out in paragraph 47 of the NPPF?

38. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF requires that the Council should identify and update annually specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of the housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% moved forward from later plan periods. Table 1 in the SAP indicates that, in the SAP area, the Core Strategy requires that allocations should be made for 5,940 houses between 2006 and 2026. However, between April 2006 and March 2013, 3,089 houses had been built and a further 2,403 had been granted planning permission – a commitments total of 5,492. It is clear, therefore, that provision in the SAP area, at least, is well ahead of target delivery with over 90% of the housing requirement having been built or granted planning permission in the first 7 years of the plan period.
39. Housing delivery taken across the whole district is somewhat different and Table 1 indicates that building rates in the GAAP area are less buoyant. The Core Strategy is quite clear in its commitment to concentrate most of the development needs of the district in and around Grantham. The challenge will be to bring forward the large Grantham Urban Extension sites which will deliver that commitment. Whilst I consider that site allocations in an up-to-date development plan can be reasonably taken into account in calculating the 5 year supply, the Council needs to be pragmatic in its assumptions about these sites coming forward in good time. A robust monitoring regime is necessary to ensure that these assumptions remain realistic over time.
40. Clearly there is considerable willingness on the parts of developers and landowners to bring forward sites in the SAP area. However, I am not persuaded that housing building rates in the SAP area should necessarily be boosted to maintain the overall 5 year supply. I accept that monitoring of the Council's performance in housing provision may at some point indicate that earlier releases of housing sites in the SAP are necessary to maintain the 5

year supply of land over the whole district. However, at this stage I have seen no clear evidence to persuade me that such action would necessarily be the only or, indeed, the best option. In my view, removal of the Council's phasing restrictions imposed on the SAP housing sites is likely to have the unwelcome effect of reducing pressure to bring forward sites in and around Grantham. The Council proposes a number of Main Modifications which clarify its position on the phasing of development sites (**SAPMM014, 016, 025 and 035**). I recommend that in the interests of effectiveness these changes should be made.

41. Paragraph 5.1.6 of the Core Strategy states that 'appropriate phasing mechanisms' will be incorporated to maintain a continuous 5 year supply. I accept that, in the absence of any restrictions such as those deriving from deficiencies in the capacity of the foul drainage system, the Council's choices with regard to phasing may seem somewhat arbitrary. However, given the number of houses which have already been built and permitted, its options are now limited.
42. The Council proposes a number of changes to paragraphs 3.5.1-5 to explain its position on, amongst other things, phasing (**SAPMM037, 038, 039 and 040 and PHMM34, 35 and 36**). In my view these paragraphs in their revised form set out a clear, flexible approach to site delivery which is clearly linked to maintaining the 5 year housing land supply. I recommend that these changes be made in the interests of effectiveness.
43. In these circumstances I conclude that the Council's approach to the phasing of delivery of housing properly reflects the Government's commitment to boost significantly the supply of housing as set out in paragraph 47 of the NPPF and is therefore sound.

Issue 4 – Is the Council's choice of allocated sites in and around Stamford justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively planned in all the circumstances?

Core Strategy Requirements

44. Core Strategy Policy H1 requires 1,140 houses to be provided in Stamford in the 2006-2026 period. By April 2013, 733 houses had been built or had been granted planning permission – leaving 407 to be allocated. The SAP allocates sites for about 525 houses through Policies STM1 and STM3. Local preference as expressed by the Town Council is for a single large site rather than a number of smaller allocations. The Council proposes a Main Modification to bring the housing figures set out in paragraph 3.1.2.1 up to date (**PHMM09**). I recommend that the change be made.
45. In addition to the housing allocations, the Core Strategy also requires that employment sites of about 24 hectares which 'afford good access to the strategic road network and which can be sympathetically integrated within the local landscape' should be allocated.

General matters

Scope

46. The Council's revised site assessment methodology has considered a wide range of sites in and around Stamford. Whilst earlier exercises have been criticised for not assessing all potential sites, I am satisfied that the latest exercise has been sufficiently comprehensive including land identified from a variety of sources and sites which are located both within the district and in the adjoining local planning authority area.

Use of previously-developed land

47. Given the scale of housing and employment land required by the Core Strategy and the local preference for a single large allocation, it is almost inevitable that a substantial part of the Stamford requirements will need to be met from sites on the edge of the settlement which comprise greenfield land to a greater or lesser degree. Those sites which comprise either wholly or partly previously-developed land are mainly in employment use.
48. Evidence contained in the 2010 'South Kesteven Employment Land Capacity Study' demonstrates that there had been a high demand for employment premises in Stamford. Core Strategy Policy E1 states that existing areas of employment in Stamford should be retained or enhanced except where the characteristics of the site make it unsuitable or inappropriate for continued employment use. Paragraph 6.1.7 of the Core Strategy states that whilst redevelopment of suitable previously-developed land and sites within the town centre will be a priority, it acknowledges that there will be a need to identify additional employment land.
49. The take-up of employment land may have been depressed by the recent downturn in the economic climate. However, I can see no reason why, with recovering economic activity, former levels of take-up should not return. During my visits to Stamford I saw little evidence that large parts of the existing employment areas were currently disused or that, where premises were currently vacant, they could not be returned to use or redeveloped in the short to medium term.
50. Given the need to provide a balance of land for housing, employment and other uses, I have seen no evidence to persuade me that the Council has chosen to allocate greenfield sites for development where reasonable brownfield alternatives existed. Had the Council allocated land for housing purposes which was already in employment use, this could lead to a significant imbalance in provision. In these circumstances I am satisfied that the Council's general approach to the use of previously-developed land is in-line with the guidance contained in the NPPF and the principles of sustainable development.

Highways and traffic

51. Stamford is the focal point of the main road network in this part of the district. This, together with the geometry and pattern of roads in the historic core of the settlement, brings with it difficulties in terms of traffic movements.
52. Both the Council and Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce (SCOTC)

provided evidence to the Examination which set out the results of exercises which modelled the traffic conditions in Stamford which would arise from various development scenarios. SCOTC criticised the Council's model in that it did not make a 'like for like' comparison in terms of the quantum of development proposed. However, both models showed very similar results and, perhaps unsurprisingly, demonstrated that, based on no traffic control measures being implemented, all of the scenarios examined would result in an increase in traffic congestion in the town. However, the effects of different development scenarios were, in the main, only marginal.

53. SCOTC made representations to the Examination of the Core Strategy to the effect that the document was unsound in that it did not include a commitment to a 'Ring Road' around Stamford. The Core Strategy Inspector rejected this argument on the basis that there was no agreement by the transport providers that a 'Ring Road' was either an appropriate or deliverable solution to Stamford's traffic difficulties. Neither was she convinced that the scale of development proposed in Stamford would be capable of delivering the road through developer contributions.
54. SCOTC reiterated its case during my Examination of the SAP. It argued that a 'Ring Road' could be financed by seeking contributions from the developers of a string of, mainly greenfield, housing sites on the edge of the town. It argued that the Council's choice of sites was a 'lost opportunity' in that it would not deliver any part of the 'Ring Road'. So far as the transport providers are concerned, matters have not moved on from the time of the Core Strategy Examination. A 'Ring Road' is not included in the Local Transport Plan and no expenditure is programmed for undertaking a feasibility study.
55. SCOTC has clearly put considerable time, effort and resources into making its case for a 'Ring Road'. However, that case is based on a road which, in SCOTC's own estimation, would cost almost £20 million (at 2011 prices) and would be paid for by contributions from the development of between 130 and 170 hectares (ha) of land. SCOTC assumes that half of this land would be devoted to housing. This would be a major departure in terms of the Council's strategy for Stamford. Clearly it involves a great deal more development than is proposed for Stamford by the Core Strategy up to 2026. It is by no means clear whether this quantum of development would be required, whether it would be appropriate for a town of this size or whether it would be acceptable to the population of the town. In any event, it would be many years before the 'Ring Road' could be completed and could properly perform the function envisaged by SCOTC. There is no clear evidence to show that all of the land required for the whole of the 'Ring road' could be acquired.
56. In my view, the dramatic solution to the traffic issues in Stamford which the 'Ring Road' and the associated development would represent should only be brought forward as part of a carefully crafted long-term strategy. The Core Strategy provides no basis for such a strategy, no other such strategy exists and none is in prospect.
57. SCOTC's traffic modelling has also examined a proposal where 25.5 ha of land to the east of Stamford would be developed and the section of the proposed 'Ring Road' from the A6121 to the A43 (effectively the section of road around the eastern and southern parts of the town) constructed. In SCOTC's proposal

the development would comprise 820-830 dwellings and 3 ha of 'high quality office accommodation'.

58. This more limited proposal would, in terms of development quantum, be more in line with the requirements of the Core Strategy. However, having taken into account the number of houses constructed and with planning permission at 1 April 2013, an allocation in the region of 820 dwellings would still result in considerable over-allocation/provision against Core Strategy targets.
59. Traffic modelling exercises undertaken by SCOTC indicate that this option would result in network speeds being maintained at 2009 levels and travel times increasing by only about 50%. On the face of it and in traffic terms alone, this seems like an attractive alternative. However, paragraph 47 of the NPPF requires that in developing a housing land supply strategy, sites should be deliverable or developable. In both cases viability is a key consideration. SCOTC estimate that this section of road would cost almost £12 million to build – although I note that this price appears to exclude land costs. Based on 850 new houses, it would require a financial contribution from developers of between £14,000 and £15,000 per dwelling. Land prices are likely to be high as much of the necessary land required for the road lies outside the development sites and the owners would be able to effectively charge 'ransom' value.
60. The developers would also be subject to other financial burdens such as affordable housing and educational facilities provision. SCOTC expressed the opinion at the Hearings that developer contributions would be better directed to the 'Ring Road' than to matters such as education or affordable housing. I disagree. I have seen no clear evidence to persuade me that all developer contributions should be directed to resolving traffic issues. I do not consider that it would be prudent of the Council to set aside its other responsibilities in this way.
61. In all the circumstances, I have seen no evidence to persuade me that this alternative partial 'Ring Road' proposal would result in a financially viable package.
62. Putting matters of viability to one side, there are other potential obstacles to the provision of the whole or part of the 'Ring Road' such as the fact that the road would need to cut across the Grade II* registered park and garden associated with Burghley House Grade I Listed building and that the road would require a roundabout junction very close to the Grade II Listed gates, arches and lodges at the western entrance to Burghley House.
63. I accept that major developments in Stamford are likely to lead to increases in traffic congestion and that paragraph 3.3.7 of the Core Strategy states that the Council will work towards measures to reduce traffic congestion and improve accessibility. I visited Stamford on many occasions during the course of the Examination and spent some considerable time watching the way in which traffic behaved. Clearly there are traffic issues in the town and this is almost inevitable given the pattern and geometry of roads in the historic centre and the 'bottleneck' formed by the Town Bridge. However, I am not persuaded that these issues are so acute or intractable that they could only be satisfactorily resolved by construction of a 'Ring Road', either in whole or in

part. I do not consider there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate the need for such a strategy. The Council is considering measures to reduce congestion, for instance the provision of traffic light controls on the B1081/Kettering Road junction and sustainable transport initiatives as part of the Policy STM3 site proposals. Whilst these measures may or may not provide the reduction in traffic congestion which would derive from the provision of the whole or part of the 'Ring Road', I am satisfied that the Council is seeking to address the commitment it made in the Core Strategy.

64. I have seen no convincing evidence to show that the SAP can only be made sound if it allocates sites which would deliver the whole or part of the 'Ring Road'. In my opinion the provision of a 'Ring Road' cannot be regarded as being sufficiently deliverable or necessary to justify making decisions at this stage which are influenced by considerations of its provision. I therefore consider that the Council's approach in this regard is sound.

Accessibility

65. Representors have argued that sites on the eastern side of Stamford are more accessible to facilities than the Council's chosen site on the western side of the town. Voice of Stamford (VoS) submitted a drawing showing distances from the 2 locations to currently available facilities. I accept that sites to the east of the town are closer to existing facilities. However, what is noticeable from the drawing is the almost complete absence of any facilities – other than a primary school - west of a line formed by Little Casterton Road/Roman Bank. A substantial part of the town is therefore already relatively isolated from existing facilities.
66. The Council's policy for the site on the western side of the town (Policy STM3) includes a requirement that a small scale local centre should be provided to serve both new occupants as well as the occupants of the adjacent existing housing areas. It also requires that, if appropriate education and health facilities are not available, these deficiencies should be addressed by the developer and that links to, amongst other things, the town centre should be facilitated. As well as meeting the needs of the new population, the development of a site on the western side of the town would therefore provide benefits in terms of providing access to facilities for the population of part of the town outside of the allocated site.
67. In these circumstances and given that it includes a substantial element of employment development as well as housing, I consider that in overall terms the Policy STM3 allocation provides considerable opportunities to reduce the need to travel. Whilst sites to the east of the town are closer to existing facilities, this advantage is, in my view, outweighed by the advantages offered by the Policy STM3 site.

Landscape and Setting

68. The Council's strategy is to provide most of the Stamford allocations on a single large, mixed use site. This would reflect the local preference for the avoidance of incremental encroachments into the countryside. It would also make the provision of supporting facilities easier to achieve. I can see no reason for concluding that such an approach is inherently unsound. The Core

Strategy sets out the level of development being sought and, in Policy STM3, the SAP makes an allocation of 29 ha. To meet this requirement, any alternative site of equivalent size will need to include at least some greenfield land. Any chosen site is therefore likely to have some effect on the surrounding landscape and setting of the town.

69. The Policy STM3 site and much of the land to the north and east of the town was identified in the 1995 South Kesteven Local Plan as a prominent area of landscape which should be protected from development. The Council has removed this designation as it is not supported by evidence. Part of the greenfield land on the eastern side of the town was allocated in the Local Plan (LP) for employment development and I note that paragraph 3.35 of the LP described development of these areas as not having 'a serious effect upon the form, character and setting of the town.' Clearly this is a matter of subjective judgement and I do not consider that judgements made at that time should necessarily dictate assessments made in current circumstances.
70. I heard a considerable amount of evidence at the Hearings from landscape specialists who had made different assessments of potential development sites using different methodologies. I have visited all of the sites myself and have viewed them from a variety of vantage points. In my view each of the alternative sites would have its own particular effect on landscape and the setting of the town. Development on the northern side of the town would be visible on the skyline from the north. Development on the eastern side of the town would, to a greater or lesser extent, intrude into views of the town across the valley of the River Gwash from a well-used network of footpaths and would be partly visible from Burghley House. Development on the western side of the town would be visible on elevated land from locations around Easton on the Hill and from the A1.
71. Conversely, development on the eastern edge of the town would be seen against a backdrop of development which is already visually poor. Development on the northern edge would have little or no effect on important views across the town. Development on the western side would comprise fill-in development between the existing edge of the town and the already intrusive presence of the A1. In these circumstances, I am not persuaded that any site of equivalent size could be argued to be significantly better or worse than any other in terms of their landscape impact.
72. I do not consider, therefore, that the Council's choice of the Policy STM3 site is inherently unsound so far as impact on landscape or the setting of the town is concerned.

Deliverability

73. Evidence provided by the Council indicates that sites on the western side of Stamford with ready access and presence alongside the A1 would be most attractive to the developers of employment land. A substantial area of part greenfield and part brownfield land to the east of the town was allocated for employment purposes in the 1995 Local Plan but remains largely undeveloped. As I made clear on a number of occasions during the course of the Examination, deliverability is a key consideration. The Core Strategy requires that 24 ha of employment land should be allocated in Stamford. To meet this

requirement the SAP allocates a total of 27 ha, almost half of which is located on the eastern side of the town. The remaining 14 ha would form part of the Policy STM3 site.

74. Local preference is for a single large extension of the town. If the full traffic and other benefits of the planned co-location of new housing and employment are to be realised, there is a sound case for a single mixed use site. The Council's aspirations for employment creation need to be realistic. Given that employment land to the east of the town has not been taken up in the past, I am not persuaded that further allocations in this location would be a sound choice. In my opinion it is only by allocating land which is most attractive to developers that the Council's strategy can have its best chance of success. I am satisfied therefore that the allocation of land on the western side of the town is a sound choice.

Flooding

75. In assessing the potential development of sites in and around Stamford the Council took account of, amongst other things, the potential for surface water flooding. From the considerable amount of evidence which I read and which I heard on this subject, I am satisfied that, so far as sites on the eastern side of Stamford are concerned, if any flooding issues exist they are not so significant that they are a determining factor in deciding whether those sites should be selected for development over other sites. In my view, any residual flooding issues, if they do exist, could be adequately addressed through the layout of development or the imposition of planning conditions on any planning permissions which are granted. I have taken this into account in my assessment of the Council's overall methodology for the selection of development sites. The issue of flooding may have had a bearing on the Council's decisions on whether or not to allocate particular sites. However, having made my own assessments of the sites, I am satisfied that, taking into account all of the relevant matters, the Council's choice of sites is sound.

Conclusion on General Matters

76. Having taken into account the general matters set out above, I am satisfied that, when considered in a balanced manner, the Council's general approach to the location of development in and around Stamford is sound. I have seen no evidence to persuade me that any site which would have been otherwise acceptable was rejected on flooding grounds.

Specific sites – Policy STM1a and STM1d sites

Landscape, Setting and Heritage

77. These sites are located on either side of Kettering Road on the southern edge of the town. The Policy STM1d site comprises the town's football ground which is intended to relocate to the northern side of town. In my view redevelopment of the site would have no harmful effect on the setting of the town or on the character of the surrounding area as it already has an urban presence and is closely confined by other development.
78. The Policy STM1a site is the subject of a Main Modification (**PHMM14**) which increases the size of the site to include a pair of small paddocks between the

original site and the floodlit playing fields of a nearby school. Whilst this would result in the loss of open land along the road frontage, in visual terms I consider that the increase in size would have little additional effect. The change would rationalise the boundary of the built-up area and, for these reasons, I consider that it is justified. My assessment is based on the extended site.

79. From rising land to the south, the development would be in the foreground of views towards the historic part of Stamford. However, because it is on lower ground, the views would not be obscured in any way. At present the fields are bounded by strong hedges and I can see no reason why these could not be retained. Together with sensitive design, this would temper the effect of the development on the adjacent countryside and would allow the buildings to be effectively blended into the countryside in views from the south.
80. From the B1081, the development would be largely screened by intervening hedges and roadside banks until the edge of the built-up area was already evident. I am not persuaded that the proposed development would have any significant effect on the appreciation of the Burghley House parkland or lodges which are on the opposite side of the road.
81. As a Minor Modification to the SAP the Council proposes to make reference to the need for careful design on the Policy STM1a site. However, I can see no sound reason at this stage for reducing the indicative number of houses that the sites are expected to deliver. The details of design and layout will determine whether a reduction in the indicative figure is warranted.

Traffic and highways

82. Representations have been made which raised concerns about the impact of development of the Policy STM1a and STM1d sites on highway conditions in the area. I spent a considerable length of time during the evening peak period observing traffic movements. Given that the junction of Kettering Road (A43) and the B1081 is at present unregulated and that the geometry of the junction is adversely affected by the proximity of buildings on the corners, my general impression was that the junction worked remarkably well. There was some queuing by vehicles seeking to turn out of Kettering Road on to the B1081 but the queue rarely amounted to more than 10 vehicles. Despite the narrow width of the carriageways, some 'rat-running' was taking place along Wothorpe Road/Station Road and to a lesser extent along Church Lane and Church Street. However, I consider that a significant factor in this was that drivers were assured of being able to exit on to the B1081 because its junction with Station Road is subject to signal control.
83. The Council argues that development of the Policy STM1a and STM1d sites would justify a contribution from the developer which would allow signalisation of the Kettering Road/B1081 junction and other changes to the local road network. In my opinion these improvements would make a significant difference to traffic conditions in the area. They would make exit to and from the B1081 more readily assured, they would reduce the need for, and ease of, 'rat-running' and they would provide other benefits for pedestrians through local realignments. In my opinion the overall improvement would more than offset the harmful effects of increased traffic generated by the proposed

developments.

84. I have already dealt with SCOTC's argument that the SAP should contain a commitment to the provision of a 'Ring Road'. I have concluded that the SAP needs to contain no such commitment to make it sound. I do not therefore consider that the concerns expressed by VoS that the development of the Policy STM1a site would inhibit the provision of such a road are of sufficient weight to make allocation of the Policy STM1a site unsound.
85. I recommend that the Main Modification (**PHMM14**) be made.

Specific Sites – Policy STM3 site

86. I was informed at the Examination that the Council had granted outline planning permission for the development of the Policy STM3 site in line with the requirements of the policy although that decision was the subject of a legal challenge. Nonetheless, I consider that it is important that the SAP should contain a policy governing the development of the site as it may be subject to other planning applications in the future.
87. The Council has proposed a number of Main Modifications to paragraph 3.1.2.4 of the SAP (**PHMM12**) and to Policy STM3 (**PHMM16**) which clarify its objectives for the site and provide flexibility in the delivery of employment development. I recommend that these changes be made in the interests of effectiveness.

Specific Sites – Policy STM2d site

88. The Council proposes Main Modifications to Policy STM2 to allocate land east of Ryhall Road for employment purposes (**PHMM15**). The site is largely made up of derelict tipped ground but also contains a large disused potato store. The site is generally untidy and overgrown. Redevelopment of the site would enable it to be tidied up. However, its proximity to other commercial premises and the difficulty of gaining access except through employment areas makes it unsuitable for residential development. Being on the eastern side of the town, the site is likely to be less attractive to the developers of employment land than other allocated sites on the western side of the town. Nonetheless, it provides part of the mixed portfolio of sites which can be offered to a variety of users. Meeting the Core Strategy requirement for employment land is not dependant on the site coming forward. Nonetheless, I endorse the Council's decision to allocate the site for employment development and the making of the change.
89. In these circumstances I conclude on the fourth main issue that the Council's choice of allocated sites in and around Stamford is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively planned in all the circumstances and is therefore sound.

Issue 5 – Is the Council's choice of allocated sites in and around Bourne justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively planned in all the circumstances?

General matters

90. The Council proposes Main Modifications to bring the housing figures in paragraph 3.2.7 up to date (**SAPMM018** and **PHMM09**). I am satisfied that these changes should be made to ensure that the SAP is properly justified.

91. The Council also proposes Main Modifications to paragraphs 3.2.10 (**SAPMM019**) and 3.2.11 (**SAPMM020**) and to Policy B1 (**PHMM19**) to draw issues of transport and drainage to the attention of users of the SAP. In the interests of effectiveness I consider that these changes should be made.

Policy B1 sites

92. The Council proposes a Main Modification (**PHMM17**) to Policy B1a to extend the allocated area of employment and to rationalise the site boundaries. In my view this would make the site capable of being more easily developed and would bring the total allocations of employment land in Bourne up to the Core Strategy target. There have been discussions with an adjacent school regarding use of the land forming the additional part of the allocation site. However, so far as I am aware, these have not progressed to a sufficiently firm position that they should inhibit the allocation. I recommend, therefore, that the change be made.

93. Whilst I note that there is a recognised national and regional shortage of care home places and other residential places for elderly and vulnerable persons, I have seen no evidence to show that there is any particularly acute shortage in this area. At the Hearings the Council informed me that a number of new establishments had been recently built or permitted in the district. I am not persuaded that there is an especially urgent need for the SAP to make a specific allocation for such accommodation in Bourne. If such allocations were to be made, I consider that they should only be made after careful examination of all of the options to ensure that the most sustainable locations are chosen. I accept that Bourne is a substantial settlement which is well served by public transport, which will generate its own needs and which could provide a range of employees for such an establishment. However, I have seen no evidence to demonstrate that there are no other sites in Bourne or in the wider area better placed to meet the whole needs of the community. However, I accept that, in seeking to meet the housing needs of the whole community, the Council may wish to give consideration to the issue of housing for the elderly in subsequent plan reviews.

94. The Council proposes a Main Modification to Policy B1c to bring the entry up to date with regard to recently granted planning permissions (**PHMM18**). In the interests of effectiveness I recommend that the change should be made.

Land at The Slipe

95. The land in question has an outstanding planning permission for employment development and the Council has made clear that it considers that the site is suitable for employment purposes - for either the permitted scheme or some suitable alternative. In these circumstances I consider that there is very little to be gained from allocating the site for employment purposes. I am satisfied therefore that the site does not need to be allocated to make the SAP sound.

Other sites

96. Land at South Road has had permission in the past for roadside facilities of various characters. I do not consider that there is any need to allocate a site in this location for roadside services in order to make the SAP sound.

Conclusion

97. In these circumstances I conclude on the fifth main issue that the Council's choice of allocated sites in and around Bourne is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively planned in all the circumstances and is therefore sound.

Issue 6 – Is the Council's choice of allocated sites in and around The Deepings justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively planned in all the circumstances

General matters

98. The Council proposes Main Modifications to bring the housing figures in paragraph 3.3.9 up to date (**SAPMM021** and **PHMM09**). It also proposes Main Modifications to bring the position on the Water Cycle (and in particular sewerage capacity) into line with the most up to date information (**SAPMM023, SAPMM024, PHMM10** and **PHMM21**). I am satisfied that these changes should be made to ensure that the provisions of the SAP are properly justified.
99. Main Modifications are proposed to Policies DE1 and DE3 to clarify the requirement for affordable housing (**PHMM13** and **PHMM23**). In the interests of effectiveness, I recommend that the changes be made. A further Minor Modification is proposed to bringing the wording of the requirement into line with Core Strategy Policy H3.
100. Representors have suggested that alternative housing sites in The Deepings should be allocated. However, I have already concluded that the Council's site selection processes are sound. The Policy DE1d and DE3 site is contained by the existing by-pass with good vehicular access and I have no reason for preferring the representors' suggested alternatives.
101. A housing site in Frognall has been promoted. There are a number of scattered houses in the vicinity of the site and there have been some housing developments in this area in the recent past. However, I understand that these later developments have been, in the main, brownfield redevelopment sites. The settlement is effectively a separate village. In my opinion, further developments in this area which would amount to the development of essentially greenfield land would be remote from the centres and facilities of The Deepings when compared with the allocated sites. In these circumstances, development would leave the residents of the dwellings largely reliant on the private car. In the light of the Government's objective of reducing the need to travel, I can see no sound planning reasons for making additional allocations in this area.

Policy DE2 and DE3 sites

102. The Council also proposes a Main Modification to paragraph 3.3.10 which explains that the requirement for new employment land in The Deepings has

been re-assessed in the light of changed economic circumstances (**PHMM20**). The allocations in the SAP will therefore deliver slightly less than the requirement set by the Core Strategy. The Core Strategy requirement was framed as 'approximately 23 hectares' and the SAP allocates 20 ha. I do not consider that this is significant and recommend that the change be made.

103. A study undertaken by the Council in 2010 identified a need for 10-15 ha of employment land but also suggested that other land could be identified to allow locally generated demand for employment premises to be accommodated. The Council therefore proposes the allocation of 14 ha of land as an extension to an existing industrial park (Policy DE2a site) and a further 6 ha of land as part of a mixed use site at the northern entrance to the town (Policy DE2b/DE3 site). Representations have suggested that, having regard to the amount of vacant employment land in the area, the 6 ha allocation on the Policy DE3 site is excessive arguing that the employment allocation should be only 1 ha in order to make up the specific identified need of 15 ha.
104. I accept that the take-up of development land for employment purposes will have slowed in recent years due to the economic downturn. However, the SAP needs to look forward to plan for increased economic growth. In 2010 The Deepings were showing 'reasonably strong' demand for land with some 'clustering' of electronic firms – the positive planning of which paragraph 21 of the NPPF particularly encourages. Given the position of the allocation sites close to the A15/A16 junctions and this history of strong demand, I consider that the Council needs to be in a position where it can take full advantage of any upturn in the market. This is particularly important in the case of the Policy DE3 site given its prominent location at the 'gateway' into the town.
105. I am also concerned that, by allocating an additional 5ha of land to housing, the suggested change would effectively increase allocations by about another 150 houses – an increase of 50% over the whole of the remaining allocation in The Deepings. However, this could be resolved by reducing the overall size of the Policy DE3 site by 5 ha.
106. It would appear that there is a strong local preference for there to be a 'prestigious' development on the Policy DE3 site and the promoters of the site seem to be supportive of this. My main concern is that a 1 ha employment allocation may be too small to deliver the type of 'prestigious' development which may come forward. In my view it would be better to 'over-allocate' in terms of employment land because, if the 'prestigious' developments failed to materialise or generated lesser requirements for land, the surplus land could be readily 're-allocated' to housing use. However, if there was an 'under-allocation' in terms of employment land in favour of residential development, the more buoyant market for houses in this area is likely to result in the land needed for the 'prestigious' developments being rapidly and permanently 'lost' to residential developments. The resulting imbalance will encourage out-commuting. In these circumstances I consider that the Council's employment land allocations are sound.
107. The Council proposes Main Modifications to paragraph 3.3.2.5 and to Policy DE3 (**PHMM22** and **PHMM23**). In addition it is proposed to make a Minor Modification to PHMM23 to refer to an 'equivalent or greater' number of jobs. These would allow a degree of flexibility in both the size of the employment

land allocation in the Policy and in the type of employment-generating uses which may be acceptable on the site. I appreciate that the Policy specifies no minimum number of jobs which would be created if only developments in Use Classes B1 and B2 were carried out. Nonetheless, given that the Council's overall objective is the creation of employment, I am satisfied that it is proper that the flexibility provided over the quantum of employment land and type of use should be trammelled by the number of jobs which would be created. To do otherwise could make developments of a size and/or type which would provide very little in the way of new employment more difficult to resist. This would undermine the objective of the policy. I recommend that the Main Modifications be made in the interests of effectiveness.

108. Matters such as green infrastructure, design and pedestrian and cycle access would be adequately dealt with by the policy requirement for a masterplanning exercise.

109. In these circumstances I consider that the SAP provisions (subject to the specified Main Modifications) so far as they relate to The Deepings are sound.

Issue 7 - Is the Council's choice of Local Service Centres (LSCs) to receive development allocations and its choice of allocated sites in and around those settlements justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively planned in all the circumstances?

General Matters

110. I have dealt above with the Council's revised methodology for deciding which of the 16 LSCs identified in the Core Strategy should receive housing allocations. I have concluded that the revised methodology is sound.

111. Main Modifications are proposed to paragraphs 3.4.2.3 and 3.4.5.2 of the SAP to bring the housing requirement position up to date (**SAPMM036** and **PHMM09**). In order that the SAP provisions are properly justified, I recommend that these changes are made.

112. Main Modifications are proposed to Policy LSC1 which clarify the requirement for affordable housing (**PHMM13**) and a further Minor Modification is proposed to bringing the wording of the requirement into line with Core Strategy Policy H3. In the interests of effectiveness, I recommend that the Main Modifications be made.

Matters relating to specific settlements

Baston

113. Baston is identified as a Tier 3 settlement. Whilst it could be argued that the settlement should be classified as Tier 2, only one Tier 2 settlement was selected to receive a housing allocation; Great Gonerby. Whilst Baston is located equidistant between the larger settlements of Bourne and The Deepings, Great Gonerby is located very close to the built-up part of Grantham – the main town in the district which provides a wide range of services and facilities. In these circumstances, I am satisfied that, although there are no drainage or highways access issues to prevent allocation of the Baston site (BAST02/02a), the Council had sound reasons for selecting Great

Gonerby when it was required to look beyond Tier 1 settlements.

Long Bennington

114. The Council has identified Long Bennington as a Tier 1 settlement and has allocated land in the settlement for housing development – the Policy LSC1f (LSC1e in the modified SAP) site. The site appears as a logical rounding-off of the built-up part of the village. In the main, other alternative sites are either much larger, suffer from drainage issues, could affect heritage assets, would involve open land identified as being locally important, would extend out into open countryside or would involve a combination of these. Of the other sites, in particular sites LB16a and LB18, I can find little to choose between them and the Policy LSC1e site. In the case of site LB16a it would appear that development levels could be limited by access constraints and there may be traffic noise issues although it seems likely that these latter difficulties could be resolved. In the case of the LB18 site it would appear that there could be problems with the access position in relation to the position of the road opposite – Westborough Lane. Whilst a mini-roundabout solution may be possible, I heard evidence which suggested that the installation of such measures on this section of road in the past had been responsible for a number of traffic accidents.
115. I heard evidence that the section of Main Road serving the Policy LSC1e site was regularly heavily parked-up with visitors to the sports fields opposite. However, the road is very wide and even if vehicles are parked on both sides there is still space for 2-way traffic to pass. In these circumstances I am satisfied that an access can be devised which would allow vehicles to safely enter and exit the Council's allocated site.
116. In these circumstances I am satisfied that the Council's proposal to allocate the Policy LSC1e site (in the modified SAP) is sound.

Barrowby

117. Barrowby is identified as a Tier 2 settlement. The Council originally proposed a housing allocation but, in the light of its revised assessment methodology, it now proposes to delete the allocation (**PHMM27**). Given that the chosen site was located outside of a Tier 1 settlement in a relatively isolated position, some distance from the facilities provided in the centre of the settlement, I agree that the site should not be allocated.

Billingborough

118. Under the Council's revised LSC assessment methodology Billingborough has been identified as a Tier 1 settlement and the Council has proposed the site of the former secondary school buildings as a housing allocation site (**PHMM28**). In addition the Council proposes a number of Minor Modifications to rationalise the boundaries of the site and to clarify access matters. The site is occupied by a range of redundant buildings which, given their former use, are unlikely to be readily converted to another purpose. The site is clearly brownfield land.
119. A proposed Main Modification to Policy LSC1 (**PHMM32**) sets out the Council's aspirations for the former playing fields associated with the school. I am satisfied that the wording used by the Council is correct in the weight that it

gives to this matter. I recommend that the Modifications should be made in the interests of effectiveness.

120. The PHMM28 Main Modification sets out the indicative capacity of the proposed housing site. I do not consider that this indicative figure should be further reduced. It is only when a detailed layout is drawn up that decisions about the effect of density of development on the surroundings can be determined and that assessments can be made about the actual capacity of the site.
121. The former school site is located on the edge of the settlement and is somewhat remote from the settlement's main facilities. I heard evidence that the site of other premises closer to the centre of the settlement would be better placed to take advantage of local facilities. I accept that this may be so. However, these alternative premises are currently in employment use and I have seen no clear evidence to persuade me that there is no possibility that they could not continue to provide local employment into the future. It is important that a balance is drawn between housing and employment development in order to discourage out-commuting. The future of the site should be monitored but, until such time as it is clearly shown that the site is no longer required for employment purposes and its use for other purposes would be more appropriate, it should not be allocated for housing.
122. The BIL06 site comprises mainly garden land on the edge of the settlement which has a narrow access between houses. It is close to the village facilities. In my opinion at least one house would need to be demolished if a satisfactory access is to be created. However, it would appear that a small number of houses (less than 10) could be developed without any demolitions being required. In those circumstances the site would be too small to allocate. The site also comprises Grade 2 agricultural land and there may be some surface water drainage issues. Having taken these constraining factors into account, I am satisfied that the Council's decision not to allocate the site at this stage is sound.

Ancaster

123. Ancaster is identified as a Tier 3 LSC settlement and, as such, the Council proposes to make no housing allocations. The ADD2 site is separated from main facilities in the settlement by a principal road. It is located alongside existing commercial/employment premises which could affect the living conditions of any residential occupiers. In my view the site is unsuitable for residential redevelopment. Some type of commercial/employment use could be acceptable. However, given that Policy E1 of the Core Strategy makes no specific provision for the allocation of employment sites in locations such as this, I can see no sound reason why the site should be allocated for employment purposes at this stage.

Castle Bytham

124. Castle Bytham is identified as a Tier 4 LSC settlement and as is described by the Council as having very poor local shops and service provision and a 'very poor' bus service.
125. The ADD11 site comprises an extensive disused quarry, the exposed faces and some other features of which are identified as a Site of Special Scientific

Interest (SSSI). Planning permissions have been granted in the past for employment development and for the development of a nursing home, affordable housing and a community health centre.

126. I accept that both nationally and regionally there is an increasing need for residential care facilities for the elderly but the provision of such facilities needs careful planning to ensure that they are best located to serve the local population. In my opinion, this may need to be addressed in a review of the Core Strategy. However, I have seen no convincing evidence to persuade me that Castle Bytham in general, and this site in particular, is likely to be the most sustainable location. The settlement is small and remote from the main towns in the district. Given that bus services serving the village are 'very poor', most staff and visitors would need to travel by private car to reach the facilities. The lack of facilities in the village would mean that the majority of services would need to be brought in from outside. Whilst the concept of the provision of a continuing care retirement community in a disused quarry may, on the face of it, seem strange, having visited the site I am satisfied that it could co-exist with its SSSI setting and I am confident that drainage issues could be overcome. Nonetheless, the sustainability credentials of the site, particularly those relating to accessibility and opportunities for the use of sustainable transport, indicate to me that the Council's decision not to allocate the site for specialist housing purposes is sound.

Colsterworth

127. Colsterworth is identified as a Tier 1 settlement. The Policy LSC1b housing allocation site comprises part of a small field on the edge of the settlement. The site is distantly visible from Woolsthorpe Manor – a Grade 1 Listed Building owned by the National Trust and the birthplace and family home of Sir Isaac Newton. It is argued that, although the proposed allocation site is some distance from the Listed Building, the setting is important in that Newton's discoveries were made in isolated rural surroundings. Whilst I can understand this argument, the Listed Building and the site are now separated by a considerable amount of new development. The site is visible from a small number of locations within the Listed Building and its surroundings but it is the low-lying part of a larger field and any new development would be substantially screened by intervening hedges. The approach to the Listed Building would remain as being largely through open countryside until the village is entered. I do not therefore consider that development of the allocation site would have any significant effect on the setting of the Listed Building.
128. The Council proposes a Main Modification to Policy LSC1 to clarify its aspirations for the provision at some stage of a small shop on the site (**PHMM32** and **PHMM33**). I agree that this change should be made in the interests of effectiveness.

Harlaxton

129. Using the Council's revised methodology, Harlaxton is identified as a Tier 3 LSC settlement. Whilst it can be argued that the settlement should have been

classified as Tier 2, these arguments are based on assessments of matters such as the distance from Grantham and these provide marginal results. In only one case has the Council found it necessary to make a housing allocation outside of the Tier 1 LSC settlements and chose to make the allocation in Great Gonerby which is located very close to the edge of Grantham. In these circumstances I consider that the Council have sound reasons for making no housing allocations in Harlaxton.

130. In the Submission version of the SAPP the Council proposed a housing allocation in Harlaxton. However, mainly because the settlement is no longer identified as a settlement which should receive an allocation, Main Modifications are proposed which delete the allocation (**PHMM31** and **PHMM32**). I agree that these changes should be made.
131. It has been argued that other sites should be allocated in Harlaxton to replace the site proposed for deletion. However, given that, for sound reasons, the Council no longer proposes to make any allocation in the settlement, I do not consider that there is a sound case for making an alternative allocation. Nonetheless, I visited the sites which have been suggested. In the case of the ADD17 site, I note that its development could bring some local community benefits by way of a car park and some drainage improvements. However, these are outweighed by the effects that development would have on the relationship between the heritage assets of Harlaxton Manor and Belvoir Castle which is readily discernible from the well-used public footpath which crosses fields to the west of the site. In the case of the HARL03 site, the site is located some distance from the main village facilities and access to them would involve crossing a busy main road. If a site was to be selected for allocation in Harlaxton, I am not persuaded that the HARL03 site would be best located to satisfy the need.

Morton

132. Morton is identified as a Tier 2 settlement and the only Tier 2 settlement selected to receive a housing allocation is Great Gonerby. I have already explained that I consider that there are sound reasons for this decision. Nonetheless, I visited the Morton sites. Most are large and would intrude into the surrounding open countryside with little relationship to the main village. Others, although generally smaller, would be out-of-keeping with the general east-west layout of the settlement, would affect heritage assets or would be in relatively remote locations away from the main village facilities. I am satisfied that the Council's decision not to make an allocation in this settlement is sound.

Great Gonerby

133. Great Gonerby is a Tier 2 settlement and, being very close to the main town of Grantham, has been selected for a housing allocation as being one of the most sustainable LSCs. A site is duly allocated – Policy LSC1d. The site is immediately opposite established housing but would extend into the open countryside. However, the same criticism could be made of all other available sites in the settlement. I am satisfied that no other site performs better in this regard. Whilst other, mainly larger, sites have been promoted for development there is no need to make further allocations to meet the outstanding Core

Strategy requirement for housing in the LSCs.

134. The Council proposes a Main Modification to paragraph 3.4.4.3 to draw attention to the influence which the setting of Belton House and Park may have on development of the allocated site (**PHMM26**). In the interests of effectiveness I recommend that the change be made.
135. In these circumstances, I consider that the Council's approach in Great Gonerby is sound and that there is no need for alternative or additional housing allocations.

Corby Glen

136. Corby Glen is identified as a Tier 1 settlement. The Submission version of the SAP made a housing allocation on the edge of the village to the east of Swinstead Road. In applying the revised site assessment methodology the Council has concluded that a site on the opposite side of Swinstead Road performs better and has therefore deleted the original allocation and replaced it by this alternative. The Council proposes Main Modifications to Policy LSC1c to effect this change (**PHMM29** and **PHMM30**). I agree that the alternative allocation appears to relate better to the pattern of development in the village and appears to be somewhat closer to the village facilities. In these circumstances I agree that the changes should be made.

Conclusion

137. In these circumstances I conclude on the seventh main issue that the Council's choice of Local Service Centres (LSCs) to receive development allocations and its choice of allocated sites in and around those settlements is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively planned in all the circumstances.

Issue 8 – Are the Plan provisions relating to land at Gonerby Moor (Policy SAP6) justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively planned in all the circumstances?

138. Policy SAP6 deals with potential employment development at Gonerby Moor – a location about 4 kilometres (km) north west of Grantham at the junction of the B1174 and the A1. There is already a considerable amount of commercial/employment development in the vicinity of the junction.
139. The Council's Employment Land Capacity Study 2010 identifies the location as the highest scoring employment site in Grantham and its surroundings but makes no comment on future employment land proposals in this location. Core Strategy Policy E1 and its supporting text make no mention of the Gonerby Moor land.
140. In the Submission version of the SAP the Council's intentions in respect of additional development in this location were very vague. The Council proposes Main Modifications to clarify its approach (**PHMM38** and **PHMM39**). The Council makes no employment land allocations but identifies an 'area of search' where specific uses or developments which are unsuitable for location in the main employment areas in Grantham or which have particular rail-freight requirements can be accommodated. The 'area of search' which would

be identified on the Proposals Map is very large – representors estimate it to be about 80 ha (200 acres) but I consider that it is somewhat larger. The Core Strategy employment land requirement for the whole of Grantham is 90 ha. The land is uniformly flat and unremarkable open countryside.

141. On the face of it, there is no strategic background or evidence to justify the Council's approach to the Gonerby Moor land. However, the Council's reasoning as set out in the Main Modifications is pragmatic. Firstly, the Council clearly wishes to take advantage of the position of Gonerby Moor given its position alongside a junction on the A1 and its proximity to Grantham. Secondly, the proposal is not a land allocation, it is only an 'area of search'. There is no suggestion that the whole of the area will be developed. Thirdly, acceptable development proposals would be those which, by reason of the type of use, specific locational requirements or rail link requirements cannot be accommodated on more sustainably located allocated land. The Council is clearly anxious not to turn away employment opportunities and, in my view, the Policy SAP6 proposal provides a useful (albeit large) 'safety valve' in the overall portfolio of employment sites.
142. However, proposals of this scale will require careful treatment. In its modified form Policy SAP6 is carefully worded and if rigorously applied it will perform its role as intended. However, if application of the Policy is more casual, the effects on the Council's strategy (particularly as it relates to the future of Grantham) could be fundamentally undermined. Alterations to the wording of the Policy which have been suggested by representors would, in my opinion, dilute the clear circumstances which would make the development of land at Gonerby Moor permissible. If the Policy is to operate as it should, the introduction of terms which blur the thrust of the Policy should be avoided.
143. In these circumstances, I consider that, with the changes suggested by the Council, the approach set out in Policy SAP6 (and the associated changes to the proposals Map) are sound.

Issue 9 – Are the Council's Policies SAPH1, SAP1-5 and 7-11 justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively planned in all the circumstances?

144. A Main Modification is proposed to Policy SAP H1 which explains how housing proposals on the edge of Grantham in the GAAP plan area will be dealt with (**PHMM37**). In the interests of effectiveness I recommend that the proposed change be made. However, this change raises a matter of process. The GAAP boundary is tightly drawn around the built-up area of Grantham and the GAAP allocation sites. Some developments on the edge of Grantham and within that boundary will be, as the Main modification makes clear, appropriately dealt with by policies of the GAAP. However, there are some issues, such as a failure of the GAAP allocation sites to come forward as expected, which may need to be resolved across the GAAP/SAP boundary. I am not persuaded that it is best for either the SAP or the GAAP in isolation to attempt to address such matters. They should be properly addressed through a review of the Core Strategy which provides a vehicle for dealing with cross-plan area issues. The Council's Core Strategy could be reviewed in the near future and I would suggest that the matter of cross-plan area issues should be addressed as part of that Review. In the meantime, the Council may wish to consider an interim

non-statutory approach which could be put in place until the Core Strategy is reviewed.

145. The Council proposes a number of Main Modifications to Policies SAP1-5 and their supporting text to bring them in line with up-to-date legislation, the NPPF and other evolving matters such as drainage (**SAPMM037, SAPMM038, SAPMM039, SAPMM041** and **SAPMM042**, and **PHMM34** and **PHMM35**). I recommend that these changes are made in order that the SAP is properly justified.
146. The Council proposes a Main Modification to Policy SAP8 to clearly set out its approach to developments around town centres (**PHMM40**). In the interests of effectiveness I recommend that the change is made. While no sites have been allocated for retail development in town centres, I do not consider that this makes the SAP unsound. Policies SAP7-9 provide adequate guidance on any developments which may come forward.
147. I am satisfied that Policy SAP10 was drawn up with a proper background of surveyed evidence.
148. The Council also proposes Main Modifications to introduce a new Policy SAP11 with supporting text to clarify its approach to proposals which have an effect on Belton House and its Historic Park and Garden (**PHMM41, PHMM42**) and **PHMM43**. In the interests of effectiveness I recommend that the changes are made.
149. Subject to the changes which I have recommended above, I consider that the policies are sound.

Issue 10 – Does the Council's Monitoring Framework ensure effective delivery of the Plan provisions?

150. The SAP should be capable of responding flexibly to changing circumstances. In order to do this effectively, its delivery should be properly monitored by the Council. The Council proposes a series of Main Modifications to make its Monitoring Framework more robust and more readily able to identify divergences from targets at an early stage which will enable appropriate responses to be made (**SAPMM044** and **PHMM44, 45** and **46-66**). I recommend that the changes be made in order that the SAP can be properly effective.
151. Main Modifications are necessary to paragraphs 5.2.8 and 5.2.9 to bring the position on drainage matters up to date (**SAPMM045** and **SAPMM046** and **PHMM67**). Changes are also needed to the Infrastructure table, the Glossary and the List of Abbreviations to bring them up to date (**SAPMM049** and **050**).

Assessment of Legal Compliance

152. My examination of the compliance of the Plan with the legal requirements is summarised in the table below. I conclude that the Plan meets them all.

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS	
Local Development Scheme (LDS)	The SAP is identified within the Council's LDS dated January 2008 which sets out an expected adoption date of June 2011. A revised LDS was produced in January 2010 which predicted adoption of the SAP in January 2012. The Council's website shows the expected adoption date as being end of February 2014. The SAP content is compliant with the LDS. Clearly there has been considerable slippage in the programme. However, the opportunity has been provided to keep interested persons up-to-date with progress. In these circumstances, I do not consider that the legal requirements have been compromised.
Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and relevant regulations	The SCI was adopted in April 2006 and consultation has been compliant with the requirements therein, including the consultation on the post-submission proposed 'Main Modification' changes (SAPMM***) and the Post Hearings main Modifications (PHMM**).
Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	A revised SA has been carried out and is now adequate.
Appropriate Assessment (AA)	The Habitats Regulations AA Screening Report sets out why AA is not necessary.
National Policy	The SAP complies with national policy except where indicated and modifications are recommended.
Sustainable Community Strategy	Satisfactory regard has been paid to the SCS.
2004 Act (as amended) and 2012 Regulations.	The SAP complies with the Act and the Regulations.

Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

153. The Submitted SAP has a number of deficiencies in relation to soundness and legal compliance for the reasons set out above, which mean that I recommend non-adoption of it as submitted, in accordance with Section 20(7A) of the Act. These deficiencies have been explored in the Main Issues set out above.

154. The Council has requested that I recommend main modifications to make the Plan sound and/or legally compliant and capable of adoption. I conclude that with the recommended main modifications set out in Appendix A the SAP satisfies the requirements of Section 20(5) of the 2004 Act and meets the criteria for soundness in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Inspector Signature

Inspector

This report is accompanied by the Appendix containing the Main Modifications.

Appendix A – Main Modifications

The Main Modifications set out below fall into 2 groups:

The SAPMM*** modifications which were proposed by the Council at the beginning of the main Hearings sessions in November 2012; and,

The PHMM** modifications which were proposed by the Council at the beginning of the additional Hearings sessions in December 2013.

Inevitably some of the PHMM** modifications propose changes to the originally proposed SAPMM*** modifications. Where this is the case, I have made reference to the further proposed changes by inserting 'See also PHMM**' under the SAPMM*** reference number. In these cases the SAPMM*** and PHMM*** changes will need to be read together.

However, where a PHMM** change makes a SAPMM*** change wholly redundant, I have removed the detail of the SAPMM*** modification from the table below and have inserted 'Replaced by PHMM**' or 'Deleted by PHMM**' under the SAPMM*** reference number. In these circumstances it will be necessary to read only the 'PHMM**' entry.

The page numbers and paragraph numbering below refer to the submission document (October 2011), and do not take account of the deletion or addition of text.

SAPMM *** Main Modifications			
Ref	Page	Policy/Paragraph	Main Modification
SAPMM001 See also PHMM03	5	1.3.1.1	Delete text in paragraph 1.3.1.1 and replace by: 'In producing the Site Allocation and Policies DPD, consideration has been given to the context provided by existing policy frameworks at the national level. Regard was also had to the then emerging Localism Act 2011, the main provisions of which came into effect in April 2012. This document has been influenced by the Government's Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) and Planning Policy Guidance (PPGs), which covered a wide range of topics, and Planning Circulars. In March 2012 the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This became effective immediately and cancelled all PPSs and PPGs. However, because the general approach of national policy remains unchanged by the NPPF it is considered that the DPD is consistent, and in general conformity, with

			the NPPF and is sound.'
SAPMM002 Replaced by PHMM03	5	1.3.1.1	See PHMM03
SAPMM003	9	2.1.2	Delete text in paragraph 2.1.2 and replace by: 'This vision reflects that of the Council's Corporate Plan. It is supported in the Core Strategy by fourteen broad objectives as the means of delivering the Local Plan.'
SAPMM004	10	2.2.1: Housing – Objective 1	Delete '8250' in line 1 and replace by '5940'.
SAPMM005 Replaced by PHMM07	12	Section 3 – Site Allocation and Development Policies	See PHMM07
SAPMM006 Replaced by PHMM08	12	Section 3 – Site Allocation and Development Policies	See PHMM08
SAPMM007 Replaced by PHMM08	12	Section 3 – Site Allocation and Development Policies	See PHMM08
SAPMM008 Replaced by PHMM08	12	Section 3 – Site Allocation and Development Policies	See PHMM08
SAPMM009 Replaced by PHMM08	12	Section 3 – Site Allocation and Development Policies	See PHMM08
SAPMM010 Replaced by PHMM09	13	3.1.9	See PHMM09
SAPMM011	14	3.1.13	Insert the following at the end of the paragraph: 'Development proposals should consider a comprehensive range of sustainable transport measures to encourage non-car-based travel.'
SAPMM012 Replaced by PHMM11	14	3.1.14	See PHMM11
SAPMM013	14	3.1.14	At the end of the first bullet point entitled 'Surface Water Management and SUDs potential' in the 4 th paragraph add: 'It is important that appropriate surface water management methods are considered early in the planning of all sites as it can affect site layout.'

SAPMM014	15	3.1.1.2	Delete last sentence of text and replace by: 'In particular, Government policy (NPPF) requires a continuous five-year supply of deliverable housing land: therefore, allocated land will be phased into five-year periods.'
SAPMM015 Replaced by PHMM09	16	3.1.2.1	See PHMM09
SAPMM016	16	3.1.2.2	After 'require' in second sentence insert: '.. additional consultation with relevant parties and ..'
SAPMM017 Replaced by PHMM16	18	Policy STM3	See PHMM16
SAPMM018 Replaced by PHMM09	20	3.2.7	See PHMM09
SAPMM019	20	3.2.10	Add the following to end of paragraph: 'Development proposals should consider a comprehensive range of sustainable transport measures to encourage non-car-based travel.'
SAPMM020	21	3.2.11	At end of second bullet point entitled 'Surface Water Management and SUDs potential' add the following sentence: 'It is important that appropriate surface water management methods are considered early in the planning of all sites as it can affect site layout.'
SAPMM021 Replaced by PHMM09	24	3.3.9	See PHMM09
SAPMM022	25	3.3.12	Insert the following sentence at the end of the paragraph: 'Development proposals should consider a comprehensive range of sustainable transport measures to encourage non-car-based travel.'
SAPMM023 See also PHMM21	25/26	3.3.15	This proposed Modification has been substantially modified by PHMM21. For ease of reference the whole of the SAPMM023 and PHMM21 changes are shown in PHMM21.
SAPMM024	25/26	3.3.15	At end of 2nd bullet point entitled 'Surface Water Management and SUDs potential' add the following sentence: 'It is important that appropriate surface water management methods are considered early in the planning of all sites as it can affect site layout.'

SAPMM025	27	3.3.1.2	Delete 3rd sentence and replace by: 'In particular, Government policy (NPPF) requires LPAs to demonstrate the availability of a continuous five-year supply of deliverable housing land plus a buffer of sites which may be drawn forward from a later phase in the plan (see paragraph 3.5.2). As a result housing land allocated in this plan will be phased into five-year periods but where it is demonstrated that a site can be developed and needs to come forward to maintain this supply, some sites may be developed in advance of the phasing indicated in policies.'
SAPMM026	27	3.3.2.1	See PHMM09
Replaced by PHMM09			
SAPMM027	29/30	Policy DE3	Add as a separate paragraph to end of policy: 'A Travel Plan should be prepared as part of the masterplan process to explore a range of sustainable travel measures to encourage occupants of the new development to use non-car-based travel modes.'
See also PHMM23			
SAPMM028	31	3.4.1.4	This proposed Modification has been substantially modified by PHMM24. For ease of reference the whole of the SAPMM028 and PHMM24 changes are shown in PHMM24.
See also PHMM2			
SAPMM029	31	3.4.2.3	See PHMM09
Replaced by PHMM09			
SAPMM030	31	3.4.2.3	After 3.4.2.3 insert new paragraph: 'Spread over 16 LSCs, this is a small amount of housing, and choices have had to be made about which villages are best able to accommodate new homes. The Council decided that a small number of sites should be allocated in a few villages, This would provide a range and mix of small sites across the District, whilst meeting the housing needs of the rural communities for both market and affordable housing, without over-burdening the existing infrastructure of these villages or impinging upon the landscape and open countryside.'
SAPMM031	31	3.4.3.1	See PHMM25
Replaced by PHMM25			
SAPMM032	31	3.4.3.1	See PHMM25
Replaced by PHMM25			

SAPMM033 Replaced by PHMM25	31	3.4.3.1	See PHMM25
SAPMM034 Replaced by PHMM25	31	3.4.3.1	See PHMM25
SAPMM035	32	3.4.4.2	Delete 3rd sentence and replace by: 'In particular, Government policy (NPPF) requires a continuous five-year supply of deliverable housing land: therefore, allocated land will be phased into five-year periods.'
SAPMM036 Replaced by PHMM09	32/33	3.4.5.2	See PHMM09
SAPMM037	34	3.5.1	Add the following text to the end of the paragraph: 'Allocations will normally be released in accordance with the phasing indicated in the policies, subject to infrastructure delivery and maintaining a continuous five year supply of deliverable sites. If delivery constraints can be satisfactorily addressed, allocated sites could be released earlier, if it is demonstrated that the site is needed to maintain a five year supply.'
SAPMM038 Deleted by PHMM34	34	3.5.2	See PHMM34
SAPMM039 See also PHMM34	34	3.5.2	This proposed Modification has been substantially modified by PHMM34. For ease of reference the whole of the SAPMM039 and PHMM34 changes are shown in PHMM34.
SAPMM040 Deleted by PHMM35	34	3.5.2	See PHMM35
SAPMM041	38	4.1.9	Delete first sentence and replace by: 'The Government has introduced legislative changes, as part of the Localism Act, which allow community groups to nominate "assets of community value.'
SAPMM042	43	4.3.2	Delete text and replace by: 'National policy is to protect the countryside from inappropriate development. The National Planning Policy Framework recognises the need to support sustainable growth and businesses in rural areas, and also that diversification into non-agricultural uses is vital to ensure the continuing vitality of rural areas.'

SAPMM043 See also PHMM41 – 43.	59	New Policy and text	This proposed Modification has been substantially modified by PHMM41 - 43. For ease of reference the whole of the SAPMM043 and PHMM41 - 43 changes are shown in PHMM43.
SAPMM044 See also PHMM46 - 66	60-67	Section 5 – Implementation and Monitoring	Delete Table and Key and replace by Table in Appendix A(1). NB For ease of reference the Table in Appendix A(1) includes the changes proposed by PHMM46 – 66.
SAPMM045 Deleted by PHMM45	63	5.2.8	See PHMM45
SAPMM046 Deleted by PHMM46	63	5.2.9	See PHMM46
SAPMM047	63	5.2.11	Delete `.` At end of first sentence and add: `..., but development (on an individual and/or cumulative basis) does have the potential to have localised impact, particularly for individual junctions.`
SAPMM048	64-67	Infrastructure Detail and Cost Table	Delete Table and replace by Table in Appendix A(2).
SAPMM049	71	Glossary	Add the following definitions in alphabetical order: Community Assets: are community facilities that are available for use by all of the community. For example churches, village halls, hospitals, and public houses. They may be multi-purpose facilities and will generally be buildings; however children’s play areas and sporting facilities may also be community assets. Cultural Facilities: can be described as buildings, places and features which demonstrate, facilitate and support the arts, and would include theatres, galleries, museums, public art and art centres. Use Classes Order: groups, types of uses of land and buildings into classes. This allows premises to change from one similar use to another without the need for planning consent. Change of use from one class to another would normally need planning consent. Floodzone 3: land assessed by the Environment Agency as being at high risk of flooding. FZ3a comprises land assessed as having a 1 in 100 or

			<p>greater annual probability of river flooding in any year. FZ3b is the functional floodplain comprising land where water has to flow or be stored in times of flood.</p> <p>SuDS: Sustainable drainage systems or sustainable (urban) drainage systems: a sequence of management practices and control structures designed to drain surface water in a more sustainable fashion than some conventional techniques.</p>
SAPMM050	71	Glossary	<p>Add the following definition in alphabetical order:</p> <p>Housing and Economic Development Plan Document (H&EDPD): A document prepared by South Kesteven District Council as part of the Development Plan under the previous planning regime. This plan was not progressed beyond consultation in 2006.</p>

PHMM** Main Modifications

Ref	Page	Policy/Paragraph	Main Modification
PHMM01	3	1.1.3-4	<p>Delete texts of paragraphs and replace by:</p> <p>'A standard set of criteria which was established by the Core Strategy have been used as the basis for the detailed site assessment process (which is described in the Supplementary Evidence Document (July 2013) published in support of this plan). The site assessment process covered four distinct stages including the assessment of the sustainability of all reasonable options, which is described in the SA/SEA Addendum Report (July 2013).</p> <p>The Core Strategy criteria upon which the site assessment was based are included within the Housing and the Economic Prosperity sections of the Core Strategy. These have been subject to examination through the Core Strategy and are, therefore, considered to be in conformity with the principles of sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).'</p>
PHMM02	5	1.2.1	<p>Delete final sentence and replace by:</p> <p>'The responses received about sites through consultation at all stages in the plan preparation (including Pre-submission consultation and examination hearing sessions in November 2012) have been taken into account and where planning matters relating to sites have been raised these have been used to inform the site assessment</p>

			process.'
PHMM03	5	1.3.1.1	Delete 2 nd sentence of SAPMM001 Delete SAPMM002 and replace by: 'The Core Strategy was adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF, and it will be necessary to consider whether there is a need to review aspects of the Core Strategy to ensure conformity with the NPPF. A Scoping of the extent of any review will be completed by the end of 2013, and any review will be dependent on its outcome.'
PHMM04	7	1.4.6	Delete paragraph text and replace by: 'In addition to the technical studies listed above a Background Evidence Report has been prepared which explains how and why policies within the plan have been prepared. A Supplementary Evidence Document (July 2013) has also been prepared which explains the site assessment process and includes a summary sheet of the assessment of each site considered. The Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) formed part of the site assessment process and was used to assess the suitability of the 16 Local Service Centres (LSCs) for a planned housing allocation. The SA/SEA Addendum Report (June 2013) describes how the LSC villages were assessed and what the outcome of the assessment was. This process established which of the 16 LSCs would be suitable for a housing allocation.'
PHMM05	8	1.6.6	Delete paragraph text and replace by 'The assessment of other plans and programmes and the consideration of baseline data is an integral part of the SA process. An SA/SEA Addendum report (June 2013) has been prepared in support of this plan which sets out clear and consistent methodologies and assessment frameworks for the assessment of the sustainability of the 16 Local Service Centres for a housing allocation; all reasonable alternative development site options and; proposed policies. The SA/SEA Addendum Report provides as assessment of the potential effect of policies and development options on environmental, social and economic objectives. Details of the baseline data, key issues, other plans and programmes and the sustainability objectives which have been used to undertake this assessment are included in the SA/SEA Addendum Report June 2013.'
PHMM06	12	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	After '2 Vision and Objectives' section insert the following text and Policy in a new Section:

			<p>'Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework confirms that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that all plans should be based upon and reflect this presumption, with clear policies to guide how the presumption will be applied locally. The Framework also confirms that there are three clear dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved, and proposed development that conflicts should be refused, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. In order to meet this requirement, the following policy will be applied.</p> <p>Policy SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable development.</p> <p>When considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. It will always work pro-actively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.</p> <p>Planning applications that accord with the policies in this Local Plan (and, where relevant, with policies in neighbourhood plans) will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</p> <p>Where there are no policies relevant to the application or relevant policies are out of date at the time of making the decision then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise - taking into account whether:</p> <p>any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or</p> <p>specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted.'</p>
PHMM07	12	Site Allocations and Development	Before '3.1 Stamford':

		Policies	Insert text and Tables set out in Appendix A(2)
PHMM08	12		<p>Before '3.1 Stamford':</p> <p>Insert the following text:</p> <p>'The primary objective of the Spatial Strategy in the Core Strategy is to promote a sustainable pattern of development by directing new development to those settlements with the best range of local facilities, which allow residents to choose to carry out their day to day activities without the need to make private car journeys. As such the Spatial Strategy directs the majority of development to the four towns in the District, with some limited development in the 16 most sustainable villages identified as Local Service Centres (LSCs). A large number of sites have been considered and assessed in detail as part of the process of determining which sites to allocate in each town and the LSCs. The detailed process together with the outcome and conclusion of the assessments is provided in the accompanying documents: Supplementary Evidence Document July 2013.</p> <p>The site assessment process used the criteria established by the Core Strategy (5.1.5 and 6.1.8) as the basis for a four stage site assessment. A first sift of sites was undertaken to check their compatibility with Core Strategy Policies. Those sites which were not compatible were ruled out at this stage. In addition sites which were significantly affected by national wildlife and heritage designations, or which include significant areas of Flood Zone 3 or Cordon Sanitaire were also ruled out at this first sift. Remaining sites were then assessed using a detailed SA/SEA framework. This process considered the potential effect of the development of each site on environmental, social and economic objectives (this process and the assessment outcomes is detailed in the SA/SEA Addendum Report - June 2013). Sites were also assessed against a series of more detailed site factors to determine which were the most preferable options for allocation. Finally consideration was given to the availability of sites for development and, using the criteria provided in the NPPF, the potential viability and deliverability of sites, to ensure that proposed allocations would be developable and deliverable.'</p>
PHMM09	13	3.1.9	<p>Delete text and replace by:</p> <p>'Between April 2006 and 31 March 2013, 560 houses had been built in Stamford. The remaining requirement for the town is, therefore, 580 houses (an annual rate of 44 per year for the</p>

			remaining 13 years). In addition, 173 homes had planning permission at 31 March 2013. Together, the completions and commitments for Stamford total 733.'
	16	3.1.2.1	In first sentence delete '750' and replace by '703'. In first bullet point delete text and insert: '173 new homes on sites with planning permission at 1 April 2013' In 2 nd bullet point delete text and insert: '130 homes on a range of sites allocated within the town (Site STM1d has planning permission so is not included in this figure)'
	20	3.2.7	Delete 5 th sentence and replace by: 'Between April 2006 and 31 st March 2013 some 1,133 houses have been built in Bourne and a further 1,576 have planning permission.'
	24	3.3.9	Delete paragraph text and replace by: Between April 2006 and 31 st March 2013 412 houses had been built in The Deepings. The remaining requirement for the town is therefore 458 houses (an annual rate of 35 per year for the remaining 13 years). In addition 288 homes had planning permission at 31 st March 2013. Together, the completions and commitments for The Deepings total 700 homes.
	27	3.3.2.1	In first sentence delete '600' and replace by '588'. Delete bullet point texts and replace by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 288 new homes on sites with planning permission at 1 April 2013 • 300 homes on allocated sites including 200 homes on a single mixed use extension site allocated to the north of the town (Policy DE3) (Sites DE1a and DE1b have planning consent so have not been included within this figure).'
	31	3.4.2.3	Delete first sentence and replace by: 'Between April 2006 and 31 st March 2013, 756 houses had been built in the LSCs and planning permission exists for 268 more homes.' Delete final sentence.
	32	3.4.5.2	Delete paragraph text and replace by: 'Provision is made in this plan for the development of at least 438 new homes in the 16 LSCs identified

			<p>in the Core Strategy Policy SP2 for the period to 2026. Comprising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 268 new homes on sites with planning permission at 1st April 2013 and • 170 homes on sites allocated in those villages which are considered most able to accommodate additional development.'
PHMM10	14	3.1.14	<p>Add the following sentence at the end of the first paragraph:</p> <p>'In November 2012 the Environment Agency and Anglian Water issued a joint statement which updates the findings of the WCS for a number of catchments. The conclusions of this update statement have been used to update the information about the water cycle set out below.'</p>
	25	3.3.14	<p>Add the following sentence at the end of the paragraph:</p> <p>'In November 2012 the Environment Agency and Anglian Water issued a joint statement which updates the findings of the WCS for a number of catchments. The conclusions of this update statement have been used to update the information about the water cycle set out below.'</p>
PHMM11 Replaces SAPMM012	14	3.1.14	<p>Delete text in the 3rd paragraph of text and replace by:</p> <p>'The Stamford WwTW has sufficient headroom capacity and there is no constraint at the Stamford Treatment Works to accommodate growth proposed in the town.'</p> <p>Delete 4th paragraph of text and replace by:</p> <p>'An Urban Pollution Management (UPM) model has been undertaken to assess the capacity of the existing sewerage network. This UPM has determined that there would be insignificant impact on water quality and therefore the amount of growth considered could be accommodated by the existing sewerage network within the necessary environmental limits. Pre-application discussions are recommended to determine whether any localised reinforcements are required, and appropriate conditions shall be imposed on planning applications to ensure adequate foul drainage is available.'</p>
PHMM12	22	3.1.2.3	<p>After 3.1.2.3 insert as a new paragraph the following text:</p> <p>'An urban extension is proposed to the west of the town between Empingham Road and Tinwell Road</p>

			<p>to meet most of the town's housing and employment land needs. This site is expected to deliver a significant number of new homes and jobs throughout the middle part of the plan period. The development is expected to be of a high quality design and layout to reflect its gateway location, and should incorporate a good mix and balance of housing, employment and community uses together with structural landscaping and open space. The location of the site adjacent to the A1 makes it highly suitable and attractive to the employment market and the development will be expected to deliver a high number of good quality jobs to capitalise upon this location. To reflect this Policy STM2 allocates an indicative area of 14 ha of land for employment generating development within Use Classes B1 and B2, and policy STM3 requires that a 10 ha business park is provided as part of the employment development. Consideration may be given to proposals for a smaller area of employment development, and/or other employment generating uses, as part of the overall development of the site, provided that it is clearly demonstrated that the proposal would generate a greater number of jobs than the typical employment gains associated with B1 and B2 uses for that site area and that the proposed uses will not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties. However, the amount of employment land included within a development proposal for the site should not be less than 10ha.'</p>
PHMM13	16	Policy STM1	<p>In the first line of the Policy, insert the following text after 'development':</p> <p>'.. , and should include up to 35% affordable housing in accordance with the provisions of Core Strategy Policy H3. The table below includes an indicative amount of affordable housing to be provided.'</p> <p>NB: the addition of 'up to' is proposed by the Council as a Minor Modification to bring the Policy fully into line with Core Strategy Policy H3.</p>
	28	Policy DE1	<p>In the first line of the Policy, insert the following text after 'development':</p> <p>'.. , and should include up to 35% affordable housing in accordance with the provisions of Core Strategy Policy H3. The table below includes an indicative amount of affordable housing to be provided.'</p> <p>NB the addition of 'up to' is proposed by the Council as a Minor Modification to bring the Policy fully into line with Core Strategy Policy H3.</p>
	33	Policy LSC1	<p>In the first line of the Policy, insert the following</p>

			<p>text after 'Centres':</p> <p>'.. , and should include up to 35% affordable housing in accordance with the provisions of Core Strategy Policy H3. The table below includes an indicative amount of affordable housing to be provided.'</p> <p>NB the addition of 'up to' is proposed by the Council as a Minor Modification to bring the Policy fully into line with Core Strategy Policy H3.</p> <p>NB In the heading of the third column of the Table the Council proposes to replace 'Area' by 'Net Developable Area' as a Minor Modification.</p>
PHMM14	16	Policy STM1	<p>In line STM1a of the Table,</p> <p>After 'Road' in column 2 add</p> <p>'to be developed as a single site with a single access, subject to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority.'</p> <p>Delete '30' in column 3 and replace by '50'.</p> <p>Delete '10' in column 4 and replace by '17'.</p> <p>NB The proposed Main Modification will require an appropriate change to the Proposals Map.</p> <p>NB As a Minor Modification the Council proposes adding text to explain that development proposals for the Policy STM1a site will need to take into account an assessment of impacts on heritage assets which may have a bearing on the quantum of development delivered from the site.</p>
PHMM15	17	Policy STM2	<p>Add a 5th line to the Table and insert;</p> <p>In column 1 'STM2d'</p> <p>In column 2 'Land east of Ryhall Road ##'</p> <p>In column 3 '3ha'</p> <p>In column 4 'General employment B1 and B2'</p> <p>Add the following text as an additional paragraph at the end of the Policy:</p> <p>'## Development proposals for this site would be expected to demonstrate that all vehicle movements arising from the development and its use can be safely accommodated within the existing highway network, and that the proposed</p>

			<p>point of access (either from Uffington Road or Ryhall Road) to the site satisfies highway safety guidelines. Restrictions may be applied to the size of vehicle and number of vehicular movements arising from the development because of existing weight restrictions within the town.'</p> <p>NB: the proposed Modification will require an appropriate change to the Proposals Map.</p>
PHMM16	18	Policy STM3	<p>Delete text of Policy and replace by:</p> <p>'29 ha of land on the western edge of Stamford between Empingham Road and Tinwell Road is allocated as a mixed use urban extension.</p> <p>The development of this site should provide approximately 400 new homes completed in phases across the 10 year period 2016 to 2026. Provision should also be made for 14 ha of land for a range of different employment uses including a 10 ha high quality and designed business park (as allocated in STM2 above). Consideration will be given to the development of a smaller area of employment land and to other employment generating uses, provided that it is clearly demonstrated that the proposal would generate a greater number of jobs than the typical employment gains associated with B1 and B2 uses from the area of land specified. Employment opportunities will also be expected to arise from the development of a small local centre within the site which will provide local facilities and shops for the residents of this development and the existing housing areas to the north and east of the site.</p> <p>Planning permission for the development of any part of the site will not be granted in isolation unless it either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • forms part of an outline or detailed planning application for the whole site which is accompanied by a comprehensive masterplan for the whole site. <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is in accordance with a comprehensive masterplan prepared and adopted as SPD by the District Council <p>The masterplan for the site should ensure that development achieves the following key principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of a vehicular access through

			<p>the site linking Empingham Road and Tinwell Road for buses, pedestrians, cyclists and emergency service vehicles. Any through route access for private vehicles will be designed to discourage rat-running through the development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provides a small scale local centre appropriate to the size of the development, which is located as to be of benefit to both new occupants of the site as well as the occupants of existing housing areas to the north and east ● Incorporates appropriately planned green infrastructure and landscaping within the design and layout of development to both reduce the impact of development on the landscape and protect the amenity of existing residents with the provision of a landscaped corridor between the new development and the existing residential area on Lonsdale Road. Green infrastructure should incorporate different forms and types of open space and landscaping including private and public open space, play and recreation facilities and other community open space as considered appropriate ● Ensures the design and layout of the development is of a high quality and standard which recognises the importance of this location at the entrance to Stamford ● Incorporates an appropriate mix of residential tenure and type that respects the surrounding context, including 35% affordable homes in accordance with the provisions of Core Strategy Policy H3 ● Ensures that appropriate education and health facilities are available and, if not, addresses any deficiencies through the provision of an appropriate financial contribution ● Secures the provision of good pedestrian and cycle access from and within the site to the local centre, and facilitates links with primary and secondary schools, new employment opportunities and the town centre ● Incorporates within the development layout appropriate surface water management systems which will ensure that greenfield run-off rates are maintained once the site is developed ● Provision of necessary infrastructure improvements required to support the development, including improvements to
--	--	--	---

			<p>the waste water transmission network</p> <p>The masterplan should be prepared in consultation with the local community.</p> <p>A Travel Plan should be prepared as part of the masterplan process to explore a range of sustainable travel measures to encourage occupants of the new development to use non-car-based travel modes.'</p> <p>NB: As Minor Modifications the Council proposes to add the words 'up to' in reference to affordable housing and the addition of the words 'an equivalent or' in respect of job numbers.</p>
PHMM17	22/23	Policy B1	<p>In line B1a of the Table delete '14ha' in column 3 and replace by '16ha'</p> <p>NB the proposed Modification will require an appropriate change to the Policies Map.</p>
PHMM18	22/23	Policy B1	<p>In line B1c of the Table delete '7ha' in column 3 and replace by '3ha'</p> <p>NB the proposed Modification will require an appropriate change to the Policies Map.</p>
PHMM19	22/23	Policy B1	<p>After the Table insert the following text as a new paragraph:</p> <p>'A Green Travel Plan should be prepared as part of a planning application for these sites. The plan should explore a range of sustainable measures to encourage occupants of the new development to use non-car-based travel modes.'</p>
PHMM20	25	3.3.10	<p>Add the following text at the end of paragraph:</p> <p>'There has been a fundamental shift in economic conditions since the Core Strategy evidence base was produced and more recent evidence, including the Employment Land Capacity Study completed in 2010, points to more modest overall employment land being required to deliver the same increase in jobs and economic output and, therefore, less land is allocated than is required by the Core Strategy.'</p>
PHMM21 Incorporating SAPMM023	25/27	3.3.15	<p>Delete text in first bullet point and replace by:</p> <p>'Wastewater Treatment and sewage network: Market Deeping and Deeping St James lie within the catchment for Deeping WwTW. Whilst there is sufficient headroom at the WwTW to accommodate the proposed development growth for the plan period, the hydraulic capacity of the WwTW is constrained by the current consented Dry Weather Flow (discharge consent). Anglian Water has explored the options with developers and the Environment Agency and considers there is</p>

			<p>reasonable prospect that a solution, that would not entail a new discharge consent, could provide sufficient capacity to serve the proposed growth. Anglian Water has created a programme of works to include auditing the consented traders and surveying (with CCTV) sections of the sewerage network to identify areas where groundwater and surface water is infiltrating the system. Given the scale of the catchment and the recorded flows at the works, Anglian Water consider there to be reasonable prospect that sufficient infiltration will be identified and removed to enable the proposed development. Developers should make early contact with Anglian Water to identify the work which may be required to service a development site.'</p>
PHMM22	28	3.3.2.4	<p>After 3.3.2.4 insert the following text as a new paragraph:</p> <p>'The Council would wish to ensure that employment development on the urban extension is appropriate to its prominent location at the gateway to Market Deeping. This is a sensitive area and could provide an opportunity for a prestigious development, where the quality and quantity of jobs provided is a most important factor. To reflect this Policy DE2 allocates an indicative area of 6ha of land for employment-generating development within Use Classes B1 and B2. Consideration may be given to proposals for a smaller area of employment development, and/or other employment generating uses as part of the overall development of the site provided that it is clearly demonstrated that the proposal would generate a greater number of jobs than the typical employment gains associated with B1 and B2 uses from the site area specified and that the proposed uses will not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.'</p> <p>NB: As a Minor Amendment the Council is proposing to add the words 'an equivalent or' to the text.</p>
PHMM23	29	Policy DE3	<p>Insert the following text at the end of the 2nd paragraph:</p> <p>'Consideration will be given to the development of a smaller area of employment land and to other employment-generating uses, provided that it is clearly demonstrated that the proposal would generate a greater number of jobs than the typical employment gains associated with B1 and B2 uses from the area of land specified.'</p> <p>NB: the addition of 'an equivalent or' is proposed by the Council as a Minor Modification</p>

			<p>In the 4th bullet point of the 4th paragraph delete the text and replace by:</p> <p>Incorporates an appropriate mix of residential tenure and type that respects the surrounding context, including up to 35% affordable homes in accordance with the provisions of Core Strategy Policy H3</p> <p>NB: the addition of 'up to' is proposed by the Council as a Minor Modification to bring the Policy fully into line with Core Strategy Policy H3.</p> <p>Delete the 9th bullet point in the 4th paragraph</p>
PHMM24	31	3.4.1.4	<p>Delete paragraph text and replace by:</p> <p>'The Outline Water Cycle Study has concluded that water resource availability is not an issue in the District. The Detailed Water Cycle Study identified that there was hydraulic capacity within all wastewater treatment works serving the LSCs to accommodate the modest levels of growth planned, except at Harlaxton, and Marston (which serves Barrowby and Great Gonerby as well as Grantham). In November 2012 the Environment Agency and Anglian Water issued a joint statement which updates the findings of the WCS for a number of catchments. The conclusions of this update statement have been used to update the information about the water cycle set out below.</p> <p>Harlaxton: Anglian Water and the Environment Agency consider there to be a reasonable prospect that sufficient areas where groundwater and surface water is infiltrating the system could be identified and removed to enable small-scale new development, however no site is allocated in Harlaxton.</p> <p>Marston: (which serves Barrowby and Great Gonerby) Due to the scale of development likely to be considered at Great Gonerby, Anglian Water and the Environment Agency do not consider there to be a wastewater infrastructure constraint to growth. No site is allocated in Barrowby.</p> <p>In Long Bennington flooding in the sewer catchment was identified as requiring a strategic solution, rather than a local upgrade, however there are some areas that could be developed without impacting on the constrained area. The allocated site is not affected by this constraint but other development proposals in the village may be restricted. Off-site reinforcement may include enlarging downstream pipes, installing storage or upgrading pumping stations. Developers should</p>

			<p>make early contact with Anglian Water to identify whether any proposals fall within the constrained area, and whether any works are required, and appropriate conditions shall be imposed on any planning permissions.</p> <p>For developments in all areas, Anglian Water recommend pre-application discussions to determine the extent of any water and infrastructure requirements, and to identify whether any localised reinforcements are required, as well as the imposition of appropriate conditions on planning approvals.'</p>
PHMM25	31/32	3.4.3.1	<p>Delete paragraph text and replace by:</p> <p>'The identification of the 16 LSCs in the Core Strategy was based upon an assessment of the relative sustainability of settlements across the District; in particular regard had been given to the range of facilities within each village. In determining which villages should be designated as an LSC, nine essential facilities were identified in the Core Strategy. Those villages which have seven or more of the nine essentials were identified as LSCs.</p> <p>The Core Strategy clearly sets out (paragraph 5.1.6) that it is not expected that an allocation will be proposed in each LSC, and that regard would be given to the capacity of each settlement to accommodate and support new development.</p> <p>To assess which of the 16 LSCs is more suitable for additional planned development, a detailed assessment of the overall sustainability of each settlement has been undertaken. This has been done through the SA/SEA process and is reported in Chapter 3 of the SA/SEA Addendum Report June 2013. This considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any potential constraints to further development – for example the capacity of the local waste water network, or whether there are important local or national designations within a village which may be adversely affected by additional development; • the range and capacity of local services and facilities within the village and the ability to easily access those which are not present in the village. All 16 villages will have between 7 and 9 of the essential criteria identified through the Core Strategy preparation, but the range of shop types and services offered within each village does vary. • the ability to access a wide range of job

			<p>opportunities within the village</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consideration of the proximity of each village to the four towns of the District and therefore the ability for residents to walk and cycle to them • the availability of public transport to access a greater range of services and facilities as well as employment opportunities. <p>As a result of the SA/SEA methodology the LSC villages have been grouped into four tiers depending upon the range of local services and facilities within them and the ability of resident within the villages to access those services which are not present by foot/cycle and public transport.</p> <p>Having determined which tier each LSC falls within, sites have been selected for allocation on a cascade basis where preference has been given to sites within Tier One villages first. Sites in Tier Two villages were only considered for allocation because there was insufficient suitable land within Tier One villages to meet the outstanding housing requirement, and it was considered that the cumulative effect of allocating all suitable sites within Tier One villages would have a significant adverse effect on the SA/SEA objectives. The decision about which site to allocate was made on a comparative basis of suitable sites across the Tier Two villages. Thus the prospect of an allocation being made in villages within Tiers Three and Four has proved to be unnecessary.'</p>
PHMM26	32	3.4.4.3	<p>In 3rd sentence delete 'three sites' and insert 'two sites'.</p> <p>Add the following text at the end of the paragraph:</p> <p>'It should also be noted that planning proposals for development of site LSC1d (at Great Gonerby) should be assessed with reference to Policy SAP11 for its impact on the setting of Belton House and Park.'</p>
PHMM27	33	Policy LSC1	<p>In line LSC1a delete entries in columns 2 – 5.</p> <p>Insert additional column between columns 2 and 3 and insert;</p> <p>'1.26' in LSC1a line</p> <p>'1.44' in LSC1b line</p> <p>'1.12' in LSC1c line</p> <p>'0.98' in LSC1d line</p>

			<p>'0.96' in LSC1e line</p> <p>In Totals line delete '185' in former column 3 and replace by '170', delete '63' in former column 4 and replace by '58'.</p> <p>NB: the proposed Modification will require an appropriate change to the Policies Map.</p>
PHMM28	33	Policy LSC1	<p>In line LSC1a:</p> <p>Insert 'former Aveland High School, Birthorpe Road, Billingborough' in column 2</p> <p>Delete '20' in former column 3 and replace by '35'</p> <p>Delete '7' in former column 4 and replace by '12'</p> <p>Delete '2021-2026' in former column 5 and replace by '2011-2016'.</p> <p>NB: the proposed Modification will require an appropriate change to the Policies Map which should reflect the Minor Modifications proposed by the Council.</p>
PHMM29	33	Policy LSC1	<p>In LSC1c line delete entry in column 2.</p> <p>NB: the proposed Modification will require an appropriate change to the Policies Map.</p>
PHMM30	33	Policy LSC1	<p>In LSC1c line insert the following text into column 2:</p> <p>'Land west of Swinstead Road, Corby Glen'</p> <p>NB: the proposed Modification will require an appropriate change to the Policies Map.</p>
PHMM31	33	Policy LSC1	<p>Delete entries in line LSC1e. Re-number line LSC1f accordingly.</p>
PHMM32	33/34	Policy LSC1	<p>Delete paragraph of text after the first Table and replace by:</p> <p>'Allocation of these sites provides the opportunity to deliver benefits to the local community. Affordable housing and open space and play facilities will be required as part of each development (in accordance with Policies H3 of the Core Strategy and SAP10 of this Plan). However, the provision of additional local facilities can also enhance the range and capacity of existing provision.</p> <p>The following sites will be required to deliver additional specific community benefit as part of any proposal for housing development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LSC1a (Billingborough): residential

			<p>development will only be permitted on the previously developed part of the former Aveland High School [approximately 1.5ha]. The remainder of the site [approximately 2.5ha] should remain as open space for community use (including playing fields and allotments), and the development must ensure provision of public access through the site to the open space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LSC1b (Colsterworth): residential development of this site should be designed to allow for the development of a small local scale shop to serve the needs of the local community either as part of the development or at a later date.' <p>NB: the proposed Modification will require an appropriate change to the Policies Map.</p> <p>NB: As a Minor Modification the Council proposes the deletion of 'remain as open space' and its replacement by 'be provided as open space' in the Policy LSC1a entry above.</p>
PHMM33	33/34	Policy LSC1	Delete second table in Policy.
PHMM34	34	3.5.2	<p>Before paragraph 3.5.2 text insert the following as a new paragraph:</p> <p>'The Council continues to monitor housing land supply and prepare an annual five-year land supply paper which assesses previous delivery rates as well as identifies a deliverable supply of housing land for that five-year period. The housing land supply paper is used to prepare the Annual Monitoring Report. Where necessary, this process of monitoring will lead to the identification of sites which are allocated in a later phase of the plan period, but which could be brought forward if it was considered necessary in order to maintain the five-year land supply and the appropriate buffer. In the event that insufficient allocated housing land is available to be brought forward to provide a five-year supply, consideration will be given, in accordance with the Core Strategy, to undertaking a partial review of the allocations included in the Plan and to granting planning permission for additional housing sites which meet the locational requirements of Core Strategy Policies SP1 and H1.'</p>
PHMM35	34	3.5.2	Delete paragraph added by SAPMM040
PHMM36	35	3.5.2	<p>Insert the following text after the first sentence of the paragraph:</p> <p>'It is, however, recognised that the planning process for large developments, such as the urban</p>

			<p>extensions proposed for Stamford and Deepings, can be lengthy. Indications are that this can take a further two years to complete, and that for these large developments it may be two or three years from submission of the planning application to the first house completions on it. In such circumstances, earlier approval to ensure that delivery occurs in the identified phase would be appropriate.'</p> <p>Remainder of paragraph 3.5.2 should be included as a separate, following paragraph.</p>
PHMM37	35/36	Policy SAP H1	<p>After paragraph 1 insert the following text as a new paragraph:</p> <p>'Development in the town of Grantham is the subject of a separate plan: the Grantham Area Action Plan (GAAP). Proposals for housing development within and on the edge of Grantham will be considered in accordance with policies of the Core Strategy and GAAP.'</p>
PHMM38	51	4.4.8	<p>After 4.4.8 insert the following text as a new paragraph:</p> <p>'The site identified in Policy SAP5 as ExE LSC1, comprising the triangle of land west of the Old Great North Road, north of the railway line and east of the A1, is occupied by various companies, including a motel and petrol filling station, a major retail superstore and garden centre, and includes warehousing as well as some expansion land. The Employment Land Capacity Study, prepared for the Council, identified land to the east of the Old Great North Road as also being suitable for a range of employment uses, and recognised that its location, immediately adjacent to the strategic road network with the potential to access a rail link, would make it attractive to the market. The Council is keen that the important role played by Gonerby Moor in the local economy continues, but would not wish further development here to be to the detriment of the economy of Grantham and the ability of Grantham to deliver the employment opportunities which are identified within the Grantham Area Action Plan. Any future development at Gonerby Moor should therefore complement existing and proposed employment provision in Grantham, by addressing specific locational requirements of employment uses which cannot be met by land or premises in Grantham. Suitable employment-generating development in this location is that which cannot be accommodated on current or allocated employment sites in Grantham, and which requires good, easy access to the strategic road network and utilises the potential for rail access which is only available in this location. Town</p>

			<p>centre uses are not considered appropriate in this area, although it may be a suitable location for "land-hungry" developments with low staff levels. No specific site is allocated in this plan for this purpose however the proposals map indicates a search area within which a scheme may be considered appropriate. Proposals which go beyond the search area will not be acceptable.'</p>
PHMM39	51	Policy SAP6	<p>Delete Policy text and replace by:</p> <p>'Within the search area identified on the proposals map, new employment-generating development will be permitted at Gonerby Moor where the applicant clearly demonstrates that the proposal is for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A specific use or development whose land and locational requirements cannot be accommodated on land which is allocated for employment use in the Grantham Area Action Plan and that no other premises or land is available or suitable to meet the needs of that development within Grantham <p>or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development which takes full advantage of the potential for rail-freight access which is only available at this location. <p>In all cases proposals must demonstrate that the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not exceed the search area identified on the proposals map • can be satisfactorily accessed and the capacity of the highway network, including the A1 slip road roundabouts, can accommodate additional traffic movements. • can be accommodated within the landscape without a detrimental impact upon the open countryside • enhances access to the area from alternative forms of transport such a rail, cycle, foot and bus.' <p>NB: the proposed Modification will require an appropriate change to the Policies Map.</p>
PHMM40	56	Policy SAP8	<p>In the text defining "on the edge of the defined town centre" delete '(up to 300 metres)'. and add the following text to the definition: 'For retail purposes this is up to 300 metres, for other main town centre uses this is within 300</p>

			metres and for offices this is outside the town centre but within 500 metres of a public transport interchange.'
PHMM41	59	New Policy and text	See PHMM43 below
PHMM42	59	New Policy and text	See PHMM43 below
PHMM43	59	New Policy and text	<p>This Modification substantially modifies Modifications previously proposed by the Council as SAPMM043.</p> <p>After Policy SAP10 and paragraph 4.7.8 insert the following text and policy:</p> <p>'Belton House and Park.</p> <p>The Grade I listed Belton House and its Grade I registered historic park and garden are heritage assets of international importance. In recognition of its importance the District Council, jointly with the National Trust, commissioned the Belton House and Park Setting Study to define the extent of the setting of these heritage assets and inform policy formulation and decision-making for development proposals within the defined area. The Belton House and Park Setting Study will be a material consideration when assessing the impact of proposals for developments which fall within the defined extent of the setting of Belton House and Park.</p> <p>The Belton House and Park Setting Study defines the extent of the visual setting of Belton House and Park and identifies the types of development which can impact upon it (Section 3 of the Study).</p> <p>All development proposals are assessed against the criteria in Core Strategy Policy EN1 for their impacts. However, in view of the importance of Belton House and Park, it is considered appropriate that proposals for development within the parameters set out in Section 3 of the Setting Study should include an assessment of their impact on the House and Park.</p> <p>Policy SAP 11: Protecting and Enhancing the Setting of Belton House and Park</p> <p>Belton House and its Historic Park and Garden are nationally and internationally significant heritage assets located in close proximity to the northern edge of the existing built-up area of Grantham. Protecting and enhancing their setting, using the Belton House and Park Setting study to inform the assessment of the impacts, is important</p>

			<p>to maintaining their significance as heritage assets.</p> <p>Proposals will need to demonstrate what, if any, impact there will be on the setting of Belton House and Park through the preparation of a Heritage Impact Statement, and how through their location, scale, design, landscaping and materials they have taken account of the setting of Belton, and that any adverse impacts have been removed and/or mitigated.</p> <p>This policy meets Plan Objective 8.'</p>
PHMM44	60	5.1.3	<p>Delete paragraph text and replace by:</p> <p>'The allocations in the Plan have been phased to ensure a continuous supply of housing development throughout the Plan period. This phasing has taken account of any supporting infrastructure requirements, as well as the need to ensure a rolling five-year supply of deliverable sites. The Housing Trajectory [included in the Core Strategy and the Five Year Housing Land Supply Paper] demonstrates how the housing allocations, together with the existing housing commitments, meet the housing requirements each year. Data recording the housing permissions granted and the numbers of houses started and completed each year is reported in the Annual Monitoring Report, which measures the effectiveness of the Plan policies. The triggers set out in Table 1: Monitoring Framework are also used when assessing effectiveness, or otherwise, of the Plan policies.'</p>
PHMM45	60	5.1.3	<p>Insert the following text as a new paragraph after 5.1.3:</p> <p>'This continuous monitoring should highlight patterns of development. If it becomes apparent, after three consecutive years, that the housing targets are not being met, the Council will consider bringing forward additional sites or the phasing of allocated sites to make up the shortfall and to ensure that sufficient housing is being delivered.'</p>
PHMM46 - 66	60	Section 5: Implementation and Monitoring Framework	<p>Modification SAPMM044 proposed a revised Framework. PHMM46 – 66 propose a number of changes to the Table. The revised Framework including the PHMM46 – 66 changes is contained in Appendix A(1).</p>
PHMM67	63	5.2.8 and 5.2.9	<p>Delete paragraphs and associated SAPMM*** changes.</p>

Appendix A(1) Monitoring and Implementation Table – see SAPMM044 and PHMM46 - 66

Table1: Monitoring Framework						
Policy	DPD objective	Responsible Agencies	Target(s)	Indicators / Monitors	Trigger	Action and contingencies
SD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable development			No more than 20% of the refused applications are allowed on appeal over a 5 year period	Number of planning permissions refused on the basis of this Policy which were allowed on appeal		Review this Policy if more than 20% of the refused applications are allowed on appeal over a 5 year period
STM1: Housing Allocations in Stamford (including affordable housing in accordance with Core Strategy Policy H3): phased delivery of residential development on 5 sites	This policy satisfies spatial objective 1, 2, 3, 8, 10 and 11	Developer / Landowner Registered Provider	Deliver an average of 55 dwellings per annum each year of the plan period (based upon Core Strategy policy H1)	Net additional housing completions each year - monitored through AMR	Shortfall of 20% of annual target according to the adopted Core Strategy Housing Trajectory (trajectory updated annually in the AMR) over 3 consecutive years	Identify problem and barrier(s) to development via assessment and/or discussions with interested parties. Bring sites forward in later phases of plan period if appropriate, in accordance with 5 year Housing Land Supply, and additional sites should be allocated, if housing targets are not being met after 3 consecutive years.
STM1a: 50 units (including 17 affordable) 2011-2016			Deliver 50 new homes by 2016	Housing commitments and completions in AMR	No planning application by 2013	
STM1b: 30 units (including 10 affordable) 2011-2016			Deliver 30 new homes by 2016	Housing commitments and completions in AMR	No planning application by 2013	
STM1c: 50 units (17 affordable units) (part of STM2b) 2016-2021			Deliver 50 new homes by 2021	Housing commitments and completions in AMR	No planning application by 2018	
STM1d: 50 units (including 17			Deliver 50 new homes (in association with relocation of	Housing commitments and completions in AMR	No planning application for	Work with key partners, developers and land owners to facilitate and enable development (eg:

affordable), linked to Football Club relocation 2016-2021			football club) by 2021		redevelopment of Football Club by 2016	access to finance, including grants, renegotiation of S106 etc). Consider whether policy review is appropriate.
STM1e: 400 units (including appropriate affordable housing @ 35%) (part of STM3) 2016-2026		See STM3				
STM2: Employment allocations in Stamford: employment development on 3 sites	This policy satisfies spatial objective 3, 8, 9 and 10	Developer / Landowner	Delivery of additional employment floorspace each year on sites allocated for employment generating uses	Amount of additional employment land floorspace completed	No net increase in employment floorspace on allocated sites as shown by annual monitoring of development on a rolling three year basis	Identify problem and barrier(s) to development via assessment and/or discussions with interested parties.
STM2a: 8ha - B1, B2 & B8			Deliver 8ha B1, B2 and B8 uses over the plan period	Amount of additional employment land floorspace completed	No planning application by 2021	Work with key partners, developers and land owners to facilitate and enable development (eg: access to finance, including grants, renegotiation of S106 etc).
STM2b: 2ha - B1 & B2 (part of STM1c)			Deliver 2ha B1 & B2 use as part of mixed development	Amount of additional employment land floorspace completed	No planning application by 2018	Consider review of policy if appropriate.
STM2c: 14ha Business Park (in B1 & B2) (part of STM3)			14ha High Quality Business Park as part of urban extension	See STM3		

STM2d: 3 ha B1 and B2			Deliver 3ha B1 and B2 uses over the plan period	Amount of additional employment land floorspace completed	No planning application by 2021	Identify problems & barrier(s) to development via assessment and/or discussions with interested parties. Consider review of policy if appropriate
<p>STM3: Mixed Use Urban Extension site in Stamford: 400 houses (including 35% affordable units) + 14ha employment land (including 10ha Business Park) 2016-2026</p> <p>Masterplan required for details: to include access road, GI provision, other infrastructure provision, "local centre" provision (includes STM1e & STM2c)</p>	This policy satisfies spatial objective 1, 2, 3, 8, 10 and 11	Developer / Landowner Registered Provider LCC	<p>Masterplan in place by 2014 and/or planning application(s) received by 2016</p> <p>S106 agreement(s) by 2016</p> <p>Legal agreement(s) for road by 2016</p> <p>Delivery of an average of 40 homes a year over the 10 years 2016-2026 of appropriate type, size and tenure (including appropriate number of affordable units @35%)</p> <p>Construction of a new 10ha Business Park and the provision of additional employment generating development in appropriate phases by 2026</p>	<p>Progress on masterplan</p> <p>Progress on application(s)</p> <p>Progress of S106/CIL</p> <p>Net additional housing completions each year</p> <p>Affordable housing completions on site</p> <p>Amount of additional employment land floorspace completed</p>	<p>No progress on masterplanning by 2014</p> <p>Application not received by 2016</p> <p>Construction of houses not started by 2017</p> <p>Construction of business park and employment development no started by 2018</p>	<p>Identify problem and barrier(s) to development via assessment and/or discussions with interested parties.</p> <p>Work with key partners, developers and land owners to facilitate and enable development (eg: access to finance, including grants, renegotiation of S106 etc).</p>
B1: Bourne employment allocations:	This policy satisfies spatial	Developer / Landowner	Delivery of additional employment floorspace each year on sites allocated for employment	Amount of additional employment land	No net increase in employment floorspace on	Identify problem and barrier(s) to development via

employment development on 5 sites	objective 3, 8, 10 and 11		generating uses	floorspace completed	allocated sites as shown by annual monitoring of development on a rolling three year basis	assessment and/or discussions with interested parties.
B1a: 16ha - B1, B2 & B8			Deliver 14ha - B1, B2 & B8 uses	Number of jobs created	No planning applications by 2018	Work with key partners, developers and land owners to facilitate and enable development (eg: access to finance, including grants, renegotiation of S106 etc). Consider review of policy if appropriate.
B1b: 21ha - B1, B2 & B8			21ha - B1, B2 & B8 uses	Amount of additional employment land floorspace completed	No planning applications by 2021	
B1c: 3ha Business Park (B1 & B2) P(part of Elsea Park)			3ha Business Park by 2023 (in accordance with schedule and SK94/0125 which allows Reserved Matters applications by 2021 & completion 2 years later)	Amount of additional employment land floorspace completed	No reserved matters application by 2021	
B1d: 8ha 0 B1, B2 & B8			8ha - B1, B2 & B8 uses	Identified in Elsea Park Masterplan for employment development (in phase 10)	No development on site by 2024	
B1e: 3ha expansion site for food processing site			Expansion of existing flood processing plant	Amount of additional employment land floorspace completed	No planning applications by 2021	
		Expansion land for specific employer	No application by 2021	Discussion with landowner about need for site.		
DE1: Housing Allocations in The Deepings (including 35% affordable housing in accordance with Core Strategy Policy H3): phased delivery of residential development on 4 sites (including delivery of community benefit on 3 sites)	This policy satisfies spatial objective 1, 2, 3, 8, 10 and 11	Developer / Landowner Registered Provider	Deliver an average of 43 dwellings per annum each year of the plan period (based upon Core Strategy policy H1)	Net additional housing completions each year	Shortfall of 20% of annual target according to the adopted Core Strategy Housing trajectory (trajectory updated annually in the AMR) over 3 consecutive years	Identify problem and barrier(s) to development via assessment and/or discussions with interested parties. Bring sites forward in later phases of plan period if appropriate, in accordance with 5year Housing Land Supply,

DE1a: 85 units (including 29 affordable) 2011-2016			Deliver 85 new homes by 2016	Housing commitments and completions in AMR	No planning application by 2012	and additional sites should be allocation, if housing targets are not being met after 3 consecutive years. Work with key partners, developers and land owners to facilitate and enable development (eg: access to finance, including grants, renegotiation of S106 etc). Consider whether policy review is appropriate.
DE1b: 15 units (including 5 affordable) 2011-2016			Deliver 15 new homes by 2016	Housing commitments and completions in AMR	No planning application by 2014	
DE1c: 100 units (including 35 affordable) 2021-2026			Deliver 100 new homes by 2026	Housing commitments and completions in AMR	No planning application by 2021	
DE1d: 200 units (including appropriate affordable housing @35%) (part of DE3) 2016-2021		See DE3				
DE2: Employment Allocations in The Deepings: employment development on 2 sites	This policy satisfies spatial objective 3, 8, 9 and 10	Developer / Landowner	Delivery of additional employment floorspace each year on sites allocated for employment generating uses	Amount of additional employment land floorspace completed	No net increase in employment floorspace on allocated sites as shown by annual monitoring of development on a rolling three year basis	Identify problem and barrier(s) to development via assessment and/or discussions with interested parties.
DE2a: 14ha - B1, B2 & B8			14ha B1, B2 & B8 use	Amount of additional employment land floorspace completed	No planning applications by 2018	Work with key partners, developers and land owners to facilitate and enable
DE2b: 6ha - B1 &			6ha B1 & B2 uses	Amount of additional	No planning	

B2 (part of DE3)				employment land floorspace completed (see DE3)	applications by 2018	development (eg: access to finance, including grants, etc). Consider review of policy if appropriate.
<p>DE3: Mixed Use Urban Extension in Market Deeping: 200 houses (inc 35% affordable units) + 6ha employment land 2016-2021.</p> <p>Masterplan required for details: to include access road(s), infrastructure provision + gateway development (includes DE1d & DE2b).</p>	This policy satisfies spatial objective 1, 2, 3, 8, 10 and 11	<p>Developer / Landowner</p> <p>Registered Provider</p> <p>LCC</p>	<p>Masterplan in place by 2016</p> <p>Planning application by 2016</p> <p>S106 agreement(s) by 2016</p> <p>Delivery of an average of 40 homes a year over the 5 years 2016-2021 of appropriate type, size & tenure (including appropriate number of affordable units @35%)</p> <p>Construction of 6ha land for employment generating development in appropriate phases</p>	<p>Progress on masterplan</p> <p>Progress on application(s)</p> <p>Net additional housing completions each year</p> <p>Affordable housing completions on site</p> <p>Amount of additional employment land floorspace completed</p>	<p>No progress on masterplan by 2014</p> <p>Application not received by 2015</p> <p>Construction of houses not started by 2017</p> <p>Construction of business park and employment development not started by 2017</p>	<p>Identify problem and barrier(s) to development via assessment and/or discussions with interested parties.</p> <p>Work with key partners, developers and land owners to facilitate and enable development (eg: access to finance, including grants, renegotiation of S106 etc).</p> <p>Work with developers and/or landowners to bring site forward.</p>
LSC1: Housing Allocations in the Local Service Centres (including 35% affordable housing in accordance with Core Strategy Policy H3): phased delivery of	This policy satisfies spatial objective 1, 2, 7, 8, 10 and 11	<p>Developer / Landowner</p> <p>Registered Provider</p>	Deliver an average of 42 dwellings per annum each year of the plan period (based upon Core Strategy policy H1)	Net additional housing completions each year	Shortfall of 20% of cumulative 5 year target according to the adopted Core Strategy Housing Trajectory	Identify problem and barrier(s) to development via assessment and/or discussions with interested parties.

residential development on 6 sites in 6 LSCs						Bring sites forward in later phases of plan period if appropriate, in accordance with 5year Housing Land Supply.
LSC1a: 35 units (including 12 affordable) 2021-2026: Billingborough and community use of former playing fields			35 new homes by 2026	Application to include retention of former school playing field as open space for community use	No planning application by 2022 Provision of access to land for playing fields by start of development	Work with key partners, developers and land owners to facilitate and enable development (eg: access to finance, including grants, renegotiation of S106 etc).
LSC1b: 40 units (including 14 affordable) 2016-2021: Colsterworth h+ local shop			Deliver 40 new homes by 2021	Application to include retail provision	No planning application by 2018	
LSC1c: 30 units (including 10 affordable) 2016-2021: Corby Glen			Deliver 30 new homes including provision of cycle / pedestrian links by 2021	Application to include cycle and pedestrian links to A151 Bourne Road	No planning application by 2018	
LSC1d: 30 units (including 10 affordable) 2021-2026: Great Gonerby			Deliver 30 new homes by 2026		No planning application by 2022	Consider whether policy review is appropriate.
LSC1e: 35 units (including 12 affordable) 2011-2016: Long Bennington			Deliver 35 new homes by 2016		No planning application by 2014	
SAP H1: Other Housing Development: redevelopment and infill sites in LSCs and towns (but not Grantham) 10 or fewer units	This policy satisfies spatial objective 1, 2, 3, 8, 10 and 11	Developer / Landowner	Delivery of a choice and ranges of housing sites bringing into use brownfield and underused land in sustainable locations	Net additional housing completions each year on brownfield and small infill sites	Completion of less than 12% of the annual average housing completions on brownfield and/or small infill sites	Bring sites forward in later phases of plan period if appropriate. Consider whether policy review/ allocation of additional sites is appropriate.
SAP1: Retention	This policy	Developer /	No loss of important community	Number of proposals	Net loss of	Consider whether

<p>of Community Services and Facilities: resist change of use resulting in loss of community services/ facilities</p>	<p>satisfies spatial objective 7, 8 and 9</p>	<p>Landowner SKDC Parish Council</p>	<p>assets to other development</p>	<p>involving community assets as monitored on annual bases</p>	<p>community facilities across the District</p>	<p>policy review is appropriate.</p>
<p>SAP2: Rural Exception Affordable Housing: assist in the provision of affordable housing in identified settlements (in 2 phases) and provide support for other villages</p>	<p>This policy satisfies spatial objective 1, 2 and 7</p>	<p>Developer / Landowner Registered Provider Parish Council</p>	<p>Completion of schemes in 6 settlements identified in phase 1 by 2015 Completion of needs assessments and (where appropriate) schemes in 7 settlements identified in phase 2 by 2018 (Core Strategy target: completion of 10 units per annum)</p>	<p>Number of schemes submitted and units permitted Number of affordable units constructed by location each year</p>	<p>Less than 10 affordable homes permitted / completed per year in rural areas in a rolling three year period</p>	<p>Identify problem and barrier(s) to development via assessment and/or discussions with parish councils, housing providers, landowners and other interested parties. Work with key partners to identify suitable sites and source funding.</p>
<p>SAP3: Supporting Local Business in LSCs: support employment-generating development</p>	<p>This policy satisfies spatial objective 3, 5, 7, 78 and 9</p>	<p>Developer / Landowner</p>	<p>Deliver local business and employment opportunities in LSCs</p>	<p>Amount of permitted and completed new employment floorspace in LSCs each year</p>	<p>No net increase in employment floorspace delivered in LSCs over rolling three year periods</p>	<p>Identify problem and barrier(s) to development via assessment and/or discussions with businesses. Consider whether policy review is appropriate.</p>
<p>SAP4: Business Development in the Countryside (including rural</p>	<p>This policy satisfies spatial objective 3,</p>	<p>Developer / Landowner</p>	<p>Support for rural diversification and local employment opportunities in rural communities</p>	<p>Number of applications received and approved</p>	<p>Less than 50% of applications approved over a rolling three year</p>	<p>Identify problem and barrier(s) to securing planning permission and completing</p>

<p>diversification schemes): support for farming, forestry, equine, rural enterprise, sport & recreation, and tourism projects</p>	<p>5, 7, 8 and 9</p>			<p>Amount of committed and completed now employment floorspace in rural areas</p>	<p>period</p>	<p>development via assessment and/or discussions with interested parties.</p> <p>Work with applicants to investigate alternative employment-generating uses.</p> <p>Consider policy review.</p>
<p>SAP5: Locally Important Existing Employment Sites: no CoU from employment use on 14 identified sites</p> <p>Support expansion of certain established "site specific" businesses</p>	<p>This policy satisfies spatial objective 3, 4 and 7</p>	<p>Developer / Landowner</p> <p>Existing employers</p>	<p>No net loss of B1, B2 and B8 floorspace on identified sites over plan period</p>	<p>Amount of existing employment land / floorspace lost to non-employment uses on annual basis, by site</p>	<p>Net loss of employment floorspace on identified sites to other use classes over rolling three year period</p>	<p>Identify problem and/or reasons for change(s) of use via assessment and/or discussions with interested parties.</p> <p>Consider review of policy, including de-designation, if appropriate.</p>
<p>SAP6: Employment Development at Gonerby Moor: support for new employment use of land at Gonerby Moor</p>	<p>This policy satisfies spatial objective 3 and 8</p>	<p>Developer / Landowner</p> <p>SKDC</p> <p>LCC</p> <p>Highways Agency</p>	<p>Additional employment floorspace developed on appropriate site(s) by 2026 if no other more suitable site available within GAAP</p>	<p>Amount of additional employment land or floorspace completed in this location on an annual basis</p>	<p>No planning applications by 2018</p>	<p>Identify problem and barrier(s) to development via assessment and/or discussions with interested parties.</p> <p>Work with key partners, developers and land owners to facilitate and enable development (eg: access to finance, including grants, etc).</p>

						Consider review of policy if appropriate.
<p>SAP7: Development Within Defined Town Centre: town centres & Primary Shopping Areas (PSA) defined</p> <p>A1 use in Primary Shopping Frontage (PSF) = 80% min</p> <p>Non-retail in PSF = 20% max</p> <p>Use in other streets = A1-A5, B1, D1 & D2</p> <p>Support non-retail use on upper floors within PSA</p>	This policy satisfies spatial objective 6	<p>Developer / Landowner</p> <p>Property Agents</p> <p>Town Centre Manager</p>	<p>Provision of additional convenience and comparison retail floorspace in sequentially preferable locations as set out in Retail Capacity and Needs Study</p> <p>Establish minimum of 80% retail (A1) use on street frontage within defined Primary Shopping Frontage (PSF)</p> <p>Net increase in homes on upper floors within defined town centres</p> <p>Net increase in office accommodation on upper floors in defined town centres</p>	<p>Number of applications for town centre uses in relation to town centre boundary</p> <p>Amount of new retail floorspace committed and completed on annual basis</p> <p>Amount of non-A1 use floorspace approved within PSF</p> <p>Amount of new residential and/or office accommodation permitted and completed on upper floors within town centre boundaries on annual basis</p>	<p>More than 20% new town centre uses located outside defined town centre boundaries over rolling 3 year period [by floorspace]</p> <p>More than 20% street frontage lost to non-A1 uses within PSF in rolling 3 year periods</p> <p>No net increase in use of upper floors after five years (2017: 2022)</p>	<p>Identify problem and barrier(s) to development within the town centre via assessment and/or discussions with interested parties.</p> <p>Dialogue with commercial property agents over rents and suitability of retail units within PSA.</p> <p>Possible review of PSA, PSF and town centre boundaries.</p>
<p>SAP8: Town Centre Opportunity Areas: support for redevelopment of town centre areas using a sequential approach</p>	This policy satisfies spatial objective 6	<p>Developer / Landowner</p> <p>SKDC</p> <p>Town Centre Manager</p>	<p>Promote the redevelopment of unused or underused sites within town centre areas, for town centre uses</p> <p>Provision of additional convenience and comparison retail floorspace in sequentially preferable locations, in accordance with needs identified in the Retail Capacity and Needs</p>	<p>Number of applications for town centre uses in relation to town centre boundary</p> <p>Amount of new retail floorspace committed and completed on annual basis</p>	<p>More than 20% of new town centre uses located outside defined town centre boundaries over rolling 3 year period [by floorspace]</p>	<p>Identify problem and barrier(s) to development within the town centre via assessment and/or discussions with interested parties.</p> <p>Work with landowners and developers to</p>

			Study			facilitate and enable development.
			Maintain or reduce vacancy rate of existing retail units within defined centres	Vacancy rates within town centres	Increase in vacancy rate of shop units by 2% per annum	Identify causes and assess possible solutions, including policy review.
			Increase in footfall in monitored town centres	Pedestrian footfall (measure three times a year) in measures town centres	No net increase, or a decline, in actual footfall rates over a two year period	Analyse cause of footfall decline in town centre and identify measures to address, including policy review.
SAP9: Bourne Core Area: support for redevelopment schemes to meet SPD requirements (including retail, leisure, business, office, public realm, access, parking)	This policy satisfies spatial objective 6	Developer / Landowner SKDC Property Agents Town Centre Manager	Redevelopment of Core Area of Bourne in phased approach in accordance with the SPG	Number of applications made for development within Core Area	No development of phase 1 by 2013	Identify problem and barrier(s) to development via discussions with interested parties and work with developers/landowners to remove obstacles and to facilitate development.
				Completion of approved development with Core Area	No progress with subsequent phases by 2018 Non-policy compliant development approved within Core Area	
				Pedestrian footfall in town centre	Decline in footfall rates over two year period	Analyse cause of footfall decline and vacancy rate increase in town centre and identify measures to address, including policy review.
				Vacancy rates within town centre	Increased vacancy rate by 2% per annum	

<p>SAP10: Open Space Provision: sets out standards for:</p> <p>informal/natural greenspace, outdoor sports other open space</p> <p>providing new open space within new development</p>	<p>This policy satisfies spatial objective 8 and 11</p>	<p>Developer / Landowner</p> <p>SKDC</p>	<p>New housing developments to provide appropriate amount, type and located open space to reflect local standards</p>	<p>Amount of open space included within approved housing proposals</p> <p>Amount of open space contributions provided through S106 contributions</p> <p>Amount of new open space completed on annual basis by location</p>	<p>Less than 80% new housing development schemes providing open space (or contribution to)</p> <p>Each S106 agreement contains triggers tailored to the specific development and its open space requirement</p> <p>No net increase in open space / GI provision</p>	<p>Review reasons for decision.</p> <p>Enforce against non-compliance with conditions / S106 requirements: take legal action if necessary.</p> <p>Review open space standards and open space strategy.</p> <p>Review policy if necessary.</p>
<p>Protect existing open space (including allotments, parks, sports pitches, green corridors etc).</p>			<p>No net loss of existing open space; sports or recreational facilities</p>	<p>Applications for development of existing open space (eg allotments)</p>	<p>Annual monitoring of applications involving a net loss of open space (including allotments) over a rolling 5 year period</p>	<p>Review reason(s) for decision.</p> <p>Consider review of policy.</p>
<p>SAP11: Protecting and Enhancing the Setting of Belton House and Park</p>	<p>This policy satisfies spatial objective 8</p>	<p>Developer / Landowner</p> <p>SKDC</p>	<p>No planning permission granted which impacts on the setting of Belton House and Park</p>	<p>Planning applications within the Buffer Zones set out in the Belton House and Park Study</p>	<p>1 application approved contrary to policy</p>	<p>Review the reason(s) for the decision and, if necessary, review and amend the policy.</p> <p>Publish additional guidance or specific</p>

		National Trust					SPD.
--	--	-------------------	--	--	--	--	------

Appendix A(2) – PHMM07

Additional text and tables setting out the housing requirement for the District and how it will be met by the plan:

The adopted Core Strategy provides the strategic framework for the amount and distribution of new homes needed in the district for the 20 year period 2006-2026. Policy H1 of the Core Strategy identifies a district wide requirement for 13,620 homes to be built over the 20 year period. It distributes 7,680 of these homes to Grantham (covered by the Grantham Area Action Plan) and the remaining 5,940 homes to be located in the rest of the District which is covered by the Site Allocation and Policies DPD.

Between 1st April 2006 and 31st March 2013 a total of 4,833 homes had already been built in the district and another 4,927 had planning permission. As a result provision must to be made for at least 3,902 additional homes for the remaining period 1st April 2013 – 31st March 2026.

Table 1 below demonstrates that the provisions of the two development plans will meet the housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy. It is anticipated that these requirements will be exceeded by 800 homes, through the development of allocations and sites with planning consent.

Table 1	Core Strategy requirement	Built 2006-2013	Site with planning permission at 1 st April 2013	Capacity of Proposed Allocation	Total supply
Grantham	7680	1644	2524*	3700 #	7868
Stamford	1140	560	173 **	525	1258
Bourne	2310	1133	1576***	0	2709
Deepings	870	412	288 ****	315	1015
LSCs	1000	756	268	170	1194
Rural areas	620	328	98	0	426
Total for district	13620	4833	4927	4710	14470

* includes 1800 with outline consent on part of the North West Quadrant, Grantham.

** includes 55 with outline consent on site allocated as STM1d (Stamford AFC, Kettering Road, Stamford)

*** includes 1,277 with planning permission at Elsea Park, Bourne

**** includes 85 with outline planning permission on site allocated at DE1a (Land to rear of Tesco, Godseys Lane, Market Deeping)

The minimum number of houses to be allocated in the GAAP (includes 1600 additional homes at North West Quadrant and 1600 at Southern Quadrant.)

The Core Strategy includes a Housing Trajectory which predicts the number of housing completions on a year by year basis for each location. The Council monitors house completions and planning permissions against the trajectory to identify whether house building continues to meet the Core Strategy requirements. This monitoring is published on an annual basis in the Annual Monitoring Report.

The National Planning Policy Framework requires Local Planning Authorities to identify a rolling five year supply of deliverable housing land across the plan period. The annual monitoring of house completions and commitments will be used to ensure that a rolling five year supply of housing land continues to be provided across the District. To help achieve this housing sites have been allocated in this plan to three five-year phases; 2011-2016; 2016-2021 and 2021-2026. Table 2 below demonstrates how the allocations have been phased.

Table 2 Phasing of Allocated Sites

	Phase 1 2011-2016	Phase 2 2016-2021	Phase 3 2021-2026	Total Allocated
Stamford	130	350	100	580
Bourne *	0	0	0	0
Deeping	100	200	100	400
LSCs	70	70	30	170
Total	300	620	230	1150

*In accordance with Policy H1 of the Core Strategy no housing sites have been allocated in Bourne where sites with planning permission (including Elsea Park) will continue to meet housing land needs for the remaining plan period.'