

Core Strategy Preferred Options, May 2007

Total Consultees: 118

Total Representations: 1203

Total Comments: 888

Representations (Sections 3.3-3.5 only): 102

Con ID: 26303

Full Name: Mr Ian Lings

Organisation: Principal Policy Officer
Planning & Conservati
on Lincolnshire
County Council

Comment ID: 1894

Title: Residential Development

Number: 3.3

Nature Of Response Object

Summary:

Object to the high level of housing development proposed in rural areas which require especially high levels of new provision in the LSC & Large Villages in Options PO3a b and c and which has not been justified in the context of the sequential approach and policies of urban concentration. The Adopted Structure Plan and Option PO3e concentrate 79.3% of provision in urban areas. In Option PO3a it is only 70% and 72.2% in Preferred Option PO3b. This is reflected in Objective 2 which sets a minimum of 70%. A more appropriate figure would be around 80%: this could then be reflected in Objective 4. Both Options PO3a and PO3b concentrate new provision entirely in Grantham and the large villages. Option PO3c would exacerbate current unsustainable patterns of development. It does illustrate that provision in large villages in the first two options is almost 1000 higher than if simply continuing current trends. Option PO3d might be the only acceptable Option in terms of rural growth but it also redistributes growth from Grantham to Stamford and the Deepings which would have negative effects on regeneration and growth in Peterborough conservation in Stamford and in terms of flood risk in the Deepings. Whilst Option PO3e would obviously best match the Structure Plan spatial strategy it would fall substantially short of the draft Regional Plan provision and is also contrary to Grantham's

Officers' Response:

See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

New Growth Point Status. We would welcome discussion of these issues between the County Council and SKDC in the context of the Regional Plan process. It is not our role to put forward precise sub-District figures but as a starting point a suggested better split would be: Grantham: between 6500 (Structure Plan %) and 7560 (SKDC Preferred Option) LSC & Large Villages; around 2700 (Option PO3d) Other Rural Villages: around 630 (SKDC Preferred Option) Stamford Bourne and the Deepings: 4860 to 5920 (concentrated entirely in Stamford and the Deepings because of the amount of development already committed in Bourne).

Con ID: 26339

Full Name: Mr R F Lovelock MBE

Organisation: Clerk Billingborough Parish Council

Comment ID: 2644

Title: Residential Development

Number: 3.3

Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

It is clear that part of the RSS requirement for the District is in the form of sites that already have housing consent but it is not clear what the status is of those which have been added in as a result of the 'Urban Capacity Study'. If this study carries no statutory weight then these additional sites should be separated out in the Core Strategy and not given the same weight as those which already have planning consent or a development plan allocation. (This point is less important than those which follow).

Officers' Response:

Agree. Remove Urban Capacity sites from calculations.

Con ID: 26277
Full Name: Jenny Young
Organisation: Planning
Archaeologist
Heritage Trust for
Lincolnshire

Comment ID: 963
Title: Residential Development
Number: 3.3
Nature Of Response Observations

Con ID: 26095
Full Name: Barbara Robinson
Organisation: Clerk to the Parish
Council Fulbeck
Parish Council
Comment ID: 2301
Title: Residential Development
Number: 3.3
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Residential development can have impact on archeological reamins.

Officers' Response:
Comments noted. Lincs Heritage is consulted when applications for development are made which may affect a Scheduled site.

Summary:
Limited infil development should be permitted in villages which do not have LSC status. The few sites available would not result in the over-provision of homes and will negate the impression that they are being allowed to die .

Officers' Response:
The Council has considered the effect of the old local plan policy which allowed infill development. This approach is considered too relaxed. Greater control needs to be exercised over development in less sustainable locations. Therefore this approach should not be changed.

Con ID: 26209
Full Name: Sir Simon Benton-Jone
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2273
Title: Residential Development
Number: 3.3

Nature Of Response Observations

Con ID: 26271
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
DLP Planning Ltd
Comment ID: 921
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.1

Nature Of Response Object

Con ID: 26112
Full Name: Alison Homes
Organisation: Director Smith
Stuart Reynolds
Comment ID: 1972
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.1
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:

Concerned with small-scale well designed domestic housing in the villages of this area. Doubling size of Irnham saved village added over 20 houses to SKDC housing stock. Another 10 could be built without causing the slightest damage.

Officers' Response:

Comments noted. Irnham is not among the villages identified as a Local Service Centre or Larger Village. It is not envisaged that large amounts of development will take place in this location.

Summary:

Little purpose therefore seems to be served by the reference to the Structure Plan housing provision.

Officers' Response:

Comments noted. References to Structure Plan will be removed from para 3.3.1. See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies. See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Summary:

It is considered that identifying the housing requirements of the Lincolnshire Structure Plan as a minimum does not reflect the plan period nor the requirements of the emerging RSS8 for 15 750 (630 dwellings pa). To do this even to 2021 would require an annual build rate of only 460 dwellings per annum severely affecting the ability to deliver housing growth and then requiring a large increase in growth during the final part of the plan period. Such an approach would be contrary to the emphasis on the early delivery of new homes in the designated New

Officers' Response:

Comments noted. The Core Strategy will ensure that the housing requirements set out in the RSS are met. See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Growth Points such as Grantham. PPS3 paragraph 53 suggests that local planning authorities should have regard to the level of housing provision proposed in the relevant emerging spatial strategy and the Council's preferred option PO3b overall growth allocation of 15 750 is supported though the district wide distribution is disputed.

Con ID: 26230

Full Name: Alison and Stamford H

Organisation: Director Smith
Stuart Reynolds

Comment ID: 2004

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.3.1

Nature Of Response Object

Summary:

Identifying the housing requirements of the Lincolnshire Structure Plan as a minimum does not reflect the plan period nor the requirements of the emerging RSS8 for 15 750 (630 dwellings pa). To do this even to 2021 would require an annual build rate of only 460 dwellings per annum severely affecting the ability to deliver housing growth and then requiring a large increase in growth during the final part of the plan period. Such an approach would be contrary to the emphasis on the early delivery of new homes in the designated New Growth Points such as Grantham. PPS3 paragraph 53 suggests that local planning authorities should have regard to the level of housing provision proposed in the relevant emerging spatial strategy and the Council's preferred option PO3b overall growth allocation of 15 750 is supported though the district wide distribution is disputed.

Officers' Response:

Comments noted. References to Structure Plan will be removed from para 3.3.1. See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies. See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26475
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
Stamford Property
Company
Comment ID: 2090
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.1
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
We object to paragraph 3.3.1. Whilst the Lincolnshire Structure plan 2006 is clearly a part of the extant development plan the professed intent of the Council to align the emerging Core strategy/LDF with RSS8 suggests that this should be the basis on which the level of residential development planned for in the Core Strategy should be derived. This in fact is what is then proposed in PO3b. Little purpose therefore seems to be served by the reference to the Structure Plan housing provision.

Officers' Response:
Comments noted. References to Structure Plan will be removed from para 3.3.1. See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies. See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26107
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2510
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.1
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Core Strategy should not be prepared in advance of the RSS being adopted.

Officers' Response:
RSS Proposed Modifications have been published. See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26106
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2530
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.1
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Core Strategy should not be prepared in advance of the RSS being adopted.

Officers' Response:
RSS Proposed Modifications have been published. See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2488

Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.1

Nature Of Response Observations

Con ID: 26560
Full Name: J & T Orrey
Organisation: C/o Brown & Co
Comment ID: 2456

Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.1

Nature Of Response Observations

Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, McCallion
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2472

Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.1

Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Core Strategy should not be prepared in advance of the RSS being adopted.

Officers' Response:
RSS Proposed Modifications have been published. See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Summary:
Core Strategy should not be prepared in advance of the RSS being adopted.

Officers' Response:
RSS Proposed Modifications have been published. See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Summary:
Core Strategy should not be prepared in advance of the RSS being adopted.

Officers' Response:
RSS Proposed Modifications have been published. See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26271
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
DLP Planning Ltd

Comment ID: 922

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.3.3

Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
Object. Things have moved on since Draft RSS published can now demonstrate an annual completion rate of 740 dwellings in South Kesteven would be more appropriate notwithstanding Grantham's designation as a 'New Growth Point'.

Officers' Response:

See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26475
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
Stamford Property
Company

Comment ID: 2091

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.3.3

Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
We also object to paragraph 3.3.3. The Council has acknowledged in its own responses to the Submission Draft of RSS8 that circumstances have changed since RSS8 was drafted in particular the publication of 2003 trend based population projections. We have made representations to RSS8 addressing this particular issue and demonstrating that an annual completion rate of 740 dwellings in South Kesteven would be appropriate notwithstanding Grantham's designation as a 'New Growth Point'.

Officers' Response:

See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2515
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.3
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Growth point partnership states it is necessary for SKDC to deliver increased levels of sustainable growth over the next decade .

Officers' Response:

Agree. Include suggested words in text.

Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer
Planning & Conservatism Lincolnshire County Council
Comment ID: 1865
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.3
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Concerns about the accuracy of para. 3.3.3.
(2nd sentence) * New Growth Point status is provisional (as stated in the next sentence) * It could be taken to imply that the Regional Plan has allocated 20% more housing to Grantham: in fact it is this Core Strategy that sets the level of provision on a basis which we feel misinterprets the 20%. * New Growth Points are not just to meet local needs. It is suggested that if this sentence is deleted the remaining text on New Growth Points then reads correctly.

Officers' Response:
Agree. Delete in order to address local needs. See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26100
Full Name: Mr N Gough
Organisation: Bigwood Associates
Comment ID: 1742
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.4
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Separate identification of specific regional growth allocation for New Growth Point required.

Officers' Response:
Agree. Grantham will be given specific housing requirement which reflects its Growth Point status.

Con ID: 26475
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
Stamford Property
Company

Comment ID: 2092

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.3.5

Nature Of Response Object

Con ID: 26271
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
DLP Planning Ltd

Comment ID: 923

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.3.5

Nature Of Response Object

Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning
Associate Bidwells

Comment ID: 1018

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.3.5

Nature Of Response Object

Summary:

Object to the way the residual requirement is calculated.

Officers' Response:

Calculation is outlined in the Five Year Land Supply background paper. Further clarification included in submission plan.

Summary:

Object to the way the residual requirement is calculated

Officers' Response:

Calculation is outlined in the Five Year Land Supply background paper. Further clarification included in submission plan.

Summary:

Unrealistic to assume that all consented sites will deliver dwellings particularly in relation to new shorter consent periods. Also the 1800 urban capacity sites figure must be revised as it is now out of date. Should be tested under the new Housing Land Availability Assessments (PPS3). This process is should be completed before the submission version Core Strategy.

Officers' Response:

A SHLAA is currently being undertaken and will provide background evidence for the Housing figures. It will be completed before submission to Secretary of State. Agree to remove UCS figures from calculation. Housing Requirement calculation will be presented in a different format which clearly demonstrates requirement with and without commitments.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2491
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.5
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Support this view about Stamford.

Officers' Response:
Noted

Con ID: 26107
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2516
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.5
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
We support the view that the option includes too higher requirement for Stamford.

Officers' Response:
noted.

Con ID: 26106
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2533
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.5
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Support the view that the option includes too higher requirement for Stamford.

Officers' Response:
Comments noted.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely

Organisation:

Comment ID: 2518

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.3.5

Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

The figure does not allow for additional 20% for Grantham Growth. Is no guarantee that the Urban Capacity sites will all be delivered.

Officers' Response:

Will ensure consistency of figures. Agree UCS sites should not be included. It should be noted that the figures included in the submission draft will be up-to-date. See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26303

Full Name: Mr Ian Lings

Organisation: Principal Policy Officer
Planning & Conservati
on Lincolnshire
County Council

Comment ID: 1867

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.3.5

Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

Regarding the supply figures in para 3.3.5 the Dec. 2005 Urban Capacity Study figure submitted in tables for the Regional EiP is 1440 which is based on the 1800 total assuming 80% deliverability. On the other hand the Regional EiP supply figures include a windfall allowance of 1020 (51 p.a 2006-2026). This key part of the evidence base needs to be consistent between the LDF and the Regional Plan.

Officers' Response:

Agree. Will ensure consistency of figures. It should be noted that the figures included in the submission draft will be up-to-date.

Con ID: 26300
Full Name: Messrs E A Sheardown
Organisation: Sheardown & Co.
Ltd

Comment ID: 2555

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.3.5

Nature Of Response Support

Summary:

Some sites identified in the Urban Capacity Study will not be delivered within the Plan period; how the overall numbers are arrived at needs to be flexible to ensure delivery of the housing target up to 2026. The Council's Annual Monitoring Report will prove essential in achieving this.

Officers' Response:

Comments noted. The Council will regularly monitor development rates across the district. The monitoring results will be published each December through the AMR which contains housing trajectories to ensure a five and ten year housing land supply is available. UCS sites will not be included in residual calculation for distribution.

Con ID: 26475
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
Stamford Property
Company
Comment ID: 2093
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.6
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
We object to paragraph 3.3.6 in the light of the above critique of the housing land position the prospect of a greenfield urban extension at Stamford albeit on a smaller scale than at Grantham should be explicitly acknowledged.

Officers' Response:
The Council has no proposed Urban Extension for Stamford. Specific development sites will be considered in the Site Allocations DPD. In the context of Grantham the Urban Extensions are strategic allocations essential to the delivery of the Growth Point initiative and therefore essential to the spatial strategy.

Con ID: 26271
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
DLP Planning Ltd
Comment ID: 924
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.6
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
the possibility of a greenfield urban extension in Stamford should be explicitly acknowledged.

Officers' Response:
The Council has no specific proposal for an Urban Extension for Stamford. Specific development sites will be considered in the Site Allocations DPD. In the context of Grantham the Urban Extensions are strategic allocations essential to the delivery of the Growth Point initiative and therefore essential to the spatial strategy.

Con ID: 26469
Full Name: Ms Alison Christie
Organisation: Strategic Partnership Officer Lincolnshire County Council

Comment ID: 2022

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.3.6

Nature Of Response Observations

Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells

Comment ID: 1019

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.3.7

Nature Of Response Object

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2493
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.7

Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

It needs to be made clear that Grantham already has significant traffic congestion problems in the peak and that simply locating development in areas where there is existing services and facilities is insufficient. Walking cycling and passenger transport will need to be significantly improved to be an attractive and reliable alternative to the private car.

Officers' Response:

Agree consideration of wider transport issues is essential to the effective planning of the growth agenda in Grantham and should be a key element of the masterplanning of development sites. A travel impact assessment will be required for all large development proposals.

Summary:

The Core Strategy will need to be amended taking into consideration the outcome of a Housing Land Availability Assessment and then the Site Allocations DPD will need to identify specific sites to comply with the PPS3 requirements.

Officers' Response:

Comment noted a SHLAA is currently being undertaken. This will feed into the Site Allocations DPD.

Summary:

As indicated before this is inappropriate and will not satisfy government requirements to accommodate growth for the RSS and growth point status of Grantham.

Officers' Response:

See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26560
Full Name: J & T Orrey
Organisation: C/o Brown & Co
Comment ID: 2461
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.7

Nature Of Response Observations

Con ID: 26475
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
Stamford Property
Company
Comment ID: 2094
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.8
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
As indicated before this is inappropriate and will not satisfy government requirements to accommodate growth for the RSS and growth point status of Grantham.

Officers' Response:
See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Summary:
We object to paragraph 3.3.8. the implicit assertion that it is more sustainable to develop brownfield sites in preference to greenfield sites does not bear scrutiny. There is a failure to appreciate the realities of the housing market in terms of supply and demand. A supply of housing to meet needs will inevitably be constrained if such restrictions are imposed e.g. the often unique costs associated with remediation of brown field sites may well hamper the ability to provide much needed affordable housing. The submission draft must acknowledge that greenfield site release alongside the development of brownfield sites will prove necessary to maximise the widest supply of house type and tenure as well as optimum delivery rates.

Officers' Response:
The preference for development on urban brownfield land before greenfield land does not in fact preclude development on greenfield land if no suitable brownfield land is available.

Con ID: 26271
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
DLP Planning Ltd

Comment ID: 925
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.8
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
The implicit assertion that it is more sustainable to develop brownfield sites in preference to greenfield sites does not bear scrutiny.

Officers' Response:
Policy will be updated in accordance with PPS3.

Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, McCallion
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2473
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
It may be appropriate to mention that developments may be in locations that will be serviced by new as well as existing services and facilities.

Officers' Response:
Agree include reference in text.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2489
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
It may be appropriate to mention that developments may be in locations that will be serviced by new as well as existing services and facilities. An integrated development plan for the larger schemes will be appropriate.

Officers' Response:
Agree make reference within this paragraph.

Con ID: 26106
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2531
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
It may be appropriate to mention that developments may be in locations that will be serviced by new as well as existing services and facilities. An integrated development plan for the larger schemes will be appropriate.

Officers' Response:
Agree make such reference in text.

Con ID: 26278
Full Name: Mr David Balfe
Organisation: Managing Director T Balfe Construction Ltd
Comment ID: 994
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Suggest site to rear of 45 51 and 53 Barrowby Road Grantham for allocation.

Officers' Response:
Requests for sites to be considered for inclusion in the Site Specific Allocations DPD will be taken at a later date.

Con ID: 26560
Full Name: J & T Orrey
Organisation: C/o Brown & Co
Comment ID: 2457
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
It may be appropriate to mention that developments may be in locations that will be serviced by new as well as existing services and facilities. An integrated development plan for the larger schemes will be appropriate.

Officers' Response:
Agree. Make reference within this paragraph.

Con ID: 26107
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2513
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
It may be appropriate to mention that developments may be in locations that will be serviced by new as well as existing services and facilities. An integrated development plan for the larger schemes will be appropriate.

Officers' Response:
Agree make reference within this paragraph.

Con ID: 26101
Full Name: Mr J Parmiter
Organisation:
Comment ID: 986
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.9
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
The over-reliance on Grantham is not sound the strategy should support development at Stamford as well.

Officers' Response:
Locating the majority of development in Grantham does not preclude locating some development elsewhere including Stamford. See Cabinet report for revised breakdown of Housing Requirement from RSS.

Con ID: 26106
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2532
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.11
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Alternative options PO3a - are premature and inappropriate as based on expected RSS allocation which have yet to be confirmed and may yet be increased. Option PO3b is in line with expectations but the total number and split cannot be finalised. Welcome a fair proportion of housing in the LSC and larger villages such as Billingborough.

Officers' Response:
The timetable for the Core Strategy is being amended to allow time to consider the panel report and consultation into changes arising. Final RSS is not however expected until September 2008 and it is considered unfeasible to postpone the production of the Submission version of the Core Strategy until this time. Option PO3b is also the Council's preferred option however the figures for the settlements may need to be reconsidered in light of possible RSS changes.

Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, McCallion
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2474
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.11
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Alternative options for PO3a PO3b PO3c PO3d and PO3e are premature and inappropriate at this stage. They are based on expected RSS allocations which have yet to be confirmed.

Officers' Response:
See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2490
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.11
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
All PO3 options are premature and inappropriate as based upon RSS allocations which have yet to be confirmed.

Officers' Response:
See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26101
Full Name: Mr J Parmiter
Organisation:
Comment ID: 988
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.12
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
To direct a disproportionate amount of growth to Grantham may harm the roles of the other main towns especially Stamford.

Officers' Response:
Grantham will be allocated a higher amount of growth to reflect its sub-regional and New Growth Point status. There is no intention to develop Grantham at the expense of development in Stamford.

Con ID: 26160
Full Name: Cecil
Organisation: c/o Strutt and Parker
Comment ID: 1943
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.13
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
The second sentence is inaccurate. There is land on the western side of Stamford which does not suffer from boundary or road constraints and is able to absorb large residential development.

Officers' Response:
Comment noted. Specific housing sites will be considered as part of the Site Allocation DPD. Revised housing requirements (as set out in Cabinet report) will allow scope for some development in Stamford.

Con ID: 26095
Full Name: Barbara Robinson
Organisation: Clerk to the Parish Council Fulbeck Parish Council
Comment ID: 2302
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.14
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Justification for the Council's preferred option paragraph 3.3.14 says that if growth is not allowed in Local Service Centre villages they will cease to be viable. This must be true of other villages equally or even more so.

Officers' Response:
Comments noted. However Council must also consider the sustainability of smaller settlements.

Con ID: 26276
Full Name: Mr Clive Henderson
Organisation: Chairman Long Bennington Parish Council
Comment ID: 962
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.16
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Percentage breakdown needed on exact numbers for LSCs. Also need a date from when the figures are applicable.

Officers' Response:
Background paper containing the data is available on the SKDC website. Figures are from 2001 until 2026 (in accordance with the RSS). Detailed breakdowns for each LSC will follow as part of the site selection process in the Site Allocations DPD.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2546
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.34

Nature Of Response Observations

Con ID: 26560
Full Name: J & T Orrey
Organisation: C/o Brown & Co
Comment ID: 2459
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.35

Nature Of Response Support

Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, McCallion
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2492
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.35

Nature Of Response Support

Summary:
OptionPO4 should state that it does require the allocation for Greenfield extensions rather than one Greenfield extension. As more than one site may be necessary.

Officers' Response:
Agree.

Summary:
We support the view that the option includes too higher requirement for Stamford.

Officers' Response:
Comments noted.

Summary:
Agree that this option is too high for Stamford.

Officers' Response:
Comments noted.

Con ID: 26560
Full Name: J & T Orrey
Organisation: C/o Brown & Co
Comment ID: 2460
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.36
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
There are areas within the Deepings that are not within the flood plain and our site is one of these. There are areas which are outside of the potential flood risk area. A refinement of this option to provide for additional growth in the Deepings would be possible if the requirement for Stamford is reduced.

Officers' Response:
See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26107
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2517
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.36
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
There are areas within the Deepings that are not within the flood plain and our site is one of these. There are areas which are outside of the potential flood risk area. A refinement of this option to provide for additional growth in the Deepings would be possible if the requirement for Stamford is reduced.

Officers' Response:
See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, McCallion
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2495
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.36
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Not all parts of the Deepings are within the area of potential flood risk. Option 3d should be refined to allow for additional growth in Deepings.

Officers' Response:
See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26160
Full Name: Cecil
Organisation: c/o Strutt and Parker
Comment ID: 1946
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.36
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Disagree with bullet points for Option 3b: 2 4 and 5 in paragraph 3.3.36.

Officers' Response:
Comments noted. Consideration of specific sites for development will be made as part of the Site Allocation DPD. Point 5 the final sentence highlights the concerns in relation to objective 1: 'although this may have a detrimental impact upon urban regeneration in Peterborough.' Agree that bullet point 4 needs clarifying it relates to the 'other rural villages.'

Con ID: 26107
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2519
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.37
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
As indicated before this is inappropriate and will not satisfy government requirements to accommodate growth for the RSS and growth point status of Grantham.

Officers' Response:
See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer Planning & Conservation Lincolnshire County Council
Comment ID: 1866
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.37
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Although the Structure Plan will be superseded by Regional Plan in terms of total provision it is still the Adopted strategic framework the principles of which still carry considerable weight in terms of spatial strategy and other general policy aims. We would therefore query 3.3.37 (bullet point 2) which states that a Structure Plan option does not reflect the spatial strategy. It is the spatial strategy of this LDF that needs to reflect the Adopted Structure Plan and Policy 6 of the Draft Regional Plan.

Officers' Response:
The Core Strategy is not expected to be adopted until after the RSS has been adopted. References to Structure Plan will not be included in final Core Strategy as it will not be relevant at that stage.

Con ID: 26102
Full Name: Mr P R Tame
Organisation: National Farmers Union
Comment ID: 2120
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.38
Nature Of Response Support with conditions

Summary:
The Council's preference for option 3b is understood; but before development is commenced all of the infrastructure required by new housing should be put in place.

Officers' Response:
Comment noted. The submitted planning application should justify how the site is to be accessed and serviced and indicate the likely impact of the development on the local transport infrastructure. These impacts will be assessed as part of the planning application consultation process through statutory consultees. If permission is granted specific conditions can be imposed as part of the permission.

Con ID: 26160
Full Name: Cecil
Organisation: c/o Strutt and Parker
Comment ID: 1947
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.3.41
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
The first sentence contradicts the results of previous consultations as stated in paragraph 3.3.11.

Officers' Response:
Disagree. The SA evidences the reasons why Option 3d does not reflect current local circumstances and needs.

Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells
Comment ID: 1022
Title: Urban Extensions
Number: 3.4
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
It is entirely inappropriate to identify specific sites for development within a Core Strategy. Therefore the Urban Extensions part of the Core Strategy does not comply with PPS12 and it is unsound to the point of requiring withdrawal of the document. To address this problem the Council must withdraw the identification of the specific sites and instead identify broad locations. As such the land to the west of Grantham to the west side of the A1 should be considered as a broad location for strategic development which can deliver one of the strategic urban extensions to Grantham required to meet housing, employment and other provision. Such work is also dependant upon the outcomes of a Housing Land Availability Assessment.

Officers' Response:
The possible urban extension sites should remain in the Core Strategy to denote areas of significant change in line with PPS12 appendix A. The A1 acts as a boundary to the expansion of Grantham. Land to the west of the A1 should therefore not be included. A SHLAA is currently being undertaken.

Con ID: 26475
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner Stamford Property Company
Comment ID: 2096
Title: Urban Extensions
Number: 3.4
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
We object to Section 3.4 of the POCS. In the light of our representations above we consider that the submission draft of the CS must address the potential for a small scale urban extension at Stamford to the east of the town.

Officers' Response:
Urban Extensions for Grantham are included within Core Strategy as these are key issues to the delivery of the Council's objectives. Development within Stamford will be considered as part of the Site Allocations DPD.

Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer
Planning & Conservation
Lincolnshire County Council

Comment ID: 1869
Title: Urban Extensions
Number: 3.4
Nature Of Response Observations

Con ID: 26293
Full Name: Mrs M. A. S. Bates
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Comment ID: 1708
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.1
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
We have no comments on the description or choice of sites but note that text elsewhere refers to at least one urban extension. Two are identified but possibly only one may be needed if the Preferred Option additional 20% discussed above is not applied. This could be important in view of the potential constraints identified.

Officers' Response:
See Cabinet report for details of RSS changes and their implications for Core Strategy policies.

Summary:
Very strongly support the submission from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust - especially referring to risk of flooding and presence of SNCI & archaeological remains.

Officers' Response:
Environment issues will be considered before site allocation. Issues relating to flood risk and natural and archaeological features will be incorporated into detailed design requirements for each growth site.

Con ID: 26295
Full Name: Mr D J Holmes
Organisation: Chairman Old Somerby Parish Council
Comment ID: 1757
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.1
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Information is too vague: cannot make a proper assessment without knowing the extent boundaries of access to the areas under consideration (and other associated information). Notwithstanding suggestions below accordingly reserve right to make alternative proposals when such boundary access information is put forward; areas seem to be exaggerated (catering for 50% more than the residual allocation (5347)); Omit land between Spitalgate Level and Somerby Hill: this seems to rely on extent on alignment of southern by-pass road feasibility and route of which are yet to be met. Re-include Belton Lane + Manthorpe Estate option. Additionally consider Wyville Road area.

Officers' Response:
Comments noted. Land between Spitalgate Level and Somerby Hill is considered a more appropriate location for Grantham as it can deliver wider benefits to Grantham and its surrounding communities.

Con ID: 26230
Full Name: Alison and Stamford H
Organisation: Director Smith
Stuart Reynolds
Comment ID: 1984
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.3
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
self-containment is not something new development should aspire to and in any event this statement conflicts with the 3rd and 6th bullets about integration. "Selfsufficiency" would be a better word.

Officers' Response:
comments noted.

Con ID: 26277
Full Name: Jenny Young
Organisation: Planning
Archaeologist
Heritage Trust for
Lincolnshire

Comment ID: 965

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.4.3

Nature Of Response Observations

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2547
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.3

Nature Of Response Support with
conditions

Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, McCallion
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2499
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.3

Nature Of Response Support with
conditions

Summary:

Urban Extension sites may yield archeological remains. In such cases the opportunities to use these for education and tourism should be recognised.

Officers' Response:

noted.

Summary:

Emphasis of para 3.4.3 should be changed and the penultimate bullet point changed to read; Ensure that development secures good quality public transport links improving the quality and frequency of public transport links where possible.

Officers' Response:

Disagree the current wording specifically requires an urban extension to utilise and improve existing public transport networks rather than allow development in a location which would require a whole new network.

Summary:

Generally support the objectives for urban extension to Grantham. Penultimate bullet point should be changed to read Ensure that development secures good quality transport links improving the quality and frequency of public transport links where possible .

Officers' Response:

Disagree the current wording specifically requires an urban extension to utilise and improve existing public transport networks rather than allow development in a location which would require a whole new network.

Con ID: 26149
Full Name: Miss E C Biott
Organisation: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Comment ID: 2289
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.3
Nature Of Response Support with conditions

Summary:
Could not support implication of second bullet point: that loss of important land/features could be permissible if mitigation strategies can not be successfully implemented. In the case of some legally protected species development is not permissible unless it can be proven to be in the national interest and there is no alternative option. Recommend specific reference to development of Green Infrastructure as part of the design process. Supports the inclusion of an objective to 'enhance the local environment through the creation of wildlife corridors and refuges and through careful consideration of the landscape'.

Officers' Response:
Comments noted. Environment issues will be considered before site allocation. Issues relating to flood risk and natural and archaeological features will be incorporated into detailed design requirements for each growth site. Agree to include reference to green infrastructure as part of the design process.

Con ID: 26268
Full Name: Mr Stephen Bickford-S
Organisation: c/o JB Planning Associates
Comment ID: 940
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.4
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
PPG3 has been superseded by PPS3 whilst this continues to give priority to urban brownfield sites over urban extensions it no longer includes the search sequence of the old PPG. Suggest paragraph is amended.

Officers' Response:
Suggest reword 3.4.4. to read: 'Government policy states that future housing needs should be met in the most sustainable way possible.' Delete 2nd sentence. 3.4.5. to be amended in light of RSS panel report which recommends deletion of Policy 2.

Con ID: 26125
Full Name: Mr Graham Foster
Organisation: Senior Planning Officer - Lincolnshire and Rutland Area Team Government Office For The East Midlands

Comment ID: 2014

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.4.4

Nature Of Response Observations

Con ID: 26230
Full Name: Alison and Stamford H
Organisation: Director Smith
Stuart Reynolds

Comment ID: 1986

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.4.4

Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

2nd sentence: the sequential approach to locating housing development was omitted from PPS 3. PPS 3 at paragraph 36 refers to creating mixed and sustainable communities by developing housing in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities and good access to jobs and to create mixed use developments etc.

Officers' Response:

Comments noted. PPS3 retains focus on brownfield development: paras 40-44 includes national target of 60% LPAs to prioritise brownfield land etc. However policies and text will be amended to accord with PPS3.

Summary:

The search sequence appears to have been taken from PPG3 which has now been replaced by PPS3 which adopts a rather different approach to site selection as set out in paragraph 38. It is considered that Site PO4a complies with these criteria and in particular would facilitate the creation of a community of sufficient size and mix to justify the development of and sustain community facilities infrastructure and services.

Officers' Response:

Suggest reword 3.4.4. to read: Government policy states that future housing needs should be met in the most sustainable way possible. Delete 2nd sentence. 3.4.5. to be amended in light of RSS panel report which recommends deletion of Policy 2.

Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, McCallion
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2500
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.7
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Figure of 1080 in this paragraph should be 1800 as indicated in paragraph 3.3.5.

Officers' Response:
Agree correct as necessary.

Con ID: 26106
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2534
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.7
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
The figure of 1 080 not be 1 800 as indicated in 3.3.5. Also concerned that not all these sites will be delivered.

Officers' Response:
Agree. Correct as necessary.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2548
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.7
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Figure should be 1800 not 1080 as in 3.3.5.

Officers' Response:
Agree. Correct as necessary.

Con ID: 26560
Full Name: J & T Orrey
Organisation: C/o Brown & Co
Comment ID: 2462
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

This section should be removed as it relates to site specific issues which should not be in the Core Strategy. Consultation on these issues should be in the DPD where alternatives can be invited before a preferred approach evolved.

Officers' Response:

Emerging national advice and Good Practice suggests that proposals for major change should be included within the Core Strategy. This includes Urban Extensions. Alternative options were identified in both the Issues and Options Paper and the first Preferred Options stages of the Core Strategy and Housing and Economic DPD. Full consideration was given to the alternatives prior to the selection of the Council's preferred options as published in May. This consideration included the SEA/SA of alternatives.

Con ID: 26106
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2535
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

This section should be removed as it relates to site specific issues which should not be in the Core Strategy. Consultation on these issues should be in the DPD where alternatives can be invited before a preferred approach evolved.

Officers' Response:

Emerging national advice and Good Practice suggests that proposals for major change should be included within the Core Strategy. This includes Urban Extensions. Alternative options were identified in both the Issues and Options Paper and the first Preferred Options stages of the Core Strategy and Housing and Economics DPD. Full consideration was given to the alternatives prior to the selection of the Council's preferred options as published in May. This consideration included the SEA/SA of alternatives.

Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, McCallion
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2475
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.4.8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

This and the sections which follow through including the preferred and alternative options PO4a PO4b and PO4c should be removed. They are site-specific issues that should not be provided for as part of a Core strategy document. the Core Strategy document should be looking to identify is the factors which will be taken into consideration the core issues and how this interrelates with existing facilities proposed infrastructure and generally need.

Officers' Response:

Emerging national advice and Good Practice suggests that proposals for major change should be included within the Core Strategy. This includes Urban Extensions. Alternative options were identified in both the Issues and Options Paper and the first Preferred Options stages of the Core Strategy and Housing and Economics DPD. Full consideration was given to the alternatives prior to the selection of the Council's preferred options as published in May. This consideration included the SEA/SA of alternatives

Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, McCallion
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2501
Title: Affordable Housing
Number: 3.5
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:

Rate for affordable housing in the district should be no higher than that in the emerging Regional plan.

Officers' Response:

Since the Core Strategy was published a new study (the Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA) has been published. This recommends 50% affordable need within SKDC. The RSS however requires a minimum of 35%. It is therefore suggested that a revised policy is included within the Core Strategy seeking a minimum 40% affordable housing on qualifying sites. With a more specific requirement being applied to SUEs in Grantham on a site by site basis.

Con ID: 26062
Full Name: Miss H Mawson
Organisation: The Home Builders Federation
Comment ID: 2581
Title: Affordable Housing
Number: 3.5
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:
The requirement must be related directly to local need and not to an arbitrary aspiration applied to the whole of the District. The high percentage requirement for affordable housing is unachievable. This unrealistic requirement may constrain the delivery of housing further and therefore exacerbate issues of affordability. Need to increase market housing price to cover affordable housing provision costs will widen affordability gap. Tenures should be determined on a site-by-site basis. The Core Strategy bears little reference to viability which is a prime concern when undertaking a development.

Officers' Response:
Since the Core Strategy was published a new study (the Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA) has been published. This recommends 50% affordable need within SKDC. The RSS however requires a minimum of 35%. It is therefore suggested that a revised policy is included within the Core Strategy seeking a minimum 40% affordable housing on qualifying sites. With a more specific requirement being applied to SUEs in Grantham on a site by site basis.

Con ID: 26332
Full Name: Mr John Shead
Organisation: Clerk Hough on the Hill Parish Council
Comment ID: 2187
Title: Affordable Housing
Number: 3.5
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Suggest remove affordable house requirement from non-sustainable hamlets and villages and also discourage any further house building in those areas. The shortfall should be met by concentrating new builds in a few suitable Larger Villages where moderate increases in population would encourage and warrant improvements to infrastructure and amenities with the view to bringing them up to Local Service Centre status. Need for affordable housing for the farming community could be satisfied by a more relaxed approach to planning consents on farming estates.

Officers' Response:
Disagree. Affordable Housing provision in rural villages/hamlets is intended to satisfy a proven local need. In these locations market housing is unlikely to be supported; therefore affordable housing as an exception or on a specifically allocated sites will be the only way new housing will be delivered within the smaller villages.

Con ID: 26160
Full Name: Cecil
Organisation: c/o Strutt and Parker
Comment ID: 1948
Title: Affordable Housing
Number: 3.5

Nature Of Response Observations

Con ID: 26231
Full Name: Mr D Bainbridge
Organisation: Senior Planning Associate Bidwells
Comment ID: 1026
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.3
Nature Of Response Object

Con ID: 26107
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2520
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.3
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

The definition of Affordable Housing as stated within the document is not supported; the definition differs significantly from PPS3. Details of the Council's Housing Partnership Agreement are not provided or mentioned in the Background evidence.

Officers' Response:

Comments noted. It is considered that the main emphasis of the PPS3 definition is contained within the Core Strategy definition tailored to South Kesteven's local needs. Details of the CHPA need to be mentioned. Include signposting to the relevant documents as background evidence.

Summary:

The Housing Market Assessment has not been fully tested and therefore the tenure split for affordable housing should take into consideration local needs and circumstances.

Officers' Response:

Comments noted. Tenure split was derived from the latest Housing Needs Survey (2006). However this has been updated with the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which recommends a 65%/35% split. This demonstrates a change within a relatively short timeframe. It is therefore recommended that specific tenure split is future proofed in the policy.

Summary:

We feel strongly that the rates to be set in SKDC over the plan period should be in line with the emerging regional plan and no higher.

Officers' Response:

Since the Core Strategy was published a new study (the Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA) has been published. This recommends 50% affordable need within SKDC. The RSS however requires a minimum of 35%. It is therefore suggested that a revised policy is included within the Core Strategy seeking a minimum 40% affordable housing on qualifying sites. With a more specific requirement being applied to SUEs in Grantham on a site by site basis.

Con ID: 26106
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2536
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.3
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
The rates to be set in SKDC for affordable housing over the plan period should be in line with the emerging regional plan and no higher.

Officers' Response:
Since the Core Strategy was published a new study (the Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA) has been published. This recommends 50% affordable need within SKDC. The RSS however requires a minimum of 35%. It is therefore suggested that a revised policy is included within the Core Strategy seeking a minimum 40% affordable housing on qualifying sites. With a more specific requirement being applied to SUEs in Grantham on a site by site basis.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2496
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.3
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
We feel strongly that the rates to be set in SKDC over the plan period should be in line with the emerging regional plan and no higher

Officers' Response:
Since the Core Strategy was published a new study (the Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA) has been published. This recommends 50% affordable need within SKDC. The RSS however requires a minimum of 35%. It is therefore suggested that a revised policy is included within the Core Strategy seeking a minimum 40% affordable housing on qualifying sites. With a more specific requirement being applied to SUEs in Grantham on a site by site basis.

Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy Officer
Planning & Conservatism Lincolnshire County Council

Comment ID: 1870

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.5.4

Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

The Housing Needs Survey is being fed into the wider Housing Market Assessment for the Peterborough HMA also being conducted by Fordhams. Although the different timescales are recognised the results of this should not be pre-judged.

Officers' Response:

The Core Strategy policies should be amended and updated to reflect the SHMA which was published early in 2008.

Con ID: 26271
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
DLP Planning Ltd

Comment ID: 928

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.5.6

Nature Of Response Object

Summary:

Object Any deviation from the definition of affordable housing in Annex B of PPS3 must be appropriately justified by the Council.

Officers' Response:

The definition is justified as a 'local' definition which incorporates the principles of the PPS3 definition but provides a locally distinct and more detailed definition which also reflects the Council's Housing Strategy.

Con ID: 26475
Full Name: Miss Ellie Smith
Organisation: Assistant Planner
Stamford Property
Company

Comment ID: 2097

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.5.6

Nature Of Response Object

Con ID: 26303
Full Name: Mr Ian Lings
Organisation: Principal Policy
Officer
Planning&Conservati
on Lincolnshire
County Council

Comment ID: 1872

Title: paragraph

Number: 3.5.6

Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

We object to paragraph 3.5.6 and the definition of affordable housing that has been provided. Any deviation from the definition of affordable housing in Annex B of PPS3 must be appropriately justified by the Council.

Officers' Response:

The definition is justified as a 'local' definition which incorporates the principles of the PPS3 definition but provides a locally distinct and more detailed definition which also reflects the Council's Housing Strategy.

Summary:

Definition of Affordable Housing needs to be checked for consistency with PPS3. Low cost market housing is now excluded from the PS3 definition under which intermediate housing includes housing sold below market prices. Also in Objective 7 what is local-need housing ? This does not fit with either the definition in para. 3.5.6 the PPS3 definition or the Council's powers

Officers' Response:

Annex B of PPS3 defines what can and cannot be considered as Affordable Housing for planning purposes. It does indeed specifically exclude low cost market housing . However the definition at para 3.5.6 of the Preferred Options document does not mention low cost market housing . It refers to low cost home ownership . Annex B of PPS3 states that Intermediate affordable housing includes ... low cost homes for sale ... Therefore the definition is correct. Local-need housing relates to those sites referred to as exception sites in small rural villages where there is an identified proven need for local families to be housed. The sites will always be small possibly as few as one dwelling and will only be for families with a local connection to the village. These sites are always 100% affordable housing.

Con ID: 26106
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2537
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.8
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:

The percentage of affordable should be reduced substantially. Other ways should be investigate to meet the shortfall. Fordhams paper is questionable. Everybody will say that there needs to be more affordable houses and the quality of this data is questionable. A better balance of supply will lower land costs making housing more affordable. Policy should also cater for Rural Exceptions sites.

Officers' Response:

Since the Core Strategy was published a new study (the Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA) has been published. This recommends 50% affordable need within SKDC. The RSS however requires a minimum of 35%. It is therefore suggested that a revised policy is included within the Core Strategy seeking a minimum 40% affordable housing on qualifying sites. With a more specific requirement being applied to SUEs in Grantham on a site by site basis.

Con ID: 26560
Full Name: J & T Orrey
Organisation: C/o Brown & Co
Comment ID: 2463
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

The percentage of affordable should be reduced substantially. Other ways should be investigate to meet the shortfall. Fordhams paper is questionable. Everybody will say that there needs to be more affordable houses and the quality of this data is questionable. A better balance of supply will lower land costs making housing more affordable. Policy should also cater for Rural Exceptions sites

Officers' Response:

Since the Core Strategy was published a new study (the Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA) has been published. This recommends 50% affordable need within SKDC. The RSS however requires a minimum of 35%. It is therefore suggested that a revised policy is included within the Core Strategy seeking a minimum 40% affordable housing on qualifying sites. With a more specific requirement being applied to SUEs in Grantham on a site by site basis.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2494
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

The percentage of affordable should be reduced substantially. The data on which the Council's policies are formulated must be questioned. We feel the Fordham Research Paper 2006 is questionable. A better balance between supply and demand will inevitably result in lower land costs which will mean that all houses should in theory be more affordable.

Officers' Response:

Since the Core Strategy was published a new study (the Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA) has been published. This recommends 50% affordable need within SKDC. The RSS however requires a minimum of 35%. It is therefore suggested that a revised policy is included within the Core Strategy seeking a minimum 40% affordable housing on qualifying sites. With a more specific requirement being applied to SUEs in Grantham on a site by site basis.

Con ID: 26107
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2521
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

The percentage of affordable should be reduced substantially. Other ways should be investigate to meet the shortfall. Fordhams paper is questionable. Everybody will say that there needs to be more affordable houses and the quality of this data is questionable. A better balance of supply will lower land costs making housing more affordable. Policy should also cater for Rural Exceptions sites

Officers' Response:

Since the Core Strategy was published a new study (the Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA) has been published. This recommends 50% affordable need within SKDC. The RSS however requires a minimum of 35%. It is therefore suggested that a revised policy is included within the Core Strategy seeking a minimum 40% affordable housing on qualifying sites. With a more specific requirement being applied to SUEs in Grantham on a site by site basis.

Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, McCallion
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2476
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.8
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

The percentage of affordable should be reduced substantially. Other ways should be investigate to meet the shortfall. Fordhams paper is questionable. Everybody will say that there needs to be more affordable houses and the quality of this data is questionable. A better balance of supply will lower land costs making housing more affordable. Policy should also cater for Rural Exceptions sites

Officers' Response:

Since the Core Strategy was published a new study (the Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA) has been published. This recommends 50% affordable need within SKDC. The RSS however requires a minimum of 35%. It is therefore suggested that a revised policy is included within the Core Strategy seeking a minimum 40% affordable housing on qualifying sites. With a more specific requirement being applied to SUEs in Grantham on a site by site basis.

Con ID: 26108
Full Name: Messrs Brint, McCallion
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2502
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.23
Nature Of Response Object

Summary:

The Council's preferred option for affordable housing should be in line with the figure which is finally adopted as part of the RSS review and not one of the options PO5a to PO5g.

Officers' Response:

Since the Core Strategy was published a new study (the Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA) has been published. This recommends 50% affordable need within SKDC. The RSS however requires a minimum of 35%. It is therefore suggested that a revised policy is included within the Core Strategy seeking a minimum 40% affordable housing on qualifying sites. With a more specific requirement being applied to SUEs in Grantham on a site by site basis.

Con ID: 26218
Full Name: Mr P Lely
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2498
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.23
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Preferred Option should be in line with RSS review figures.

Officers' Response:
Since the Core Strategy was published a new study (the Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA) has been published. This recommends 50% affordable need within SKDC. The RSS however requires a minimum of 35%. It is therefore suggested that a revised policy is included within the Core Strategy seeking a minimum 40% affordable housing on qualifying sites. With a more specific requirement being applied to SUEs in Grantham on a site by site basis.

Con ID: 26106
Full Name: Mrs J Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2538
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.23
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:
Affordable housing figure should be in line with that which is finally adopted in the RSS.

Officers' Response:
Since the Core Strategy was published a new study (the Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA) has been published. This recommends 50% affordable need within SKDC. The RSS however requires a minimum of 35%. It is therefore suggested that a revised policy is included within the Core Strategy seeking a minimum 40% affordable housing on qualifying sites. With a more specific requirement being applied to SUEs in Grantham on a site by site basis.

Con ID: 26107
Full Name: Mr & Mrs T Shaw
Organisation:
Comment ID: 2522
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.23
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

We contend that the Council's preferred option should be in line with the figure which is finally adopted as part of the RSS review and not one of the options PO5a to PO5g

Officers' Response:

Since the Core Strategy was published a new study (the Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA) has been published. This recommends 50% affordable need within SKDC. The RSS however requires a minimum of 35%. It is therefore suggested that a revised policy is included within the Core Strategy seeking a minimum 40% affordable housing on qualifying sites. With a more specific requirement being applied to SUEs in Grantham on a site by site basis.

Con ID: 26560
Full Name: J & T Orrey
Organisation: C/o Brown & Co
Comment ID: 2464
Title: paragraph
Number: 3.5.23
Nature Of Response Observations

Summary:

We contend that the Council's preferred option should be in line with the figure which is finally adopted as part of the RSS review and not one of the options PO5a to PO5g

Officers' Response:

Since the Core Strategy was published a new study (the Peterborough Strategic Housing Market Assessment SHMA) has been published. This recommends 50% affordable need within SKDC. The RSS however requires a minimum of 35%. It is therefore suggested that a revised policy is included within the Core Strategy seeking a minimum 40% affordable housing on qualifying sites. With a more specific requirement being applied to SUEs in Grantham on a site by site basis.
