

# REPORT TO CABINET

**REPORT OF:** Economic Development Portfolio Holder

**REPORT NO:** PLA 899

**DATE:** 1<sup>st</sup> August 2011

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Site Allocation and Policies DPD: Site Assessment and Allocation</b>	
<b>KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:</b>	Key Decision	
<b>PORTFOLIO HOLDER: NAME AND DESIGNATION:</b>	Cllr Frances Cartwright Economic Development Portfolio Holder	
<b>CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	Rachel Armstrong, Senior Planning Policy Officer 01476 406469 <a href="mailto:r.armstrong@southkesteven.gov.uk">r.armstrong@southkesteven.gov.uk</a>	
<b>INITIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT:</b>	Carried out and Referred to in paragraph (7) below: n/a	Full impact assessment Required: No
<b>Equality and Diversity</b>		
<b>FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT:</b>	This report is publicly available via the Your Council and I Democracy link on the Council's website: <a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk">www.southkesteven.gov.uk</a>	
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS:</b>	PLA830 Adoption of Core Strategy PLA835 Site Allocations and Policies DPD: Additional Sites consultation PLA848 Site Allocation and Policies DPD: Proposed Consultation on Policies PLA867 Site Allocation and Policies DPD: Response to policies consultation PLA 891 Site Allocation and Policies DPD: Outstanding policy issues	

## 1. RECOMMENDATION

That Cabinet:

- a) notes the comments and issues raised by the representations made to the Site Consultation (October 2009) and Additional Site consultation (August 2010) , as set out in Appendix 1
- b) notes the site assessment summaries included at Appendix 2 which have led to recommendation c) below
- c) allocate those sites recommended throughout this report (and listed at Appendix 4) for housing, employment and mixed use development in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD

- d) **approves the proposed draft Policies, as set out in Appendix 5 to the report, for inclusion in the Submission version of the Site Allocation and Policies Development Plan Document.**

## **2. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 2.1 To enable the Cabinet to consider the issues and comments made about suggested development sites made during consultation, and to consider the conclusions and recommendation of the assessment process about which sites to allocate for housing, employment and mixed use development in the Submission, or final, version of the Plan. The Development Plan Document (DPD) covers all of South Kesteven except the town of Grantham which is covered by the Grantham Area Action Plan.
- 2.2 The preparation of the Site Allocation and Policies DPD supports the Good for Business Priority Theme.

## **3. DETAILS OF REPORT**

- 3.1 In addition to the detailed policies previously considered by Cabinet, the Site Allocation and Policies DPD will include allocated sites for development in Bourne, Stamford and the Deepings and in some of the 16 Local Service Centres. This development is required to meet the development needs of the district established by the Adopted Core Strategy.
- 3.2 Since 2004 when work began on the LDF land owners, developers and other groups and organisations have been suggesting sites for consideration for future development. In October 2009 the Council published for six weeks consultation the first Suggested Sites consultation document; this identified some 227 sites across the district (excluding Grantham) and sought peoples comments about them. As a result of this consultation a further 44 sites were suggested, and in August 2010 a further six week consultation period was undertaken about these additional sites.
- 3.3 Consultation was carried out with all those who had responded to earlier consultations on the Site Allocation and Policies DPD or who had asked to be kept informed about it, Parish and Town Councils and national, regional and local groups and organisations with a particular interest in the areas covered by the policies.
- 3.4 At the end of the consultation periods, a total of 2711 representations had been received from 567 organisations and individuals about the Suggested Site (October 2009) and a further 766 representations had been received from 315 organisations and individuals about the Additional sites. In total there were 344 expressions of support, 2317 objections and 817 observations. Appendix 1 attached to this report summarises all the representations received about the sites. These comments have been fed through the site assessment process and are included in summary form in the Site Assessment summaries at Appendix 2.

- 3.5 This report considers the responses to consultation on the sites that have been put forward as future development sites and considers the suitability and desirability of each of the sites for the use or development suggested.

#### **4. SITE ASSESSMENT PROCESS**

- 4.1 Each suggested site has been assessed using a standard set of criteria prescribed by the Core Strategy and the Sustainability Appraisal. The assessment also relies upon evidence contained within a number of Background Evidence reports and studies, and the responses of statutory consultees and service providers. All sites have also been visited by members of the Planning Policy team.

- 4.2 The Core Strategy includes, within both the Housing and the Economic Prosperity sections, a list of criteria to be used to assess the suitability of sites for allocation. This criterion has been subject to examination through the Core Strategy and is, therefore, considered to be the most appropriate criteria to consider the suggested sites. The Core Strategy lists the following criteria for housing allocations:

- Availability
- Relationship to the existing highway network, public transport, cycling and pedestrian network, or the ability to create opportunities to improve accessibility
- Access to and capacity of existing services and infrastructure
- Potential impact on wildlife, biodiversity, historic assets, archaeology
- Ability of existing built up area to absorb/accommodate development
- Visual impact on surrounding landscape
- Known constraints to development (eg flood risk)

The following criteria are also listed for employment allocations:

- Suitability of site for employment use
- Market attractiveness
- Relationship to the strategic highway network

- 4.3 The LDF Regulations require DPD's to be subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (SA/SEA) throughout its preparation. The SA forms part of the evidence base to support the DPD and will be examined by the Inspector at Examination. Failure to meet these SA requirements would render the plan "unsound", therefore the suggested sites have also been assessed against the 14 sustainability objectives set out in the SA.

- 4.4 A significant body of Background Evidence has been gathered to support the preparation of the LDF. Much of this was prepared for the Core Strategy; however some additional studies and reports or reviews of previous reports have been undertaken in the last two years to support the process of selecting sites for development. In particular the following studies have been prepared to help assess the suitability of sites for allocation:

- Employment Land and Capacity Study (March 2010)
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Level 2 (January 2010)
- Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity Report (January 2010)
- Water Cycle Study Scoping and Outline Report (January 2011)

- Detailed Water Cycle Study (Part 1- draft Jul 2011)
- Stamford Traffic Model – Traffic Forecasting Results Report (February 2009)

- 4.5 In addition to these studies officers have liaised closely with statutory service providers such as the Highways Agency; Lincolnshire County Council (as highway authority, education authority, providers of social services and archaeology and heritage management) GPs and medical centres; Anglian Water; Internal Drainage Boards; The Environment Agency; Natural England and English Heritage. The information, comments and support of these agencies is a fundamental part of the site selection process.
- 4.6 The results of the site assessment process have been summarised on a site by site basis. The summary for each site is included at Appendix 2 to this report. This summary includes a conclusion about the suitability (or not) of each suggested site for the development proposed. As a result, a number of sites are assessed as either not suitable for development or are not available or viable for development. These sites have therefore been rejected. The result is a shortlist of about 90 sites.
- 4.7 During the first two weeks of July members of the Planning Policy team have held meetings with the Town and Parish Councils about the assessment process and its conclusions. The “short list” of suitable sites have been discussed with the parish and town councils to try to gauge some local feedback about which of the short listed sites might be considered most acceptable by the local communities.
- 4.8 The outcome of these meetings is summarised where appropriate in this report. Whilst every effort has been made to take on board the comments, concerns and preferences of the Town and Parish council’s throughout the site assessment process, it must be recognised that it will not be possible in every case to satisfy their wishes. Difficult choices have to be made about allocating sites for development and in some cases the sites which are most suitable from the technical assessment process are not the most popular choices locally.

## **5. BOURNE**

- 5.1 The Core Strategy establishes that provision should be made for 2310 new homes and up to 50 ha of employment land in Bourne for the period 2006 – 2026. By 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011 850 homes had been built and a further 1496 had planning permission. The Core Strategy recognises that the housing requirements in Bourne will be met by existing planning permissions – including the houses remaining at Elsea Park. Thus the Core Strategy explicitly states that no additional housing land is required in the town, and therefore no sites will be allocated for housing in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD. 16 sites, primarily located on the western and northern edges of the town had been suggested for housing development. However these sites have not been assessed because there is no need to identify housing sites in this location.
- 5.2 The high level of employment land established by the Core Strategy forms part of a positive policy approach to try to increase local employment opportunities in line with the increase in population arising from the major housing

development at Elsea Park. The take up of employment allocations in the Local Plan was high, leaving very little suitable or available land for employment use in more recent years. Provision of a range of employment allocations in the DPD should help to create a better balance of jobs and homes and therefore reduce the need to commute out of the town for work. Traditionally the employment areas of the town lie on the eastern and southern side, and 16 new sites have been considered which largely follow this pattern.

- 5.3 Of the 16 sites suggested for employment use, 7 have been assessed as suitable and available for future employment development. **Four areas are recommended for allocation, two of which comprise groupings of the suitable sites. These are:**
- **Land to the north of Manning Road and west of Meadow Drove (sites BOUR23, 24, 25 and 26) which could provide up to 14 ha which would be suitable for the full range of B uses;**
  - **Land to the south of Tunnel Bank (BOUR12 and a small part of BOUR11) 21 ha for all B uses and other employment generating commercial uses;**
  - **Land South of Spalding Road at Bourne North Farm (BOUR20) 8ha land south of West Road , north of Elsea Park (7 ha) for a small business park with B1 office and commercial uses.**
  - **In addition it is considered appropriate to retain the existing local plan allocation north of Carr Dyke (adjacent to Bakavor foods) BOUR19 as an expansion site for Bakavor or any subsequent occupant (3 ha).**

These sites will provide a gross site area of about 53 ha of employment land. In addition to these allocations it is expected that some small scale employment development will be created as part of the Bourne Core Area, however this is most likely to be small scale office and services industry accommodation located at first floor level.

- 5.4 Together these sites will provide a wide range of employment sites which could suit the development needs of a range of different employment generating developments and opportunities. Bourne Town Council have indicated that they would generally support these recommendations; in particular they support no additional housing allocations and the principle of identifying a wide range of employment sites around the town.

## **6. STAMFORD**

- 6.1 The Core Strategy establishes a need to make provision for the development of 1140 new homes and 24 ha of additional employment land in Stamford in the period to 2026.
- 6.2 Since 2006 about 380 homes have been built and at 31st March 2011 170 had planning permission. Therefore additional land should be allocated for at least 580 new homes in the town.
- 6.3 22 sites were suggested for housing and employment development in Stamford. This includes some moderate sized infill or redevelopment sites within the town, small Greenfield sites within or on the edge of the town and three very large Greenfield urban extension sites on the northern, eastern and

western sides which have all been suggested for a mix of housing and employment uses together with some small scale local facilities appropriate to the scale of the site proposed.

- 6.4 The Town Council have made it clear that they do not wish to see the scale of development proposed in Stamford and particularly do not support the loss of Greenfield agricultural land to development. However, they also recognise that the town needs to develop in order to continue to prosper. The difficulty of deciding how to accommodate housing development in Stamford was reflected by the Town Council when it met Council officers in July. The Town Council considers that it would be more appropriate to provide the housing allocation in a single urban extension rather than allowing multiple sites to be added. Specifically they have raised concerns about a number of the smaller sites within the town which they consider are not suitable for housing development. They have, however, agreed with the assessment of the three large urban extension sites and reluctantly conclude that the site to the west of the town would be the better site to allocate, as long as it included major infrastructure and commercial employment land provision
- 6.5 Good quality, attractive and available employment land has been in short supply in Stamford for a number of years, despite Local Plan allocations which have remained undeveloped. The site assessment process has revealed few new suitable employment sites, and an assessment of the existing Local Plan allocations reveal that other than as part of the large Greenfield extension sites there is only one site suitable for allocation – STAM08 Off Barnack Road which could provide almost 8ha of land suitable for B2 and B8 uses. This leaves a shortfall of employment land of about 16ha.
- 6.6 The housing and employment land shortfalls in Stamford must be addressed. Failure to allocate sufficient land will result in sites being determined through the planning application and appeal process. Consideration must, therefore, be given to the merits of each of the three large Greenfield extension sites proposed.
- Land north of Great North Road, Rutland (RUT01). This site comprises 26 ha of agricultural and open land. The site is largely flat and lies behind the new housing development on the former Williamson Cliff brickworks. It is located wholly outside South Kesteven's administrative area in Rutland. It could provide up to 400 homes and about 10 ha employment land.
  - Land between Empingham Road and Tinwell Road (STAM01 & 02). This is a 29 ha site in agricultural use between the A1 and the housing on Lonsdale Road on the western edge of the town. The site could provide 400 homes and up to 15 ha employment land together with a small local centre.
  - Land at Newstead (STAM14-16) is the largest of the three areas comprising about 91 ha of agricultural and open grazing land, the River Gwash and small areas of woodland. The site has the potential to provide in the region of 1000-1500 new homes and employment land. It could also provide a new link road from Uffington Road to Ryhall Road. If developed in full it could provide a new local centre including the potential for a new primary school( if 1000 + homes are built)

6.7 Each site has been assessed against the criteria referred to in paragraph 4.2 above, however due to the scale of the sites additional consideration has been given to the following matters which are considered in detail in the background evidence reports: Landscape capacity and sensitivity; the impact of traffic on Stamford town centre (using the Stamford Traffic Model (Feb 2009)), the ability of water infrastructure to accommodate development in each location (Detailed Water Cycle Study).

Criteria	RUT01	STAM01/02	STAM 14 - 16
Availability			
Relationship to highways etc			
Capacity of infrastructure (S106 required)	Capacity of Stamford infrastructure to support development outside authority area		
Vulnerability to flooding	Risk of surface water flooding	Risk of surface water flooding	Areas of high risk from river and surface water flooding
Sewage network connection	Size and Location of site would require major improvements to network	Significant infrastructure improvements required	Significant infrastructure improvements required
Traffic model impact			
Wildlife / biodiversity			
Impact on existing built up area			
Visual impact in landscape			
Constraints	Access for Little Casterton Road severely restricted	Surface water flood risk Productive agricultural land	Fluvial and surface water flood risk; Access.; includes areas of productive agricultural land
Employment suitability			
Market attractiveness			Requires road link to make it attractive
Relationship to strategic highway			

- 6.8 The above table provides a simplified analysis of each of the three large sites against the assessment criteria. The site to the west of the town off Empingham Road scores the best of the three sites, with the site in Rutland closely following. Both sites perform well using the transport model as traffic is less likely to pass through the centre of the town. Both sites also perform best in the Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity study. The site to the west of the town performs better than the site in Rutland for employment development because of its proximity to the A1 and junctions off the A1 which make it an attractive location for business development. Land to the east of the town at Newstead performs poorly on a number of issues in particular its impact on traffic congestion within the town (using the traffic model) and its impact on the landscape and sensitivity to development and impact on wildlife and biodiversity. The site is much larger than the other two, and could provide in the region of 1500 homes and some employment land. To deliver this amount of development the site would need to provide a link road connecting Uffington Road with Ryhall Road. Without this link road access to the site would be severely limited thus reducing the overall capacity of the site. The whole site was considered by the Planning Inspector at the Core Strategy Public Examination last year. The Inspector concluded that the site should not be identified as a strategic location for development in the Core Strategy.
- 6.9 This Council is not able to allocate the site in Rutland as it lies outside of the authority's area. If this site were considered the best option for allocation the Council would have to work together with Rutland County Council to prepare a separate joint development plan. There is no provision within Rutland County Council's recently adopted Core Strategy to accommodate a large amount of housing or employment development on its boundary with Stamford. There is no apparent appetite from Rutland to consider major development in this location. It should also be noted that any financial benefits of development in this location in terms of council tax, New Homes Bonus, CIL or S106 would be collected by Rutland County Council, however, the new occupants of the site would inevitably use all the facilities and services of Stamford.
- 6.10 Public consultation and discussions with the Town Council reflect the fact that deciding which site to allocate is indeed a very difficult choice. Both the Newstead and the Empingham Road sites have been objected to by local residents and the Town Council, who are concerned about the impact development, in either location, would have upon the town and its setting.
- 6.11 Using the results of the technical assessment land to the west of the town between Empingham Road and Tinwell Road is considered the best site for allocation. However, despite the Town Council's conclusions that a single allocation would be most acceptable, it should be noted that the site at Empingham Road cannot accommodate the full housing and employment requirements of 600 houses and 16 ha of employment land, as well as the associated infrastructure, open space and local facilities necessary for a development of this scale. In addition, it is desirable to provide for some housing development on smaller sites within the town as this provides a choice for developers and home owners.

- 6.12 It is, therefore, recommended that the following smaller sites are allocated for housing and employment development in Stamford:**
- **STAM05 (Stamford AFC Kettering Road) – 50 houses provided that a suitable relocation facility for the football club is provided prior to development.**
  - **STAM09 and 10 (Land south of Uffington Road adjacent to Meadow View)– 50 houses, plus up to 2 ha employment land**
  - **ADD39 (Land rear of Belvoir Close) – 30 houses**
  - **ADD41 (Land off Priory Road)– 40 houses, subject to confirmation from English Heritage that site is not part of the setting of the scheduled monument (this will be updated verbally at the Cabinet Meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2011).**
  - **ADD42 (Land Adjacent to Kettering Road) – 30 houses**

**And that a single urban extension to the west of the town between Empingham Road and Tinwell Road be allocated for a mixed use development providing up to 400 homes (including about 140 affordable homes), a local centre to serve the local needs of the new and existing residential areas and up to 14 ha (gross) of employment land to accommodate a high quality business park and employment generating development. The development of this site would also be expected to provide appropriate open space and green infrastructure and to be of a design and quality appropriate to this gateway location.**

## **7. DEEPINGS**

- 7.1 The Core Strategy establishes a need to make provision for the development of 870 new homes and 23 ha of additional employment land in Market Deeping and Deeping St James in the period to 2026.
- 7.2 Since 2006 270 homes have been built and at 31st March 2011 195 had planning permission. Therefore additional land should be allocated for at least 400 new homes in the town.
- 7.3 29 sites were originally suggested for housing and employment development in the Deepings. A further five sites were consulted on as additional sites, although only one of these was a new site the other four were amalgamations of smaller sites into larger single proposals . The suggested sites are mostly Greenfield sites on the edges of the town with very few small infill / redevelopment sites within the built up area. Four large Greenfield areas of land were suggested (in smaller plots) to the west, north and east. Two of these were suggested for a mix of housing and employment development the other two were suggested for housing development only. One of the mixed use sites (Land west of Linchfield Road (DEEP01) has been withdrawn from consideration by the land owner.
- 7.4 The site assessment process concludes that a number of the suggested sites (located to the east of the town and in Frognall) are not suitable for housing because their location is not considered sustainable. This is because of the distance from Frognall to Market Deeping and its services and facilities including schools, shops, medical centre and employment areas. A lack of adequate footpaths and cycle ways from Frognall to Market Deeping

exacerbate this problem. In addition sites have been discounted because of issues relating to flood risk, impact on the open countryside and encroachment into the open countryside.

7.5 As a result there is not one single option which could meet the housing and employment needs of the town. Discussions with Market Deeping Town Council and Deeping St James Parish Council gave some clear indication of sites which the council's would not wish to be allocated for any development, they also agreed that the extension of the Northfields industrial estate was the sensible and logical choice for employment development. These conclusions have helped to determine the sites recommend for allocation below.

7.6 **It is, therefore, recommended that a package of the following sites be allocated in the Deepings:**

- **3 small and medium sized housing sites located in Deeping St James and Market Deeping are allocated (ADD38 land behind Tesco off Godseys Lane), DEEP02 (Land west of Linchfield Road and north of Cowslip Drive) and DEEP 07 (Land at Spalding Road/Broadgate) to provide about 200 homes (including up to 70 affordable units)**
- **a larger mixed use housing and employment site at land north of Towngate East (ADD44) to provide 200 homes (including up to 70 affordable units) and up to 6ha employment land (incorporating the Sptifire Way development) and**
- **an extension to the Northfields Industrial estate (MDEEP14) to provide 14 ha of land for employment and business uses.**

7.7 This will deliver about 400 homes and up to 20 ha of employment land

## **8. LOCAL SERVICE CENTRES**

8.1 The Core Strategy establishes a need to make provision for the development of 1000 new homes across the 16 Local Service Centres (LSCs) up to 2026. Since 2006, 633 homes have been built and at 31st March 2011, 262 had planning permission. Allowing for some flexibility for some of the committed sites to not come forward, additional land should be allocated for at least 150 new homes in these villages.

8.2 165 sites were suggested for housing development across the 16 LSCs. These are mostly Greenfield sites on the edges of the villages, in some cases the suggested sites comprised very large areas of land. In assessing the suitability of these sites consideration has also been given to the suitability of a smaller part or parts of sites.

8.3 The site assessment process concludes that a large number of the suggested sites were unsuitable for allocation for a number of reasons:

- too small for allocation (sites of less than 10 houses)
- highway objection or serious concern/prohibitive cost of improvement works
- high risk of flooding (both fluvial and surface water)
- impact on the landscape and/or existing built up area
- encroachment into the open countryside.

- Within Anglian Water Cordon Sanitaire

This leaves a shortlist of 1 to 3 suitable and available sites in all villages except Barkston and Baston where no suitable sites remain.

- 8.4 Alongside the assessment of sites, officers have also undertaken an assessment of the capacity of each Local Service Centre to accommodate new development. The village capacity assessment looks at :
- how many new houses have been built in each village since 2006 and how many additional houses have planning consent.
  - the level of need for affordable housing
  - the response of the education authority in relation to the capacity of schools serving the village and the ability of those schools to expand to accommodate additional pupils.
  - The Water Cycle Studies conclusions in relation to sewerage treatment and disposal and surface water disposal
  - Flood risk
  - Availability of good regular public transport and/or a full range of local facilities including employment opportunities
  - Availability of a GP practice and its ability to accommodate additional patients
  - Response of the parish council and public consultation to the idea of additional housing development
- 8.5 A matrix showing this assessment for the 16 LSCs is included at Appendix 3 to this report. This shows that Barkston, Baston, Castle Bytham, Langtoft and Morton are less suitable for additional development, whilst Ancaster, Barrowby, Billingborough, Caythorpe, Colsterworth, Corby Glen, Great Gonerby, Harlaxton and South Witham could accommodate a modest allocation. In addition the level of affordable housing need in Long Bennington indicates that a small development in this village which would deliver affordable housing might also be appropriate.
- 8.6 The village capacity assessment and the site assessment process lead to a number of options for making allocations in the LSCs.
- Option 1: Make small allocations (of 10-15 houses) in all LSCs This would spread the new development across the villages, however, it would reduce the benefit in terms of affordable housing, S106 contributions etc. It may also make some sites unviable because of the reduced site capacity.
  - Option 2: Allocate a small number of suitable sites in 5-6 key villages
  - Option 3: make 1-2 large allocations in one or two villages (subject to site suitability)
- 8.7 Two meetings have been held with a number of representatives of all 16 of the Local Service Centres. The purpose of those meetings was to inform the Parishes of the conclusions of the site assessment of sites within their village and to confirm some agreement of the conclusions of the assessment. We also asked the Parishes, where they were comfortable to do so (or had a remit from their Parish Council to) to indicate which of the suitable sites would be their preference for allocation.

8.8 Some Parishes gave an indication of preference at the meetings, others felt it was inappropriate to do so and a number of Parishes have subsequently had a Parish Council meeting and fed back their comments. Some of the preferred sites were sites which had been rejected on technical grounds through the assessment process. As a result of the Parish Council feedback, a number of villages which are considered able to accommodate development have indicated very strongly that they would not support an allocation in their village. This has been noted on the village capacity matrix attached at Appendix 3. The comments and concerns about sites have been used to inform the recommended list of site for allocation included below.

8.9 The following table shows the sites in the LSCs which have been assessed as being suitable and available for development. These sites have also been ranked in order of preference for allocation, where 1 is considered the best for each village. Where available an indication of the Parish Council support for this option has also been given. By doing this an appropriate package of sites can be identified depending on which of the three options above is considered most appropriate.

Village	Site Ref	Address	Potential capacity	Use	Rank	Parish council support
<b>Ancaster</b>	ANC02	Land West of St Martins Way	40	housing		No
<b>Barrowby</b>	BARR02	Land adjacent Low Road	50	housing	1	Second choice
	ADD8	W of Chilvers Close & The Drift	20	housing	2	First choice
	ADD10	S of Low Road	30	housing	3	no
<b>Bilingborough</b>	BIL02	Grimers Transport, Station Road/West Street	80	housing	3	no
	BIL03	Adj 30-32 Birthorpe Road	40	housing	1	ok
	BIL04	Land between Pointon Road & Birthorpe Road	40	housing	2	no
	BIL10	South of Folkingham Road	40	housing	4	no
<b>Castle Bytham</b>	CAS06	Land adjacent to 45 Station Road (Plot C)	40	housing	1	ok
	ADD11	The Old Quarry, Station Road	0	housing	2	no
<b>Caythorpe</b>	CAY01	West of Back Lane	40	housing		no
<b>Colsterworth</b>	COL04	Site off Bridge End Road	40	housing	1	Yes as smaller combined site
	COL05	Land North of Woodlands Drive	40	housing	1	
	COL06	Field adjacent to A1 and B676	100	housing	3	no
	COL07	Adj A1, north of roundabout, Colsterworth		Employment		yes

	COL08	North of A151, East of Colsterworth Roundabout		Employment		
<b>Corby Glen</b>	CORB10	Land off Swinstead Road	40	housing	1	?
<b>Village</b>	<b>Site Ref</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Potential capacity</b>	<b>Use</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Parish council support</b>
	ADD15	between Bourne Road & Swinstead Road	50	housing	2	?
<b>Great Gonerby</b>	GGON02	pt OS 0006	20	Housing	2	no
	GGON03	pt OS 0006 North of Highfield Mews	25	Housing	1	yes
	GGON08	Land East of Eastthorpe Road	60	Housing	3	yes
<b>Gonerby Moor</b>	GMOOR01	East of B1174, Gonerby Moor		Employment		
<b>Harlaxton</b>	HARL06	Adj doctors surgery, Swinehill	50	housing	1	yes
	ADD17	W of Swine Hill	50	housing	2	
<b>Langtoft</b>	LANG01	Land at Old Langtoft Gravel Pit	50	housing	1	No
	LANG03	Land off Peterborough Road	40	housing	3	No
	LANG08	Land off New Road	20	housing	2	No
	LANG09	Land off Bourne Road	20	housing	4	No
<b>Long Bennington</b>	LB02	Land at Main Road	30	housing	1	Yes
	LB12	adj Main Road, south of The Pastures	90	Housing	3	Ok
	LB18	Land West of Old Great North Road	30	Housing	2	
	ADD20	S of Elm Close	10	Housing	4	No
	ADD25	Roseland Business Park (10)		Employment		Yes
<b>Morton</b>	MORT05	Land South of Station Road, Morton Fen	40	Housing		No
<b>South Witham</b>	SWITH03	Land North of Mill Lane	30	Housing	2	No
	SWITH04	Land South of Mill Lane	20	Housing	1	Yes
<b>Thurlby</b>	THURL02	North of Homestead Gardens	40	Housing	1	
	THURL03	Part of Elm Farmyard, High Street	50	Housing	3	
	ADD31	N of Earl House Farm	10	Housing	2	

8.10 If all of these sites were allocated they would provide about 600 houses. This is well in excess of the Core Strategy requirement And, therefore, choices need to be made about which sites in which villages should be allocated. It is recommended that about 150-200 houses are allocated which will provide a range and mix of small sites across the District, helping to meet the housing needs of the rural communities both in the provision of market and affordable housing, whilst not over burdening the existing infrastructure of these settlements or impinging upon the landscape and open countryside.

8.11 Billingborough is identified as a village which could support a modest development, the parish council supports this view but are concerned that as it has now been confirmed that the Aveland Secondary School on Birthorpe Road will close at the end of the 2011/ 2012 academic year consideration should be given to the allocation of this site for housing and community facilities including open space. Lincolnshire County Council have just confirmed that the school will close and the site will therefore be available for development. The site is brownfield and is considered suitable for redevelopment, however it has not been subject to public consultation or the full site assessment process, therefore allocating the site in the Submission plan may cause legal problems for the plan. A planning application for the redevelopment of the site would be considered acceptable under the Core Strategy policy framework. The preference for this council and the parish council would be for the redevelopment of this site rather than a Greenfield alternative, it is therefore recommended that no site is allocated in this plan in Billingborough.

**8.12 Using the above information it is recommended that option 2 would provide the best balance and choice of sites. Within Option 2 using feedback from the parish councils and the site assessments the following sites are considered the most appropriate sites for allocation:**

Consultati on Site ref		No houses	Affordabl e houses	phase
ADD7	<b>West of Chilvers Close &amp; The Drift, Barrowby</b>	20	7	2021-2026
Part of COL4 and COL5	<b>Site off Bridge End Road, Colsterworth</b>	40	14	2016-2021
ADD15	<b>between Bourne Road &amp; Swinstead Road, Corby Glen</b>	30	10	2016-2021
GGON08 (part)	<b>Land East of Eastthorpe Road, Great Gonerby</b>	30	10	2021-2026
HARL06	<b>Adj doctors surgery, Swinehill, Harlaxton</b>	30	10	2016-2021
LB02a (part)	<b>Land at Main Road, Long Bennington</b>	35	12	2011-2016
<b>Total</b>		185	62	

## **Employment**

- 9.31 The Core Strategy does not establish an Employment land requirement for the Local Service Centres. However it does identify that up to 8 ha at Roseland Business Park and 10 ha at Colsterworth should be provided. Planning permission exists for just under 10 ha at Colsterworth and a number of suitable areas are available for expansion of employment development at Roseland – this will be restricted to the sites immediately adjacent to the existing buildings on the site. No provision is made in the Core Strategy for employment allocations in other LSCs, however policy consideration should be given to the role of Gonerby Moor in the local economy. Recognition of the role additional employment land at Gonerby Moor should be included within policy SAP4 and SAP5. This will allow areas within Gonerby Moor to be developed or redeveloped for employment uses. A policy is proposed which would allow for additional employment land to be developed at Gonerby Moor.

## **10 Phasing and delivery framework**

- 10.1 It is important to ensure that the supply of housing land remains available throughout the plan period. It is proposed that the recommended allocations are phased in five year bands to ensure a continuous supply of land. This phasing also recognises that some sites will be constrained in the early parts of the plan period by the capacity of existing infrastructure and the need to provide improvements to infrastructure prior to development. Text explaining the phased delivery of allocated housing sites is recommended.

## **11. NEXT STEPS**

- 11.1 The proposed allocations and the draft policies associated with them will, subject to Cabinet approval, be included in the draft Submission version of the DPD: this will be final version of the Plan that will be made available for formal consultation prior to submission for examination.

## **12. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 12.1 The Adopted Core Strategy provides the overarching policy framework which requires sites to be identified and allocated for development. The Core Strategy specifically sets out that sites will be allocated in the Site Allocations and Policies DPD to meet the housing and employment needs of the district. If it does not do this it will not be in conformity with the Core Strategy and could fail to be found sound at examination. More importantly however if insufficient appropriate, suitable and deliverable sites are allocated to meet the development needs identified in the Core Strategy there is a high risk that inappropriate sites and forms of development will be permitted via planning application and appeal. This will be costly and time consuming to the council and does will not give any measure of certainty to the public, developers and organisations about where or how the district should development. This will be detrimental to the growth and stability of the local economy.

## **13. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

13.1 None arising out of this report. There will be some costs associated with the subsequent consultation and examination process of the Submission Site Allocation and Policies DPD, the costs of which have been included in the Planning Policy and Partnerships Service Budget for 2011/2012.

**14. RISK AND MITIGATION (INCLUDING HEALTH AND SAFETY AND DATA QUALITY)**

14.1 None identified.

**15. ISSUES ARISING FROM EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

15.1 The Core Strategy which establishes the policy framework and the need for these policies has been the subject of an equality impact assessment. A service Equality Impact Assessment has recently been completed and issues arising from this have been taken into account in finalising the DPD.

**16. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

16.1 None arising from this report.

**17. COMMENTS OF FINANCE SECTION**

17.1 I have no specific financial comments to make in respect of this report. All costs associated with the development of the Local Development Framework can be met from within existing budgets supported by the monies received from the Housing and Planning Delivery Grant award.

**18. COMMENTS OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

18.1 The Site Allocations and Policies DPD will form part of the Local Development Framework. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 places a statutory requirement upon the council to prepare an LDF for the district. The overarching policy framework is already established by the Core Strategy. This includes the need to allocate sufficient land for housing and employment development in the district. This report demonstrates the processes which have been followed to select sites for allocation. The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (Regulation 27(3)) requires the Local Planning Authority to consider any representation made as part of "presubmission consultation" prior to submission of the relevant Development Plan Document to the Secretary of State. To satisfy this statutory requirement Members must have regard to the content of this report and the attached appendices.

**19. APPENDICES**

- APPENDIX 1:** Schedule of Representations Received to Consultation on Suggested Sites and Additional Suggested Sites (
- APPENDIX 2:** Site Assessment Summaries
- APPENDIX 3:** Village Capacity Matrix
- APPENDIX 4:** List of sites recommended for allocation
- APPENDIX 5:** Draft policies and allocations for inclusion in the DPD
- APPENDIX 6:** MAPS OF SITES RECOMMENDED FOR ALLOCATION