



SOUTH
KESTEVEN
DISTRICT
COUNCIL



Regulation 18 Statement of Consultation
Appendix E – Summary of Responses and
Officer Response

February 2025

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

This Appendix summarises the main issues and comments raised during the consultation process. A full summary of responses is available to view on the [consultation portal](#).

Chapter 1 – A New Local Plan for South Kesteven

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
<p>Chapter 1 – A New Local Plan for South Kesteven</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Plan Preparation Call for Sites Sustainability Appraisal Habitats Regulation Assessment List of Policies and Proposed Update 	10	60	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References to 2011 Census when 2021 data is fully available. The evidence base is insufficient to meet the requirements of paragraph 31 of the NPPF. Consultation process has not been robust Objections and clarity sought on the methodology for site selection Homes should be built on brownfield sites not large developments on farmland as proposed in the Local Plan. Policy LV-H4 Bourne Road with no reason why this has been removed as it is land with planning permission approved. Objection to the removal of Policy M1 although no commitment to an early review the plan should keep a review policy as in accordance with paragraph 33. 	<p>References to census information to be reviewed.</p> <p>The scope of the Local Plan was determined at the Issues & Options stage of plan production. The review is focussed on: Employment Land; Gypsy & Travellers; accordance with NPPF; Housing. Evidence to support these policy areas, as well as other policy areas requiring update has been prepared.</p> <p>Allocated sites which have since gained planning permission have been removed as allocations.</p> <p>The methodology for site selection can be found in the 2024 Site Assessment Report.</p> <p>The consultation process has been undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and the 2012 Planning Regulations.</p>

Chapter 2 – South Kesteven District

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
<p>Chapter 2 – South Kesteven District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan Period Climate Change Housing Growth Employment Growth and Prosperity 	19	74	93	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan period should be extended to ensure that a minimum of 15-year period can be achieved. No confidence that climate change is taken seriously by SKDC or developers Additional housing is required but consideration must be given to where. There will be challenges to deliver strategic infrastructure that will be needed to deliver the housing and employment growth. 	<p>Chapter 2 provides an overview of what the Local Plan contains. Comments received have been considered at relevant points and policies through the Plan.</p> <p>'Made' Neighbourhood Plans make up part of the statutory development framework for South Kesteven, meaning they hold full weight when determining planning applications within their specified areas.</p> <p>Elections for a Grantham Parish (Town) Council took place on the 4 May 2024. Residents within Grantham were notified and given opportunity to make comment on</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning for Population Changes • Meeting Specific Housing Needs • Protecting and Enhancing the Environment • Making it Happen • South Kesteven in Context • District Profile • Challenges for the Local Plan to address • Duty to Co-operate • Neighbourhood Plans 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough job opportunities for the number of homes you are providing • Employment land in Stamford is inadequate. • Objections to 'easy travel to surrounding cities' bus services considered inadequate. • Affordable housing must be a priority • Brownfield should be a priority rather than agricultural land. • Good co-operation with neighbouring authorities is essential. Co-operation is essential with Peterborough City Council and no evidence that this has been undertaken with Newark and Sherwood. • Grantham residents are at a disadvantage because they do not have a Parish (Town) Council meaning they cannot protect from overdevelopment • Neighbourhood Plan information needs updating as Corby Glen Neighbourhood Plan has now been approved. • Concerns that Claypole Neighbourhood Plan has been given no weight as it has not been included on Figure 4. 	<p>the Draft Local Plan consultation through the same channels as residents and other Parish Councils throughout the rest of the district. Text to be included in Local Plan referencing Grantham Town Council</p> <p>The creation of a Neighbourhood Plan is completely optional and is down to the 'qualifying body' (i.e. a Parish Council) to seek designation and prepare a plan. In cases where there is no Parish Council then National Planning Policy Guidance allows for the creation of a Neighbourhood Forum under Paragraph: 016 Reference ID: 41-016-20140306.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the factual inaccuracies showing the 'making' of the Corby Glen and Claypole Neighbourhood Plans on Figure 4: Neighbourhood Plan Designation Map, have been noted. Map to be updated to reflect inaccuracies.</p> <p>The Council has a Duty to Cooperate with neighbouring authorities. All neighbouring authorities have been consulted at various stages of the plan making process. A 'Duty to Cooperate' statement is being prepared.</p>
---	--	--	--	---

Chapter 3 – Vision and Strategic Objectives

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
<p>The Vision for South Kesteven's Local Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2041 Vision for South Kesteven 	24	40	64	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support is given for development in and around the identified Larger Villages. • Support is also given to the Settlement Hierarchy which is considered to be justified. • Support is given to the vision's ambition to tackle climate change, as well as creating sustainable, diverse and safe communities across the district. Increasing the plan period is suggested. • The definition of sustainable growth is queried. • Concern expressed that regarding those allocations proposed on greenfield land. • Concern is expressed that some policies of the plan contradict the vision's aim to maximise the district's potential through growing the economy. • Comments have been made regarding the existing highways infrastructure and the concern that additional development will bring additional traffic • Sport England expressed the vision should not only emphasise high quality of life but should also support the creation of healthy communities. Reference is made to guidance published in 2023 regarding Active Design. 	<p>The Settlement Hierarchy is supported by a robust evidence paper which was published alongside the Regulation 18 Local Plan and will be updated to take into account consultation comments received.</p> <p>Due to a Government Written Ministerial Statement published in 2023, further climate change evidence is being prepared which will support the preparation of policies in the Plan.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan proposes development allocations on both brownfield and greenfield land. All allocations are required to be sustainably developed, in accordance with Policy SD1 of the Draft Plan, and all other relevant policies.</p> <p>The Highways Authority and National Highways have been consulted on the Draft Local Plan policies and site allocations, and comments received can be viewed in the Site Assessment Report which was published alongside the Draft Local Plan. The comments were used to inform the site allocation process and development principals included within each allocation policy, where applicable. An Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be also published alongside the Pre-Submission Local Plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is prepared in consultation with infrastructure providers including highways, education, health and utilities.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern expressed that the aspirations of the vision will not translate into action. The vision is disputed, with the sustainability of growth proposed through the Local Plan questioned. The vision should be broader, as perceived focus on the market towns. Development should be directed to all settlements as currently an overreliance on windfall development, but it is the development in the villages and countryside which will provide opportunities for employment. The Council's commitment to fighting climate change reflected through the updated vision is supported. However, the effects of climate change need to be taken into account, such as flooding. Support is expressed for the vision to improve infrastructure and services to enable all section of the community to enjoy a sustainable way of life. However, concern is expressed that infrastructure provision is insufficient for existing and planned growth. The vision for employment growth is not considered to be reflected through the policy. Support is expressed for the vision, and its role as a sub-regional centre and it is considered that Grantham should be strengthened through significant housing and employment growth. However, concern is expressed due to proposed greenfield development which could detract from the rural nature of the town. Support is expressed for the Council's approach to biodiversity net gain and climate change, through the proposed objectives but it is considered that the Local Plan can go further. Proposed directions of growth around various towns and larger villages is questioned. The positive recognition of the historic environment is acknowledged by Historic England. 	<p>Chapter 11 of the Draft Local Plan sets out design requirements to promote good quality design. Policy DE1 requires streets and spaces to be designed to encourage healthy lifestyles. Policy SD1 also requires development to create strong, vibrant and healthy communities. A Design Code is being prepared for the district which will consider how active environments can be achieved through design.</p> <p>The Local Plan policies seek to ensure that development contributes to and accords with the vision, and objectives of the Plan, from the sustainability of growth through to infrastructure provision.</p> <p>Development is directed towards the main towns and larger villages as deemed the most sustainable locations. However, an appropriate level of windfall is acceptable in some locations which is reflected in the relevant proposed policies.</p> <p>The Settlement Hierarchy has been updated to reflect the current position of services and facilities within villages but it is accepted that this is a snapshot in time. The report was published for consultation alongside the Regulation 18 Local Plan and comments will be taken into consideration as the report is finalised.</p> <p>Further evidence is being prepared which will inform the policies and site allocations: Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Climate Change Study, Transport Modelling and review of the employment evidence. A Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulations Assessment will also inform the Pre-Submission Local Plan.</p>	
Strategic Objectives for the Local Plan	20	23	43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support is expressed for the Vision and Strategic Objectives The emphasis on sustainable growth is welcomed. Recommendation is given that objective 10 should be amended to accord with policy 63 of the 2023 NPPF. How the Local Plan is supporting the success of the district's town centres has been queried. The Settlement Hierarchy is queried, with particular reference to the categorisation of site allocations How the objectives of the Draft Local Plan relate to proposed site allocations is queried. Comment made that Objective 4's priorities are incorrect as living and leisure are perceived to be more important. A policy for agricultural worker dwellings is considered absent from the Local Plan Whilst extension of the plan period is supported, it is questioned why Lincolnshire County Council supports the vision, objectives and overall approach to delivering sustainable growth. 	<p>Site allocations are not necessarily categorised depending on the parish, but the settlement to which they abut. Supporting evidence to be amended to ensure factual accuracy.</p> <p>Whilst the objectives broadly accord with paragraph 63 of the NPPF, it is agreed that Objective 10 could be reviewed for clarity.</p> <p>Development is required to meet the objectives of the plan by according with the other policies within the plan. For example, objective 15 strives to minimise pollution. This objective is supported by policies SD1, E7 and EN4, the latter of which specifically requires development to minimise pollution.</p> <p>Objective 4's priorities to be reordered to: 'living, leisure and shopping'</p> <p>Agricultural worker dwellings are considered under policy SP5: Development Outside of Settlements. Policy SP5 to be amended for clarification.</p> <p>As suggested by Natural England, objective 12 to be to be amended to include reference to the Nature Recovery Network</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England generally welcomes the objectives and suggests that Objective 12 should make reference to the Nature Recovery Network which will help to address biodiversity loss, climate resilience and access to nature. Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership supports objectives 11, 12 and 13. GLNP recommends that objective 12 is amended to include reference to biodiversity net gain. 	As suggested by Greater Lincolnshire Partnership, objective 12 to be amended to include reference to Biodiversity Net Gain.
--	--	--	--	---

Chapter 4 – Sustainable Development in South Kesteven

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
Chapter 4 – Sustainable Development in South Kesteven	1	4	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vital that our distinct communities are celebrated and retain their character. Reconsider and prioritise a sustainable pattern of development that genuinely meets the needs of both current and future generations. Watering down of the climate change impacts wording, and the new wording does not make grammatical sense. ‘...minimise their impact on climate change...’ should read – ‘natural environment and natural store of carbon through green infrastructure.’ 	<p>The Local Plan’s Spatial Strategy prioritises sustainable development. The Local Plan is informed by evidence including Local Housing Needs Assessment and Employment Study and Open Space, Sports & Recreation Study to ensure that the policies reflects the needs of both current and future generations.</p> <p>Criteria k. regarding the natural environment to be reviewed.</p>
SD1: The Principles of Sustainable Development in South Kesteven	18	10	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All new houses should be built with renewable sources. General support to the policy. The integrated approach to sustainable development including moves to net zero carbon and to protect and enhance the natural environment is welcomed. Text in criteria i) that developments proposals shall consider how they can proactively support strong, vibrant and healthy communities is welcomed. Focus on net zero is welcomed. Further revisions to provide greater clarity as to the expectations of how development proposals are to meet criteria a-m within the policy. The policy is currently unclear if all 13 requirements are expected to be met and the relationship between them. Point g) should also include previously developed land, conversions or the redevelopment of vacant or unutilised land or buildings outside settlements. Suggestion that part c is refined by including ‘either on-site’ or after text ‘facilities can be accessed’. 	<p>Support of policy is welcomed.</p> <p>A climate change study is being prepared which will inform Local Plan climate change policy, including renewables.</p> <p>Policy SP5 of the Draft Local Plan sets out the criteria for development in the open countryside, including conversions of buildings within the open countryside.</p> <p>Proposals are required to take into account all criteria of policy SD1. The policy will be strengthened to state that proposals must consider the policy criteria.</p> <p>The Local Plan includes multiple policies which accord with policy SD1 and add further policy requirement and detail, consequently, the Local Plan should be read as a whole.</p>

Chapter 5 – Climate Change and Energy

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
<p>Chapter 5 – Climate Change and Energy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impacts of Climate Change in the UK National legislation and policies The Built Environment The issue for South Kesteven 	20	22	42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support of the Council’s ambitions to contribute to national net-zero targets. The Regulation 18 draft represented a missed opportunity to engage with the sector regarding specific details The Council had declared a climate emergency in 2019, inclusion of action to address climate change within the Local Plan was overdue. Several comments stated an incompatibility between additional developments and national net-zero carbon targets. Commentary on national policy regarding energy mix and the relationship to international carbon reduction targets. Critical about the choice of concrete as a building material. Energy efficiency and low carbon standards should be enforced for new developments, including both the build and operational phases of development Lack of breakdown of proportion of national carbon emissions for the built environment sector reduced the usefulness of including the data. It is not the role of Local Plans to go over and above existing energy efficiency targets The siting of developments and subsequent transport implications is a critical consideration for climate change policy, particularly regarding access to public transport. All new build developments should be equipped with solar PV. Increase in ambition to address climate change is welcomed but does not go far enough. Need to improve evidence base regarding flooding, particularly for the fenland edge of the district. 	<p>A new Written Ministerial Statement was issued on 13th December 2023, which has the effect of limiting how planning authorities can require improvements on energy efficiency for new buildings. Due to the timings of this statement and the Council's Regulation 18 draft being published on 29 February 2024, it was not possible to amend the existing proposed policy in line with the Written Ministerial Statement. Further work is being undertaken on the Climate Change Study in light of the Written Ministerial Statement. A new climate change chapter and policy will be included within the Local Plan, once the evidence is complete. The climate change study will assess ways in which policy can support net zero carbon, including adequate provision of solar PV for new domestic and commercial developments. Local Plan policy is subject to a Whole Plan Viability Assessment.</p> <p>Sustainable design and construction, including choice of building material, is a considered in further detail through the current Design Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>The current Local Plan to 2036 was published in early 2020, shortly after the Council's declaration of climate emergency in September 2019.</p> <p>Commentary on the UK energy mix and relation to national net-zero targets is outside the scope of the Council's Local Plan.</p> <p>Existing standards through the 2022 uplift to building regulations mean that new homes must produce at least 30% lower carbon than current standards. A further government consultation published this year included plans to include standards to be introduced in 2025 for all new homes to be 'zero-carbon ready' meaning they will need no retrofitting to produce zero carbon emissions as the electricity grid decarbonises. These standards are being assessed in detail.</p> <p>Further breakdown of the proportion of carbon emissions arising from the built environment, using latest information published by the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero, will be included.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Water Cycle Study is being prepared for the district.</p>
RE1: Renewable Energy Generation	7	13	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments, both in support and objection to the supporting text, raised question of stronger promotion for low-carbon and renewable energy generation for new developments. Supportive of renewable energy as far as possible within the scope of the Local Plan and further details being included at Regulation 19 stage. Comments reference potential loss of green space resulting from development. 	<p>As part of the climate change study, renewable energy policy is being reviewed in line with the considerations set out in the Written Ministerial Statement of 13th December 2023. This includes reviewing the current Renewable Energy Appendix to ensure it is fit for purpose, and in line with the recent removal of footnotes 57 and 58 in the NPPF regarding onshore wind developments.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A comment questions whether the Renewable Energy Appendix will be retained in its current form • Current policy sets a very high bar for renewable energy proposals. Notes the high consideration that opposition to site selection is currently given. • The current criteria for renewable energy development fails to recognise the potential to recover nature and deliver multiple benefits such as natural flood management, Large renewable projects have potential to recover biodiversity at a landscape scale while increasing habitat connectivity. • A comment notes the statutory consideration, set out by the Department for Transport, concerning the siting of renewable energy developments around highways infrastructure. • A comment is critical of solar PV and questions the full carbon cost of the technology. 	<p>We recognise the potential for well sited and designed renewable energy schemes to also deliver ecosystem services including flood management as well as nature recovery. This will be reviewed with consideration for policy EN2.</p> <p>Solar PV is an established technology which, when delivered for new developments, can help to meet some of the energy demand of buildings and reduce energy bills for residents. Given the typical operational life on solar PV, the technology delivers carbon reduction versus the current mix of grid supplied energy.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

Chapter 6 – Spatial Strategy

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
<p>Chapter 6 – Spatial Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy • Assessing Local Housing Need 	7	8	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield should be developed before greenfield. • Allocating housing sites in rural areas can also provide opportunities for small sites. • ‘Wherever possible’ should be removed in policies for small villages. • Support for the sub-regional growth status of Grantham given its strategic location. • Should take account of the location of Stamford in relation to cross boundary development and any impact from growth on the town. • The current range of services should not be used as a basis for only allocating development close to existing services, it could identify where services could be improved through new development. • The Local Plan should recognise cluster villages served by a range of services. • The Local Housing Needs Assessment is welcomed but if the findings are at odds with the Standard Method how will the council address this? • Settlements are not defined within the Local Plan. • Regardless of any perceived protection that the local plan may seem to give small villages there are unwanted development on villages in these edge of settlement sites. • Bourne seems to have far lower level of proposed development than you would expect. 	<p>Development on brownfield land is a priority set out within the Local Plan review. There is not enough brownfield land to meet the required need in terms of housing provision across the plan period. Therefore, suitable greenfield sites have been considered to ensure that housing requirements are achieved.</p> <p>The housing need for the district is based on the most current standard methodology as set by the government. The standard method is a starting point for housing and additional supply is included to ensure that the minimum requirement will be delivered over the plan period.</p> <p>With Grantham as the largest sustainable settlement in South Kesteven it is the centre of growth, this follows the natural settlement set out in the spatial strategy of the Local Plan. The other Market Towns, Stamford, Bourne, and The Deepings are seen as the secondary focus for development.</p> <p>Development is not excluded in the smaller villages. To ensure sustainable development, the Vision of the Local Plan looks to meet the need by focusing development to the four main towns and those villages with a good level of services and facilities. Policies SP3 and SP4 deal with infill development and development on the edge of settlements respectively.</p> <p>The proposed approach to the settlement hierarchy is considered appropriate for South Kesteven, however, a review of the methodology will be undertaken as part of the update to the Settlement Hierarchy Report.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

SP1: Spatial Strategy	24	28	52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about being reliant on the strategic developments in Grantham to deliver the majority of housing. However, comments made in support of Grantham being identified as the main and most sustainable settlement. Support that SP1 identifies Grantham as a sub-regional centre, three market towns, and larger villages as all being capable of supporting growth and development. The plan period is not considered to be long enough and should be rolled forward as a buffer to any potential delays and to ensure the plan period provides a minimum of 15 years at adoption. Policy SP1 should specifically identify the housing requirement for specialist housing for older people, across the plan period. The policy should be broadened out so that reference is also be made to the proposed mix of housing being determined by the local market conditions and demand at the time of a planning application. SP1 should be modified to include reference to the overall level of employment provision to be delivered within the plan period as well as setting out a broad distribution strategy for meeting that need. The use of the Standard Method is supported. The buffer should be incorporated formally as part of SP1 and expressed as the minimum (16,284). The LHN figure should not be re-calculated mid-way through the plan preparation and should align with the date of the review commencement. The policy should make reference to the overall level of employment provision to be delivered within the plan period, as well as setting out a broad distribution strategy for meeting that need. Boundary of Grantham should be extended beyond the urban area to ensure development is not restricted. Should explore opportunities above the minimum LHR to enhance the contribution of affordable housing. 	<p>Comments in support of the spatial strategy and focusing growth to Grantham is welcomed. Grantham as the largest sustainable settlement in South Kesteven is the centre of growth, this follows the natural settlement set out in the spatial strategy of the Local Plan. The other Market Towns, Stamford, Bourne, and The Deepings are seen as the secondary focus for development.</p> <p>The housing need for the district are based on the most current standard methodology as set by the government. The standard method is a starting point for housing and additional supply is included to ensure that the minimum requirement will be delivered over the plan period. The Draft Local Plan includes a buffer above the minimum housing requirement to provide a greater choice of sites and to have a contingency in case sites are not delivered as anticipated.</p> <p>The Settlement Hierarchy plays an important role identifying sustainable locations for development and is a way of categorising settlements with similar characteristics. The proposed approach to the settlement hierarchy is considered appropriate for South Kesteven, however, a review of the methodology will be undertaken as part of the update to the Settlement Hierarchy Report.</p> <p>Grantham as the largest sustainable settlement in South Kesteven is the centre of growth, this follows the natural settlement set out in the spatial strategy of the Local Plan. The other Market Towns, Stamford, Bourne, and The Deepings are seen as the secondary focus for development.</p> <p>There are no defined settlement boundaries in South Kesteven.</p> <p>Policy SP1 sets out the minimum housing need for South Kesteven using the Standard Method and for clarity, the buffer has not been included in this reference.</p> <p>Policy SP1 to be reviewed to add reference to the district's employment need.</p>
SP2: Settlement Hierarchy	27	18	45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the Draft Policy SP2 and the overall hierarchy and distribution for growth. Support also expressed for the methodology of the settlement hierarchy. Updating the assessment of villages to incorporate correct services and facilities is required. The methodology is considered unclear why facilities chosen or prioritised over others and fails to take account of para 9 of the NPPF relying only on a points scoring system. Suggestions to change the approach to the methodology include providing flexibility to settlement definitions as services change constantly, recognise the sustainability of each settlement without discounting settlements which lack facilities, results should be based on the settlements overall score not four questions, settlements within walking distances to towns 	<p>The Settlement Hierarchy as set out in Policy SP2 is supported by a robust evidence paper published alongside the Regulation 18. The Council will undertake a review of the services and facilities to determine any changes to Larger and Smaller Villages set out in Policy SP2.</p> <p>The proposed approach to the settlement hierarchy is considered appropriate for South Kesteven, however, a review of the methodology will be undertaken as part of the update to the Settlement Hierarchy Report.</p> <p>The Settlement Hierarchy plays an important role identifying sustainable locations for development and is a way of categorising settlements with similar characteristics. The inclusion of Claypole as a Larger Village and Hough on the Hill retaining its status as a Smaller Village reflects the methodology of the Settlement Hierarchy. The status of all villages defined in Policy SP2 will be revisited as part of the updated assessment.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<p>and larger villages should be reclassified as larger villages, a public house being identified as an essential facility requires review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the inclusion of Claypole as a Larger Village instead of a Smaller Village. However, comments also object to the reclassification of Claypole due to its services being much less extensive than other larger villages, errors in the scoring, and not considering its proximity to Newark. • Hough on the Hill should not be classified as a smaller village. • Stamford should be classified as the same tier as Grantham (as within the updated settlement hierarchy report). • Policy would be enhanced if additional opportunity was given to small villages given current opportunity is limited, and development would support services. • Support for new development proposals on sustainable greenfield sites where development will not comprise the town's nature and character is welcomed. 	<p>Grantham as the largest sustainable settlement in South Kesteven is the centre of growth, this follows the natural settlement set out in the spatial strategy of the Local Plan. The other Market Towns, Stamford, Bourne, and The Deepings are seen as the secondary focus for development.</p> <p>The settlement hierarchy does not in itself determine the appropriate level of growth a particular settlement can support but does seek to identify the most sustainable places where growth could be directed.</p>
SP3: Residential Developments with Settlements	3	9	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infill development can have an impact on character an appearance of settlements through loss of open space and green areas. • Clearer definition of substantially built-up area is required • Appropriate small-scale growth in villages is important for their vitality and viability and services • Removal of frontage from policy considered to promote back-land development • Recommended that Policy SP3 is strengthened by referring to the protection of the water environment to ensure further development in areas with infrastructure capacity issues do not harm the environment. • Water recycling centre capacity concerns. • Query over policy implementation relating only to allocated sites. 	<p>The Local Plan should be read as a whole, the Plan contains policies which seek to protect formal open and green spaces and the water environment. 'Substantially built-up areas' is assessed using planning judgement, as such a rigid definition is not provided.</p> <p>The policy does not apply to allocated sites</p>
SP4: New Residential Development on the Edge of Settlements	5	32	37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for use of the word "must" making the policy stricter • Requiring community support will stop schemes that are otherwise acceptable and give communities a veto over planning. May also be too much burden on small sites • SP4 does not allow community control of non-resi schemes • Ambiguity over definition of "edge of settlement", "community support" • Ambiguity over whether this applies to allocated sites that are still edge of settlement • Typo in final paragraph "application" instead of "applicant". Also bullet points say a) twice • Support for criteria d) • Should criteria b) also include undeveloped allocations? Also should this only cover greenfield, as no reference made to brownfield 	<p>Policy SP4 to be reviewed, to make clear if the policy applies to all development, or residential only. 'Community support' is defined within the policy. 'Edge of settlement' is assessed using planning judgement, as such a rigid definition is not provided. Policy SP4 does not apply to allocated sites.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

New Policy 1: Rural Exception Schemes	3	1	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separating rural exceptions from SP4 provides clarity Market housing alongside affordable is welcomed Ambiguity of definition of exception sites and whether they can apply to the main towns under SP4 	A definition of Rural Exception Sites, taken from the 2023 National Planning Policy Framework, is included within the Local Plan's Glossary at appendix 3 of the Draft Local Plan.
SP5: Development Outside of Settlements	3	8	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to traveller sites in open countryside Definition requested for "outside of settlements" as there are no formal settlement boundaries Policy does not cover agri-worker dwellings, nor buildings that are convertible outside of class Q Bullet point e) is missing No reference to NPPF exceptional designs 	<p>Policy SP5: 'Outside of settlement' is assessed using planning judgement, as such a rigid definition is not provided. The policy to be reviewed to make clear that Policy 5 refers to any development not considered under policy SP4. Policy SP5 to be reviewed for clarity to make clear that criterion a. also relates to agricultural worker dwellings. Conversion of buildings is considered under criterion d. Exceptional design is considered within the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>In regard to Gypsy and Traveller sites in the open countryside, the Independent Examining Inspector of the adopted Local Plan stated in his report that: <i>"whilst sites need to be accessible to local services a degree of practicality is needed in that locational requirements typically for peripheral sites at or just beyond the edge of settlements may not be readily accessible by public transport or on foot / bicycle."</i></p>
New Policy 2: Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land	5	7	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All areas of countryside should be protected Support the protection of productive agricultural land Concerns about the cumulative impacts of proposals on the loss of agricultural resources within the District Any development on Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land (BAMVAL) should have a soil handling plan and sustainable soil management strategy based on detailed soil surveys The threshold for the production of Agricultural Land Classification Reports is different to that set out in national policy and is unjustified. The wording of the policy should be revised to remove the requirement for Agricultural Land Classification Reports to be produced for sites allocated in the Local Plan. The requirement to return land to agricultural use open on the cessation of development should be removed. Amendments suggested to allow for consideration of active agricultural use, impact on agricultural land holding, and biodiversity net gain benefits. 	<p>The policy seeks to protect Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land as a soil resource. There are other policies within the Plan which assess the suitability of development within other areas of open countryside.</p> <p>The potential cumulative impact of development would be assessed through the planning application process, and for large scale solar development would be considered through the Environmental Impact Assessment regime.</p> <p>There is no national requirement for all planning applications involving Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land (BMVAL) to provide a soil handling and soil management strategy, and therefore, the introduction of a policy requirement through the LP would be unjustified.</p> <p>Removal of reference to hectareage within policy criterion (b) to be reviewed.</p> <p>The wording of criteria (d) is clear that it is applicable where feasible. The policy seeks to protect the BMVAL as a soil resource, and therefore, it is appropriate for any temporary loss to be mitigated at the end of the development period.</p> <p>Criteria (b) allows for suitable consideration of material planning considerations in the balance against the loss of BMVAL. Consideration of whether the land is currently in active use would not be justified as it cannot be controlled through the planning process.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

Chapter 7 – Meeting Housing Needs

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
Delivering New Homes	4	28	32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on bringing back vacant homes and properties before building new homes. Concerns raised regarding the impacts of proposed development on community wellbeing, biodiversity, loss of open space, habitats, infrastructure capacity, population increases. Objections to planning for homes above the target due to overdevelopment concerns. Support to the use of the Standard Method and the buffer of 21%. A higher annual target should be adopted in excess of the standard method. Further sites should be allocated to meet the shortfall. Trajectory is heavily reliant on sites with planning permission to meet housing needs. Detailed evidence to support the trajectory should be available to provide assurance on the accuracy of data. There is a need for specialist homes for older people and there is no policy that sets out the minimum delivery target. Support to increasing the percentage of development in Larger Villages from the adopted Local Plan. 	<p>The housing need for the district is based on the most current standard methodology as set by the government. The standard method is a starting point for housing and additional supply is included to ensure that the minimum requirement will be delivered over the plan period. The Draft Local Plan includes a buffer above the minimum housing requirement to provide a greater choice of sites and to have a contingency in case sites are not delivered as anticipated.</p> <p>The Council notes the objections for the proposed site allocations. Comments on site specifics will be considered in detail through each specific site allocation policy at Chapter 12.</p> <p>A trajectory illustrating the expected rate of housing over the plan period is included at Figure 6 of the plan. Table 2 details the majority of development is to be delivered on adopted and proposed Local Plan allocations. Further details regarding delivery of homes will be published as part of housing land supply evidence.</p> <p>Support welcomed.</p>
Existing and Proposed Housing Supply	1	22	23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed distribution is not equally spread across the district putting too much pressure on Grantham and its infrastructure to accommodate growth. Larger Villages could accommodate further growth and alleviate pressure in Grantham. The proposed distribution of housing development shifts housing development from the largest and most sustainable settlements to smaller and less sustainable settlements in rural locations. It does not represent the most sustainable pattern of development. Support to Grantham and surrounding areas being the primary focus for growth which supports the spatial strategy in terms of Grantham being the sub-regional centre. The distribution of housing does not take into consideration existing planned developments (e.g. Barnack Road) or cross boundary developments (e.g. Quarry Farm) Consideration is needed as to where proposed housing is located and should only be considered where there is infrastructure in place. 	<p>Site allocations are proposed within the Local Plan to meet the identified housing and employment needs of the district for the plan period. Site allocations are directed towards the most sustainable settlements including the towns and 'Larger Villages' as identified through the Settlement Hierarchy Review which considers services and facilities. The Local Plan policies seek to ensure that development contributes to and accords with the vision, and objectives of the Plan, from the sustainability of growth through to infrastructure provision.</p> <p>Development is directed towards the main towns and larger villages as deemed the most sustainable locations. However, an appropriate level of windfall is acceptable in some locations which is reflected in the relevant proposed policies.</p> <p>The distribution of housing takes into account completions, commitments (which includes the development at Barnack Road), adopted and proposed housing allocations as set out in Table 2 of the Draft Local Plan. The Quarry Farm development is not taken into consideration into the distribution of development as this part of the Stamford North cross boundary development is located within and will meet the housing needs of Rutland County Council.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding over supply and its impacts the community and loss of green space. The table is labelled incorrectly making it misleading. 	Table 2 will be corrected indicate the years of completions.
H1: Housing Allocations	7	74	81	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objections to the following sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SKPR 53 Land at mill Drove (alternative site promoted) SKPR 83 (Land North of Mill Drove (alternative site promoted) SKPR 57 - Land off Belton Lane SKPR277 SKPR-56 - Land off Obthorpe Lane, Thurlby SKPR-277 Elm Farm Yard, Thurlby Exeter Fields, Stamford Stamford developments SKPR 71 Dickens Close SKPR 241 - Land off Church Lane, Great Gonerby Concern expressed that insufficient land is allocated at Bourne. Alternative sites recommended for allocation in various locations. Market Deeping is incorrectly referenced. The policy should refer to The Deepings. Support for the following sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GR3-H2 SKPR 83 Land at Mill Drove, Bourne SKPR 57 Land off Belton Lane GR3-H3 SKPR-58 Ermine Street, Ancaster Stamford North (supported by Rutland County Council) National Trust has recommended that Policy H1 should signpost to the more detailed site allocation policies within the plan. Sport England advises that existing sports and recreational buildings and land require protection and any adjoining sports facilities require integration, without unnecessary restrictions placed on them. 	<p>The Council notes the objections and support for the proposed site allocations. Comments will be considered in detail through each specific site allocation policy at Chapter 12.</p> <p>Wording to be included within Policy H1 to signpost to the site specific detailed policies within chapter 12.</p> <p>All development must accord with all relevant policies within the Local Plan, which must be read as a whole. Evidence has been prepared including an Open Space, Sport & Recreation Study; and Play Pitch Strategy to inform Local Plan policy and development principles. Policy OS1 seeks to protect existing open spaces, but also requires development to provide new open space. A Play Pitch Strategy is also being prepared which will seek to deliver new play pitches (where required) and protect existing play pitches.</p> <p>The distribution of site allocations is per the Local Plan's Spatial Strategy, taking into account the availability and suitability of land.</p>
H2: Affordable Housing Contributions	15	32	47	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If commuted sums only gets used on Affordable Housing is queried. The 27-57% is low for developers it is considered that the rate should be an absolute minimum of 35% with Councils not accepting challenges by developers to the minimum delivery through viability submissions. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment has not been made available to say what the Policy Affordable Housing percentage delivery should be. Affordable Housing targets need to be much higher, and steps taken to ensure they are delivered. Exact affordable housing requirements should be specified in the policy and should not be above the indicative figures set out in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. 	<p>Commuted sums relating to affordable housing are ring fenced for affordable housing.</p> <p>The Local Housing Needs Assessment is a study that looks to clarify the Housing Need in the area. Our report shows the total houses that need to be delivered each year, and the % that needs to be affordable is between 27 and 57%. A Viability Assessment has been undertaken to help determine what is a realistic percentage the Council to deliver.</p> <p>The Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan was prepared in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework of the time (December 2023) whereby 25% First Homes was a compulsory requirement. Based on local evidence, the percentage split for rent and ownership is ascertained.</p> <p>Affordable housing definition is included within the glossary of the local plan as taken from Annex 2 of the 2023 NPPF.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The percentage range is higher than the current 20% affordable housing requirement for Grantham in the adopted Local Plan. 30% on strategic is considered too high due to development costs and financial climate. Clarity required on tenure % mix – if there is a 60/40 split and if this is this before or after the compulsory 25% First Homes. Affordable rent/ intermediate rent should be defined. Clarity required on what percentage of dwellings will be required on individual development sites. Clarity required as to the level of affordable housing and the mix of tenures that are required to meet needs. Unclear as to how the Council has identified a range in the first part and fixed requirements in relation to the mix of affordable housing provided on site. Suggested that there be a separate affordable housing rate for specialist housing for older people to be consistent with the Viability Assessment. Concerns regarding some assumptions that have been used in the Viability Assessment. Considers that the policy in only allowing Affordable Housing offsite in exceptional circumstances inflexible. It is currently unclear Should 'Contributions' be replaced in the LP with 'Provisions' It is not appropriate for Affordable Housing requirements to be expressed as a range. Clarity is required. Suggestion to consider the need for affordable housing for NHS staff and health and care workers. The policy should reflect the Whole Plan Viability Assessment of 10% on Brownfield and 20% on Greenfield and 30% on strategic sites. 	<p>Affordable housing policies will be reviewed in light of the new National Planning Policy Framework which was published in December 2024.</p> <p>Identifying the specific housing need for NHS staff and health workers in the area is outside of the scope of the Local Housing Needs Assessment for this Local Plan.</p> <p>An application to vary a Section 106 must be submitted to alter the number/type of affordable housing.</p>
<p>H4: Meeting All Housing Needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specialist Housing Provision 	9	20	29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subclause a) of this policy is highly commendable and supported as such Policy does not clarify how retirement accommodation need will be met. It should be clear that the market mix in Table 4 is only a guide and not a fixed requirement to be rigidly delivered on site. Criteria 9a) should be reworded to include the word 'consider' retirement accommodation. Support that there should be a flexible approach to housing mix across all tenures and balanced communities to meet the need of older and disabled people. It should not be compulsory for all major developments to meet m4(2) standard. It should be more flexible- and depend on the suitability/viability of the site There needs to be separate targets for retirement accommodation – separate from other specialist housing. Flexibility is needed within the policy This policy does not mention requirements for out of area children's homes. 	<p>Table 4 makes clear that mix of homes to be delivered is indicative.</p> <p>Children's homes are outside of the scope of the Local Housing Needs Assessment for this Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Whilst the Local Plan does not include detailed targets for retirement accommodation Policy H2 requires that 10% on sites of 10 or more dwellings should be developed as accessible and adaptable. If the Part M4(2) requirement is deemed to make a development unviable, a viability assessment should be submitted as part of a planning application.</p> <p>Affordable housing policies will be reviewed in light of the new National Planning Policy Framework which was published in December 2024.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The wording of the policy needs to be exception-based. Sustainable locations should be identified for retirement accommodation. Suggests specific sites to deliver retirement accommodation requirement. 'Indicative mix of homes to be delivered up to 2041' - 2021 Census data should be used rather than 2011 data, and more up to data household projections that ONS 2018 projections. 	
H3: Self and Custom Build Housing	3	6	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexibility of the policy that the plot can return to market use if not required is welcomed. Concerns that requiring a percentage of self-build plots on major developments is unlikely to meet the demands and aspirations of those on the self-build register. How plots will be delivered within large developments would need to be considered such as design impacts and gaps in the street scene where plots are delivered later than the rest of the development. A policy which encourages self and custom build development and sets out where it will be supported in principle would be more appropriate. Policy should be criteria based which encourages the delivery of such plots where they are fully justified and flexible. The requirement of self-build housing could be met by single dwelling approvals without the additional policy requirements. Targets need to be based on robust evidence of need, taking into account genuine expressions of interest such as double counting 1 person registered to more than one LPA area. 	<p>Local Authorities are required to maintain a register of people and organisations wishing to acquire plots of land for self build and custom build per the Self and Custom Housing Building Act 2015. To meet the demand, local authorities are also required to enable the delivery of a sufficient number of serviced plots to meet the demand.</p> <p>Regarding design, the majority of self and custom build development currently occurs on small individual sites within and on the edge of towns and villages and as such policies SP3 and SP4 of the plan enable the ongoing provision of such sites. Guidance on the design of SP3 and SP4 sites is included within the adopted Design Guide, and the emerging Design Code.</p> <p>Regarding large sites, the location of self-build plots should form part of the masterplan of each strategic site and will be expected to be developed in accordance with the design code or principles established by the masterplan or planning consent.</p> <p>Self and Custom Build plots should be marketed appropriately for at least 12 months including direct contact with the people on the register and via the national custom and self-build association.</p>
H5: Gypsies and Travellers	4	5	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to no sites being identified. Expansion of existing sites would provide additional pitches. Objection and concerns regarding the removal of reference to the risk of flooding. Support from the Environment Agency regarding the removal of flood risk. Recommend an overarching Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan for SKDC that can be applied to these sites. Inclusion of design but could that be defined or documents referred to. Travellers and gypsies like all residents are entitled to support from our District. If suitable sites are not put forward, then SKDC should consider purchasing land blocks to support a community waiting over 10 years for sites to be allocated. 	<p>An additional Call for Sites was undertaken in April 2024 seeking land for Gypsies, Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Sites submitted will be assessed and considered for their suitability in accommodating Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.</p> <p>Flood risk references have been removed as the Local Plan should be read as a whole. Policy EN5 requires applications demonstrate flood risk management.</p>
H6: Travelling Showpeople	3	1	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding the removal of reference to the risk of flooding. Expansion of existing sites would provide additional pitches. Support from the Environment Agency regarding the removal of flood risk. Recommend an overarching Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan for SKDC that can be applied to these sites. Travellers and gypsies like all residents are entitled to support from our District. If suitable sites are not put forward, then 	<p>Flood risk references have been removed as the Local Plan should be read as a whole. Policy EN5 requires applications demonstrate flood risk management.</p> <p>An additional Call for Sites was undertaken in April 2024 seeking land for Gypsies, Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople. Sites submitted will be assessed and considered for their suitability in accommodating Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				SKDC should consider purchasing land blocks to support a community waiting over 10 years for sites to be allocated.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Chapter 8 – Protecting Existing Community Facilities and Providing New Facilities

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
Chapter 8 – Protecting Existing Community Facilities and Providing New Facilities	2	2	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence shows Town Centre's are declining. Can the Council influence commercial property owners to promote the revival of our towns? The council rightly identify the ongoing provision of local services and facilities is of critical importance to the sustainability of the District's towns and villages. 	The Local Plan includes town centre policies which supports the development and reuse of building for a range of uses including retail, leisure, offices, food and drink, cultural and residential uses.
SP6: Protecting Community Services and Facilities	6	5	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for policy. Wording needs strengthening to protect the already established community and to make it more robust. Reference need rather than viability, Part c references re-use of the same use under a different operational model as well as re-use for an alternative facility, Supporting text should set out what sort of evidence is required. Modification where healthcare facilities are formally declared surplus to the operational healthcare requirements of the NHS or identified as surplus as part of a published estates strategy or service transformation plan, the requirements listed under Part D and E of the Policy will not apply. 	<p>Support for the policy is welcomed.</p> <p>The required need is covered by criterion a.</p> <p>Reuse for the same use under a different operational model does not constitute a change of use and therefore is not subject to planning control.</p> <p>Due to the wide ranging nature of community services the policy cannot specify specific requirements. Advice can be provided as part of a pre application enquiry.</p> <p>Evidence such as estate strategies should be submitted as part of an application.</p>
New Policy 3: New Community Services and Facilities	9	4	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inclusion of prioritising and promoting access by walking cycling and public transport is welcomed. Wording needs strengthening to protect community already there. There is very little public transport to start with. Plan sufficient parking places for new facilities as well. Sport England welcomes the inclusion of a policy which supports new community services and facilities and the wording 	<p>Support for the policy is welcomed.</p> <p>The Local Plan should be read as a whole. Policy DE1 sets out car parking provision should be sufficient for the location and type of development.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

			<p>that these facilities should be well located to serve the intended community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inclusion of the wording 'wherever feasible' is welcomed as this provides flexibility which is in accordance with paragraph 16 (b) of the NPPF which states 'plans should be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable'. 	
--	--	--	--	--

Chapter 9 – Employment and Economic Prosperity

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
<p>Chapter 9 – Employment and Economic Prosperity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Aims Regional Aims Local Aims Employment policies 	11	18	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns over which employers have guaranteed new jobs and expansion within SKDC. The Council should be seeking to accommodate employment sectors beyond B2 and B8 use classes especially within the Stamford area. Concerns over the amount of Employment land provided within SKDC being higher than the identified need. Support for the Employment sites at Long Bennington subject to the improvements to road infrastructure and no increases to HGV traffic through the village. Support for the ambitions of SKDC and the GLLEP to deliver high-quality economic growth throughout the LEP area as South Kesteven's location at the gateway of established and potential economic activity means it is perfectly placed to lead, and drive continued economic growth. Setting future goals is fine but what action is SKDC taking and how will the success be measured Comment around what incentives are being used to attract inward investment Considers the allocation of the site at Gonerby Moor (SKPR-100) is logical and helps to offset the employment land lost in the Grantham Sub Regional Centre from the Southern Gateway. The site will help to support the economic development needs of the area so that the local economy is not adversely impacted and hence is a suitable proposed allocation put forward by the Council. Para 9.29, is the 'the' an extra word in the second sentence, "...supports the one...?" Request use class types are added to Table 7 	<p>SKDC have consulted with the promoters of the proposed employment sites and have received information in terms of end users, employment types and proposed job outputs. Draft policy E5 allows for the expansion of existing businesses.</p> <p>There is flexibility and scope for appropriate E(g) use classes to come forward on proposed employment sites as demonstrated within draft policies E1 and E2 of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>SKDC has proposed an ambitious employment land target from what is the recommended need set out within the Employment Land Study (2023). This is intended to drive greater commercial development, promote job growth, and take advantage of the strategic A1 corridor network. An additional piece of regional employment work is being prepared to further evidence SKDCs position in terms of seeking an overallocation.</p> <p>Comments of support for the of employment and economic prosperity are noted. Any employment proposals will be expected to have minimal impact on the highway network and transport assessments will be required as necessary.</p> <p>The primary purpose of a Local Plan is to positively shape the long-term future of its area. Local Plans are however monitored to ensure that its sites are delivering as intended and in the case of employment land it is important to have information on the supply and marketability. Additionally, as set out in paragraph 9.14. the Economic Development Plan is currently being updated (for 2024 – 2028) to ensure that the economic vision of the council is being met.</p> <p>The Local Plan review itself is a tool to attract investment as SKDC has proposed an ambitious employment land target intended to drive greater commercial development, promote job growth, and take advantage of the strategic A1 corridor. Paragraph 9.21 sets out that the employment policies have been devised to ensure sufficient land is allocated to maximise South Kesteven's future economic growth scenario. This in turn will support broader local economic growth objectives, such as high value job generation and</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

					<p>increased inward investment, with proposed sites being backed by evidenced market interest.</p> <p>Comments in relation to SKPR-100 supporting the economic development needs of the area are noted.</p> <p>Comment relating to paragraph 9.29 is noted and will be corrected.</p> <p>Employment use class types to be included with the glossary.</p>
The Employment Land Study 2023	2	6	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment that Scenario 1 of the employment land study (2023) does not reflect the most accurate approach to employment provision across the district as it does not consider 'economic shock factors'. Using Labour Demand to forecast growth may limit the consideration for jobs linked to the growing B8 market. Scenario 1 should be used as an absolute minimum for growth. Aspirational Approaches need to be further considered which align with the growth aspirations of the district. • Table 7 of the Local Plan Review presents the amount of employment land needed to 2041, split by use class type, as identified in the Employment Land Study 2023. This need amounts to 79.5ha, however, it falls significantly below the amount of employment sites allocated within the Plan, at circa 338ha • The ELS does not take account of the LPA's aspirational approach to economic growth as underpinned by various aspects of the economic evidence base and does not account for "larger than local" strategic demand across the FEMA nor historic suppressed demand, which is considerable. • Challenges to the ELS assessment ratings of sites SKPR-185 and SKPR-234 	<p>The Labour Demand Scenario (Scenario 1), put forward by the Employment Land Study (2023) uses Experian's model to consider the existing economic structure of each Local Authority (broken down by economic sector) and the historical relationship between the regional performance of an industry and the performance observed at the Local Authority level. In including coverage of years affected by Covid19 and the UK's exit from the European Union, the forecast model has taken account of the impact of shocks in its projections as best as can be known, and not in respect of unforeseen shocks as explained at footnote 52 on page 104. The Economic Development Needs Assessment in the Employment Land Study (2023) has considered a range of potential growth scenarios, aligning with PPG requirements. The PPG does not require an aspirational growth scenario to be considered as part of such assessments. In respect of consideration of jobs linked to the growing B8 market, the Past Take-up scenario, whilst not selected as the Preferred Scenario for growth, reflects to some extent recent years of prosperity in the B8 market and arrives at a similar floorspace requirement to Scenario 1 (within 10% higher), so the latter should not be considered to be an outlier or notable underestimate. This is notwithstanding that the Council's approach in allocating more land than is projected as need, would mean that need arising under any aspirational growth scenario would still very likely be met by the allocated supply.</p> <p>Table 7 of the Local Plan review sets out the identified need for employment land provision across the district for the plan period based off a Labour Demand Forecast - Paragraph 19.19 however reiterates the ELS recommendations that considerations should also be given to the opportunities of each site by assessing their strengths and weaknesses, as well as the surrounding context and environment when making any new employment designations.</p> <p>To strengthen the position of SKDCs proposed aspirational approach to economic growth the Council has commissioned further investigation of the supply and demand for employment land at a regional level. This is to consider the wider demand for employment land and supply position in neighbouring authorities to better understand if SKDC are justified (or not) in proposed aspirational allocations. Paragraph will be incorporated to reflect this.</p> <p>Comments on specific employment sites that have been assessed through the ELS have been forwarded over to consultants for review. It is intended for the ELS to be 'refreshed' and the outcomes regarding sites will be presented within the site assessment report accompanying the pre submission Local Plan.</p>
E1: Grantham Southern Gateway Strategy Employment Opportunity	4	10	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map on page 62 should be updated to show completed phases of the GSRR and Phase 3 in construction. Acreages of allocation SKPR-286 are likely to be overstated because of Phases 1 and 2 	<p>Policy E1 is currently delivering in terms of its strategic employment outputs with the approval of applications S21/1057 and S17/1262. It is an omission that these plots have been granted consent for housing and a retail park.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site has not been delivering as per previous policy. • Objection to the wording in paragraph d as it singles out this development area from all others by requiring 'attractive landscape edges • Objection to the wording in j as to building heights respecting the sensitivities of the surrounding landscape: as modern B2/B8 buildings are high and bulky by nature. • Without appropriate acknowledgement of the NGET assets present within the site, these policies should not be considered effective as they cannot be delivered as proposed. • Proposes land at Stornoway to be included within the SKPR-286 employment allocation so that all the land to the south of Gorse Lane be considered as one. • E1, is there an extra word in the first sentence, "...of for...?" • National Highways have no objection in principle to this allocation, the Strategic Transport Assessment supporting this Local Plan should identify the cumulative traffic impacts of Plan growth on the Spittlegate junction • Would welcome the inclusion of a policy point similar to point a. within GR3-H1. • An expansion of the existing allocation (GR-SE1) through the land to the immediate west (reference SKPR-234) would represent a more sustainable focus for employment development. 	<p>SKDC is proposing an aspirational employment increase across the functional economic market area, which will support investment across the district. Additional employment sites are still being considered depending on the outcomes of the draft Local Plan Review consultation.</p> <p>Criteria d and j were considered suitable by the appointed examiner of the adopted Local Plan. It proposed that the criteria remain as the site is an important gateway location into southern Grantham and would expect this to be addressed within a landscaping plan. While it is accepted modern employment buildings can be 'bulky' it is expected that size and scale of development to consider its surrounding context. B2/B8 units have already been approved as part of Policy E1 and deemed acceptable in terms of their height and scale.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the site being within proximity or crossing NGET assets has been noted.</p> <p>The land at Stornoway does not fall within Policy E1 and located next to land proposed to be deallocated, therefore would not be strategically linked to the rest of the employment allocation.</p> <p>National Highways comments have been noted.</p> <p>SKDC is proposing an aspirational employment increase across the functional economic market area, which will support investment across the district. Additional employment sites are still being considered depending on the outcomes of the draft Local Plan Review consultation.</p> <p>Minor typographical errors to the policy have been noted and will be addressed.</p>
E2: Employment Sites	11	41	<p>52</p> <p><u>Stamford</u> Employment in Stamford does not promote sustainable development given the amount of housing which is currently being developed/ proposed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.9 hectares of employment is unacceptable for Stamford • Exeter Fields should remain for commercial use • Removal of site south of Empingham Road (SKPR-266) is inconsistent with paragraph 9.33 • St Martin's Park with planning permission should be included as an allocation to prevent change of use to housing • Ryhall Road, Stamford (SKPR-288) should be reallocated from employment to residential development. • Duty to co-operate and cross boundary regarding joint allocation at Stamford North predicted employment land would be provided at Exeter Fields and therefore Stamford North would not need to include employment land. <p><u>Gonerby Moor (Grantham)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of allocation SKPR-100 at Land South of Gonerby Lane, West of the A1, Gonerby Moor, Grantham • Allocation of 172.7ha at Land at Gonerby Moor is unsustainable and unsupported in employment strategy terms, allocations 	<p><u>Stamford</u> While there will be an overall loss of employment land within Stamford, there is an aspirational increase in employment generating land across SKDC as a whole and within the wider functional economic market area. The Employment Land Study (2024) found that site SKPR-266 was constrained, and intense employment would not be appropriate. Options to bring forward less intense employment generating uses alongside residential on the site is being considered to ensure a broader choice of employment within Stamford.</p> <p>St Martin's Park is expected to bring forward employment generating uses in line with the application (S20/2056) and an allocation would not usually be required.</p> <p><u>Gonerby Moor (Grantham)</u> The allocations at Gonerby Moor provide a suitable and deliverable location for larger scale employment generating development. Development in this location can also take advantage of the strategic transport links and will promote economic and job growth across South Kesteven and the functional economic market area as a whole.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to include appropriate phasing and infrastructure criteria for this site.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

		<p>considered to be unjustified by evidence and located poorly in respect of sustainable travel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of allocation SKPR-65 (GR3-H4) and that other employment generating uses may be appropriate, however requests is extended to include all Class E uses • Specific policy should be provided to acknowledge the strategic role of Oakdale, Gonerby Moor • Additional policy should address phasing of the Gonerby Moor allocations • Supportive of allocation SKPR-202 Land at Gonerby Lane, however inaccuracies in the assessment report which should be revisited. • A1 between Gonerby Moor and Long Bennington suffer from existing delays and safety issues. National Highways have no planned improvements but identified as an area from further investigation within the Route Strategies. <p><u>Bourne</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough land allocated within Bourne, and sites allocated are speculative and not deliverable in the plan period <p><u>The Deepings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mention of gateway principles to Land Fronting Peterborough Road (DEP-E1) and if its industrial development. Land should be considered for housing • Support to retain SKPR-55 (DEP-E1) and SKPR-284 (DEP-SE1) object to any proposals that seek to change SKPR-55 into residential. <p><u>Long Bennington</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of the proposed continued allocation of Roseland Business Park (SKPR-287 (RBP-E1)) • Highways England question Land at Valley Lane (SKPR-262) would constitute as sustainable development as access from South would be though Long Bennington. Assess directly from the A1 would not be permitted. • Potential archaeology and impact upon historic village of Allington and its heritage assets at SKPR-262 Land at Valley Lane. • Valley Lane is in close proximity to The River Witham (LWS) and Long Bennington and associated applications should provide measures to reduce potential impacts on this sensitive site and integrate into recovery of the local environment. <p><u>Additional sites to be considered allocated</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SKPR-132, SKPR-133, SKPR-219, SKPR-234, SKPR-230, land to the northeast of Great North Road, land south of Fen Road, North Field Road and the A1175 Market Deeping Bypass. <p><u>Supporting text and other comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 9.32 makes it seem housing is priority over employment opportunities in Grantham when both are equally 	<p>Comments in respect of the inaccuracies that are highlighted as part of the wider response will be considered when producing the pre submission version of the site assessment report.</p> <p>Suitable and sustainable transport options will be expected for any allocated site as set out in proposed policy ID2 of the draft Local Plan review.</p> <p><u>Bourne</u> The Local Plan proposes to allocate 11ha of employment land within Bourne, which has been carried over from the adopted Local Plan. Allocated sites have demonstrated their suitability/achievability/deliverability and indicative timescales for bringing the site forward within the plan period.</p> <p><u>The Deepings</u> Within the Pre-Submission Local Plan, it is proposed that all employment generating allocations will have their own set of site-specific development criteria. Discussions are ongoing into sites continued suitability for employment generating uses.</p> <p><u>Long Bennington</u> Support of the proposed continued allocation of Roseland Business Park (SKPR-287 (RBP-E1)) has been noted.</p> <p>SKDC will collaborate with Lincolnshire County Council as the lead transport authority when assessing the proposed impact that southern bound traffic may have on the village of Long Bennington. Within the Pre-Submission Local Plan it is proposed that all employment generating allocations will have their own set of site-specific development criteria. Therefore, for this site, access off Valley Lane will be specified.</p> <p>Draft Local Plan policy EN2 'Protecting Biodiversity and Geodiversity' seeks to facilitate the conservation, enhancement and promotion of the district's biodiversity and geological interest of the natural environment. This includes seeking to enhance ecological networks and delivering a net gain on all proposals, which will include allocated sites.</p> <p><u>Additional sites to be considered allocated</u></p> <p>Comments have been noted as to the additional proposed employment sites for inclusion within policy E2. Additional employment sites will be considered through the Employment Land Study (2024) and Site Assessment process. Employment allocations may be reviewed depending on the outcomes of the draft Local Plan Review consultation and decisions will be reflected within the Pre-Submission version of the Local Plan review and its subsequent evidence base.</p> <p><u>Supporting text and other comments</u> Comment noted in relation to the wording of paragraph 9.32. Strategic planning is built on the fundamentals that as the population and demand for homes increases, there should be adequate job opportunities brought forward in conjunction to meet this demand, which in turn will promote a stable economy. SKDC will seek to rectify the wording of the paragraph to better reflect this.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.35 will be corrected to ensure that it addresses the total of employment land.</p>
--	--	---	---

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<p>important and should be closely linked without one outweighing the other.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity in wording that the Draft Plan allocated circa 338ha of employment land however is carried over from the current adopted allocations. • It would be wise the council has an agreed delivery statement for each of the sites in question. 	
E4: Protecting Employment Generating Sites	6	4	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for EMP-D3 (Northfields) and EMP2 (Hards Lane) from the Deepings Neighbourhood Plan Group and Deeping St James Parish Council. Additional note for EMP2 is that there is an application S23/0401 on adjacent site to the west which is supported in principle by DSJ Parish Council for employment development. 	<p>Comments of support for EMP-D3 (Northfields) and EMP2 (Hards Lane) have been noted. SKDC are aware of the planning application adjacent to the site, and this has been noted in terms of the wider employment delivery of the area.</p> <p>The site code for Hards Lane has been labelled incorrectly and should be 'EMP1' as to be consistent with the Employment Land study (2024), this will be rectified.</p>
E5: Expansion of Existing Businesses	2	2	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments not relevant. 	No action required.
E6: Loss of Employment Land and Buildings to Non-Employment Uses	3	8	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 9.39 refers to “the city”. There are no cities within SKDC. • Comment agreeing with what the paragraph seems to be saying but, in this case, do not permit the change of use of SKPR-266 Exeter fields in Stamford from commercial to residential. • Policy E6 could be more flexible in allowing the release of certain employment land. It is clear the Council have identified sufficient land to meet the employment requirement of the district, therefore smaller sites in more urban built-up areas would perhaps be better suited to meet the housing needs of the district instead of employment. • If the Council deems Policy E6 as necessary to protect employment sites across the plan period, then it is important that they allocate those sites which they know have a high chance of delivery and success for employment purposes. • Part of the Grantham Southern Gateway (SKPR-286) which has been released from employment purposes should be removed from the allocation in order to adhere to this Policy. • Land at Peterborough Road, Market Deeping (SKPR-55) should be released from employment use and be allocated for residential use. • Policy E6 should be amended to allow for other employment generating uses within class E to be delivered. Such an approach would assist in ensuring that employment land is not lost to other non-employment generating uses. 	<p>SKDC are aware that paragraph 3.39 makes references to a “city” when there are none within the district. This has been identified as an omission when preparing the draft document and will be corrected for the pre submission version of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Comment noted in relation to the paragraph’s intentions regarding the loss of Employment land to none-employment use have been noted. SKDC will seek to resist the loss of employment sites to other uses, although in relation to Exeter fields (SKPR-266) specifically, the site was reviewed by the Employment Land Study (2024) and was found to be constrained by surrounding residential development. SKDC have therefore decided that intense employment generating uses on the site would not be wholly appropriate to the surrounding context and are currently assessing options to bring forward less intense employment generating uses (e.g. Use class E) alongside proposed residential on Exeter fields (SKPR-266).</p>
E7: Rural Economy	3	2	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sport England welcomes the inclusion of sport and recreation into the list of types of small business schemes which will be supported in rural areas and the need for large scale sport and leisure facilities to be sited where they can be easily accessed by public transport, foot and cycle. 	<p>Sport England comment welcoming the inclusion of sport and recreation into the policy has been noted.</p> <p>Comments around the traffic impact and noise arising from small business schemes that may come forward through Policy E7 (i.e. farm diversification and sports development) have been noted. The policies within the Local Plan must be read as a whole, meaning that schemes will be expected to comply with the draft sustainable development, and environmental policies to ensure that schemes will not have an unacceptable impact in</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment that farm diversification, particularly for storage and distribution, can lead to the use of lanes for HGV's above and beyond the previous agricultural use. Additionally, some sport developments can lead to excessive noise affecting amenity in a wider area due to topography and weather conditions. Is there a policy to control these better? Forestry should be appropriate to the area. This means native species, rather yet another conifer plantation. Criteria d could be spelt out more clearly. 	<p>terms of noise or traffic (as well as other factors). Additionally, within draft Policy E7 there is criterion 'c' which requires small rural business schemes to demonstrate that they will not negatively impact on existing neighbouring uses.</p> <p>Comment noted regarding forestry developments being appropriate to the area. SKDC are of the opinion that draft criteria 'd' adequately covers the broad range of proposals that could come forward in terms of small business schemes relating to forestry developments. Applications for any larger scale planting scheme would be expected to consult with the Forestry Commission and the Woodland Trust to ensure suitability.</p>
E8: Other Employment Proposals	2	1	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments not relevant. 	No action required.
E9: The Visitor Economy	2	2	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should be a specific policy relating to holiday lets, particularly short stay tourist accommodation in town centres. The policy should seek to strike the right balance between upper floors of retail premises being used as homes for local people and the need for tourist accommodation to support the tourist economy. Proposals which generate high levels of visitor traffic or increased public use of tourist facilities should be encouraged. Where there is insufficient transport infrastructure (including parking for cars and coaches), they should be provided too. You are not going to get any significant numbers of people visiting tourist venues on public transport in SKDC, and no one is going to walk from a neighbouring local authority. 	<p>Comment noted regarding a specific policy regarding holiday lets. Regulations have been consulted on by the previous government which will require those looking to let property on a short-term basis, to seek planning permission from their local authority to do so. In addition to gaining planning permission, the previous government also has proposed a national register of short-let properties – allowing local authorities to discern information about specific short-term lets within their catchment area. These regulations are still in draft format and therefore, at present, SKDC does not have the required evidence to produce a specific policy regarding holiday lets.</p> <p>Comments noted in relation to encouraging proposed tourist developments to have high levels of visitor traffic or increased public use. While it is understood that this may be beneficial from an economic perspective, SKDC feels a balance needs to be struck in ensuring that development schemes meet the elements of sustainable development. Draft policy E9 does not strictly discourage developments that would cause to cause high levels of traffic or public use, it requires them to be near to an identified main town or larger village to ensure it can be easily accessed by public transport, foot and cycle.</p>

Chapter 10 – Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
EN1: Landscape Character	8	13	21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that pollution levels will increase as population grows Concern that the growth proposals of the Local Plan will detrimentally impact the natural environment, including the natural landscape, woodlands, wildlife and flora. Suggestion that a policy for the requirement of 'swift bricks' should be included. Query regarding 'Points of the Compass' Support for the policy Support for reference to the Landscape character areas 	<p>Support for the policy welcomed.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan includes a policy (EN4) which seeks to minimise pollution and where possible contribute to the protection and improvement of the quality of air, land and water.</p> <p>The Natural Environment section of the Local Plan includes policies which seek to protect and enhance South Kesteven's natural environment including landscape, Biodiversity Net Gain, green infrastructure, pollution control, and the water environment.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern regarding the development of greenfield land in and around settlements Review of the landscape evidence is recommended Concern regarding the impact of development on the historic environment, including Belton House Natural England and GLNP welcome the policy 	<p>A 'Points of the Compass' exercise was undertaken through the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal which was also consulted upon alongside the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan. The Points of the Compass exercise evaluates land around the district's towns and identified 'Larger Villages' identifying and analysing constraints such as landscape, the historic environment, flood risk, and agricultural land classification. The analysis is used to inform the site allocation process.</p> <p>Site allocations are proposed within the Local Plan to meet the identified housing and employment needs of the district for the plan period. Site allocations are directed towards the most sustainable settlements including the towns and 'Larger Villages' as identified through the Settlement Hierarchy Review which considers services and facilities.</p> <p>Sustainably located brownfield sites have been prioritised, if assessed as suitable. However, there is not enough brownfield land within the district to meet the district's housing and employment needs.</p> <p>The Local Plan contains policies which seek to protect the historic environment, including EN6: The Historic Environment, and GR1: Protecting and Enhancing the Setting of Belton Housing and Park.</p>
EN2: Protecting Biodiversity and Geodiversity	6	12	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy supported by LCC and in part by the Woodland Trust, the Wildlife Trust, GLNP Concern that proposed allocations will detrimentally affect irreplaceable habitats. The inclusion of policy which seeks to protect ancient woodland is welcomed. However, additional wording is suggested. Concern that the policy does not reference Biodiversity Net Gain. 	<p>Support for the policy welcomed.</p> <p>Policy EN2 which seeks to protect ancient woodland and aged and veteran trees. Permission will be refused resulting in the loss of irreplaceable habitats unless certain criteria can be met. The policy relating to irreplaceable habitats will be strengthened to reference 'exceptional circumstances and the requirement of compensation strategies.</p>
New Policy 4: Biodiversity Opportunity and Delivering Measurable Net Gains	20	15	35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy supported by LCC and in part by the Woodland Trust, the Wildlife Trust, GLNP Concern that proposed allocations will detrimentally affect irreplaceable habitats. The inclusion of policy which seeks to protect ancient woodland is welcomed. However, additional wording is suggested. Concern that the policy does not reference Biodiversity Net Gain. 	<p>The new policy goes beyond national policy through the introduction of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Opportunity Mapping and the associated policy requirements.</p> <p>The policy will be reviewed to take into account secondary legislation and recently published guidance and secondary legislation.</p> <p>The delivery of BNG will be monitored through legal agreements, and annual monitoring of Local Plan policy.</p>
EN3: Green Infrastructure	13	13	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments received regarding green infrastructure and site allocations. A policy requiring the linkage of sites with their wider green infrastructure context is welcomed Natural England's Green infrastructure Framework: principles & Standards should be referenced Concern regarding development on greenfield land. Recommendation that the South Kesteven Tree Strategy should be referenced 	<p>Policy EN3 to be reviewed to include reference of the functionality of green infrastructure. The supporting text to be amended to include reference to Natural England's Green Infrastructure and the multiple benefits of green infrastructure.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support from the Wildlife Trust with the recommendation to include additional text on the multiple benefits of green infrastructure 	
EN4: Pollution Control	4	9	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern regarding the potential of pollution from developments, including construction noise, vehicles and the delivery of infrastructure; and from the households once in residence. Support for the requirement that development should be designed from the outset to improve air, land and water quality and promote environmental benefits (wildlife trust) Recommendation that the policy should be amended to include reference to practicality and viability Concern regarding the potential of pollution from developments, including construction noise, vehicles and the delivery of infrastructure; and from the households once in residence. 	<p>Policy EN4: Pollution control requires development to minimise pollution and where possible contribute to the protection and improvement of the quality of air, land and water.</p> <p>Policy EN4: Pollution control requires development to minimise pollution and where possible contribute to the protection and improvement of the quality of air, land and water. A Whole Plan Viability Assessment has been produced which tests the viability of draft Local Plan policies. The Whole Plan Viability has not indicated that requiring development to seek to minimise pollution and there possible contribute to the protection and improvement of the quality of air, land and water would undermine viability.</p>
EN5: Water Environment and Flood Risk Management	7	16	23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments received querying the timeline for the production of the Water Cycle Study Concern regarding all sources of flooding affecting existing and proposed development, and that existing issues could be exacerbated. Concern regarding the removal of natural flood plain by development. Query regarding sequential tests for allocated sites. Support for the policy, including the requirements for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) and that opportunities must be sought to achieve multiple benefits, such as through green infrastructure provision. Policy amendments suggested by statutory consultees, including the Environment Agency to ensure that the policy is in accordance with national planning policy and guidance. 	<p>Policy to be reviewed as recommended by statutory consultees, including the Environment Agency.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Water Cycle Study are in preparation which will inform site allocations, future planning applications and relevant Local Plan policy. The studies will be published, once finalised.</p>
EN6: The Historic Environment	10	12	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy should be strengthened, in particular ensuring Heritage Impact Assessments comply with NPPF and that a requirement that Archaeological findings and reports are required to be made public as soon as possible. Omits reference to Statement of Common Ground 2012 agreed between SKDC, Historic England and National Trust on interpretation of Setting Study Preservation in situ should not be a default preferred solution. 'Non-Designated heritage Assets and Archaeological Assets' states at paragraphs 1, 4 and 5 that the Council will seek to ensure mitigation of impact through preservation of the remains in situ as a preferred solution Designated Heritage Assets/Listed buildings: Further qualification is needed here; what constitutes "public benefit" and "potential harm"? Objection to archaeology works prior to planning consent, considered will impact on viability and delivery of housing 	<p>The proposed Historic Environment policy is based on the current NPPF Chapter 16 as well as the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act. The aim is to strengthen and clarify the requirements for works that could affect any heritage asset and their setting. We will review areas addressing the requirements for HIAs and setting impacts to ensure they are fully in line with the NPPF and the Act. We will also review the wording to ensure it is aligned with the national policy wording.</p> <p>We intend to review to glossary of the Local Plan, to include key terms such as listed buildings, heritage asset, public benefit, potential harm.</p> <p>As noted in the PPG, 'where an asset is thought to have archaeological interest, the potential knowledge which may be unlocked by investigation may be harmed even by minor disturbance'. The PPG further confirms that 'it is estimated that following the initial assessment of archaeological interest only a small proportion – around 3% – of all planning applications justify a requirement for detailed assessment'. Based on Historic England Guidance, the preservation of remains of archaeological interest in situ is the preferred solution, however we recognise that this may not always be feasible, which the policy acknowledges, and notes other mitigation strategies, based on a Written Scheme</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestions to strengthen wording on trees in conservation areas. • Car Dyke should be made a scheduled monument • Draft text relating to public benefit in the context of harm could align more precisely with national policy wording. • Clear reference to heritage asset setting, which contributes to significance, as a criterion in relevant assessments is welcomed. • Policy EN6 is welcomed. • More detailed supporting text would be welcomed. 	<p>of Investigation, which will be decided on a case by case basis. A level of archaeological investigation, such as geophysics and trial trenching may be required before a decision can be made, however this is dependent on the site.</p> <p>Declaring Scheduled Monuments is outside of the remit of the Council's Local Plan, and is decided by the Secretary of State following an application via Historic England.</p> <p>Trees within conservation area do have the benefit of requiring Section 211 permission for any works. While not every tree within a conservation area is of heritage significance, we strive to note important trees within the Conservation Area Appraisals, which provides them with further protection. Further clarifications on this can be added to the Conservation Area section, to strengthen the requirement for obtaining such permissions and that the recommendations of the appraisals should be followed.</p>
EN7: Protecting and Enhancing Grantham Canal	9	1	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy supported but queries as to why the Car Dyke does not also have a bespoke policy. • There should be an aspiration to reconnect the two parts of Grantham Canal, either side of the A1 and to extend the canal in Grantham back to its original length, up to Old Wharf Road • Policy welcomed by Historic England 	Support welcomed for the policy. The scope of the Local Plan was determined at the Regulation 18 Issues and Options stage.

Chapter 11 – The Built Environment

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
DE1: Promoting Good Quality Design	13	25	38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about whether the policy wording should be 'should' or 'must' • Car parking provision should be sufficient. Define the number of car parking spaces per dwelling linked to the number of bedrooms and type of property. • Solar should be on all buildings and new homes should have heat pumps and electric charging points. • Change 'adhere' to 'in accordance with' in paragraph 1 to allow flexibility in the application of the policy. • All major development (as defined in the Glossary) must demonstrate compliance with (and any subsequent versions). • Different character areas should be recognised in preparing the SKDC design code, villages all differ for example. • Positive principles of this policy are noted. • Detail relating to swift bricks as recommended by National Model Design Code. • Concerns about wording not being clear and that the policy states 'applications for planning permission that are not well designed will be refused' 	<p>Comments noted, the policy wording will be reviewed. Including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ reference to major development only to be reviewed. ➤ Additional text to clarify was it meant by 'applications with planning permissions that are not well designed will be refused' will be considered. ➤ reference to Natural England Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide should be included within the policy, however it should be noted that such guidance may be superseded. ➤ Paragraph detailing what major development is required to comply with to be reviewed. <p>Character areas will be reviewed through the design code.</p> <p>How design guides and codes are referenced will be reviewed throughout the plan.</p> <p>Regarding car parking provision, Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) are the authority who would set standards, and they presently do not have car parking standards, although do provide some guidance. Our Design Guide SPD provides a link to the LCC guidance that does set out some advisory number of spaces.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests the inclusion of “x. taking a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to development including respecting existing site constraints including utilities situated within sites.” • The draft plan appears to consider that only major developments need meet design guidance. • Reference should be made within this policy of the Natural England Green Infrastructure Planning and Design Guide 2023 which provides evidence based practical guidance on how to plan and design good green infrastructure. • Is it possible to include very small or individual developments in sensitive locations to be referred to the design team? • Is there a reference and an approach to the new NPPF policies, para 139b and para 84e and whether they should trump other local plan policies such as SP5? Whether community support is required? Definition of ‘outstanding’ design? • Recommend requiring a minimum tree canopy cover from development sites, of at least 20% and ideally 30%. 	<p>https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/downloads/file/2061/lincolnshire-development-roads-and-sustainable-drainage-design-approach</p> <p>A Climate Change study is being prepared which will inform relevant policies.</p> <p>The Council has published a tree and woodland strategy which has been developed to protect and enhance the districts tree populations helping to boost biodiversity and climate change. The Design Guide SPD also promotes trees within the public realm. An emerging design code for the district will further explore how trees can be incorporated into developments.</p>
New Policy 5: Householder Development	3	1	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion to strengthen the policy by adding a point in support of tree retention. • Development should aim to identify flood risk mitigation measures in line with those required for new build development of the same type, as far as this is practicable and should be in accordance with national flood risk standing advice if the development falls within Flood Zone 2 or 3. 	<p>Policy EN6 and DE1 considers tree retention and enhancement and the emerging design code will also consider the integration and retention of trees.</p> <p>The Local Plan should be read as a whole. Policy EN5 requires applications demonstrate flood risk management.</p>
SB1: Sustainable Building	12	16	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers must show a low carbon approach. Allowing bund at Stamford North to be demolished is opposite of a low carbon design. • The Government though its written ministerial statement of 13 December 2023 that is does not expect Local Plans to impose energy efficiency standards in excess of current or proposed building regulations. • This policy and the requirements set out should deleted as compliance with building regulations will address its objectives in full. • Support the policy but must ensure it is enforced. • Policy could be strengthened to include new developments having solar panels and heat pumps. • This policy alongside all other policies need to be factored into the Whole Plan Viability Assessment. • Policy would be better worded to refer to compliance with the Future Homes Standard or the relevant standard in place at the time of construction. • Policy SB1 is at risk of becoming redundant in the short term as building regulations will required greater standards than those outlined in the emerging policy. • The Woodland Trust propose policy to be strengthened by adding a new section on Nature Based Solutions. 	<p>The Whole Plan Viability Study which was published alongside the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan takes into account all relevant policies within the emerging Local Plan and the policies will be reviewed accordingly.</p> <p>The policy has been reviewed to reflect the Councils ambition to reach net zero carbon by 2050 and will be further reviewed to take into account the emerging climate change evidence and new NPPF. Incorporating the policy into the new climate change chapter will be considered.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy should only encourage the inclusion of energy efficiency measures and use of renewable energy sources which go beyond Building Regulation requirements. • The Council will also be expected to provide evidence supporting the inclusion of optional water efficiency target of 110 litres per house per day. • Reword to offer clarity on where these are building reg issues. • Not consistent with Climate Change chapter. • NHS Property Services: support policies that promote carbon neutral development, and securing of financial contributions where on-site carbon mitigation requirements cannot be met. • Environment Agency: support the adoption of the Building Regulations optional higher water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day to ensure water efficiency. • In relation to Part 1 it is suggested that the policy should reflect the national position and include the terminology 'proactive approach' rather than to 'strive to be zero carbon'. • It is considered that water efficiency is a matter most appropriately dealt with through Building Regulations. • Support that the final policy, will be informed by a Whole Plan Viability Assessment which will accompany the plan. • Concerns that this policy is broadly similar to the conditions proposed within Chapter 5 which deals with climate change and suggests the policy is incorporated within that chapter. • Support to the principle of a policy which seeks to reduce carbon, there are some practical considerations which should be taking into account. 	
<p>Open Space, Sport and Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Open Space Policy Context • Local Open Space Policy Context • The Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study 	6	9	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SKPR-57 is an accessible, good quality open space which makes a significant quality of life contribution to hundreds of residents of South Kesteven. • The benefits of the green open space now landmarked for housing will have a devastating impact on neuro diverse community. As it will force highly autistic children to leave their "safe space" and will cause extreme anxiety. • Comment requesting a map showing the 2,670ha of identified open spaces would be useful. • Comment asking if there is there an opportunity to include new open spaces? Such as the 150ha of woodland on the Prince William of Gloucester Barracks currently proposed to be built on, as it would make an asset for the town and wellbeing of the residents. • Paragraph 11.10 refers to a "Play Pitch Strategy being prepared to assess indoor play space provision across South Kesteven." Is this reference to the Playing Pitch Strategy currently being prepared by the Council? Reference to the completed Playing Pitch Strategy informing the pre-submission version of the local plan review is welcomed. • Wording omissions in that have been found in Paragraphs 11.22 and 11.23. 	<p>In relation to proposed site allocation Land off Belton Lane (SKPR – 57) it is important to note that the land has not been formally identified as an area of open space. The Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study (2023) conducted an audit of open spaces across SKDC and assigned each open space a proposed typology and quality grade. The Land off Belton Lane (SKPR – 57) was not audited through the report. The current use of the site has been identified by the promoter to be for farming/agricultural purposes, as evidenced within the submitted 'site proforma'.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan does not landmark any areas of identified 'green open space' for proposed development. Areas which have been recognised as 'open space' would have been considered unfavourably through the assessment process when selecting the preferred site allocations. Majority of the greenfield sites considered for allocation within the Draft Local Plan are either vacant or have an agriculture / farming use taking place. Additionally, planning for mental health is of high importance and the NPPF outlines that as a key pillar of social sustainability, policies should support health, social and cultural well-being. Open space and the opportunities for sport and physical activity are important for the health and well-being of communities. This is why draft policy OS1 requires developments to provide open space as an integral part of its development layout and seeks to protect already identified open spaces to the fullest extent possible.</p> <p>Comment noted in relation to having a map showing the 2,670ha of identified open space. SKDC will assess the practicalities of producing a map as part of the pre-submission version of the Plan.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Planning Policy Framework states policies should be based... “on up-to-date assessments of the need for open space”. There is no trace of this assessment being carried out that can be found. Residents of Grantham have not had a Parish Council (Town Council) for decades and so the opportunity to protect local areas via a Neighbourhood Plan has been denied. This inability to create a Neighbourhood Plan and protect Grantham’s open spaces leaves SKDC open to the question of fairness and equality. Leave the countryside alone to have much more open space 	<p>The option to identify new open spaces is a possibility although Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans (which includes the designation of Local Green Spaces). SKDC commissioned the ‘The Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study’ (2023) to conduct and audit into the quality and quantity of open spaces across the district and has agreed with the recommendations and findings of the report in terms of current provision. In relation to the Prince William of Gloucester Barracks (SKPR-65) proposed policy GR3-H4 of the draft Plan Review contains a development criterion which requires the “feasible retention of as much existing woodland as possible including recently planted areas, as well as the provision of new areas of woodland and green access routes.”</p> <p>The Playing Pitch Strategy is being produced by consultants on behalf of SKDC and will provide a clear, strategic framework which ensures that the provision of outdoor sports facilities and ancillary facilities meet the local needs of existing and future residents across the district.</p>
OS1: Open Space and Recreation	10	6	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment from Sport England that the Playing Pitch Calculator should be included in the policy wording for both on-site and off-site provision. Policy OS1 is not compliant with the wording in paragraph 103 of the NPPF as it would not adequately protect playing fields from being built on. Suggest that the phrase ‘playing fields’ should be used instead of ‘sports pitches’. Additional comment that the list should also include ‘existing sports and recreational land’ Comment that improved clarity and quantification of the types of open space will help to ensure a sufficient variety of open spaces are included in all development plans. Suggested clarification of the text to demonstrate that standards to increase open space provision would be based on deficiency, the proper planning of an area, or other site-specific circumstances. Policy would benefit from further explanation of how it is to be applied in practice. For example, the policy sets a standard of 1.6ha of outdoor sports facilities within 1200m of a development. Where a site is not within 1200m it is unclear what scale of development would be expected to generate on-site provision rather than a financial contribution and how that contribution would be calculated. Comment querying if the Whole Plan Viability Assessment (2024) will allow for the costs of creating the open space and recreation facilities as part of its normal analysis. Natural England welcomes the link with the green infrastructure policy (EN3). Suggestion to refer to Natural England’s Accessible Greenspace Standards to determine open space needs based on size, proximity capacity and quality. Comment that within paragraph 11.30, first sentence, the word “on” is missing from “type of open space, based population figures...” Comment that within policy OS1, first sentence, there is a “*” after “...adequate open space...”. Query if the symbol is an error or should there be a footnote. 	<p>Comment noted in reference to the Sport England ‘Play Pitch Calculator’ being included within policy OS1. SKDC will explore options for wording to be included within either the policy or supporting text. This is to ensure any additional demand for different pitch sport types generated by housing developments are taken into consideration.</p> <p>Draft Policy OS1 seeks to secure the protection and enhancement of all open space types throughout the district, unless there is a justifiable reason otherwise. Therefore, consideration will be given to ensure that ‘playing fields’ and ‘existing sports and recreational land’ are referenced within the policy.</p> <p>Comment in support of improved clarity and quantification of the types of open space have been noted.</p> <p>Comment suggesting text clarification around the increase in open space standards has been noted. SKDC believes that the policy adequacy covers the reasoning behind the changes in open space standards as set out within the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (2023). In addition, the policy requires the proper planning of an area by ensuring that developments specifically address the open space deficiencies within each defined ‘sub area’ across SKDC. Any site-specific circumstances would be assessed on a case-by-case bases at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Comment in relation to providing additional explanation of how the policy is to be applied has been noted. As set out in draft policy OS1, open space provision to meet the standards is required of developments capable of delivering 10 or more units. SKDC will explore options for the inclusion of additional policy text around how the type of on-site provision will depend on the nature and location of the proposal and the quantity and type of open space needed. The policy wording will also be strengthened to acknowledge that offsite provision will only be applicable in ‘certain circumstances’ and will be secured through section 106 contributions.</p> <p>Comment querying if the Whole Plan Viability Study (2024) has allowed for the costs of creating open space and recreation facilities as part of its normal analysis has been noted. As set out in the Whole Plan Viability Study (2024), the open space, sport and recreation standards have been considered within paragraphs 8.60-8.62 and reflected in the subsequent viability modelling.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome the Councils view that accessible, good quality open spaces can make a significant quality of life contribution to the residents of South Kesteven. The proposed site to the West of Grantham (SKPR-101) has the capacity to deliver significant open space. This would allow for exercise and recreation within the site and would assist with increasing and enhancing the provision for the wider District. • Comment that the commitments to provide these essential elements (open space) are promises are not kept. How will SKDC ensure compliance. • Development in South West Bourne should be allocated for open space in order to deliver a range of different types of open space and recreation areas. • Justification needs to be provided for the increase in requirements for open space provision and the increases need to be factored into the Whole Plan Viability. • Comment requesting the adoption of Natural England's Accessible Natural Green Space Standard, and the Woodland Trust's Woodland Access Standard, as part of the policy to determine open space needs based on size, proximity capacity and quality. • Suggestion that the policy it should link with the green infrastructure policy (EN3). 	<p>Comment welcoming the link with green infrastructure policy E3 is noted. As set out in the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (2023), Natural England's green infrastructure Standards for England (2023) have already been considered when setting out the recommended provision and accessibility of open spaces within Policy OS1.</p> <p>Comments relating to wording omissions in paragraph 11.30 and policy OS1 have been noted and will be corrected.</p> <p>Comment noted in relation to welcoming the quality-of-life contribution that open spaces can provide to the residents of SKDC. In connection with the submitted site at West Grantham (SKPR-101) it is acknowledged the site would provide an overall net gain in open space provision. However, as set out in the draft Site Assessment Report (2024) the site is of a significant size to generate multiple constraints and therefore other sites have been preferred as proposed allocations through this review of the Plan.</p> <p>Comment noted around ensuring compliance. Open space is a fundamental requirement, and therefore SKDC expects all major developments to provide opportunities for open space provision in line with draft policy OS1. Compliance for open space is secured via Section 106 funding agreements, which are legally binding in terms of the requirement to provide new open space or upgrading established open space.</p> <p>Comment noted in relation to allocating the development in South West Bourne for open space. The development in question will already have open space approved through via planning permission, meaning the implementation and management of open spaces have been secured via planning conditions and Section 106 funding agreements. Therefore, there is no requirement for them to be allocated.</p> <p>Comment noted requiring justification for the increases in open space provision. As set out in the Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study (2024) the justification for increases in provision (for Parks and Gardens, Natural and Semi Natural open space and Outdoor Sports) have all been based of a combination of Fields in Trust (FiT) national benchmark standards, consultation feedback and the required demand within the identified sub areas. The open space standards proposed by the Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study (2024) for developments has been factored into the Viability Study (2024) modelling, as set out in paragraphs 8.60 to 8.62.</p> <p>Comment noted in relation to the request for the incorporation of Natural England's Accessible Natural Green Space Standard, and the Woodland Trust's Woodland Access Standard. Although it should be noted that both documents were taken into consideration as part of the Open Space, Sports and Recreation Study (2024) and have been factored into the proposed open space standards that can be found in draft policy OS1.</p> <p>Comment suggesting a link with green infrastructure policy E3 is noted. SKDC are aware of the advantages that open space can provide in terms of enhancing and connecting green infrastructure. Although, it should be noted that developments need to comply with the development plan 'as a whole', meaning that the principles set out in draft policy E3 should already be read in conjunction with draft policy OS1.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
Chapter 12 – South Kesteven Communities • South Kesteven's Four Market Towns	4	5	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council is encouraged to ensure that on-site delivery of BNG has been properly factored into their housing capacity calculations. Indicative dwelling potential of sites should relate to C3 housing development only. Concern regarding countryside development. 	<p>The indicative dwelling numbers included within each allocation's policy refers to C3 dwellings only.</p> <p>A robust site assessment process has been undertaken to allocate the most sustainable sites development on both brown and greenfield sites. For speculative development, the Local Plan proposes a number of policies which steer development to the most sustainable development within and on the edge of settlement. Development within the open countryside is restricted to a small number of uses as set out in policy SP5.</p>
Grantham	1	3	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Query received regarding empty shops and a diminished market Concern about building new homes within Grantham with the suggestion that brownfield, regeneration sites and peripheral areas to be prioritised. The proposed density and targeting growth in and around Grantham is supported. Further employment growth is recommended to continue to support Grantham's economy and in turn the wider district's economy. Concern regarding the development of the countryside which is used for recreation and biodiversity. 	<p>The Local Plan seeks to support and facilitate Grantham's ambition to be a leading sub-regional centre with the inclusion of a town centre policy for Grantham (GR4) which prioritises the use of sites within the town centre for town centre uses, as opposed to edge of town or out of centre locations. The generation of an evening economy within the town centre is also encouraged and supported. The Local Plan has been appraised by a Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>A robust site assessment process has been undertaken to allocate the most sustainable sites for development on both brownfield sites (where available) and greenfield sites. As per the settlement hierarchy, sites within and on the edge of Grantham are preferred as Grantham is the district's largest town with a range of infrastructure, services and facilities with a role as sub-regional centre.</p> <p>The Local Plan steers development towards the most sustainable locations within and on the edge of settlements. The Local Plan includes policies which seek to protect and enhance formal open space with the requirement for development to provide new open space for recreation.</p> <p>The Local Plan includes policies which seek to protect the natural environment including biodiversity with the requirement for qualifying development to provide a biodiversity net gain of at least 10%.</p>
GR1: Protecting and Enhancing the Setting of Belton House and Park	7	2	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site allocation SKPR-57 will impact on Belton House. Retention of this policy is supported Supporting text is welcomed. Omits reference to Statement of Common Ground 2012 agreed between SKDC, Historic England and National Trust on interpretation of Setting Study. 	<p>The policy does not deal with specific site allocations. Concerns regarding specific sites will be considered as part of the allocations.</p> <p>The Statement of Common Ground 2012 agreed between SKDC, Historic England and National Trust is not referenced due to the changing of attitudes towards setting that has been seen in recent planning decisions. Additionally, since the agreement was signed, Historic England has published The Setting of Heritage Assets (2015 revised in 2017) which outlines their guidance on setting, and this can be applied nationally and not just to the specific location of Belton House.</p>
Supporting Grantham's Economy	3	2	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for employment growth, noting unemployment rates within the town and district wide and the role of Grantham as a sub-regional centre. 	Support welcomed.

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern of the development of 'tin sheds' 	<p>The Local Plan, supported by a Design Guide, includes a policy which expects high quality design of development. The Council is currently preparing a Design Code which will mandate high quality design of all development within the district.</p>
GR2: Sustainable Transport in Grantham	2	4	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More public buses should be provided Current road infrastructure, including pedestrian, into the town centre is inadequate. Concern that the Grantham Transport Strategy is not a robust document Clarity required regarding proposed allocation GR3-H4 (currently an allocation in the adopted Local Plan) 	<p>Policy GR2 requires all major development within the defined Grantham Transport Strategy area and other qualifying development proposals to make appropriate contribution to necessary transport improvements and the delivery of the objectives of the strategy.</p> <p>The scope and production of the Grantham Transport Strategy is outside the scope of the Local Plan, however it does inform the Local Plan. Policy GR2 to be reviewed in light of comments.</p>
GR3: Grantham Allocations	0	9	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Job opportunities should be considered in conjunction with housing development Proposed land allocations incorrectly referenced as Grantham when located within Barrowby Parish Concern that there is insufficient infrastructure to support further growth. 	<p>The Local Plan allocates land for housing and employment to meet identified needs as evidenced by the Local Housing Market Assessment and Employment Land Study. Site allocations are referenced as per the adjacent settlement, not the parish. Local Plan and Site Assessment Report to be reviewed to check parish references.</p> <p>The Local Plan is accompanied and informed by an Infrastructure Delivery Report which considers the infrastructure required to support proposed development including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is prepared in consultation with infrastructure providers including highways, education, health and utilities.</p>
SKPR-278 (GR3-H1): Spitalgate Heath - Garden Village (Mixed Use Allocation)	6	11	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further works need to be undertaken to understand the suitability of employment provision. Unclear as to how complementary the employment land will be to achieving Garden Village principles. Should focus on benefiting residential benefits and remove pressure on allocating additional sites within the Town. Delivery timescales are considered to be unrealistic Severe impacts of the road infrastructure from Spitalgate Heath and the Barracks Sport facilities on site would either need to be retained or replaced Criteria (i) is welcomed Development allocations has the potential to adversely impact Local Wildlife Sites. This site is adjacent to Whalebone Lane Verges LWS and Old Somerby Road Verge LWS, any development must be designed in a way which avoids adverse impacts on these sites. Points j, k, l and r welcomed. Emphasis the importance of taking the opportunity on this sites to create a connected green infrastructure network using the mapping. Advise the principles and standards in Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework should be incorporated within the design. No mention of River Witham, flooding impacts. Houses will be built on springs with the river at the foot. Suggested changes to the wording of the policy Clarify requirements for delivery of new education infrastructure Point a is welcomed. The allocation is likely to put additional pressure on the A1/A52 junction. Whilst not suggested to explicitly reference 	<p>The employment uses on the site are part of a comprehensive approach to the site as a Garden Village. The site has been included in the assessment of employment land, as the western part of the site has been proposed for employment land since at least 2014 (through planning application reference S14/2169) albeit that the current local plan does not include employment uses in the allocation of this site. The area proposed for the employment allocation is well-located to existing employment land and is connected well to the town centre, the proposed residential development and the A1 trunk road. The completion of the Grantham Southern Relief Road (GSRR) is anticipated to be timely to provide east-west links for the proposed employment uses.</p> <p>The housing trajectory for this site has been reviewed and is considered to be robust.</p> <p>The impacts of the proposed allocation on the existing infrastructure are an important consideration which have been taken into account. Part (e) of the proposed policy addresses the need for safe and convenient access and the assessment of this through a planning application will include the impact on existing infrastructure and any necessary mitigation required.</p> <p>This site does not contain existing sports facilities but does lie adjacent to a rugby club. Part (r) of the proposed policy requires the future development of the site to include opportunities for recreation, including open space and sporting facilities, in accordance with policy OS1. This will ensure sporting facilities are provided in proportion to the scale of the development proposed.</p> <p>Parts (j), (k) and (l) of the proposed policy seek to enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>The requirement for all development proposals to demonstrate how regard has been had to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework is established in proposed policy EN3.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<p>improvements to this junction, wording amendment is suggested to the policy regarding transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>The importance of the River Witham and the need to consider flood risk and flooding are implicit within the proposed policy, including in parts (g), (h), (j), (k) and (r), taken together with the suite of policies in the local plan.</p> <p>It is not necessary, nor appropriate, to list the Garden Village principles in the policy. Reference to current Garden Village principles is clear and acceptable.</p> <p>The facilitation of the provision of linkages to the Prince William of Gloucester Barracks (PWBG) site is an important part of the overall planning for this eastern part of Grantham, however, it is not anticipated that the developer for the Spitalgate Heath site would provide an actual link to the PWBG site, just that the potential for a link is designed into the scheme.</p> <p>It is necessary for a development of the scale proposed to be allocated to meet a broad range of accommodation needs. Part (p) of the proposed policy is intended to do this and allows flexibility insofar as it states “an appropriate mix” which will be assessed depending on the housing needs situation at the time the application is determined.</p> <p>The wording in part (q) of the proposed policy is appropriate to secure education provision. Existing capacity and pupil place requirements change year by year, so it is not appropriate to include specific details in the proposed policy. All specific details will be assessed and discussed on a case by case basis and at the time of the determination of any planning application.</p>
SKPR-279 (GR3-H2): Rectory Farm (Phase 2)	6	5	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the site allocation and associated SPD expressed. • Local Plan policy should include stronger wording. • Policy should reference that parts of the site now have planning permission and part under construction. • Sport England: There is a need for the development principles to include provision of a new sports facility and playing fields and/or contributions towards off-site provision. • Natural England: We would reiterate the importance of establishing a connected network of high quality green infrastructure at the earliest stage of the planning process. • Upper Witham Drainage Board: Provision should be put in place to ensure the watercourse is protected and maintained. • National Highways: policy welcomed but would also welcome the inclusion of a point setting out the need for a masterplan which is based on an assessment of the transport impacts of the full allocation and has identified the infrastructure needed to deliver this allocation, the timings for this requirement, and how the necessary infrastructure will be secured delivered. • Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: Development of, or exceeding, 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation, including the potential for an environment attractive to hazardous bird species to be formed temporarily 	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>The Local Plan's policy wording will be reviewed to ensure it is robust and sound.</p> <p>Associated text to policy to be reviewed to include reference to the development commencing.</p> <p>The Local Plan should be read as a whole which includes policies regarding sports provision, drainage and water resources and green infrastructure which all development will be subject to.</p> <p>Further evidence is being undertaken regarding the strategic road network.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

SKPR-280 (GR3-H3): Rectory Farm (Phase 3)	5	5	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Plan policy should include stronger wording. Proposed land allocations incorrectly referenced as Grantham when located within Barrowby Parish Sport England: There is a need for the development principles to include provision of a new sports facility and playing fields and/or contributions towards off-site provision. Historic England welcomes criterion h) Natural England: We would reiterate the importance of establishing a connected network of high quality green infrastructure at the earliest stage of the planning process. National Highways: The Strategic Transport Assessment supporting the Plan should identify the cumulative traffic impacts of growth on the A1/A52 junction in particular. Consideration may need to be given to how this allocation might affect the longer-term ability to deliver future highways improvements given that the site abuts the junction. In addition, as the site sits adjacent to the A1 trunk road, proposals will be considered in relation to any potential boundary impacts for instance drainage and geotechnical matters. Planning applications would also need to be accompanied by assessments which consider noise and air quality impacts from the adjacent A1 trunk road. National Highways comments for Rectory Farm Phase 3 are the broadly the same as those for Rectory Farm Phase 2 although note that the need for a Masterplan has already been identified under policy point a. Also welcome policy point m which sets out that the impacts on the SRN must be identified and mitigated. It is also noted that this allocation shares a common boundary with the SRN and whilst have no objections in principle to this allocation, planning applications will need to demonstrate their impact on National Highways network and assets, and where necessary, provide appropriate mitigation. Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: Development of, or exceeding, 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation, including the potential for an environment attractive to hazardous bird species to be formed temporarily 	<p>Support for policy criteria welcomed. The Local Plan's policy wording will be reviewed to ensure it is robust and sound.</p> <p>Local Plan and Site Assessment Report to be reviewed to check parish references.</p> <p>The Local Plan should be read as a whole which includes policies regarding sports provision, drainage and water resources and green infrastructure which all development will be subject to.</p> <p>Further evidence is being undertaken regarding the strategic road network.</p>
SKPR-65 (GR3-H4): Prince William of Gloucester Barracks (Mixed Use Allocation)	5	13	18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Plan policy should include stronger wording. Concern regarding removal of trees and the preservation of woodland. Concern of impact of the development on the existing infrastructure including highways. Woodland Trust: The Woodland Trust does not object to the principle of development on this site. They object to the scale of development envisaged in this policy, of up to 3,500 – 4,000 dwellings requiring loss of 45.5ha of woodland on site, some 60% of the total woodland and 80-100% of the new planting undertaken by the Trust. The policy be amended to require a revised master plan with stronger focus on tree retention, a site-wide canopy 	<p>Support for policy criteria is welcomed. The Local Plan's policy wording will be reviewed to ensure it is robust and sound.</p> <p>The policy criteria requires a site wide comprehensive masterplan which the council will be consulted on prior to the submission of a planning application.</p> <p>The policy also recognises the potential loss of trees and consequently requires the provision of new blue green infrastructure and the feasible retention of as much existing woodland as possible, as well as the provision of new areas of woodland and green access routes.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

			<p>cover target of 30% and compensation for any woodland loss through woodland creation to buffer and link nearby fragments of ancient woodland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Trust: The National Trust is currently neither for nor against these specific proposed allocations in principle. In the supporting evidence criteria (i-vi) request that wording is included, perhaps in relation to criteria iv, to the effect of: 'Response to the locality's historic environment and external heritage assets (including Belton House and Registered Park and Garden), incorporating an integrated assessment of their significance and related setting.' Also, words the effect of: • 'The development proposal must take into account the Belton House Park Setting Study in Policy GR1'. This aligns with proposed allocation SKPR-57 and allows for full consideration of Belton's setting at the masterplanning stage. Would also welcome reference to the avoidance of tall buildings, appropriate massing, and the use of landscape buffers (including to the north of the site)/green infrastructure to help break up potential development bulk. • Sports England: This site contains sports facilities which would either need to be retained or replaced as part of any redevelopment proposal. The retention of the sports facility may impact on the number of dwellings that could be constructed at the site. There is a need for the development to provide new sports facilities and playing fields within the site which should be informed by the production of a Sports Feasibility Report. This report will establish the level and nature of on-site and offsite provision required. This report would be informed by the Playing Pitch Strategy. • As South Kesteven District will soon have an up-to-date Playing Pitch Strategy the Council can also use Sport England's Playing Pitch Calculator and Sport England's Sports Facility Calculator to calculate off-site contributions into sport and recreation because of the additional population generated by this proposed site. • Historic England: welcomes criteria iv. • Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust: Proposed Mixed-Use Allocation SKPR65 is adjacent to Cold Harbour Road Verges, Cold Harbour Road Verges East and Blue Harbour Road Verges. The site is also near to Ropsley Rise Wood, Old Somerby to Ropsley Rise Wood Road Verges. We wish to see any associated applications provide measures to reduce any potential impacts on this sensitive site, as well as opportunities to integrate them into the recovery of the local environment by securing management for the LWSsif presently not under positive management and through building nature corridors within development between such sites - SKPR-278, SKPR-65, and SKPR-262. • Natural England: We would reiterate the importance of establishing a connected network of high quality green infrastructure at the earliest stage of the planning process. 	<p>Policy will be amended to include reference to the Belton Park Setting Study and the requirement for landscape buffers to the north.</p> <p>The Local Plan should be read as a whole which includes policies regarding Belton House Park Setting Study, sports provision, drainage and water resources and green infrastructure which all development will be subject to.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DIO: The DIO fully supports the continued identification of its land interests at Prince William of Gloucester Barracks, Grantham, as a suitable site for strategic development. The proposed amendment to the Policy to incorporate the employment generating uses and reflect the mixed-use nature of the site is supported. Requested policy amendments. 	
SKPR-117 – Land to the East of Sheepwash Lane	2	6	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development is located in Barrowby Parish not Grantham. Support the allocation and draft criteria in the policy. Considered that the site could deliver in excess of the 72 dwellings proposed and could achieve at least 87 dwellings. Natural England: We would reiterate the importance of establishing a connected network of high quality green infrastructure at the earliest stage of the planning process. Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: Development of, or exceeding, 45.7m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement, Development that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation, including the potential for an environment attractive to hazardous bird species to be formed temporarily 	<p>Site allocations are not necessarily categorised depending on the parish, but the settlement to which they abut. Supporting evidence to be amended to ensure factual accuracy.</p> <p>The site capacity quoted within the allocation policy is an indicative figure based on the site area and identified constraints. The actual quantum of development would be considered through the planning application process.</p> <p>Comments from Natural England have been noted. Proposed Policy EN3 sets out the importance of developments establishing, integrating and connecting green infrastructure.</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any of the proposed residential development on the site will exceed the 45.7m. Although as noted, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p>
SKPR-268 – Land at Train Station – Mixed Use Allocation	1	7	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More information is needed to make a decision such as loss of car parking at the station and demolition of buildings Only acceptable is a true brownfield site It is a railway station not a train station National Trust: The National Trust is currently neither for nor against these specific proposed allocations in principle. The requirement for a comprehensive masterplan and consideration of heritage assets is noted. Given the possibility for buildings of height, including a multistorey car park, further guidance around height parameters and location within the site could be included to help mitigate harm to proximate heritage assets. The position of Grantham House is also considered here. Historic England: More detail is required in criteria C of the policy. There are Grade II Listed buildings within the northern section of the site together with evidence of previous archaeological finds – a heritage assessment, including archaeological assessment will be required. 507012 – the railway station on the London and York Railway opened in 1850. Natural England: We would reiterate the importance of establishing a connected network of high quality green infrastructure at the earliest stage of the planning process. No up to date rationale for the Mixed-Use allocation, aware of an old feasibility study and consider it would be helpful to know if this has been updated and publicly shared. See investment better directed to enhance footpath and cycle routes towards the High Street and Westgate. 	<p>Historic England and the National Trust's comments have been noted. The NPPF and Draft Plan review ensures there is emphasis on understanding and conserving the significance of heritage assets as part of sustainable development. This makes the need to consider historic environment constraints imperative, therefore a heritage statement and/or archaeological evaluation will be required on identified sites as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that the site is currently in use, in part, and will liaise with the landowners and promoters to ensure the delivery of the site.</p> <p>The policy includes reference to the site including a Green Infrastructure Area. Proposals on the site are required to incorporate the relevant principles for development within Green Infrastructure Areas set out in the Policy EN3 Green Infrastructure.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: Development of, or exceeding, 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement, Development that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation, including the potential for an environment attractive to hazardous bird species to be formed temporarily. 	
SKPR-57 – Land off Belton Lane	2	158	160	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petition received of 1,113 signatures in objecting to the proposed allocation, comments also reference being in support of the submission by Gonerby Hill Foot Community Group. Concerns regarding infrastructure capacity and proposed level of development. Insufficient capacity at schools and medical services. Existing road network in unsuitable to accommodate additional vehicles. Concerns expressed regarding existing Belton Lane traffic congestion and safety. Development encroaches into the Parish of Great Gonerby, concerns about merging with Grantham and loss of village identity. Development would have negative impact on heritage sites of Belton House and Park, views of St Wulframs church, The Bellmount Tower. Should only build on brownfield sites. Grantham Hospital is not suitable for increased housing and the numbers of people this development would bring Concern regarding Proximity to Air Quality Management area Land provides green space and nature for the community to benefit and enjoy. Loss of access to green space for local people. 60m contour – site goes above the 60m contour, and the net developable area would unlikely accommodate indicative houses proposed. Development would impact on landscape character and topography. Concerns on impacts to wildlife and habitats. Flooding risk on site and surrounding roads. Development goes against protection of food security Previous objection on site was upheld. National Trust: Likely to relate to the setting of Belton. With potential views potential views from the roof of Belton House, Bellmount Tower’s viewing platform and key approaches. Criteria (h) is welcomed in principle. However, slightly unclear, perhaps not accounting fully for return views, suggested alternative wording. Requests refence in policy wording to a two storey building height limit, appropriate massing, recessive materials and the use of landscape buffers (including to the east of the site)/green infrastructure. Historic England: Criteria h is welcomed. It may be helpful to request a detailed heritage assessment also considering 	<p>Comments received, including the 1,113 signature petition have been noted.</p> <p>The Council will continue to liaise with Lincolnshire County Council highways team to determine deliverability of the site given the highways constraints at the Belton Lane/Newark Hill junction.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements arising from new development will be addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and relevant policies within the Plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is prepared in consultation with infrastructure providers including highways, education, health and utilities.</p> <p>Development on brownfield land is a priority set out within the Local Plan review. Although there is not enough brownfield land to meet the required need in terms of housing provision across the plan period. Therefore, suitable greenfield sites have been considered</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is in preparation which will inform site allocations, future planning applications and relevant Local Plan policy. The study will be published, once finalised.</p> <p>The sensitive nature of the historic environment is acknowledged and policy criteria to be reviewed accordingly, taking into account National Trust and Historic England’s advice, and other comments.</p> <p>The policy criteria requires masterplanning of the site to have regard for the landscape and topography. The policy criteria to be reviewed regarding the 60m contour requirement.</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. Statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<p>cumulative impact. Requires archaeological assessment AMIE 891796 Romano-British, Early Medieval and Medieval pottery and tile.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural England: We would reiterate the importance of establishing a connected network of high quality green infrastructure at the earliest stage of the planning process. Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: Development of, or exceeding, 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation, including the potential for an environment attractive to hazardous bird species to be formed temporarily. 	
SKPR-62 – The Grantham Church High School Playing Fields, Queensway	3	3	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development would suit affordable housing Agree the land should be utilised for housing. Natural England: We would reiterate the importance of establishing a connected network of high quality green infrastructure at the earliest stage of the planning process. Suggested amendments to the policy criteria. Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: Development of, or exceeding, 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation, including the potential for an environment attractive to hazardous bird species to be formed temporarily 	<p>Comments of support welcomed. The Local Plan's policy wording will be reviewed to ensure it is robust and sound.</p> <p>Comments from Natural England have been noted. Proposed Policy EN3 sets out the importance of developments establishing, integrating and connecting green infrastructure.</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. Statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p>
GR4: Grantham Town Centre Policy	4	2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern over councils influence over who owns and rents out the businesses. first sentence under Town Centre Boundary "...proposals for E-uses classes (space needed) and appropriate residential development on upper floors (wondered if 'will be supported' is missing from here), provided that the use..." 	Comments noted, suggested corrections will be reviewed.
Stamford	0	9	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 12.28 is incorrect in terms of the facilities and services that are currently within Stamford. Additional comment that there are not several doctors and dentists, only one bank, not many national retailers and no 6th form education provision. Land offered for commercial/ industrial use in Stamford should be protected and therefore Exeter Fields (SKPR -266) should not be changed from commercial to housing for 300 homes. Stamford has already exceeded the limits of sustainable development as traffic (in town and on the A1) and health services cannot cope with the current population. No consideration has been given to areas rich in wildlife and that farmland is being built on instead of providing food security. Additionally, housing designs do not appear to address the need for sustainable energy targets. 	<p>SKDC acknowledges the comments in relation to paragraph 12.28. The paragraph is intended to provide a brief overview of the facilities and services provided within the town and will be reviewed prior to the pre submission publication of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Comment in relation to commercial / industrial land being protected has been noted. Policy E4 of the Draft Plan review seeks to ensure that employment generating sites across the district are protected, which includes 17.4ha of employment generating land within Stamford. In relation to Exeter fields (SKPR-266) specifically, the site was reviewed by the Employment Land Study (2024) and was found to be constrained by surrounding residential development. SKDC have therefore decided that intense employment generating uses on the site would not be wholly appropriate to the surrounding context. Therefore, in line with paragraph 120 of the NPPF (December 2023), which requires planning policies to reflect changes in the demand for land, SKDC have proposed the reallocation of this site to residential through the Draft Plan review. SKDC are currently assessing options to bring forward less intense employment</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment requesting that developers and councils involved in aspects of original proposals work to ensure the integrity of agreed allocations. As Stamford cannot function as a giant housing estate for Rutland whilst its own infrastructure is wilfully ignored. • Developments in Stamford should have a clause in the final plans that all the infrastructure is to be put in place before any homes are built. 	<p>generating uses (e.g. E(g)) alongside proposed residential on Exeter fields (SKPR-266) to establish additional employment uses into Stamford.</p> <p>No evidence has been brought before SKDC to evidence that the transport network or health service will be unable to cope with future population increases. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan has identified potential shortfalls in provision and developments will be required to provide appropriate infrastructure on-site or through expansion to existing facilities to mitigate the impacts.</p> <p>Proposed developments have been assessed to ensure that they have minimal impacts on Local, National and European designated sites. Additionally, SKDCs New Policy 2 of the Draft Plan review seeks to protect the 'best and most versatile' agricultural land, to ensure continued food security throughout the district. Housing designs and sustainable building targets have been addressed through Draft Plan review policies DE1 and SB1.</p> <p>Allocations are expected to be developed as per the criterion set out within the Local Plan review and in line with subsequent approved planning conditions. Furthermore, infrastructure contributions from the Rutland section of the Stamford North (SKPR-281) allocation will directly be used to address any unavoidable impacts caused by the development.</p> <p>The Local Plan review sets out the required suitable development principles which seeks to achieve the growth needed for the district, by delivering identified housing need in a sustainable manner alongside the necessary infrastructure provision.</p>
SKPR-281 (STM1-H1): Stamford North	6	48	54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to the increase in site capacity to 1350. • The acoustic impacts of the removal of the bund have not been considered. • The east-west link road should be at the northern end of the site. • There is insufficient infrastructure to accommodate the development. • The development would result in a loss in biodiversity • The development would result in the loss of an area of existing parking at Borderville Sports Centre • Support the need for the development to be undertaken in a comprehensive manner, and therefore, supports the requirement for a high level masterplan and detailed development brief for the entire site (including Quarry Farm). • Requests that the policy also includes a preference for the site to be considered through a single planning application. • The development would have significant highways impacts. • The development would have an unacceptable impact on foul water drainage. • Development should only take place on brownfield land. • Objection to the loss of agricultural land. • The proposed development would be completely out of scale with the character of the town. • The allocation requires the development of Quarry Farm, which is a candidate Local Wildlife Site. 	<p>The site capacity quoted within the allocation policy is an indicative figure based on the site area and identified constraints. The actual quantum of development would be considered through a planning application.</p> <p>The LP site allocation boundary does not include the acoustic bund to the south of Borderville Sports Centre., or the site of the sports pitches and / or parking for the Sports Centre. Any removal of the bund would be subject to consideration through a planning application.</p> <p>The position of the link road will be subject to consideration through the site-wide masterplan, which will balance all material planning considerations.</p> <p>The development will be required to provide appropriate infrastructure on-site or through expansion to existing facilities to mitigate the impacts of the development. Existing deficiencies in infrastructure are not a material consideration. The allocation policy requires the development to provide a biodiversity net gain. This will be subject to assessment through a detailed planning application.</p> <p>Whilst a single planning application would be encouraged, the key consideration is to ensure that there is co-ordination across the development parcels; this will be achieved through the policy requirement for a site-wide masterplan. National Highways and Lincolnshire County Council (as Local Highways Authority) have been consulted on the draft plan, and have accepted that, in principle, the site is capable of accommodating the development. The impact of the development on foul water drainage, and any mitigation required, would be subject to detailed assessment through a formal planning application. No objections to the allocation have been received from statutory undertakers.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The retention of the sports facility may impact on the number of dwellings that could be constructed on the site. • There is also a need for the development to provide new sports facilities and playing fields within the site, which should be reflective of the Playing Pitch Strategy. • The allocation should be revised to include the land around and to the south of Borderville Sports Centre, which would be consistent with the current outline planning application. • The increased capacity of the allocation means that some of these dwellings are likely to be located within Flood Zone 2. Further evidence required to demonstrate that properties would be sequentially located and that climate change allowances will be considered for any development on the allocation. • There is no evidence of local need for additional development in Stamford. • Objection to the long-term construction impacts. • The allocation policy should clarify the requirement for the delivery of new education infrastructure, including when it should be delivered to support housing growth, the minimum site area required, any preferred site characteristics and any requirements for safeguarding additional land. • Request revision from “Highways England” to “National Highways” 	<p>There is insufficient availability of brownfield land within Stamford to meet the needs for future growth. The allocation has been informed by the evidence provided within the Stamford Capacity and Limits to Growth Study.</p> <p>Quarry Farm is located within Rutland County Council’s administrative area, and therefore, SKDC cannot control any decisions on the allocation and / or approval of development on Quarry Farm. However, under the duty to co-operate, both LPAs have been working collaboratively to identify a comprehensive approach to development on the edge of Stamford.</p> <p>The requirement to provide new sports provision to meet the needs of the development would be covered through other policies within the Local Plan.</p> <p>The site allocation cannot pre-determine the outcome of the current application. The inclusion of the land around Borderville Sports Centre would require evidence that the development would meet one of Sport England’s exceptions, and this evidence has not been obtained.</p> <p>Criterion to be added to policy requiring a Flood Risk Assessment to be submitted, and where necessary, sequential approach to layout.</p> <p>The LP housing requirement has been based on an objectively assessed need for the District. The spatial strategy seeks to achieve the necessary growth to deliver the identified housing need in a sustainable manner. Stamford is identified as one of four market towns in the District, which are to be the focus for growth.</p> <p>Construction impacts can be appropriately mitigated through a CMP; but are deemed to be short-term in the context of planning.</p> <p>Further details on the education criteria cannot be provided within the policy, as it is not possible to give certainty on the education requirements at this stage. There are a large number of variables which impact the timing of any education requirements, and this would be subject to consideration at the point of a planning application being determined.</p> <p>Revision to policy to update name of National Highways.</p>
SKPR-282 (STM1- H2): Stamford East	2	8	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site has flood risk potential and concern over excess traffic along Ryhall Rd with the Stamford North development as current congestion levels are high. • Site should only be acceptable if it is brownfield. • Natural England comment that for proposed residential allocations within Stamford it should be important to establish a connected network of high-quality green infrastructure. Also advise that residential developments surrounding Stamford may require an assessment of recreational pressure if it falls within the Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) for Cambridgeshire SSSIs. • Comment objecting to the loss of employment land to residential land at SKPR-282 (Stamford East) which is exacerbating the lack of alternative options to both existing businesses and future occupiers in the market. Objections to 	<p>Comments regarding flood risk and congestion at Stamford East (SKPR-282) have been noted. No cumulative congestion concerns have been raised by Lincolnshire County Council as the lead transport authority and the site will be expected to maximise sustainable transport options and mitigate travel as set out in draft policy ID2. Assessment work undertaken on the site has identified minimal flood risk at the lower level in the northeastern corner alongside the River Gwash, which will mean a flood risk assessment will be required under draft policy EN5.</p> <p>The site at Stamford East (SKPR-282) is made up of the former Mirlees Blackstones engineering works and vacant industrial buildings. Therefore, the site meets the definition of brownfield as set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy EN3 sets out the importance of developments establishing, integrating and connecting green infrastructure, which is further reinforced by Criteria I) of the site-</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<p>LPA Ref: S22/1591 on the basis of poor pedestrian connectivity, design and the dominance of the car.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team comment that development exceeding, 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement, for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation. Policy criterion should be amended to remove reference to the requirement of a comprehensive masterplan as this is no longer applicable or justifiable following the grant of planning permission ref: S22/2109 	<p>specific policy. The assessment of recreational pressure due to Impact Risk Zones (IRZ) would be determined through the planning application process.</p> <p>There is presently no active or protected employment uses on the site under draft Policy EN4, meaning there is no overall loss of employment within the area. Matters relating specifically to application S22/1591 will be addressed through the planning application process.</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any of the proposed residential development on the site will exceed the 91.4m. Although as noted, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p>
SKPR-266 – Stamford Gateway (Exeter Fields)	6	68	74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support reclassification for housing, increase in homeworking has contributed to business premises lying empty. A1 rules out concerns that more homes would create congestion Business premises are better situated in the centre of Stamford, close to amenities. Support the change to residential as more homes are needed. Consider there to be scope for the draft allocation to be amended to add clarity to the policy wording and increase the sites indicative housing units to 260 dwellings and 40dph Highways England support the site but comment that as it is adjacent to the A606/A1 junction, consideration at the boundary will need to be given to drainage and geotechnical matters. Planning applications would also need to be accompanied by assessments which consider noise and air quality impacts from the adjacent A1 trunk road. Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team advise development which exceeds 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement due to bird species hazardous to aviation. The site would not promote a better work life balance and would reduce the standard of living due to the need to commute long distances to a workplace elsewhere. No consideration has been given to a sustainable land use mix. There is already enough land set aside in Stamford for residential development. More houses mean more commuting which means more traffic and congestion. The land is already allocated for employment uses and changing this to residential would mean the loss of more local employment for a proposed increase in housing numbers. Stamford would only have 3.9 hectares of proposed employment with a reliance on a single, land locked allocation to deliver new job growth. The Draft Site Assessment Report (2024) and the Employment Land Study (2024) identify the deallocation of this site is on the basis that the site is unsuitable for employment use due to adjacent residential development. Those constraints remain 	<p>Supporting comments have been noted in respect of the site being well connected and providing more homes. The site capacity quoted within the allocation policy is an indicative figure based on the site area and identified constraints. The actual quantum of development would be considered through the planning application process.</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organization Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any proposed development on the site will exceed the 91.4m. Although as noted, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p> <p>Any development will be required to demonstrate compliance with draft policy SD1 to show how it has aligned growth and infrastructure; improved the environment, mitigated climate change and made effective use of land. A sustainable land use mix will be further considered by SKDC for this allocation and options are being considered to bring forward less intense employment generating uses (E use class) alongside proposed residential on site SKPR -266 to ensure a broader choice of employment within Stamford.</p> <p>While SKDC accepts that there will be an overall loss of employment land within Stamford, there is an aspirational increase in employment generating land across SKDC as a whole and within the wider functional economic market area. The Employment Land Study (2024) RAG (red, amber, green) assessment found that site SKPR-266 was constrained by surrounding residential development and SKDC have therefore decided that intense employment generating uses on the site would not be wholly appropriate to the surrounding context. The site promoter for SKPR-266 has also demonstrated that marketing on the site has taken place, but there has been a lack of interest in employment generating uses.</p> <p>No evidence has been brought before SKDC to demonstrate that the site would cause severe congestion or road safety issues. The site has previously been found acceptable in highways terms for development through its allocation for employment development in the adopted local plan (2011-2036). National Highways and Lincolnshire County Council (as Local Highways Authority) have been consulted on the draft plan, and have accepted that, in principle, the site is capable of accommodating the development. Noise and air quality impacts from the adjacent A1 will be required as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>The site will be required to provide appropriate infrastructure on-site or through expansion to existing facilities to mitigate the impacts of the development through</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<p>unchanged since the Employment Land Study (2015) which deemed this part of the site suitable for employment use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site has not been marketed enough for employment generating uses. • Site would compound traffic issues accessing the A1 and will place additional strain on the A1/A606 junction which is already over capacity at peak times. • Together with other housing developments on the edge of Stamford it will create excessive congestion, safety risks and inappropriate use of existing residential roads. • Traffic will be increased as people will need to drive to employment opportunities. • There is a lack of facilities within the west of Stamford and this site would only exacerbate these issues. • Facilities were proposed as part of the current development where the site was originally meant to provide shops, community centre and employment facilities. • A school would be useful on this side of town, instead of having it on Stamford North which is in close proximity to many other schools • There is insufficient water supply capacity, foul drainage & surface water disposal for any new developments at present. Necessity for the construction of an extra pumping station & connecting new sewer network before development commences. • Historic core of the town is already compromised. • Rutland County Council objects to the allocation as it will have a detrimental impact on employment land supply in the south-western part of South Kesteven and will also impact on employment land supply and travel patterns in Rutland. The site is extremely well placed for high quality employment uses, next the strategic road network with direct access and visibility onto the A1. There are no other sites in Stamford which offer such a location. ELS has not taken a robust assessment of the site into consideration. • Natural England objects as the site should establish a connected network of high-quality green infrastructure at the earliest stage of the planning process. Also advise that for residential developments surrounding Stamford may require an assessment of recreational pressure if it falls within the Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) for Cambridgeshire SSSIs. 	<p>Section 106 agreements. Options are being considered to bring forward less intense employment generating uses (E use class) alongside proposed residential on site SKPR-266 to ensure a broader choice of employment and that the element of a community centre remains in place. A primary/ secondary school has not been required as part of the overall development criteria.</p> <p>This site has previously been found acceptable for development through its allocation for employment development in the adopted local plan (2011-2036). In addition, no objections to SKPR-266 have been received from statutory undertakers. The impact of development on foul water drainage, and any mitigation required, would be subject to detailed assessment through a formal planning application process.</p> <p>No evidence has been brought before SKDC to demonstrate that the site would further impact on the historic core of Stamford. A Heritage Statement will be required as part of the planning application process to identify nearby heritage assets and understand if development may impact on them. SKPR-266 is not within a conservation area and is located 1.5km away from the core of Stamford.</p> <p>Comments from Rutland County Council have been noted. While SKDC accepts that there will be an overall loss of employment land to the south-west of the district, there is an aspirational increase in employment generating land across SKDC as a whole and within the wider functional economic market area. Additionally, no evidence has been brought before SKDC to demonstrate that the proposed reclassification of the site to residential will impact the employment land supply and travel patterns in Rutland. However, these issues will be addressed through the required duty to cooperate and SKDC will seek to work proactively with Rutland County Council regarding these matters.</p> <p>Comments from Natural England have been noted. Draft Policy EN3 sets out the importance of developments establishing, integrating and connecting green infrastructure, which is further reinforced by Criteria E) of the site-specific policy. The assessment of recreational pressure due to Impact Risk Zones (IRZ) would be determined through the planning application process.</p>
STM2: Stamford Town Centre Policy	4	1	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment that there are no banks in Stamford and only 1 local shop. Also, that further expansion of the town will grid lock it. • Comment supporting the policy but asking for specific policy relating to holiday lets, particularly short stay tourist accommodation in the town centre. The policy should seek to strike the right balance between upper floors of retail premises being used as homes for local people and the need for tourist accommodation to support the tourist economy. 	<p>Stamford as one of the three Market Towns within SDKC has been identified as having a range of facilities, services and shops within its town centre capable of supporting sustainable growth. In relation to congestion, no evidence has been brought before SKDC to demonstrate that proposed expansion would cause severe congestion or road safety issues within Stamford's town centre. Lincolnshire County Council (as Local Highways Authority) has also been consulted on the draft plan and has raised no objections surrounding traffic impacts on the town centre.</p> <p>Regulations have been consulted on by the previous National Government which will require those looking to let property on a short-term basis, to seek planning permission</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

					from their local authority to do so. In addition to gaining planning permission, the previous National Government also has proposed a national register of short-let properties – allowing local authorities to discern information about specific short-term lets within their catchment area. These regulations are still in draft format and therefore, at present, SKDC does not have the required evidence to produce a specific policy regarding holiday lets.
Bourne	1	2	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic prevents the town centre from realizing its potential and no mention to address this in the Local Plan. No allowance for consideration of a road improvements to proposed housing and employment allocations. 	The Local Plan policies seek to ensure that development contributes to and accords with the vision, and objectives of the Plan, from the sustainability of growth through to infrastructure provision.
SKPR-53 – Land at Mill Drove	7	12	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns over flooding, infrastructure capacity, road suitability, housing density, and impacts to wildlife and habitats. Support to proposed allocations and the direction of growth in Bourne to the North-East. Development principles considered appropriately specific and relevant to site. Considerations to be made that direct improvements may not be possible to Carr Dyke but appropriate integration, dwellings should front onto open space proposed alongside Dyke, land reserved to facilitate expansion of Bourne Academy, pedestrian and cycle links. Site falls within Flood Zone 2 and should be considered medium flood risk not high. Site is not within a Green Infrastructure Area and requires amendment. A single masterplan be prepared for allocations SKPR-53 and SKPR-83. Historic England notes potential for archaeology impacts and revisions will be required. Site could accommodate additional homes. 	<p>Concerns regarding infrastructure capacity are noted. Infrastructure requirements arising from new development including medical, schools and highways will be addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and relevant policies within the Plan.</p> <p>No evidence has been brought before SKDC to demonstrate that the site would cause severe congestion or road safety issues. National Highways and Lincolnshire County Council (as Local Highways Authority) have been consulted on the draft plan, and have accepted that, in principle, the site is capable of accommodating the development.</p> <p>The site capacity quoted within the allocation policy is an indicative figure based on the site area and identified constraints. The actual quantum of development would be considered through a planning application.</p> <p>The Council recognises that part of the site lies within a flood risk area. This has been carefully considered within the policy principles to ensure that the area of flood risk will not be developed but instead utilised for open space provision, landscaping and suitable urban drainage.</p> <p>Comments of support are welcomed.</p> <p>Historic England comments have been noted. The NPPF and Draft Local Plan ensures there is emphasis on understanding and conserving the significance of heritage assets as part of sustainable development. This makes the need to consider historic environment constraints imperative, therefore a heritage statement and/or archaeological evaluation will be required on identified sites as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>The criterion referencing the site being located within a Green Infrastructure Area is an error and will be corrected.</p> <p>A comprehensive masterplan for sites SKPR-53 and SKPR-83 has not been proposed. SKPR-53 will require a masterplan to ensure that all parties work together to ensure the site comes forward comprehensively, due to different landownerships.</p>
SKPR-83 – Land North of Mill Drove	3	10	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns over flooding, infrastructure capacity, road suitability, housing density, and impacts to wildlife and habitats. Support to proposed allocations and the direction of growth in Bourne to the North-East. Development should consider dwellings to front onto open space proposed alongside Dyke, land reserved to facilitate 	<p>Concerns regarding infrastructure capacity are noted. Infrastructure requirements arising from new development including medical, schools and highways will be addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and relevant policies within the Plan.</p> <p>No evidence has been brought before SKDC to demonstrate that the site would cause severe congestion or road safety issues. National Highways and Lincolnshire County</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<p>expansion of Bourne Academy, pedestrian and cycle links including integration with Carr Dyke.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A single masterplan should be prepared for allocations SKPR-53 and SKPR-83. • Historic England note the potential for archaeology impacts and revisions will be required. Allocation likely to have setting impact upon the SM to the north. Reference should be made to the Car Dyke Schedule Monument to the north of the site. 	<p>Council (as Local Highways Authority) have been consulted on the draft plan, and have accepted that, in principle, the site is capable of accommodating the development.</p> <p>The site capacity quoted within the allocation policy is an indicative figure based on the site area and identified constraints. The actual quantum of development would be considered through a planning application.</p> <p>Comments of support are welcomed.</p> <p>A comprehensive masterplan for sites SKPR-53 and SKPR-83 has not been proposed. SKPR-53 will require a masterplan to ensure that all parties work together to ensure the site comes forward comprehensively, due to different landownerships.</p> <p>Reference to the Car Dyke Scheduled Monument to the north of the site within the policy will be reviewed.</p>
BRN2: Bourne Town Centre Policy	4	2	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no mention of improved transport links. More public transport is required to ease the burden on the roads attract more business investment to Bourne, and to combat climate change. • The town centre cannot be made more visually attractive with heavy commercial vehicles. • Public transport needed and improvements for safe walking and cycling. • Empty shops need to be turned into affordable housing which residents can walk to work, shop and socialize creating a vibrant town centre. 	<p>The Local Plan should be read as a whole, other policies in the plan ensure consideration of proposals to encourage sustainable development.</p> <p>The Local Plan aims to support the development of a sustainable, efficient and safe transport system, increase sustainable methods of travel, protect the environment and improve access to key services. Additionally, the Local Plan is aligned with the Local Transport Plan for Lincolnshire which sets out the overall strategy and delivery for transport across the whole of Lincolnshire. https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/downloads/file/7200/local-transport-plan-5</p>
The Deepings	1	3	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals for Market Deeping do not consider the lack of amenities in the area. There is no manned fire station, no police station or easily accessible stations, only a tiny library run by volunteers and totally inadequate leisure facilities. As for medical facilities, they already are failing badly. • No reference made to the adopted Deepings Neighbourhood Plan. 	<p>The Deepings is considered as one of the three Market Towns within SKDC and has been identified as having a range of facilities, services and shops capable of supporting sustainable growth. Developments will be required to provide appropriate infrastructure on-site, or through expansion to existing facilities to mitigate its impacts via Section 106 agreements. No evidence has been brought before SKDC to demonstrate that current medical facilities are failing, the Clinical commissioning group (CCG) and the National Health Service (NHS) have both been consulted on the draft Local Plan review.</p> <p>While Neighbourhood Plans are not specifically referenced within 'Chapter 12 – South Kesteven's Communities' they are addressed within 'Chapter 2 - South Kesteven District' under the Neighbourhood Plan section.</p>
SKPR-36 (DEP1-H1): Towngate West	4	3	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic England support the density per hectare paragraph together with development criterion C and E for the site. • Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team advise development which exceeds 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement due to bird species hazardous to aviation. • Policy contains excellent development principles related to the need of a high-quality gateway development for the Northern access to Market Deeping. • Supportive of Land at Towngate West (SKPR-36) as a residential allocation but proposes amendment to the site outline of to reflect the Site Location Plan and comprehensive 	<p>Historic England comments supporting the density per hectare paragraph, together with development criterion C and E for the site have been noted.</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organization Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any proposed development on the site will exceed the 91.4m limit. Although, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p> <p>Comment supporting the site in its creation of a high-quality gateway development for the Northern access to Market Deeping has been noted.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<p>proposals of the Illustrative Masterplan as per outline planning application S24/0617.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site should only be acceptable if a true brownfield site, else should not happen. Comment requesting reference to the 'Deepings Green Walk' is added to the development criterion as set out in the adopted Deepings Neighbourhood Plan. 	<p>The illustrative masterplan for approved outline application S24/0617 includes the northeast section up to the boundary of the A15. This area has been identified for retained grassland, biodiversity improvements, green infrastructure provision and Suds. SKDC will seek to amend the site boundary in line with the approved outline application masterplan and will ensure the inclusion of development criterion which states that only the uses outlined on the masterplan will be acceptable on the expanded portion of the site.</p> <p>Development on brownfield land is a priority set out within the Local Plan review. Although there is not enough brownfield land to meet the required need in terms of housing provision across the plan period. Therefore, suitable greenfield sites have been considered. The site at Towngate West (SKPR - 36) is currently deemed as an acceptable allocation under adopted Local Plan policy DEP-H1. The site is presently in agricultural use and is a location for sustainable development, which does not impact on best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>Given the approval of outline application S24/0617 and the proposed boundary changes to align with the approved masterplan, reference to the 'Deeping Green Walk' will be added to the as a development criterion to Towngate West (SKPR-36).</p>
SKPR-37 (DEP1-H2): Linchfield Road	4	3	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team advise development which exceeds 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement due to bird species hazardous to aviation. Sport England comment that the allocations in the Deepings area will generate additional demand for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. The Council does not have a robust and up to date assessment of the need for indoor sport and recreation facilities as required by paragraph 102 of the NPPF. There is a need for the local plan review to deal with the refurbishment/ replacement/relocation of The Deepings Leisure Centre. Housing allocations in this area should contribute towards an indoor sports facility. The site should only be acceptable if a true brownfield site, else should not happen. Comment requesting reference to the 'Deepings Green Walk' is added to the development criterion as set out in the adopted Deepings Neighbourhood Plan. 	<p>Defence Infrastructure Organization Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any proposed development on the site will exceed the 91.4m limit. Although, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that through the emerging evidence base, the Play Pitch Strategy will set out the demands and requirements for outdoor sports provision. In terms of indoor sports provision, works are being undertaken separately to the Local Plan review for securing re use of the Deepings Leisure Centre by charity organisations. Should there be additional requirements for indoor sports provision then opportunities will be explored for proposed allocations to make contributions through appropriate S106 agreements.</p> <p>Development on brownfield land is a priority set out within the Local Plan review. Although there is not enough brownfield land to meet the required need in terms of housing provision across the plan period, therefore suitable greenfield sites have been considered. The site at Linchfield Road (SKPR - 37) is currently deemed as an acceptable allocation under DEP-H2. The site is presently in agricultural use and is a location for sustainable development, which does not impact on best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>Comment requesting the inclusion of a reference to the 'Deepings Green Walk' as set out in the Deepings Neighbourhood Plan has been noted. It should be recognised that the Deepings Neighbourhood Plan makes up part of the development framework which should be read as a whole when considering planning applications. The identified 'Deeping Green Walk' area crosses the northern boundary of Linchfield Road (SKPR – 37) and therefore SKDC will explore options for it to be referenced within the development criterion.</p>
SKPR-144 Land to the West of Millfield Road	4	128	132	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment supporting the allocation for 200 houses and the draft criteria in the policy. In addition, the illustrative layout confirms that it is possible to achieve the requirements in criteria (a-h) on 	<p>Comment supporting the allocation of SKPR-144 for 200 units and its proposed criterion has been noted.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

			<p>the site. The supporting technical work demonstrated that there are no known constraints which would prevent the site being developed for housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team - Advise development which exceeds 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement due to bird species hazardous to aviation. • Environment Agency - Environment Agency comment that Deepings Water Recycling Centre (WRC) has been identified as having capacity issues. However, no concerns about the development as it is small. Encourage the council to liaise with Anglian Water Services (AWS) to ensure that acceptable plans are in place for the management of foul water, in advance of planning permission being determined. • SKPR-144 (Millfield Road) generated a significant number of objections which have been summarised into the following key themes. • SKPR-144 destroys an amenity for the whole area which is not in keeping with the Local Plan reviews aim 'to protect and enhance.' • SKPR-144 is unsuitable and other better suited sites are available. Councils should be concentrating on brownfield and several existing approved sites that remain undeveloped. • The infrastructure in The Deepings (water, electricity supply, sewage drainage) is inadequate for the current population. The Deepings has grown significantly and does not have sufficient infrastructure to support further growth. • Services such as public transport are limited. SKPR-144 is not on a bus route and quite a distance from the nearest bus stop. • Public facilities such as a doctors, schools and banks are at capacity or extremely overwhelmed. There is no leisure centre or exercise facilities in the Deepings. • Unsustainable demand on local Policing, Fire and Ambulance, which could exacerbate crime and safety considerations through increased opportunity • Millfield Road is a lane unsuited and not at the required standards for more traffic. • The junction with Stamford Road has a dangerous blind spot. Cars exiting the nearby roundabout are not seen by other road users. • The traffic on the A15 is currently unable to cope with commuters and traffic is at standstill at peak times. • The extra volume of traffic would cause problems to the Tattershall Drive Estate • The A15 is noisy and SKPR-144 will remove a site which currently forms a buffer between the Deepings by-pass and Millfield Road. • SKPR-144 will cause air quality impacts through CO2 emissions via fumes and congestion. SKPR-144 would be reliant on cars, which would go against the National 	<p>Defence Infrastructure Organization Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any proposed development on SKPR-144 will exceed the 91.4m limit. Although, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p> <p>Comments regarding the sites impact on sustainable development have been noted. The primary principle of the Local Plan review is to promote sustainable development, meaning any proposal must have regard to the three key pillars of environmental, social and economic sustainability. Consequently, any development will be required to demonstrate compliance with draft policy SD1 of the Local Plan review, which seeks to ensure that development proposals consider how they can proactively enhance the district's character. Furthermore, sustainably developed sites on brownfield land are the priority as set out within the Local Plan review. Although, there is not enough brownfield land to meet the required need in terms of housing provision across the plan period. Suitable greenfield sites (including SKPR-144) have therefore been considered as potential allocations.</p> <p>Objections in relation to infrastructure / services/ facilities have been noted. However, no evidence has been brought before SKDC to evidence that SKPR-144 would cause additional, detrimental impacts in terms of current infrastructure / services/ facilities provision within the Deepings. Any application on SKPR-144 must comply with draft Local Plan review policy ID1 in order to demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity to support the requirements arising from the proposed development. This must be provided through appropriate infrastructure/facilities/services on-site, or through expansion to existing facilities to mitigate potential impacts via legal Section 106 agreements. Furthermore, no objections have been received from the statutory infrastructure providers /bodies during the draft consultation process.</p> <p>Objections to SKPR-144 exacerbating traffic, noise and air pollution have been noted. It is accepted that any development could naturally cause the above issues to increase. Therefore, any development will be expected to comply with draft policy EN4 and ID2 to minimise pollution, improve air quality and promote sustainable forms of safe transportation. No objections have been received from Lincolnshire County Council (as Local Highways Authority) who in principle, have identified that the highway network, including the A15, Stamford Road and Millfield Road, can accommodate the development. Noise mitigation from the adjacent A15 will be required as part of the planning application process as set out in the draft site criterion (G).</p> <p>Objections in relation to the Deepings water supply issues and SKPR-144 exacerbating flood risk have been noted. However, no evidence has been put forward to SKDC to show that SKPR-144 would further affect the water supply of the Deepings area. Additionally, SKPR-144 is not identified to be within either flood zones 2 or 3. SKPR-144 will be expected to comply with draft policy EN5 which requires all development to avoid increasing flood risk elsewhere and to demonstrate that water is available. Furthermore, EN5 states that surface water should be managed effectively on site through the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs) and planning applications should be accompanied by a statement of how surface water is to be discharged. No objections have been received from statutory undertakers, both Anglian Water Services and the Environment Agency for SKPR-144.</p> <p>Heritage / Landscape Comments in relation to heritage/landscape have been noted. Any development will be expected to comply with draft policy EN1 of the Local Plan review and demonstrate that it is appropriate to the natural, historic and cultural</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

			<p>Government’s objectives of reducing the need to travel where ‘ecofriendly’ is promoted and ‘net zero’ aimed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a history of flooding issues. SKPR -144 would cause the loss of the Millfield’s flood plain role which must be preserved due to changes in climate and weather. • SKPR-144 would increase the flood risk to surrounding areas and development must avoid increasing flood risk elsewhere. • SKPR-144 is close to the River Welland, and it is likely that the river is in partial continuity with the ground water in Mill Field. • WSP flood risk assessment (2018) identifies the drainage ditches on Mill Field as at high risk of surface water flooding. Surface water flooding through the development of SKPR-144 would mean significantly increased polluted rainwater runoff into roads and existing properties adjacent to Millfield Road. • SKPR-144 has history within the community, having served agricultural shows, sporting events, and galas since 1882. • SKPR-144 has historic remains • Development would be against the setting of the neighbourhood and would drastically change the character of Market Deeping. • With reference to criteria (d), "Sensitive landscaping shall be incorporated along the northern and western edges of the site". Suggest that it is the eastern boundary, alongside Millfield Road, rather than the western boundary, where such landscaping should be incorporated. • Millfield Road is identified as a Green Lane which would have to be altered, and this would spoil the entrance to this rural lane. • The proposed access to SKPR-144 would be onto the Green Lane and inevitably cars from the new houses would use the Green Lane to access services and facilities. This would result in an unacceptable increase in traffic along the Green Lane. • Market Deeping does not have enough green spaces within the area which are assessable. SKPR-144 is the last large mature green space. • SKPR-144 is valued by local residents and has been in constant use for exercise, leisure and mental/physical health benefits. • SKPR-144 should be protected as a Local Green Space (LGS) for future generations by removing the risk of development now and in the future. • SKDC’s Open Space and Recreation Study 2023 states that the Deepings is deficient in natural and semi natural green space. SKPR-144 is not an official natural green space but as grassland satisfies SKDC’s standard provision for that category- 2ha per 1000 population within 720 metres. • SKPR-144 acts as a wildlife corridor for the bypass and the river for a variety of species. • SKPR-144 is a rewilding area and the only space locally that has this. • SKPR-144 is edged with mature trees and ancient hedgerows and sustains a great deal of wildlife. Encouraged to plant trees 	<p>attributes of the surrounding area. Additionally, under the proposed draft site criterion (D), sensitive landscaping is to be incorporated along the northern and western edges of the site. A Heritage Impact Statement will also be required as part of the planning application process to identify nearby heritage assets and understand if development may impact on them. SKPR-144 is expected to be of high-quality design and will require a comprehensive masterplan as set out in draft site criterion (A). It will also be required to follow the guidelines set out in the forthcoming South Kesteven District Council Design code. The site is not in a conservation area</p> <p>Comments in relation to ‘Millfield Road’ being a green lane have been noted. The green lane adjacent to proposed draft allocation SKPR-144 is identified through policy DNP12 of the made Deepings Neighbourhood Plan and protecting its rural character and appearance is important. This is acknowledged by draft site criterion (G) for SKPR-144 which ensures that development must positively preserve and enhance the designated Green Lane along Millfield Road in accordance with the Deepings Neighbourhood Plan. Objections regarding the loss of open space in the Deepings has been understood. Areas which have been recognised as open space or Local Green Space would have been considered unfavourability through the assessment process when selecting preferred site allocations. Majority of the greenfield sites considered for allocation within the draft Local Plan review are either vacant or have an agriculture / farming use taking place. SKPR-144 is not formally identified as an area of open space nor is it allocated as a Local Green Space through a development plan document. Additionally, planning for the needs of mental/ physical health is of high importance and the NPPF outlines that as a key pillar of social sustainably, policies should support health, social and cultural well-being. Open space and the opportunities for sport and physical activity are important for the health and well-being of communities. Therefore, draft policy OS1 requires developments to provide open space as an integral part of its development layout and address any deficiencies as set out within the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (2024).</p> <p>Objections to SKPR-144 due to its impact on wildlife has been noted. Although no evidence has been brought before SKDC to demonstrate that SKPR-144 will impact on any statutory or un-statutory ‘designated’ environmental site. Any development will be expected to comply with draft policy EN2 which facilitates the conservation, enhancement and promotion of the natural environment. The draft Local Plan review has also been accompanied by a Habitat Regulation Assessment which ensures that the proposed site allocations do not have a cumulative impact on protected wildlife sites. No objections regarding the environment or wildlife have been raised by Natural England or Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust for SKPR-144. There is no evidence of SKPR-144 being a being a rewilding area and tree planting will be encouraged as part of the overall scheme.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<p>to carbon neutralize our towns and to absorb excess rainfall not to destroy them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding SKPR-144 proximity to nearby Designated Site(s) (SAC, SPA, SSSI) 	
SKPR-26 – Priory Farm Land, Deeping St James	7	8	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Market Deeping Town Council comment that the allocation is a potentially suitable site also supported by Deeping St James Parish Council. The Deepings Neighbourhood Plan Group support the principle of development. But, object that there is no reference to Back Lane as a 'green lane' as highlighted in the Deepings Neighbourhood Plan (DNP). Additional comment that there should be no access from Back Lane to protect the character of the rural route. Finally, site boundaries seem to incorrectly include highway verge. Environment Agency comment that Deepings Water Recycling Centre (WRC) has been identified as having capacity issues. However, no concerns about the development as it is small. Encourage the council to liaise with Anglian Water Services (AWS) to ensure that acceptable plans are in place for the management of foul water, in advance of planning permission being determined. Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team advise development which exceeds 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement due to bird species hazardous to aviation. Support the sites allocation as it is within a single ownership and is available for development within the first five years of the new Local Plan. There is a keen focus on environmental and social benefits for the local community. The development is promoted to be a low carbon development, in design, delivery, use and future use. Community well-being has not been taken into consideration. Development could alter community dynamics, impacting residents' quality of life and privacy. Authorities should prioritise preserving the environment and community integrity over short-term development interests. Green field plot enjoyed by locals for exercise, wildlife and a connection to a green lane. Development should be on brownfield and not agricultural land. Site could clash visually with the existing landscape, detracting from the area's historical and cultural significance. Site threatens local wildlife and disrupts a conservation area, potentially harming ecosystems. The development could strain infrastructure, increase traffic, noise and air pollution. There could be road safety risks arising from the proposed development. The strain on sewage systems from added households could lead to environmental issues and further impact the quality of life for nearby residents. 	<p>Market Deeping Town Council comment of support has been noted, although there has been no comment from Deeping St James Parish Council in relation to the allocation.</p> <p>The Deepings Neighbourhood Plan group comments have been noted. It is acknowledged that Back Lane is identified as a 'green lane' within policy DNP12 of the made DNP and therefore reference to protecting its rural character and importance will be added to the development criterion. No objections in relation to using Back Lane for access have been received from Lincolnshire County Council as the lead highway authority, nor has any evidence been presented to show that access would be unsuitable. The site boundary has been drawn in conjunction with the red line plan submitted by the site promoter. Land ownership is not considered a material consideration and is not a criterion by which proposed draft allocation sites have been assessed or discounted under.</p> <p>Environment Agency comments have been noted. AWS are a statutory consultee for the Local Plan review and planning application process. Therefore, they are a critical component in ensuring the suitability of proposed allocations and applications in terms of foul water management.</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organization Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any proposed development on SKPR-26 will exceed the 91.4m limit. Although, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p> <p>Comment in support noted.</p> <p>The primary principle of the Local Plan review is to promote sustainable development, meaning any proposal must have regard to the three key pillars of environmental, social and economic sustainability. Consequently, any development will be required to demonstrate compliance with draft policy SD1 of the Local Plan review. Furthermore, sustainably developed sites on brownfield land are the priority as set out within the Local Plan review. Although there is not enough brownfield land to meet the required need in terms of housing provision across the plan period. Consideration of suitable greenfield sites (including agricultural) have therefore been considered as potential allocations. SKPR-26 is presently in agricultural use, however its development would not impact on best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>No evidence has been brought before SKDC to demonstrate that SKPR-26 would cause a harmful impact on the landscape character of the area. Under the proposed draft site criterion (B), SKPR-26 will be required to provide landscape screening to its eastern edge to reduce the impact on views from the open countryside. Any development will also be expected to comply with draft policy EN1 and demonstrate that it is appropriate to the natural, historic and cultural attributes of the surrounding area. No objections regarding landscape have been raised by SKDCs urban design officer.</p> <p>No evidence has been brought before SKDC to demonstrate that SKPR-26 will impact on any statutory or un-statutory 'designated' environmental site. Any development will</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing services like schools and healthcare are already overburdened, and adding more housing will only exacerbate these issues. Development of Deepings has been mismanaged and outstripped the capacity of its infrastructure which cannot cope. 	<p>be expected to comply with draft policy EN2 which facilitates the conservation, enhancement and promotion of the natural environment. The draft Local Plan review has also been accompanied by a Habitat Regulation Assessment which ensures that the proposed site allocations do not have a cumulative impact on protected wildlife sites. No objections regarding the environment or wildlife have been raised by Natural England or Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust for SKPR-26.</p> <p>It is accepted that any development could naturally cause the above issues to increase. Therefore, any development will be expected to comply with draft policy EN4 to minimise pollution and where possible contribute to the protection and improvement of the quality of air, land and water. No objections have been received from Lincolnshire County Council (as Local Highways Authority) who in principle, have identified that the highway network can accommodate the development.</p> <p>No evidence has been put forward to SKDC to show that the additional strain on sewerage would lead to further environmental issues. Any development will be expected to comply with draft policy EN5 and demonstrate that adequate foul water treatment and disposal already exists or can be provided. No objections have been received from statutory undertakers, both Anglian Water Services and the Environment agency for SKPR-26. The impact of development on foul water drainage, and any mitigation required, would also be subject to detailed assessment through a formal planning application process.</p> <p>No evidence has been brought before SKDC to demonstrate that SKPR-26 would cause additional, detrimental impacts in terms of current infrastructure provision within the Deepings. SKPR-26 must also comply with draft Local Plan review policy ID1 in order to demonstrate that there is sufficient infrastructure capacity to support the requirements arising from the proposed development. This must be provided through appropriate infrastructure on-site, or through expansion to existing facilities to mitigate its impacts via legal Section 106 agreements.</p>
DEP2: Market Deeping Town Centre Policy	3	5	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment that the reference to "Horsegate" is incorrect due to error. Correct street name is "High Street", with the western end being "Market Place". Comment from The Deepings Neighbourhood Plan Group and Deeping St James Parish Council that there is no secondary shopping frontage provision in the Deepings Neighbourhood Plan. The Local Plan review policy DEP2 should directly align with Deeping Neighbourhood Plan policies. Map 5 (The Deepings Town Centre) needs to be geographically clearer. 	<p>Comment in relation to the incorrect street name has been noted and will be corrected.</p> <p>Comment in relation to secondary shopping frontages and the policies not being aligned has been noted. The Deepings Neighbourhood Plan makes up part of the development framework for South Kesteven, meaning that its policies are used when determining planning applications alongside the adopted Local Plan. There is not a requirement for the two policies to be directly aligned with one another. Furthermore, The Deepings Neighbourhood Plan policy DNP5 identified a safeguarding area for the expansion of the Town Centre boundary, which has been reflected through draft Local Plan review policy DEP2. The Deepings Neighbourhood Plan did not evidence any further changes, or the removal of the established primary / secondary frontages set out in the current Local Plan (2011-2036). Therefore, these frontages have remained as part of the draft Local Plan review policy DEP2.</p> <p>Comment in relation to map 5 (The Deepings Town Centre) being geographically clearer have been noted. Although these maps are intended to be for illustrative purposes only. The published interactive policies map on the SKDC Local Plan review webpage establishes the policy boundaries in detail and should be the first point of reference.</p>
Ancaster	1	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments not relevant. 	No action required.

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

SKPR-271 (LV-H2): Wilsford Lane, Ancaster	3	1	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development will be expected to contribute to the community, ideally via the Parish Council. Parking design and safety, green space and its maintenance and charges to be considered. • Considers that the site be allocated for up to 81 dwellings at 30dph. Land to the south of should be included in the site boundary for additional community benefits. • Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: Development of, or exceeding, 45.7m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation, including the potential for an environment attractive to hazardous bird species to be formed temporarily. 	<p>Comments noted. The allocation proposal will be required to comply with Policy ID1. Site contributions to be secured through S106 legal agreements between stakeholders and the District/County/Parish Council. Policy DE1 sets out car parking provision should be sufficient for the location and type of development. Management of community green space would be addressed through planning conditions at a later stage.</p> <p>The site capacity quoted within the allocation policy is an indicative figure based on the site area and identified constraints. The actual quantum of development would be considered through a planning application.</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any proposed development on the site will exceed the 45.7m limit. Although, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p>
SKPR-58 Land to the East of Ermine Street, Ancaster	3	2	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes are required, and the sites should be retained as an allocation • Development will be expected to contribute to the community, ideally via the Parish Council. Parking design and safety, green space and its maintenance and charges to be considered. • Encourage a higher percentage of affordable houses and welcome reserved for family links to the village • Advises highlighting specific boundary treatment coming up against existing houses. • Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: Development of, or exceeding, 45.7m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation, including the potential for an environment attractive to hazardous bird species to be formed temporarily. • Historic England: Archaeology assessment required (325952 finds to north roman inurnations and possible malting oven). Criteria c within policy SKPR-58 is noted. 	<p>Comments noted. The Local Plan's policy wording will be reviewed to ensure it is robust and sound.</p> <p>The allocation proposal will be required to comply with Policy ID1. Site contributions to be secured through S106 legal agreements between stakeholders and the District/County/Parish Council. Policy DE1 sets out car parking provision should be sufficient for the location and type of development. Management of community green space would be addressed through planning conditions at a later stage.</p> <p>Specific details regarding housing mix will be addressed during the planning application stage.</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any proposed development on the site will exceed the 91.4m limit. Although, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p> <p>Historic England comments have been noted. The NPPF and Draft Local Plan ensures there is emphasis on understanding and conserving the significance of heritage assets as part of sustainable development. This makes the need to consider historic environment constraints imperative, therefore a heritage statement and/or archaeological evaluation will be required on identified sites as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organization Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any proposed development on the site will exceed the 91.4m limit. Although, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p>
SKPR-283 – Land off St Martins Way, Ancaster	4	1	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development will be expected to contribute to the community, ideally via the Parish Council. Parking design and safety, green space and its maintenance and charges to be considered. • Encourage a higher percentage of affordable houses and welcome reserved for family links to the village • Advises highlighting specific boundary treatment coming up against existing houses. • Historic England: Archaeology assessment required. Site is a high potential for prehistoric through roman activity. Features 	<p>Comments noted. The Local Plan's policy wording will be reviewed to ensure it is robust and sound.</p> <p>The allocation proposal will be required to comply with Policy ID1. Site contributions to be secured through S106 legal agreements between stakeholders and the District/County/Parish Council. Policy DE1 sets out car parking provision should be sufficient for the location and type of development. Management of community green space would be addressed through planning conditions at a later stage.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<p>marked immediate south and west are former quarries (west) and the train station (south). Criteria e is noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a number of factors recorded as constraints or as potential negative effects associated with developing the Site which would not, in fact, occur. • Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: - Development of, or exceeding, 15.2m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation, including the potential for an environment attractive to hazardous bird species to be formed temporarily Eastern WAM Network safeguarding criteria trigger - Development of, or exceeding, 45.7m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. 	<p>Specific details regarding housing mix will be addressed during the planning application stage.</p> <p>Historic England comments have been noted. The NPPF and Draft Local Plan ensures there is emphasis on understanding and conserving the significance of heritage assets as part of sustainable development. This makes the need to consider historic environment constraints imperative, therefore a heritage statement and/or archaeological evaluation will be required on identified sites as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organization Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any proposed development on the site will exceed the 15.2m limit. Although, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p>
Barkston	0	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment not relevant. 	No action required.
SKPR-242 Land East of Honington Road, Barkston	2	3	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site not considered suitable but may be for self-build • Site suitable and appropriate location for development • Historic England: concerns regarding the setting of the Church of St Nicholas, views into towards the spire and from the churchyard. An assessment should test views. • Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: Development of, or exceeding, 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation, including the potential for an environment attractive to hazardous bird species to be formed temporarily 	<p>Comments of support noted.</p> <p>Historic England concerns noted. The NPPF and Draft Plan review ensures there is emphasis on understanding and conserving the significance of heritage assets as part of sustainable development. This makes the need to consider historic environment constraints imperative, therefore a heritage statement and/or archaeological evaluation will be required on identified sites as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organization Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any proposed development will exceed the 91.4m limit. Although, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p>
Barrowby	0	5	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information in paragraph 12.59 incorrect. The Post Office and store have shut, Co-op store now open. • Information in paragraph 12.61 is incorrect. Barrowby Parish will also deliver additional 500+ homes when developments SKPR-117 and SKPR-280 are correctly allocated to Barrowby not Grantham 	<p>Text will be amended to ensure factual accuracy.</p> <p>Site allocations are not necessarily categorised depending on the parish, but the settlement to which they abut. Supporting evidence to be amended to ensure factual accuracy.</p>
SKPR-272 (LV-H3): Low Road, Barrowby	1	6	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The masterplan for this site has been delivered and accepted by SKDC Board. Correct the information and add any necessary details from the masterplan before publishing • Site not considered to be capable of delivering 270 units as part of the site (49 dwellings) has already been delivered and subsequently it is considered further dwellings will need to be found to replace the allocation. • Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: Development of, or exceeding, 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to 	<p>Full planning permission has now been granted - 49 units were completed on site in 2022/23. Full planning permission (S23/0299) for 67 dwellings approved at planning committee (13 June 24) subject to completion of a S106 agreement. Hybrid planning application (S23/2175) for 175 dwellings (full application) and community facility (outline).</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organization Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any proposed development will exceed the 91.4m limit. Although, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				aviation, including the potential for an environment attractive to hazardous bird species to be formed temporarily	
Baston	0	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment not relevant. 	No action required.
SKPR-109 – Land Fronting Deeping Road, Baston	2	14	16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns over road safety particularly crossing the A15, access and congestion, infrastructure capacity, existing residential views, and impact to the character of Baston. Site should come forward with SKPR-110 comprehensively to provide greater benefit to local community and District. An updated Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is required regarding nearby flooding. Historic England note that an archaeology assessment will be required. 	<p>Infrastructure requirements arising from new development will be addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and relevant policies within the Plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is prepared in consultation with infrastructure providers including highways, education, health and utilities.</p> <p>A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is in preparation which will inform site allocations, future planning applications and relevant Local Plan policy. The study will be published, once finalised.</p> <p>Historic England comments have been noted. The NPPF and Draft Plan review ensures there is emphasis on understanding and conserving the significance of heritage assets as part of sustainable development. This makes the need to consider historic environment constraints imperative, therefore a heritage statement and/or archaeological evaluation will be required on identified sites as part of the planning application process.</p>
Billingborough	0	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment not relevant. 	No action required.
SKPR-61 and SKPR-103 – Former Aveland School, and Land to the West of Pointon Road, Billingborough	1	5	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding impact on existing infrastructure, drainage capacity, and on traffic congestion. Historic England - assessment required due to size/potential for cumulative impact (including upon western and southern entrance gateways to the village) on historic core of Billingborough and its Conservation Area. Support for the allocation for residential development. Suggested amendments to principles to allow more flexible approach to development, factual corrections and clarification. 	<p>Infrastructure requirements arising from new development will be addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and relevant policies within the Plan.</p> <p>Historic England comments have been noted. The NPPF and Draft Plan review ensures there is emphasis on understanding and conserving the significance of heritage assets as part of sustainable development. This makes the need to consider historic environment constraints imperative, therefore a heritage statement and/or archaeological evaluation will be required on identified sites as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>Comments of support noted. The Local Plan's policy wording will be reviewed to ensure it is robust and sound.</p>
Caythorpe and Frieston	1	1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Police Office mentioned may be redundant even though the building remains. 	Supporting text will be amended to ensure factual accuracy.
Claypole	1	23	24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objections to the proposal to classify Claypole as a Larger Village, due to previously deemed unsustainable and since been no changes, infrastructure is not considered suitable to support further development, flooding concerns, and concerns on impacts to the historic identify. The Claypole Neighbourhood Plan should be considered in the classification of the village. 	The Settlement Hierarchy as set out in Policy SP2 is supported by a robust evidence paper published alongside the Regulation 18. The Council will undertake a review of the services and facilities and determine any changes to Larger and Smaller Villages set out in Policy SP2.
Colsterworth	0	8	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about the proposed residential allocation within the village. Comments regarding impact on infrastructure, insufficient facilities and services, traffic and impacts on road safety, impacts on wildlife, risk of flooding to accommodate further development. 	Comments relating to the proposed residential development in Colsterworth. See response to SKPR-120 – Land at the East of Stamford Road, Colsterworth.

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments note planning permission was approved for residential development but not developed near the Co-op. 	
SKPR-120 Land at the East of Stamford Road, Colsterworth	1	66	67	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding infrastructure capacity and proposed level of development. Village amenities are unable to accommodate increase in population Concerns regarding negative impacts on landscape character, biodiversity, wildlife and habitats Road structure is unsuitable and concerns regarding road safety Land is Grade II agricultural land, brownfield sites are more suitable Site is on green belt and should be protected New homes built at Bourne Road are not selling. Impact of existing new development have not yet been understood. Existing pressure on facilities and services. Land at Bridge End road with previous planning permission considered more suitable as located closer to amenities and reducing congestion. Other suitable sites considered to be SKPR-78, SKPR-127, SKPR-237. Developing the proposed land will this increase the risk of local flooding Few employment opportunities so will need to commute Further development will dramatically reduce the value of the properties Historic England: Potential for archaeology (finds within site, including 325496 Anglo Saxon sword) Grid Ref : SK9300023000 Summary : Anglo Saxon sword found in the River Witham More information : An Anglo-Saxon, sword, 31in. long and 2in. wide, from Colsterworth, is in Grantham Museum. (1-2) To the west of the Stamford road between it and the river lies the remains of the deserted medieval village to Twyford - Deserted Medieval village comprising hollow ways, boundaries, enclosures, buildings and pits seen as earthworks Site boundary different to that put through the appraisal process without information to explain this decision beyond mitigating impact on the highway network or identifying how it changes the site appraisal. Pedestrian access via a PROW is unable to provide suitable and safe junction design Proposed allocation conflicts with the Neighbourhood Development Plan Support to the allocations but should be increased as additional land would facilitate and enable access to the land now and for future phases. Concerns regarding longer term plan for SKPR-232. Would require consideration of a masterplan. Does not indicate how the proposed housing allocation is to be accessed from the existing public highway and mitigation to provide safe crossing facility along Bourne Road. 	<p>Infrastructure requirements arising from new development will be addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and relevant policies within the Plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is prepared in consultation with infrastructure providers including highways, education, health and utilities.</p> <p>Historic England comments have been noted. The NPPF and Draft Plan review ensures there is emphasis on understanding and conserving the significance of heritage assets as part of sustainable development. This makes the need to consider historic environment constraints imperative, therefore a heritage statement and/or archaeological evaluation will be required on identified sites as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>The requirement of a masterplan will be considered and a policy criterion added if required.</p> <p>Made Neighbourhood Plans form part of the Council's development plan and all proposed allocations and planning applications must be in accordance with any made Neighbourhood Plan for the locality. Where there is any conflict in regard to policy the most up to date document will take precedent.</p> <p>There is no greenbelt within South Kesteven District.</p> <p>Land at Bridge End Road's planning permission has now lapsed and the site was not submitted through the Call for Sites and as such is not deemed available for consideration through the Local Plan.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian access via a PROW is unable to provide suitable and safe junction design. 	
Corby Glen	0	3	3	<p>Objection that there has been enough development in Corby Glen as a result of the current Local Plan (2011-2036). The fabric of a predominantly rural village will be lost, and any large-scale development should not take place until the village has settled from the new homes already under construction.</p> <p>Comment that more development in Corby Glen will lead to capacity issues with schools and doctors. Development will also increase local high street traffic with people queuing to use the shop and amenities around the square.</p> <p>Comment that paragraph 12.78 is inaccurate as the Post Office is closed and there is now only a post van 4 days/week for 1 hour. There are also 2 cafés and a C of E Church.</p> <p>Comment that site LV-H5 has been omitted from figure 33 which does not show the 3 new significant developments adding houses to the village.</p>	<p>Objection regarding Corby Glen having enough development has been noted. Although, as set out in the Settlement Hierarchy review (2021-2041) to accompany the draft Local Plan review, Corby Glen is identified as a 'well scoring' Larger Village. This means that it has the level of facilities and services to be able to accommodate future growth and aid in meeting the required housing needs of the district over the new plan period. Awaiting sites to finish construction has not been a factor when determining the most suitable allocations within each settlement, however, any development will be expected to come forward in a comprehensive manor which does not harm the nature and character of the area.</p> <p>Comments regarding the infrastructure of Corby Glen has been noted. Although no evidence has been brought before SKDC to demonstrate that further development would cause an unacceptable impact on capacity. No objections have been raised by Lincolnshire County Council as the lead transport, health and education body for the area. Any development which does come forward must also comply with draft Local Plan review policy ID1 in order to demonstrate that there is sufficient infrastructure capacity to support the requirements arising from the proposed development. This must be provided through appropriate infrastructure on-site, or through expansion to existing facilities to mitigate its impacts via legal Section 106 agreements.</p> <p>SKDC acknowledges the comments in relation to paragraph 12.78. The paragraph is intended to provide a brief overview of the facilities and services provided within the town and will be reviewed prior to the pre submission publication of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Figure 33 is only to provide an indicative image of the proposed Corby Glen allocations in the Local Plan review. The Ordnance Survey base maps used for these indicative figures are only to illustrate a snapshot in time and may not have been fully updated at the date of publication. It is not the intention of the indicative figures within the Local Plan review to show all developments that have planning permission. The published virtual policies maps on the Local Plan review webpage - South Kesteven District Council – Local Plan: Policies and Constraints Map 2024 provide the most accurate and up to date information and should be viewed when seeking the extent of any policies or allocations.</p>
SKPR-247 – Land North of Bourne Road, Corby Glen	2	60	62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment supporting proposed area for the village and future development of the site will be able to connect in a positive and meaningful manner with the existing settlement of Corby Glen. Improvements to these connections will ensure integrated communities to aid the delivery of sustainable development in the village. • SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) generated a number of objections which have been summarised into the following key themes. • Fails to take account the 3 current areas of development ongoing within the village which are unfinished. • Having already experienced an increase in housing stock, further development would jeopardise the strong sense of community. 	<p>Comment of support for SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) and how it will improve the connectivity and sustainability of the village have been noted.</p> <p>Comments noted in relation to SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) causing overdevelopment. Although, as set out in the Settlement Hierarchy review (2021-2041), Corby Glen is identified as a 'well scoring' Larger Village. This means that it has the level of facilities and services to be able to accommodate future growth and aid in meeting the required housing needs of the district over the new plan period. SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) has a proposed density of 30 dwellings per hectare which would be an appropriately efficient use of land at this edge of village location. Additionally, the development will be expected to come forward in a comprehensive manor which does not harm the nature and character of the area and promotes all the elements of sustainable development as set out in draft policy SD1.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) is 144 dwellings, the largest single site for any of the larger villages • The proposed development SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) would place significant strain on local infrastructure, including schools, healthcare facilities. Adequate provision of essential services must be guaranteed before introducing any major residential or commercial projects to the area. • SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) is 9.8km from the nearest employment site in the draft plan, a non-sustainable solution due to lack of employment opportunities • Objection from Corby Glen Primary School – For Economic viability reasons the primary school admission number is reduced. An additional 144 dwellings are likely to be over pupil capacity, or residents will not be able to secure a place at their local school. • There is only one small Village store that is used by surrounding Villages and there is insufficient parking around it. • SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) would increase traffic in rural areas with poor public transport links. The A151 is dangerous, with high accident potential and poor road surfaces. • The access to this site is off the A151, with the constraints of the frontage of existing properties between the site and the village, cycle ways and footpaths could not be provided. • There is a very limited bus service in the village so new residents will need to use a car, increasing the volume, noise and pollution of traffic on the A151 • Parking in the market square is extremely busy. Many residents have to park in the market square and surrounding area as lots of houses do not have off road parking. • SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) builds over a greenfield site with subsequent loss of arable land that can grow crops. • Developing on the countryside increases greenhouse gases, global warming and local pollution. • SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) is likely home to various forms of wildlife and ecosystems. Developing this land would disrupt these habitats • Encroaching upon agricultural land and disrupting local habitats undermines the ecological balance of our village and diminishes its natural beauty. • The open rolling landscape of the Kesteven Uplands NCA before the landform slopes down into the Lower Trent and Belvoir Vales around Grantham, is fundamental to the character of Corby Glen and must be protected. • The Corby Glen Neighbourhood Plan identified a number of key views which contribute to the character and the appearance of the neighbourhood area. • SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) will change forever the rural nature of the local area 	<p>Objections regarding SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) impact on services and facilities has been noted. Any application on SKPR-247 must comply with draft Local Plan review policy ID1 in order to demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity to support the requirements arising from the proposed development. This must be provided through appropriate facilities or services on-site, or through expansion of existing services/facilities to mitigate its impacts via legal Section 106 agreements. Furthermore, no objections have been received from the statutory infrastructure providers /bodies during the draft consultation process. The Comment in relation to Corby Glen Primary Schools admission numbers has been sent for review to Lincolnshire County Council as the lead education provider. The outcomes will be reflected in the next version of the Local Plan review.</p> <p>Comments regarding SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) impact on traffic / transport and parking have been noted. It is accepted that any development could naturally cause the above issues to increase. Therefore, any development will be expected to comply with draft policy EN4 and ID2 to minimise pollution, improve air quality and promote sustainable forms of safe transportation. No objections have been received from Lincolnshire County Council (as Local Highways Authority) who in principle, have identified that the highway network, including the A151 can accommodate further development. There is also no clear evidence that the safety of the road network would be severely comprised. In terms of the parking in the Market Square, policy criterion (B) requires pedestrian links from the site into the centre of the village in order to reduce the reliance on car journeys. These networks would be agreed through the application stage as appropriate based on appropriate design and masterplanning. Bus service provision is addressed through the councils Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), and it will be for developers to contribute to bus scheme provision through S106 agreements where required.</p> <p>Objections to SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) due to its impact on the natural environment have been noted. Although no evidence has been brought before SKDC to demonstrate that SKPR-247 will impact on any statutory or un-statutory 'designated' environmental site. Any development will be expected to comply with draft policy EN2 which facilitates the conservation, enhancement and promotion of the natural environment. Additionally, draft policy criterion (G) and (H) require SKPR-247 to incorporate proposals for the enhancement of biodiversity opportunities and green infrastructure provision. Furthermore, sites graded to be of the 'best and most versatile' agricultural land would have been assessed poorly against the site assessment framework. SKPR-247 has not been identified as being 'best and most versatile.' Therefore, it presents an opportunity to aid in meeting the required housing needs of the district while promoting all the elements of sustainable development as set out in draft policy SD1.</p> <p>Comments in relation to landscape/character have been noted. Any development on SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) will be expected to comply with draft policy EN1 and demonstrate that it is appropriate to the natural, historic and cultural attributes of the surrounding area. Furthermore, draft policy (E) ensures that any potential landscape impacts should be mitigated through high quality design and landscaping. This will include taking into consideration SKDCs upcoming design code and the relevant character area assessments accompanying the Local Plan review. In terms of protecting the key views of the area, draft site criterion (D), requires sensitive landscaping to be incorporated along the northern and western edges of the site so that</p>
--	--	--	--

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The character of the village and the landscapes of a traditional Lincolnshire village are at risk of being completely lost and changed. Surface water is being directed down into the River Glen which has flooded and closed the A151. SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) raises serious safety concerns for current and future residents that have significant drainage problems SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) is extremely wet in the winter months and floods due to the clay conditions There is flooding currently experienced every time there is heavy rain and this increases the risk of raw sewerage from Corby Glen sewerage works being released into the River Glen. 	<p>the views from the open countryside and those identified in the Corby Glen Neighbourhood Plan are protected.</p> <p>Objections in relation to SKPR-247 (Land North of Bourne Road) increasing flood risk and sewerage issues have been noted. However, no evidence has been put forward to SKDC to demonstrate that SKPR-247 would further exacerbate any of these proposed issues within Corby Glen. Any development on SKPR-247 will be expected to comply with draft policy EN5 which requires development to avoid increasing flood risk elsewhere through the use of on-site Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs). Planning applications are also expected to be accompanied by a statement of how surface water is to be discharged. No objections have been received from statutory undertakers, both Anglian Water Servies and the Environment Agency for SKPR-247. Additionally, SKPR-247 is not identified to be within either flood zones 2 or 3.</p>
Great Gonerby	0	5	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding density of proposed allocations and encroachment of surrounding developments being located within the Parish of Great Gonerby. Impact of proposals in and around Great Gonerby need to be considered in the plan. 	<p>The Local Plan should be read as a whole, other policies in the plan ensure consideration of proposals to encourage sustainable development. The Local Plan policies seek to ensure that development contributes to and accords with the vision, and objectives of the Plan, from the sustainability of growth through to infrastructure provision.</p>
SKPR-241 – Land Off Church Lane, Great Gonerby	3	51	54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petition received of 470 signatures in objection to the proposed allocation, comments also reference being in support of the submitted petition. 200 questionnaire submissions were received with various responses on village identify impacts on traffic, population, services and facilities, historic character, landscape, wildlife and habitats. Concerns about the loss of established paddocks, hedgerows, biodiversity and disturbance to wildlife. Church Lane is a popular route for walkers. In SKDC Grantham Green Infrastructure Strategy as "Great Gonerby Walk" and the green fields site area is marked as "Historic Landscape" and "Historic Settlement Core", enjoyed by the community. Infrastructure capacity, flooding, congestion, increased pollution, damage to mental health concerns Church Lane is a single track restricted by way, poor viability, road and pedestrian safety concerns and not considered suitable. Junction redevelopment would mean loss of the 'Pinfold' an old part of the village that is of special importance Loss of village identity and impact on the conservation area concerns. Historic England: Assessment required, potential for impact upon Grade I Church of St Sebastian to north west together with the conservation to the north west. Criteria c of policy SKPR-214 noted. Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: Development of, or exceeding, 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. Development that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to 	<p>Comments received, including the 470 signature petition and 200 questionnaire submissions noted.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements arising from new development will be addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and relevant policies within the Plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is prepared in consultation with infrastructure providers including highways, education, health and utilities.</p> <p>The Local Plan seeks to protect and enhance the environment. New Policy 4: Biodiversity Opportunity and Delivering Measurable Gains requires all qualifying development proposals to deliver at least 10% measurable biodiversity net gain, achieved through onsite habitat enhancement where possible.</p> <p>All development proposals are required to retain, protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity features proportionate to their scale, through site layout and the design of new buildings. Development proposals are expected to create new habitats and links between habitats to maintain and enhance a network of wildlife sites and corridors. The emerging Local Plan has introduced Biodiversity Opportunity and Green Infrastructure Mapping which development proposals must take into account.</p> <p>Criterion e of the policy acknowledges that the site is within a Green Infrastructure Area which consists of semi natural habitat. Green Infrastructure Areas offer an opportunity to enhance the green and blue infrastructure network thereby improving the range and level of benefits they provide. Proposals in such areas, should seek to enhance the network of green infrastructure by taking opportunities to manage green infrastructure and should avoid any loss of opportunities to manage green infrastructure where possible.</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council has been consulted on the proposed allocation. The County Council has advised that highways improvements to Church Lane would be required and this has been reflected in criterion b. of the policy.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<p>aviation, including the potential for an environment attractive to hazardous bird species to be formed temporarily</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site previously dismissed and not considered suitable for development in 2009 • Site Assessment highlights access issues and site will need highway improvements to Church Lane. • Landowner keen to work with developer and neighbours to deliver the site. • Great Gonerby is a suitable location for growth, there are no constraints or issues that would impact the deliverability or suitability of the site. • Proposed density is not in keeping with low development at the lane • Land not on neighbourhood plan where other suitable sites have been identified. • Would appear to impair the existing Green Infrastructure Area • Only green space and should remain 	<p>Potential for impact upon Grade I Church of St Sebastian to the north-west and the conservation to the north west noted. Criterion c requires the site to seek to positively incorporate views towards the St Sebastian's Church and its setting. The policy will be strengthened to also require a Heritage Impact Assessment as advised by Historic England.</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organization Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. Statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p> <p>A number of sites considered through the emerging Local Plan have been assessed through previous local plans, but were not selected as they were not required to meet the required housing need at that time. This does not necessarily deem a site unsuitable. Nevertheless, all sites submitted for consideration through the emerging Local Plan have undergone a recent assessment, even if sites have been assessed previously.</p> <p>The density and resultant housing numbers to be delivered on site, as referenced in the policy is indicative only and may change at the planning application stage, taking into account factors such as landscape sensitivity, historic environment sensitivity and design.</p>
Harlaxton	1	1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns regarding potential large development (SKPR-198) although not identified as a preferred site allocation 	Comment noted, no action required.
SKPR-74 – The Land West of The Drift, Harlaxton	1	3	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning application S24/0070 is 'live' and seeks to build 9 houses not 24 as indicated in the Draft Plan • Historic England: Harlaxton Conservation Areas to south and Harlaxton Grade II* RPAG. Assessment required. • Canal and River Trust: Open space is not required on site, so off site available of open space will be more important with the canal's proximity to contribute. Access improvements/wayfinding at Harlaxton Bridge may therefore be an appropriate opportunity. 	Full planning permission has now been granted, site to be removed as a proposed allocation.
Langtoft	0	2	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Langtoft is already at full capacity with housing 	There is no evidence to demonstrate that the Village is at capacity in terms of its housing numbers. The Settlement Hierarchy review (2021-2041) to accompany the draft Local Plan review identifies Langtoft as a 'well scoring' Larger Village. This means that it has the level of facilities and services to be able to accommodate future growth and aid in meeting the required housing needs of the district over the new plan period.
SKPR-71 Land North of Dickens Close, Langtoft	1	21	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SKPR-71 (Land North of Dickens Close, Stowe Road) generated a number of objections which have been summarised into the following key themes. • Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team - Advise development which exceeds 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement due to bird species hazardous to aviation. • Vast number of houses built in Langtoft over the past number of years, already another development on Dickens Close which exceeds current village capacity • New development must be considered when deciding upon the number of future housing requirements in the village. 	<p>Defence Infrastructure Organization Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any proposed development on SKPR-71 will exceed the 91.4m limit. Although, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p> <p>Objection regarding Langtoft being at capacity and current developments not selling have been noted. Although, as set out in the Settlement Hierarchy review (2021-2041) to accompany the draft Local Plan review, Langtoft is identified as a 'well scoring' Larger Village. This means that it has the level of facilities and services to be able to accommodate future growth and aid in meeting the required housing needs of the district over the new plan period. There has been no evidence presented SKDC to demonstrate that the village is at capacity. Awaiting units to be sold on other housing sites has not been a factor when determining the most suitable allocations within each</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Properties around the village have not sold indicating there is the supply but not the demand • Development previously rejected on the field. • There is no evidence in the Draft Plan as to how the local infrastructure will be improved or funded to accommodate the increased number of residents • Concerned about access to doctors, dentists and capacity of schools • No services or bus stop that end of a mile long village. This is beyond the distance most people would be prepared to walk to use local facilities on a daily basis. • Local wastewater treatment is operating at full capacity and will not support additional waste from new developments. • The proposal would mean traffic passing through Dickens Close which is narrow and totally unsuitable for heavy construction vehicles. There will be noise and disruption to residents associated with construction. • King Street is accident black spot, with no defined road boundaries, no road markings or lighting. It is also busy at peak times busy due to volume of traffic travelling to Peterborough. • Stowe Road at capacity. Increase in vehicle movements arising from the development would also compromise highway safety in Langtoft, including the junction with the A15. • Additional households will equate to more cars. SKDC have declared a 'climate emergency'. It has an ambition to reduce its carbon footprint and the significant contribution that transport emissions from cars make to the climate emergency. • The proposed development would be built on Grade 2 Agricultural Land. Which is essential for maintaining agricultural productivity. • Development would lead directly to a significant adverse effect on the Langtoft gravel pits– SSSI and its conservation objectives/ characteristics. • Natural England / DEFRA designate the area as within the Impact Risk Zone, attached to the Langtoft gravel pits– SSSI. These pits were classified in 2011 as being in “unfavourable, declining condition”, and are very close to the proposed site. • Development would present a range of risks of direct impact, particularly to farmland/green space / semi natural habitat surrounding SKPR-71. • Flood risk level must be reassessed after 2023/24 caused severe flooding all around site. • Anglian Water’s SPA pipeline has devastated the landscape directly adjacent to Dickens Close and site SKPR-71, causing deep flooding • A key consideration is potential disturbance to water courses and strain on existing drains. A natural watercourse runs through the site, there is clear threat from ground water and run off and the water table is already known to be very high. • Anglian Water will not be investing in much-needed wastewater treatment upgrades, despite exceeding maximum capacity in 	<p>settlement. Additionally, comments surrounding development on SKPR-71 being rejected previously is incorrect, as there is no planning history on the site.</p> <p>Objections regarding SKPR-71 (Land North of Dickens Close, Stowe Road) impact on infrastructure and facilities has been noted. Although no evidence has been brought before SKDC to demonstrate capacity issues with infrastructure or service provision across the village. Any application on SKPR-71 must comply with draft Local Plan review policy ID1 in order to demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity to support the requirements arising from the proposed development. This must be provided through appropriate facilities or services on-site, or through expansion of existing services/facilities to mitigate its impacts via legal Section 106 agreements. Furthermore, no objections have been received from the statutory infrastructure providers /bodies during the draft consultation process.</p> <p>Comments regarding SKPR-71 (Land North of Dickens Close, Stowe Road) impact on the road network has been noted. It is accepted that any development could naturally cause the dependency on cars to increase. Therefore, any development will be expected to comply with draft policy EN4 and ID2 to minimise pollution, improve air quality and promote sustainable forms of safe transportation. No objections have been received from Lincolnshire County Council (as Local Highways Authority) who in principle, have identified that the local highway network, including Stowe Road, King Street and the A15 can accommodate further development. There is also no clear evidence that the safety of the local road network would be severely comprised. In terms of Dickens Close, a construction management plan would be expected to be produced during the planning application stage of any development on SKPR-71. The management plan will outline what mitigations will be in place to minimise the impact to nearby properties.</p> <p>Objections to SKPR-71(Land North of Dickens Close, Stowe Road) due to its impact on the natural environment have been noted. Although no evidence has been brought before SKDC to demonstrate that SKPR-71 will impact on any statutory or un-statutory ‘designated’ environmental site. SKPR-71 falls within the SSSI impact risk zone of the Langtoft Gravel Pits, therefore an assessment of recreational pressures will be expected during the planning application stage. Any development will also be expected to comply with draft policy EN2 which facilitates the conservation, enhancement and promotion of the natural environment. Additionally, draft policy criterion (C) requires SKPR-71 to incorporate proposals for the enhancement of green infrastructure provision. Furthermore, while it is acknowledged that SKPR-71 is grade 2 agricultural Land, the site presents an opportunity to aid in meeting the required housing needs of the district. Any development will be expected to incorporate all the elements of sustainable development as set out in draft policy SD1 and a land classification and justification report will also be required as part of the planning application process. There has been no objection to the site in principle from Natural England or the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership.</p> <p>Objections in relation to SKPR-71 (Land North of Dickens Close, Stowe Road) increasing flood risk and surface water issues have been noted. Any development on SKPR-71 will be expected to comply with draft policy EN5 which requires development to avoid increasing flood risk elsewhere through the use of on-site Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDs). Planning applications are also expected to be accompanied by a statement of how surface water is to be discharged. SKRP-71 is not identified to be within either flood zones 2 or 3 from the latest Environment Agency maps, which are</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<p>our area which cannot support new development in rural villages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed site is at the gateway to the village and is visible some distance away across a large, flat arable field. Development would erode the perception of open countryside on the approach into Langtoft. Historic England objection requiring a full Archaeological assessment. 	<p>updated every three months using local data. Additionally, a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is being prepared to set out the detailed nature of flood risk and other sources of flooding for each proposed site. No objections have been received from the Environment Agency or Lincolnshire County Council as the lead flood risk authority. Furthermore, no objections have been received from the statutory water undertaker Anglian Water, whose water pipelaying infrastructure project from Grantham to Peterborough is set to restart in summer 2026.</p> <p>Comments in relation to landscape/character have been noted. Any development on SKPR-71 (Land North of Dickens Close, Stowe Road) will be expected to comply with draft policy EN1 and demonstrate that it is appropriate to the natural, historic and cultural attributes of the surrounding area. Furthermore, draft policy (B) ensures that any potential landscape impacts should be mitigated through high quality design and landscaping. This will include taking into consideration SKDCs upcoming design code and the relevant character area assessments accompanying the Local Plan review. The objection from Historic England has been noted. The addition of a draft site criterion requiring an archaeological assessment will be explored, although this will normally be a requirement at the planning application stage.</p>
Long Bennington	1	0	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments not relevant 	No action required.
SKPR-273 (LV-H7): Main Road (South), Long Bennington	2	0	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: Development of, or exceeding, 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement 	It is highly unlikely that any proposed development will exceed the 91.4m limit. Although, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.
Morton	0	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments not relevant 	No action required
SKPR-274 LV-H9: Folkingham Road, Morton	0	1	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments not relevant 	No action required
SKPR-135 Land to the South of Edenham Road, Morton	1	2	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocation and draft criteria supported. Historic England: Assessment required, edge of Conservation Area and finds to the west (1030978 probable medieval ridge and furrow) 	<p>Comments of supported welcomed.</p> <p>Historic England comments have been noted. The NPPF and Draft Local Plan ensures there is emphasis on understanding and conserving the significance of heritage assets as part of sustainable development. This makes the need to consider historic environment constraints imperative, therefore a heritage statement and/or archaeological evaluation will be required on identified sites as part of the planning application process.</p>
South Witham	0	3	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate infrastructure to support proposed developments in South Witham, flood, traffic and poor public transport and main drainage could be impacted further 	The Local Plan should be read as a whole, other policies in the plan ensure consideration of proposals to encourage sustainable development. The Local Plan policies seek to ensure that development contributes to and accords with the vision, and objectives of the Plan, from the sustainability of growth through to infrastructure provision.
SKPR-275 (LV-H10): Thistleton Lane and Mill Lane, South Witham	0	3	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not have the infrastructure to support 172 homes being built Access on to Mill Lane is dangerous The extent of the site allocation should be extended to include the poultry farm which lies immediately to the south and east. 	Infrastructure requirements arising from new development will be addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and relevant policies within the Plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is prepared in consultation with infrastructure providers including highways, education, health and utilities.
SKPR-192 and SKPR- 276 (LV-H11): Land	3	4	7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roads are not suitable to cope with additional traffic that will be generated by new houses No existing healthcare infrastructure to cope 	Infrastructure requirements arising from new development will be addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and relevant policies within the Plan. The Infrastructure

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

North of High Street, South Witham				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of countryside to buildings and congestion The draft criteria considered reasonable, and the comprehensive masterplan approach is supported as it means a coherent and more efficient development sharing infrastructure. Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: Eastern WAM network safeguarding criteria trigger. Any development or change of use will trigger statutory consultation requirement. The potential for an environment attractive to hazardous bird species to be formed temporarily. 	<p>Delivery Plan is prepared in consultation with infrastructure providers including highways, education, health and utilities.</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. Statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage.</p>
Thurlby	0	9	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paragraph 12.95 requires factual amendments. Further concerns expressed regarding the proposed residential allocations in Thurlby. 	<p>Paragraph 12.95 will be reviewed in light of comments made regarding the current available facilities and services in Thurlby.</p>
SKPR-277 (LV-H12): Part of Elm Farm Yard, Thurlby	2	57	59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns over flooding, road safety, access and congestion, infrastructure capacity, impacts to wildlife, impact to rural character of the village, and loss of agricultural land. 50 homes are manageable on this land with infrastructure improvements. Access to the site should be sought from the A15 not High Street. No consideration of the impacts to Thurlby from the existing developments at Elsea Park Proposal goes against the Thurlby Neighbourhood Plan in regard to building outside of the existing village housing lines. Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: Development of, or exceeding, 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. 	<p>Concerns regarding infrastructure capacity/ road suitability/ Wildlife and habitats/flooding are noted. Infrastructure requirements arising from new development including medical, schools and highways will be addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and relevant policies within the Plan.</p> <p>The Local Plan's policy wording will be reviewed to ensure it is robust and sound.</p> <p>Made Neighbourhood Plans form part of the Council's development plan and all proposed allocations and planning applications must be in accordance with any made Neighbourhood Plan for the locality. Where there is any conflict in regard to policy the most up to date document will take precedent.</p> <p>Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any proposed development will exceed the 91.4m limit. Although, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council's Highways team has been consulted on all sites assessed. Criterion a. of the policy requires access not to be sought from the A15.</p>
SKPR-56 – Land at Obthorpe Lane, Thurlby	2	67	69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns over flooding, road safety, access and congestion, infrastructure capacity, impacts to wildlife, impact to rural character of the village, and loss of agricultural land. Site not considered suitable to accommodate 86 dwellings. Concerns over the assumed site capacity. Proposal goes against the Thurlby Neighbourhood Plan in regard to building outside of the existing village housing lines. Public right of way does not run along the eastern edge. Defence Infrastructure Organisation Safeguarding Team: Development of, or exceeding, 91.4m in height above ground level will trigger statutory consultation requirement. 	<p>Concerns regarding infrastructure capacity/ road suitability/ Wildlife and habitats/flooding are noted. Infrastructure requirements arising from new development including medical, schools and highways will be addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and relevant policies within the Plan. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan is prepared in consultation with infrastructure providers including highways, education, health and utilities.</p> <p>Made Neighbourhood Plans form part of the Council's development plan and all proposed allocations and planning applications must be in accordance with any made Neighbourhood Plan for the locality. Where there is any conflict in regard to policy the most up to date document will take precedent.</p> <p>The site capacity quoted within the allocation policy is an indicative figure based on the site area and identified constraints. The actual quantum of development would be considered through the planning application process.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				Defence Infrastructure Organization Safeguarding Team comments have been noted. It is highly unlikely that any proposed development will exceed the 91.4m limit. Although, statutory consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage should any building exceed the height limit.
--	--	--	--	---

Chapter 13 – Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
Chapter 13 – Infrastructure and Development Contributions	13	13	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure is at capacity in most areas. Concerns regarding traffic congestion, school capacity, Local NHS services being already stretched, drainage and sewage capacity. Lack of planning for infrastructure issues make this plan unrealistic. The infrastructure development plan should dictate heavily towards this spatial strategy not be an after thought. New town/village adjacent to A1 would decrease amount of pollution Bourne appears to be the only major conurbation between Peterborough and the Humber Bridge which does not have a relief road of any sort, congestion through the town at all times and busy east-west route adds to the problem. Situation requires review. Stantec model regarding Stamford North is not commensurate with the size of the development and a link road. As Exeter fields proposed as housing it will skew any traffic impact assessments. The need for infrastructure to be provided in a timely manner alongside growth and development is fundamental to achieving sustainable development and the Regulation 18 document correctly identifies that. Support that paragraph 13.1 provides examples of relevant infrastructure and types of outlines but also acknowledges each community is unique and will required different provision at different times. Sport England: welcomes the inclusion and green infrastructure in the list of main items of infrastructure to be considered. Sport England have provided comments on the IDP. The emerging Playing Pitch Strategy will provide evidence on the need for additional facilities because of the increased population. The Council does not have a robust and up to date assessment of the need for indoor sports and recreation facilities as required by para 102 of the NPPF. House Builders Federation: Development can only be required to mitigate its own impacts and cannot be required to address existing issues and shortfalls in provision. It would be unreasonable and fail the CIL tests for developers to be expected to pay to address existing deficiencies. 	<p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared which will accompany and inform the Local Plan. The Plan is prepared in consultation with infrastructure providers including Health, Education, Lincolnshire County Council Highways, National Highways Local Lead Flood Authority, Drainage Boards, and utilities including National Grid and Anglian Water. All comments received, including those received through the Regulation 18 Draft Plan Consultation, will be considered through the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>All proposed site allocations will be assessed through the IDP to ascertain infrastructure requirements to make the development acceptable.</p> <p>Taking into account the recommendations from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS) which will identify the physical, social and green infrastructure needed to support the vision and growth proposals included in the Local Plan over the plan period, including where known, when the infrastructure will be required and how it will be funded.</p> <p>Chapter 13 to be reviewed to incorporate recommendations of IDP.</p> <p>The Council welcomes engagement from infrastructure providers and will continue discussions as the Local Plan progresses.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment Agency: supportive that water and drainage of the IDP will include flood risk management. Expect the developer to work with AWS to contribute to any developments if needed for proper discharge of sewage and wastewater. • Department for Education: Support principle SKD safeguarding land for the provision of new schools to meet government planning policy objectives. SKDC should also have regard to the Joint Policy Statement from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Secretary of State for Education on Planning for Schools Development (2011) which sets out the government's commitment to support the development of state-funded schools and their delivery through the planning system. Request a reference within the Local Plan's policies or supporting text to explain that developer contributions may be secured retrospectively, when it has been necessary to forward fund infrastructure projects in advance of anticipated housing growth. • National Highways: following the completion of the Strategic Transport Assessment, any highways infrastructure necessary to support Local Plan growth should be set out in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). This should identify what, when, where and how/by whom infrastructure is required, as well as estimated costs and funding sources. With regards funding, please see our later comment with respect to Policy ID1 related to infrastructure. • National Grid: recommends early contact for confirmation of National Grid's capacity to accommodate planned growth. • Colsterworth & District Parish expect to be included in discussions regarding robust infrastructure upgrade plan which are essential for any future developments that could increase the population of the district. • SKDC must ensure developer contributions are made for the good of residents - they must not be allowed to water them down, change them etc. • Concerned that the details of the IDP and Infrastructure Delivery Schedule documents are not provided at this stage of the plan making process to allow for engagement and representations to be made on approach, requirements and timescales envisaged. • The Local Plan needs to provide an indication as to the level of Section 106 that may be requested for different types of development in different parts of the plan area. Without this clarification, the Council's Viability Appraisal is flawed because assumptions used in relation to Section 106 may not be accurate and therefore could be under or over stating requirements that need to meet the tests for planning obligations. 	
ID1: Infrastructure for Growth	7	13	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relevant public authorities must make adequate provision to meet the shortfall which may be anticipated. • The existing infrastructure is inadequate, we need to see the infrastructure first. SKDC has to hold developers to account and get it built first to ensure it does get built. • The text on "viability considerations" is weak - almost an invitation to developers to apply for a revised viability assessment 	An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is being prepared which will accompany and inform the Local Plan. The Plan is prepared in consultation with infrastructure providers including Health, Education, Lincolnshire County Council Highways, National Highways Local Lead Flood Authority, Drainage Boards, and utilities including National Grid and Anglian Water. All comments received, including those received through the Regulation 18 Draft Plan Consultation, will be considered through the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy needs a clear definition of "infrastructure" and a clear definition of "amenities" and should then set out clearly the policy for each of them. • A relief road around Bourne would support the required town centre improvements • Suggest the policy wording should be updated to highlight those other bodies involved with bringing forward infrastructure. • While the policy is related to the provision of infrastructure required as a result of new development, it should be recognised that there are significant existing infrastructure issues in Bourne. • The plan should clearly show the timing for an improved and larger capacity sewage works at Towngate West which must be implemented before any further development is carried out. • It is unreasonable to expect that development proposals provide the necessary infrastructure at an appropriate time as this fails to acknowledge the range of parties that need to align and be involved with bringing forward the infrastructure. • Would welcome an acknowledgement of the delivery of an excess or a significant improvement in local infrastructure that could enable additional sustainable development. • Is important that all statutory consultees provide realistic assumptions on contributions that will be sought for proposed allocations in order to avoid the need for further viability assessment at the decision making stage (PPG Reference ID: 10-002-20190509). Currently the Viability Assessment just notes an assumption of S106 Agreement costs of £20,000 per unit. It is unclear from the Assessment whether this is based on what has been requested by consultees or just experience by the Consultants elsewhere. • Lincolnshire County Council: suggests the final paragraph of ID1 is strengthened to advise that only 'particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage'. Welcomes the early consideration of the infrastructure requirements, specifically of the site allocations. This should be considered beyond Highway infrastructure and look at the land holistically in terms of all requirements on the land such as drainage, sewerage, energy and clean water. • NHS Property Services: Welcomes the recognition of health infrastructure as essential infrastructure, with an expectation that development proposals will make provision to meet the cost of healthcare infrastructure. Recommends the Local Plan have a specific section in the document that sets out the process to determine the appropriate form of developer contributions to health infrastructure. Recommends engagement with relevant IDB to add further detail and support IDP. Provides suggestions to processes as a starting point. • Canal and River Trust: On the western edge of Grantham there are various employment allocations that may need to provide off-site improvements to blue green infrastructure, such improvements could be considered within the canal corridor. 	<p>All proposed site allocations will be assessed through the IDP to ascertain infrastructure requirements to make the development acceptable.</p> <p>Taking into account the recommendations from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS) which will identify the physical, social and green infrastructure needed to support the vision and growth proposals included in the Local Plan over the plan period, including where known, when the infrastructure will be required and how it will be funded.</p> <p>Policy ID1 to be reviewed to incorporate recommendations of IDP.</p>
ID2: Transport and Strategic Transport Infrastructure	11	6	17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Stamford, Ryhall Road and connecting residential streets will be affected by traffic using the proposed west-east road. Recommend that our council enlists people with expert knowledge and people with local 	<p>The Council is undertaking a Strategic Transport Assessment which will understand the impact of future growth on the road network, including cumulatively. All proposed site allocations will be assessed.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

			<p>knowledge to scrutinise the traffic models on behalf of the people of Stamford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SKPR-57 is too far from Grantham town centre. Active Travel will not work from here. Site not within town boundaries. LCC say "Overall mitigation required probably too great for site". This has seemingly been completely ignored. • Traffic is already a problem in Stamford and with the number of houses expected to be built as part of the various housing developments it will only get worse. Need to improve public transport and more safe cycle and pedestrian routes. • Would like to see where policies seek good cycling infrastructure, reference is made to the Department for Transport Local Transport Note LTN 1/20 Cycle infrastructure design. • Concerned at the lack of safety on the A151 • The policy commitment of SKDC to work with delivery partners to support and promote an efficient and safe transport network which offers choice, reduces the need to travel by car and encourages the use of alternative modes of transport is strongly supported. • While the policy is related to new development, it should be recognised that there are significant existing transport issues within the town of Bourne which need to be addressed, including the following, Town centre traffic, reducing the need to travel by car, and promoting cycling. • Canal and River Trust: Developments on the western edge of Grantham may need to provide off-site improvements that could include improvements to the towpath as a sustainable transport route to/from Denton/Harlaxton into Grantham. • A review of the existing provision for Lorry Parks, and parking has identified that the A1 does have existing provisions for such facilities, however there is very limited lorry parking available within and around Grantham. • Policy ID2 as set out in the Draft Local Plan which states that new development will be required to contribute to transport improvements in line with appropriate evidence, including the Infrastructure Delivery, the Local Transport Plan and local transport strategies is welcomed. • The specifics on what the infrastructure requirements are have not been set out as such therefore it is not clear what the figures are based on. • National Highways: Recommends the text be amended so the delivery mechanisms under the Highway Act 198 through Section 278 Agreements are also included for the delivery of the highway mitigations. <p>Comments on supporting text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SKDC to exert pressure on LCC and central government to recognise the needs of rural areas for exception funding due to the distribution of communities. • This section should also make reference to the new LCC Stamford Transport Strategy. • National Highways: Transport Evidence Base - National Highways will expect this process to explore all options to reduce a reliance on the SRN for local journeys including a reduction in the need to travel and integrating land use considerations with the need to maximise 	<p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is being prepared which will accompany an inform the Local Plan. The Plan is prepared in consultation with infrastructure providers including Lincolnshire County Council Highways and Highways England. Taking into account the recommendations from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS) which will identify the physical, social and green infrastructure needed to support the vision and growth proposals included in the Local Plan over the plan period, including where known, when the infrastructure will be required and how it will be funded.</p> <p>Policy ID1 to be reviewed to incorporate recommendations of IDP and Strategic Transport Assessment.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

				opportunities for walking, wheeling, cycling, public transport and shared travel. A robust evidence base will be required, including demand forecasting models, which inform analysis of alternatives by accounting for the effects of possible mitigation scenarios that shift demand into less carbon-intensive forms of travel. Understanding the impact at the following locations will be of particular interest to National Highways: - A1/A52 Barrowby Junction, A1 Spittalgate Junction, A1/A606 & A1/A6121 Stamford, and A1 Gonerby Moor & Long Bennington junctions	
ID3: Broadband and Communication Infrastructure	5	3	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy needs revising to bring it up to date. You should not accept a developer proposing to install FTTC; only FTTP is now acceptable. • It is reasonable to identify this as a key policy consideration as all sectors of the community, both residents and businesses rely more than ever on access to broadband and communications networks. • Concerned that the policy and supporting text only focuses on what a developer is required to integrate into their development and fails to hold the communications providers to account for the overall network. The requirement to “future proof” is understood but this needs to be considered further to reflect that across South Kesteven the overall network will be mixed with some locations benefiting from greater connections than others, reflecting the urban and rural communities. • Considered that ‘where possible’ should be added so the policy states ‘where possible new developments must be served by either: Fibre to the Premises...or Fibre to the Cabinet technology’. This is accordance with NPPF paragraph 16 (b) which states that ‘plans should be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable’. 	<p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is being prepared which will accompany an inform the Local Plan. The Plan is prepared in consultation with infrastructure providers including broadband and communications infrastructure providers. Taking into account the recommendations from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS) which will what communication infrastructure will be needed to support the vision and growth proposals included in the Local Plan over the plan period, including where known, when the infrastructure will be required and how it will be funded.</p> <p>The policy will be reviewed to take into account the recommendations of the IDP.</p>

Chapter 14 – Monitoring and Implementation

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
Chapter 14 – Monitoring and Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring Framework • Review 	4	4	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the inclusion of a Monitoring Framework which sets out triggers and actions. • The Monitoring Framework should set out a benchmark to measure compliance, how and when Monitoring will be undertaken, and set out Affordable housing S106 and outcomes. • More information required on triggers regarding under delivery of housing. • Support for the removal of Policy M1. 	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>The Council has a duty to monitor the implementation of policies. A Monitoring and Implementation Framework will be prepared as part of the submission version of the Local Plan. The indicators will be reported on an annual basis in the Authority Monitoring Report. The monitoring indicators will provide information about whether policies are achieving their objectives; determine if any targets are being met; and determine if the policies in the Local Plan remain relevant or whether updates to policy are required.</p> <p>Monitoring of Affordable Housing S106 monies is already reported annually within the Infrastructure Funding Statement.</p>

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

Appendices

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
Appendix 1: Principle for Development within Biodiversity Opportunity Areas	8	5	13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Destruction of the countryside will adversely affect wildlife and biodiversity • Stamford North and Quarry Farm development will have detrimental impact on the local biodiversity. • Developers should be accountable to deliver significant measurable net gains before housing development is started. • Objects to the designation of Land as Green Infrastructure or Biodiversity Opportunity areas without any justification or consultation. • Appendix 1 should be reworded to provide an explanation, rather than act as an additional policy. • The Regulation 18 draft plan also includes policies that impact on the future of the site, whether as a future allocation or for promotion via a planning application. The various mapping exercises which are unjustified and/or inaccurate, and as such should not form the basis of a planning policy. 	<p>Development Principles within Appendix 1 to be moved to corresponding policy for clarity.</p> <p>Development Principles within Appendix 2 to be moved to corresponding policy for clarity. Appendix to be reviewed to determine if any further explanation is required.</p>
Appendix 2: Principles for Development within Green Infrastructure Areas	6	2	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the designation of Land as Green Infrastructure or Biodiversity Opportunity areas without any justification or consultation. • Appendix 1 should be reworded to provide an explanation, rather than act as an additional policy. • The Regulation 18 draft plan also includes policies that impact on the future of the site, whether as a future allocation or for promotion via a planning application. The various mapping exercises which are unjustified and/or inaccurate, and as such should not form the basis of a planning policy. 	<p>The designation of land as Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Opportunity areas has been consulted on through the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan consultation.</p> <p>Development Principles within Appendix 2 to be moved to corresponding policy for clarity. Appendix to be reviewed to determine if any further explanation is required.</p>
Appendix 3: Glossary	1	1	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments not relevant. 	No action required.

Supporting Documents – Interim Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulation Assessment

Appendix E – Summary of Responses and Officer Response

Please note that this Statement of Consultation reflects the current position and there may be further consideration and additional amendments to the Local Plan following emerging evidence base, national policy change, any future consultations, and ongoing discussions with statutory consultees, neighbouring planning authorities, and infrastructure providers.

Chapter/Policy/Theme	Support	Objection	Representations	Summary of Responses	Council Response
Interim Sustainability Appraisal	6	22	28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many comments are from concerned residents highlighting potential issues with specific sites. Flood risks, traffic concerns, lack of infrastructure to support growth, and landscape sensitivities are mentioned frequently. • Comments requesting updates to the RAG ratings for certain criteria within the site assessment. • Points of the Compass Appraisal approach is supported in several responses, and recognised as being a robust method to identify the most appropriate locations for growth in each settlement. Additionally, the consideration of the spread of the data as a basis to inform the RAG rules is also welcomed in several responses. • Historic England: highlight that a distance based approach to considering impacts to heritage assets is discouraged, and a detailed and holistic consideration of potential impacts to the significance of heritage assets is more appropriate. • Natural England: complementary of the Interim SA, and considers it to provide a comprehensive assessment at this stage of the Local Plan. They've provided suggestions to enhance policy wording. 	<p>Site specific concerns will be reviewed to consider whether constraints have been appropriately highlighted with site allocations through the SA, updating where appropriate to reference any proposed mitigation measures within policies.</p> <p>The assessment utilised the latest available datasets, including locally specific layers provided by the Council. Some of these layers might not have captured all features (e.g., bus stops) as they may not have been recently updated. This is recognised as a potential limitation with the site assessment, and the date of publication for each layer has been included within the assessment.</p> <p>Support to the Points of the Compass Appraisal, and recognised as being a robust method to identify the most appropriate locations for growth in each settlement is welcomed.</p> <p>Historic England comments have been noted. We acknowledge the limitations of a distance based approach within the SA Technical Annex, but will revisit and update the text to reflect concerns.</p> <p>Natural England comments have been noted. Any policy changes will be considered through the next stage SA report within an updated plan appraisal chapter.</p>
Habitats Regulation Assessment	3	3	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England is satisfied that the Screening Report follows accepted methodology and is in line with appropriate legislation and guidance. Acknowledges that policies that may have a Likely Significant Effect on a European Site have been identified. • Natural England seek clarification on the justification for using a 5km distance to screen out likely significant effects and what evidence has been used to support this distance. • Suggestions to make reference to 'average; distances as not considered appropriate, given the range of variable factors at play, and that bespoke survey or evidence should be used to determine of 8km was used as a reasonable distance to measure disturbance to Habitat Sites which included the Barnack Hills & Holes SAC. • Comments focusing on site specifics. 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Natural England comments have been noted. Revisions will be considered through the next stage HRA Report.</p>