



**North Kesteven District Council
Local Development Framework**

Sleaford Maltings Supplementary Planning Document

Final Consultation Statement

August 2006

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1.0 <u>Introduction</u>	3
2.0 <u>Requirement for Statement addressing Representations Received on Draft SPD and SA</u>	3
3.0 <u>Sleaford Maltings SPD: Background and Aims</u>	4
4.0 <u>Details of Public Consultation on Draft SPD and SA</u>	5
5.0 <u>Results of Public Consultation - Representations Received</u>	7
6.0 <u>Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations</u>	7
7.0 <u>Council Consideration and Response</u>	8
8.0 <u>How Main Issues Raised in Representations have been Addressed in SPD</u>	8
9.0 <u>Monitoring and Implementation</u>	10

Appendices:

Appendix A:

Copy of Press Notice advertising Draft SPD Documents	11
--	----

Appendix B:

List of Respondents to Consultation	13
-------------------------------------	----

Appendix C:

Table of Representations Received and approved Council Responses	15
--	----

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This Final Consultation Statement (August 2006) is produced to accompany the Adopted Sleaford Maltings Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), and to meet Planning Regulations.

1.2 This Final Consultation Statement sets out how the Council has undertaken formal public Consultation on the Draft Sleaford Maltings SPD and its accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA), in February and March 2006.

1.3 It reports on the subsequent Representations received, the approved Council Responses, the Main Issues raised and how these have been addressed and taken into account in the development of the SPD and SA Report.

1.4 This statement follows on from the earlier Consultation Statement document of January 2006 (which accompanied the formal public consultation), which described the extensive informal pre-SPD "Consultation Undertaken So Far" up to that time, before the Draft SPD was produced.

2.0 Requirement for Statement addressing Representations Received on Draft SPD and SA

2.1 SPD

Under the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 a Council shall not adopt an SPD until it has considered any duly made Representations on the draft SPD (Regulation 18).

2.2 The Regulations also require that, alongside the published Adopted Supplementary Planning Document, a Statement be produced (Regulation 19) setting out a summary of the main issues raised in Representations received as a result of the public consultation undertaken (under Regulation 17), and also setting out how these main issues have been addressed in the SPD which the Council intends to adopt. This Statement meets these requirements.

2.3 Sustainability Appraisal

The ODPM Guidance on Sustainability Appraisal of Local Development Documents (Nov 2005) advises that during the public participation stage a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) report must be consulted upon at the same time as the draft SPD. A Draft Sustainability Appraisal report was therefore also published and consulted upon, along with the Draft SPD. The Maltings Sustainability Appraisal analysed the effects of the SPD on sustainability and the effect on sustainability of producing the document or not. It was clear from the options appraisal that to produce the SPD had the most positive effect on the Sustainability Criteria identified.

2.4 The government Guidance advises that the findings of the SA and consultation responses must be taken into account and the decision-making process documented. Following the adoption of the SPD, a consultation statement must be prepared to show the ways in which responses to consultation have been taken into account. This summary must provide enough information to make clear how the SPD was changed, both as a result of the SA process and responses to consultation, or why no changes were made, or why options were rejected. This Statement also meets these requirements

2.5 In response to public consultation representations, the SPD has been altered. The Maltings SA Report has also been altered, including adding clarifying references to other relevant policies and amended SPD objectives.

2.6 Overall, the Council has considered and addressed all these SPD and SA consultation matters and representations received. This Consultation Statement sets out these matters and fulfills the relevant requirements.

3.0 Sleaford Maltings SPD: Background and Aims

3.1 The Supplementary Planning Document for Sleaford Maltings sets out the Council's position in relation to the Maltings and forms supplementary planning guidance for use when considering any planning applications that would affect the site. The SPD supplements policies in the emerging North Kesteven Local Plan. The preparation of the SPD has been informed by a range of background studies commissioned by the Sleaford Maltings Project Development Group (a partnership between: the Council, HRH The Prince of Wales's Phoenix Trust, the owners, County Council, Town Council, Lincolnshire Enterprise, Government Office).

3.2 The aims of the SPD are as follows:

- Preserve the site, prevent inappropriate alterations and prevent demolition of any significant part of the complex unless it has been fully justified;
- Promote a comprehensive mixed use development of the whole area which makes the most of the existing features and protects against any ad hoc proposals that may prejudice this aim;
- Set out the physical and policy parameters that would influence the development; and
- Ensure that the new development integrates the site with Sleaford town, with appropriate access.

4.0 Details of Public Consultation on Draft SPD and SA

4.1 The Council's Executive Board approved the Draft Sleaford Maltings SPD for formal public consultation purposes at its 8 December 2005 meeting.

4.2 Documents for Public Inspection:

A coloured printed Consultation Draft SPD document, with maps and photographs, was produced in January 2006, along with its accompanying draft Sustainability Appraisal Report and other associated SPD documents required under the Planning Regulations.

4.3 In compliance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (Reg.17), the Council made copies of the SPD documents available for Public Inspection for a public consultation period running from Wednesday 1 February until Monday 13 March 2006. The Council invited comments from everyone on both the draft SPD and draft Sustainability Appraisal.

4.4 To provide wide public access, copies of the SPD Consultation Draft, associated supporting Documents and a Public Notice were made available for public inspection free of charge, during normal opening hours, in the following locations: -

- District Council Offices, Sleaford
- Info-Links Offices, North Hykeham
- Info-Links Offices, Metherringham
- All Council's Community Access Points (10)
- County static Libraries, within the District (9)
- County mobile Libraries, within the District (6)

4.5 Website:

The relevant SPD documents, and a letter from the Regional Planning Body (East Midlands Regional Assembly) confirming compliance of the SPD with the Regional Spatial Strategy, were also made available for inspection, and downloading, on the Council's website at www.n-kesteven.gov.uk. An electronic Online version of the Response Form was made available on the Council's website for completing and making representations regarding the SPD.

4.6 Publicity:

The SPD Consultation was publicised through a local advertisement placed in the Public Notices section of the Lincolnshire Echo newspaper on Wednesday 1st February 2006. A copy of the Press Notice is attached in **Appendix A**. The public consultation on the Maltings Draft SPD was also publicised on the Sleaford Chamber of Commerce's own web site, which set out all the consultation information in the Council's press advertisement.

4.7 The document was also publicised through articles and illustrations in the Sleaford Standard newspaper on Weds 8th February 2006 and in the Sleaford Target newspaper of Wednesday 8th February 2006.

4.8 Extent of consultation

As the Council's Draft Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) is not yet formally adopted, the Council consulted on this Draft SPD in accordance with the minimum requirements (at least) of the 2004 Regulations, as advised by national policy PPS12 (Local Development Frameworks, paragraph 4.39).

The Council sent the relevant SPD Consultation documents pack to "specific consultation bodies", who the Council thought would be affected by the SPD, and "general consultation bodies" who it considered to be appropriate (in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 17(3)). Additionally, however, the Council also consulted wider, and sent the draft SPD Consultation documents pack to other bodies, organisations and individuals it considered relevant, in the 'spirit' of the Draft SCI and based upon the Draft SCI consultation list.

4.9 Documents sent:

Copies of the Draft SPD Consultation documents (183), together with covering letters, were Sent to: -

- All Statutory consultees
- Adjoining authorities
- General consultees considered appropriate
- North Kesteven Parish and Town Councils
- NK Developers and Agents Forum
- NKDC Executive Board and Sleaford Ward Councillors (12)
- Sleaford Town Council members (20)

Amongst these, the Govt Office for the East Midlands (GOEM) was sent a copy of the SPD documents.

4.10 Notification sent:

In addition to the above approximately 120 notification letters advising of the availability of the SPD documents were sent to a range of other parties, including:

- Adjoining Parish Councils
- People/organisations who asked to be notified
- Individual members of the public
- All other General consultees
- Remaining NKDC Councillors (offered paper or CD version of draft SPD on request)
- Sleaford Maltings Project Development Group (PDG) members, and other interested parties (approx 50).

5.0 Results of Public Consultation - Representations Received

5.1 In response to the Public Consultation, the Council has received 144 separate Comments from 47 different Respondents. Each Respondent's reply has been subdivided into individual Representations/Comments (with an individual Ref No.) on different topics, to aid formulation of Council responses. A List of Respondents to Consultation is attached at **Appendix B**.

5.2 Of all these comments, there were 31 in Support and 113 objections to elements of the SPD or SA. None objected to the principal aims of the documents.

5.3 Of all these comments, there were 125 comments on the draft SPD and 16 comments on the draft Sustainability Appraisal document, and 3 combined comments on both SPD/SA. Of the 144 Comments, 6 were received late (including the GO-EM).

5.4 The detail of each Representation and the Council's Response is set out in the Table contained in **Appendix C**.

6.0 Summary of Main Issues Raised in Representations

A Summary of the main Issues raised by the representations is set out below. They concern the following general topic or Issue areas: -

- (1) Preserving Listed Building: - Extent and justification for part demolition. Strengthen wording to preserve Block 2(or 3) and equipment as historic example.
- (2) Comments on the boundary of the SPD Site: - should it also include: all the nearby associated Listed Buildings originally built as part of the complex; the Advanta seeds site; the Tec Foods site; or land in open countryside?
- (3) Impact of Potential New Link Road and Bridge: - concern at impact of road on the building and open space to the north of the railway; greater definition of road and bridge route; need for it?; connecting site to town centre (pedestrian and transport links).
- (4) Impact on town generally and Town centre specifically: - effect on and enhancement of viability & vitality of Sleaford town centre.
- (5) Use of open land to South East (outside site): - effect of potential developments on Landscape Character and Views – from South (e.g. potential parking use).

- (6) Comments on Sustainability Appraisal: - should it consider more than 2 Options; provide more on mitigation measures; or give greater consideration to a range of issues such as: impact of: proposed traffic measures, part demolition, and of mixed use development on conservation of historic character of town.
- (7) Concern over individual uses – should it specify preferred uses? (especially NHS Dentists, Doctors, Health centre).

7.0 Council Consideration and Response

7.1 All the consultation comments and representations received were presented to and considered by the Executive Board on 15 June 2006 before consideration by full Council.

7.2 On 29 June 2006, a meeting of North Kesteven District Council considered all the comments on the Draft Sleaford Maltings SPD and accompanying SA, and approved detailed Responses to all the representations received. The Council also approved an amended version of the SPD for adoption, incorporating text and layout changes as a result of the approved responses.

7.3 All respondents were subsequently informed by letter of the Council's approved detailed Response to the Representation they made, and will also be informed when the SPD is formally adopted.

8.0 How Main Issues Raised in Representations have been Addressed in SPD

8.1 A description is set out below (paragraph 8.4) of how the Main Issues raised through representations received have been addressed by the Council in the development of the SPD it intends to adopt.

8.2 The Council at its 29 June 2006 meeting considered all the individual Representations and has approved individual Responses to each. These approved Responses are set out in the Response column of the Table contained in the attached **Appendix C**.

8.3 The Issues raised have therefore been taken into account by the approved Council Responses and, where considered necessary, by making changes (deletions and additions) to the text and layout of the Draft SPD or SA. These Council Responses also contain details of the SPD changes. The Council also approved the amended SPD text for adoption at its 29 June 2006 meeting. The Issues raised in Representations have therefore been addressed in the development of the SPD and the SA Report.

8.4 The Council Responses have addressed the Main Issues raised in the following ways: -

- (1) Preserving Listed Building: - *Agreement with the objectors concerns or proposals*, and in consequence making amendments to the draft SPD wording by deleting or adding written text to appear in the adopted version of the SPD.
In particular there is agreement with a majority of English Heritage comments to amend the text to strengthen part-demolition & design criteria, to prevent demolition of any significant part of the complex unless it has been justified, and to retain an historic example Block. English Heritage will be a key consultee for any proposed physical works to this Listed Grade II* building, and for approval of future planning and listed building applications.
- (2) Comments on the boundary of the SPD Site: - *Setting out the reasoning for not extending the SPD site to include the whole adjacent south-east quarter of Sleaford, or nearby listed buildings*. Extending the SPD site boundary to include other potential development sites and associated listed buildings is not agreed with. The SPD's aim and focus is on preserving and encouraging changes that bring new uses to the main redundant, damaged, under-used Listed Building Grade II* Maltings site only. The Response to English Heritage (representation Ref: 43.116) is representative of the Council response on this topic.
- (3) Impact of Potential New Link Road and Bridge: - *Providing Responses prompted by the Map showing an "Indicative Potential New Link Road and Bridge Corridor " to Boston Road*. These Responses explain that resolving the Impacts of a purely Indicative Road Route outside the site is not the role of this SPD. The responses refer to the key issue of providing appropriate transport accessibility to serve the Maltings. They also refer to the separate traffic studies undertaken (and publicly available) which have examined the variety of potential options for providing transport connections to the Maltings site and addressing Sleaford-wide congestion generally. They explain that all these access options will involve development on land outside the SPD site boundary, which will first require separate planning approval for development, after public consultation and assessing the impact.
The Response to Mr B. Pope (representation Ref: 11.22) is representative of the Council response on this topic.
- (4) Impact on town generally and Town centre specifically: - *Setting out how any Impact of new Maltings uses on the adjacent Sleaford Town Centre would be considered*. The Responses given confirm that the impact on the adjacent Town Centre of any new town centre uses (e.g. retail) in the Maltings would be assessed under existing relevant local and national planning policies. The SPD has been altered to add new text to paragraph 5.1 to re-iterate that this impact assessment is needed. The

Response to English Heritage (representation Ref: 43.137) is representative of the Council response on this topic.

- (5) Use of open land to South East (outside site): - *Setting out how development in the open countryside landscape to the south-east would be considered.* The Responses confirm that the open land to the south and east of the site lies in an open Countryside location outside the settlement curtilage for Sleaford, and contributes to the setting of the listed building. The Responses confirm that development proposals would be considered under existing relevant local and national planning policies, and that no alteration to the SPD is necessary. The Response to CPRE (representation Ref: 25.54) is representative of the Council response on this topic.
- (6) Comments on Sustainability Appraisal: - *Responding to comments on the extent and coverage of the Sustainability Appraisal topics and considerations.* The Responses state it is considered that the SA, its methodology, process and coverage of topics adequately meet the requirements of national guidance. The Responses to English Heritage (representation Refs: 34.90-34.96) are the Council responses on these topics.
- (7) Concern over individual uses: - *Responding to requests for the SPD to allocate/specify particular uses (e.g. Dentists) and all detailed design requirements. (e.g. Renewable Energy, species survey).*
The Responses indicate: that there are a wide range of uses acceptable here in principle, that the planning system can not specify or constrain a particular service provider, and that the SPD does not attempt to cover every potential design consideration, as they are already promoted in other relevant and applicable local, regional and national planning policies. The Responses to C.E. Wood (Ref: 18.39), P. McCallum (Ref: 30.71) and R. Doughty (Ref: 39.106) are representative of the Council responses on these topics.

8.5 Discussion also took place with English Heritage and the Highway Authority after the public consultation period finished, in order to clarify matters and aid the Council in formulating Responses to address issues.

9.0 Monitoring and Implementation

9.1 Once adopted, the SPD will form part of the Local Development Framework. The success, progress and effects of implementing the SPD will be monitored each year in the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).

Copy of Press Notice in Lincolnshire Echo 1st February 2006
- Advertising Draft SPD Documents for Inspection

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

The Town and Country Planning (Local Development)
(England) Regulations 2004 – Regulation 17

Notice of Public Participation



Sleaford Maltings
Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
Consultation Draft

North Kesteven District Council has prepared a Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the Sleaford Maltings site for public consultation.

The Draft SPD sets out, for developers and the wider community, the broad guidance and criteria the Council will adopt in seeking the comprehensive re-use and restoration of this Listed Buildings site in Sleaford.

The purpose of this Draft SPD is to provide more local guidance for applicants who wish to convert the Listed Buildings site to new uses, supplementing and expanding upon particular Policies within the emerging saved North Kesteven Local Plan for the whole District. The SPD will become a material consideration in the determination of planning and listed building applications, when adopted, and will form part of the part of the Local Development Framework (LDF) for the District.

The Council is seeking your comments on this public consultation draft SPD.

Copies of the SPD Consultation Draft and associated documents have been published under the above Regulations, and are available for Inspection free of charge at the following locations:-

- Reception, District Council Offices, Kesteven Street, Sleaford (Monday - Thursday 8:15am - 5:15pm, Fridays 8:15am - 4:45pm)
- Info-Links Office, The North Kesteven Centre, Moor Lane, North Hykeham (Monday to Friday 9am - 5pm, Saturdays 9am - 1pm)
- Info-Links Office, 15A High Street, Metherringham (Monday/Thursday/Saturday 9am - 1pm, Fridays 9am - 5pm)

The Documents will also be available for Inspection at the Council's Community Access Points and County Libraries within the District. For details of the addresses please contact the Forward Plans Section.

Representations on the Draft SPD should be submitted in writing and returned to:

- Principal Forward Planning Officer, Forward Planning, Planning Services, North Kesteven District Council, Kesteven Street, Sleaford, Lincolnshire NG34 7EF.
- Or by fax to: 01529 413956
- Or by e-mail to: talkplanning@n-kesteven.gov.uk

Before 5.15 pm on Monday 13th March 2006.

Objections to and representations in respect of the Draft SPD should preferably be on the Response Forms available, and should specify the matters and paragraphs to which they relate, and the grounds on which they are made. Representations by paper or electronic communications should be received by the Council by the date set out above.

Representations will be considered by the Council before preparing a subsequent version of the SPD for adoption.

Further information is available: by visiting the North Kesteven District Council website www.n-kesteven.gov.uk where copies of documents, and an electronic method for making representations are available; by visiting the Council Offices; by telephoning 01529 414155 and asking for the Forward Plans team; or by emailing talkplanning@n-kesteven.gov.uk

Clive Redshaw, Corporate Director, Housing, Community and Planning Services
January 2006.

Working towards 100 Flourishing Communities

Appendix B

List of Respondents to Consultation

47 parties responded to Public Consultation on the Draft SPD and SA

Name	Organisation
EOC Helpline	Equal Opportunities Commission
Wayleave Department	EDF Energy
Station Manager K. Baker	Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue
Roger Jacobson	DEFRA
Julia Rex	Disability Rights Commission
Hazel Lloyd	Anglian Water
Richard Kisby	Environment Agency
Neil Pike	English Nature
Louise Chambers	Vodafone
Mrs E. Kennedy, Parish Clerk	Leasingham and Roxholm Parish Council
Bernard J. Pope	-
S.J. Elkington	Hodgson Elkington
Mrs A. Sutton, Parish Clerk	Washingborough Parish Council
M. Lee	-
Andrew Pritchard, Director of Planning	East Midlands Regional Assembly
Jill Stephenson	Network Rail
Anna Maloney	Commission for Architecture & the Built Environment (CABE)
C. E. Wood	-
Mrs S Gordon	Sleaford & District Civic Trust
Peter D Cunningham MBE, Chairman	Ruskington Parish Council
Kevin Middleton	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)
Serena Carmichael, Planning Manager	Highways Agency
Mark Talton	National Farmers Union (NFU)
F C Thompson	Anwick Parish Council
P Dryburgh	Campaign to Protect Rural England (Lincs)
John Pearson	-
Barbara Jones	Lincolnshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry (Sleaford Area)
Trevor Page, Parish Clerk	Heckington Parish Council
Mrs H.L. Ash, Parish Clerk	Bassingham Parish Council
Paul McCallum	Skanska UK Civil Engineering
P B Jowett	Rail Future (Railway Development Society)
John Anderson	John Anderson Planning
Debbie Scott	Sleaford Development Group
Ann Plackett, Regional Planner	English Heritage - East Midlands Region
Val Smith, Parish Clerk	Ashby de la Launde & Bloxholm with Temple Bruer & Temple High Grange Parish Council

Michael Jones	Sanderson Weatherall
Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust
Sally Murray	The Countryside Agency - Landscape Access Recreation
Robert J C Doughty	Robert Doughty Consultancy
Ruth Walker	Sport England - East Midlands Region
E Riley, Clerk to the Council	Sleaford Town Council
Cllr David Suiter, Navigation Ward	Sleaford Town Council
James Edgar, Team Leader - Lincolnshire, Rutland & Notts City	English Heritage - East Midlands Region
Michael John Dorr, Parish Clerk	Helpringham Parish Council
Elizabeth Bott	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Jo Penter	Government Office for the East Midlands
Mrs Lesley Frances, Parish Clerk	Kirkby La Thorpe Parish Council

Consultation Statement:

Draft Sleaford Maltings Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), and Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

Representations and Responses

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
01.01	EOC Helpline Equal Opportunities Commission	SPD	O		The Equal Opportunities Commission does not wish to receive any further documents relating to the Sleaford Maltings Planning Document.	Noted
02.02	Wayleave Dept EDF Energy	SPD	S		EDF Energy have advised that they do not deal with/supply power to the Sleaford area	Noted

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
03.03	Baker Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue	SPD	O		Applications - It will be necessary for me to visit North Kesteven District Council offices to examine the proposals and to visit the site with your representatives to assess whether the access for the fire appliances and the water supplies are adequate for the proposals.	<p>The representation comments appear to assume that the Draft SPD consultation concerns a formal planning or listed building application received by North Kesteven for development or conversion of this site. There are no current planning or listed building applications for re-use of this site, for the Fire Service to examine. A site visit can, however, be arranged.</p> <p>The SPD document sent for comments is a planning Brief setting out principles of development for this Listed Buildings (Grade II*) site. It aims to guide and encourage developers who are considering submitting applications for the re-use of these listed buildings, and seeks to retain their historical and architectural character. The SPD sets out that a wide range of potential uses, or mix of uses, is considered acceptable in Planning terms for these buildings. The Draft SPD is the draft form of a policy guidance document to 'steer' future development proposals, supplementing Local Plan policies.</p> <p>The representation's detailed comments will be retained, and made available for future developers considering proposals for re-use of these listed buildings.</p>
03.04	Baker Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue	SPD	O		Access - It is necessary to consider access between the nearest roadway and the site access as laid out in Approved Document B5.	Response as 03.03
03.05	Baker Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue	SPD	O		Water Supplies - the following items will have to be taken into consideration: Flow requirements; possibilities for increase in mains pressure; low mains pressures caused by high usage industries in the locality; alternative water supplies - tidal/seasonal differences; access.	Response as 03.03

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
03.06	Baker Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue	SPD	O		Environmental - Additional items to be taken into account are: bulk storage of highly flammable/explosive/water reactive/toxic substances for which the Fire Authority does not have the resources to deal with. Environment Agency prohibits the use of large quantities of water due to the consequences of pollution from fire fighting water run-off.	Response as 03.03
04.07	Roger Jacobson Defra	SPD	O		Defra does not deal with such consultations, instead they are handled on our behalf by the Relevant Government Office, in this case GOEM, therefore we do not need to see any future consultations on local planning issues here.	Noted
05.08	Julia Rex Disability Rights Commission	SPD	O		The Disabled Rghts Commission is not in a position to evaluate local government policies or practices, though we appreciate that these are of direct relevance to the lives of disabled individuals. We would like to draw your attention to the Disability Equality Duty, which is being incorporated into the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) via the 2005 amendment Act.	Noted
06.09	Hazel Lloyd Anglian Water	SPD	O		The enquiry is being dealt with and we should be able to provide a response in approximately three weeks. (Anglian Water subsequently submitted representations numbered: 6.10, 6.11, 6.12, 6.13, & 6.14.)	Noted

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
06.10	Hazel Lloyd Anglian Water	SPD	O		Foul Drainage - It is understood that the Bass Maltings Regeneration scheme will generate an additional foul flow of up to 80 litres/sec to the existing 600mm x 400mm foul sewer south of the existing buildings. There are two 800mm x 400mm foul sewers that cross the railway at or very near the proposed bridge, and whilst these could be diverted under S185 of the Water Industry Act, additional protection works might also be required if the rail trackbed were to be lowered. Although there is a capacity available in these sewers, they are believed to be towards the end of their service life and may be in poor condition in places, therefore a CCTV survey will need to be carried out in order to decide whether any renewal or remediation works are required as part of this project. If re-laid, the replacement sewers must pass through a structural sleeve under the bridge and rail track, with one or more spare sleeves to enable the sewer itself to be replaced if necessary without loss of service.	These Drainage infrastructure comments are noted, and will be retained and made available for developers who submit proposals for the Maltings.
06.11	Hazel Lloyd Anglian Water	SPD	O		Foul Drainage - North of the railway, these sewers pass under the Advanta Seeds warehouse, and any development on the Pines or Recreation Grounds will affect both this and the 725mm foul sewer from Sleaford Junction and the town centre.	These Drainage infrastructure comments are noted, and will be retained and made available for developers who submit proposals for the Maltings, or adjacent land.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
06.12	Hazel Lloyd Anglian Water	SPD	O		Surface Water Drainage - The rate of surface water run-off from the re-developed Bass Maltings site is likely to be greater than that at present due to the additional roads and parking areas. There appears to be a pond east of the site that may overflow to Black Sluice Internal Drainage Board (BSIDB) controlled drains, and you should consult the Environment Agency (EA) and BSIDB concerning the need to control surface water runoff, and if so, to what rate and under what critical storm return period. Whilst development on the Advanta Seeds site will not of itself increase the surface water runoff, improved drainage connections will increase the rate of runoff especially under high intensity short duration storms, with the result that some control would be advisable.	These Drainage infrastructure comments are noted, and will be retained and made available for developers who submit proposals for the Maltings, or adjacent land.
06.13	Hazel Lloyd Anglian Water	SPD	O		Surface Water Drainage - The Recreation Ground and associated open space is considered to be substantially "greenfield" in nature and the rate of surface water runoff will need to be controlled to not exceed 3.0 litres per sec per hectare of development under a 1 in 30 year storm event, unless either the EA or BSIDB require other standards, in which case the more stringent criteria shall be applied.	The Recreation Ground is outside the SPD site, but Anglian Water will be notified about applications affecting it.
06.14	Hazel Lloyd Anglian Water	SPD	O		General - It would be appreciated if you would provide Anglian Water Services with a copy of your indicative layout and more detailed proposals as soon as they are available in order that the foul and surface water drainage issues can be fully addressed at an early stage. The above Comments relate to circumstances prevailing at the present time. These may change if there is further development in area or for other reasons. Accordingly if your development does not proceed within 6 months you may wish to renew your request in order to ensure that capacity remains available.	Anglian Water will be notified about major applications affecting the Maltings site when they are submitted. The SPD is a planning principles document.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
07.15	Richard Kisby Environment Agency	SPD & SA	S		The Environment Agency has considered the proposed plan and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and have no serious concerns with the document.	Support Noted and Welcomed
07.16	Richard Kisby Environment Agency	SPD	O		We recommend the inclusion of design constraints to require the use of sustainable drainage systems where practicable in the development. If this can be included as a strategic aim of the redevelopment of the site it will increase the likelihood of such a scheme taking place. My concern is that if it is not included then as various parts of the site are developed no single developer will be willing to take on the responsibility for the design, implementation and maintenance of such a scheme. If it can be included as a feature of the development site that all developers contribute to, this could avoid any potential for the 'buck to be passed'. This would also be in line with policy C13 of the Revised Deposit Draft of the Local Plan. Particularly as justified by paragraph 3.45.	<p>The SPD deals with general principles for these listed buildings, and not prescribing all potential design details of possible developments, which are covered by existing policies in the Local Plan and elsewhere. The SPD does not replace these policies, or make new policy, but purely supplements certain aspects of Local Plan policies. As paragraph 4.5 of the SPD states, the detail of "Any proposal would also be assessed against all other relevant national, regional and local Policies as appropriate and current at that time."</p> <p>The inclusion of sustainable surface water drainage systems, specific energy & water supply and efficiency measures will therefore be considered in the light of re-use of these listed buildings, and existing policies.</p> <p>With regard to controlling Implementation of potential development schemes, the Draft SPD (at paragraph 6.1) refers to the Council first requiring the development/submission of a comprehensive plan, to contribute to a sustainable future for the site. This co-ordinating comprehensive plan/development framework would be to establish the underpinning design principles & long term development structure for the life of the project, to be applied to any future development proposals, amendments or developers. It could include common infrastructure and services requirements.</p> <p>It is therefore not necessary to list every detailed development requirement in this SPD.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
07.17	Richard Kisby Environment Agency	SPD	O		The inclusion of specific energy and water efficiency targets for all development within the site would also contribute towards the Local Plans Core Policies, specifically policies C14 and C20	Noted. Response as 07.16.
08.18	Neil Pike English Nature	SPD	S		We acknowledge with thanks your consultation copy of the SPD. English Nature has no comments to make on this proposed SPD, and no objection to its adoption.	Support Noted and Welcomed
09.19	Louise Chambers Vodafone	SPD	O		We have forwarded the Statement to Mono Consultants who act on behalf of all the Telecommunications operators in monitoring local development policies. They will contact you in due course in relation to the documentation you have sent.	We note that Mono consultants are acting for all Telecommunications operators. However, Mono Consultants have not responded to the Council's consultation you have forwarded to them.
10.20	E Kennedy Leasingham & Roxholm Parish Council	SPD	S		Support the SPD	Support Noted and Welcomed
11.21	Bernard J Pope	SA	O	6.1 SA	Re Sustainability Appraisal. Para 6.1. N K Local Plan - I objected to the local plan. If my objection is accepted I have no comment to make. My objection stated that in my view it is imperative that consideration of this development is assessed in the context of the whole of Sleaford town centre, not just the south east corner and in particular concerning the provision of highways and on and off street parking provision.	The SPD already states (SPD paras 5.2 and 4.4) that consideration be given to the impact of any Maltings development on the adjacent town centre, as well as taking into account national PPS 6 policy (SPD para 4.5). The Sustainability Appraisal also addresses how the SPD supplements local plan policy R1 with regard to the town centre (SA, paras 6.19 to 6.22).

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
11.22	Bernard J Pope	SPD	O	3.3	3.3 Access - the paragraph should state what problems the traffic model identified and suggest possible solutions, state a preferred option and say why others were rejected.	<p>These comments refer to conclusions on one potential solution to provide access, as set out in paragraphs 3.3 to 3.6 of the Draft SPD. This conclusion has been derived from Highway Authority reports on Sleaford-wide traffic model studies, forecasting general future town-wide traffic congestion levels, assuming different development scenarios, and giving future access options. These separate reports set out alternative potential options, solutions and conclusions on managing & relieving central Sleaford forecast traffic congestion, and providing improved vehicular and pedestrian access to all of central Sleaford – including a re-used Maltings site. Details and information on the potential traffic and access options and solutions can be viewed separately in these reports on Sleaford traffic model studies – which are publicly available for viewing.</p> <p>The amount of information contained in them is considered too detailed and inappropriate to include in this succinct SPD on the re-use and restoration of these listed buildings, and it can be readily viewed elsewhere.</p> <p>The SPD (page 9) shows only an “Indicative potential new link road and bridge Corridor”. The SPD is not the place to set out the detail of all potential new or modified road and access routes to serve central Sleaford. The building of any such potential new link road and/or new rail bridge scheme to provide improved access to central Sleaford would first require separate planning approval (after general & public consultation) before development could proceed.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
11.23	Bernard J Pope	SPD	O	3.4	3.4.(i) The paragraph would read better stating the preferred option is a link road to Boston Road. Possible routes are a, b and c. The preferred route is shown on the plan (provided with the comments). (ii) A modified route is shown on the provided plan, over the bowling club land. The advantages would be: a) less land take from the recreation ground; b) fewer large trees to be cut down; c) an adequate road junction onto Boston Road; d) a service road to the properties on the north side of Boston Road so avoiding direct access onto the new road junction.	Response as 11.22
11.24	Bernard J Pope	SPD	O	3.4	3.4 (iii) The proposed new road will adversely affect the club: a) noise; b) land take for visibility purposes; c) visual intrusion; d) if the suggestion in the local paper to extend the road to East Road is adopted then the adverse effect on the club will be greater because of the larger road and junction; e) the club should be moved elsewhere modern facilities can be provided. (iv) I support the suggested extension of the new road to East Road.	Response as 11.22

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
11.25	Bernard J Pope	SPD	O	4.4	4.4 Appropriate uses - the site should be enlarged to the south and east to provide adequate car parking for: a) site occupiers and users; b) railway commuter's use; c) long term town centre parking; d) displaced non-residential parking on town centre streets when a residential parking scheme is introduced	<p>Parking: The land to the south and east of the site (outside the SPD site) lies in an open countryside location outside the settlement curtilage for Sleaford, where any proposals for ancillary parking use to serve the development, or to serve the wider Sleaford area, will be considered under existing Local Plan Policy C2 (Development in the Countryside). Parking use development proposals in this location will also be considered under existing Local Plan Policy T5 (Parking provision) and Policy T1 (Developments attracting significant numbers of journeys). Considerations would include whether they provide adequate and effective measures to facilitate access by all modes of transport including public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2 of the SPD already addresses the possibility of parking provision in this open area, that forms part of the views from the south contributing to the setting of the listed building.</p> <p>Also, as paragraph 4.5 of the SPD states, the detail of "Any proposal would also be assessed against all other relevant national, regional and local Policies as appropriate and current at that time." The SPD deals with general principles for these listed buildings, and not prescribing all potential design and servicing details of possible developments, which are covered by existing policies in the Local Plan and elsewhere. The level of parking, transport accessibility and servicing required is currently unknown, and will be dictated by the potential proposed mix of site occupiers and users.</p> <p>It is therefore not considered appropriate to enlarge the SPD site boundary, to extend into this open countryside area.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
12.26	S J Elkington Hodgson Elkington	SPD	S		Support the SPD	Support Noted and Welcomed
12.27	S J Elkington Hodgson Elkington	SPD	O	3.3 to-3.6	3.3 to 3.6: It is essential that this is the link to the town centre from the Maltings. It will be necessary for a joint funding approach to be taken as a link bridge will provide numerous benefits to both residents and traffic users in the town. A single body or project can not be expected to fund this proposal.	<p>Paragraphs 3.3 to 3.6 of the Draft SPD set out one potential solution to provide access, which is an "Indicative potential new link road and bridge Corridor"— a road and rail bridge link from Mareham Lane to Boston Road. Agree that some form of adequate and effective measures are required to facilitate easier access and links to the site from the town centre by all modes of transport (including public transport, walking and cycling).</p> <p>This access solution conclusion has been derived from Highway Authority report(s) on Sleaford-wide traffic model studies, forecasting general future town-wide traffic congestion levels, and giving other access options. The building of any such potential new link road and/or new rail bridge proposal to provide improved access to serve all of central Sleaford would first require a separate planning permission (after general & public consultation) before development could proceed.</p> <p>Whilst comments on taking a joint project funding approach to provide such a Sleaford-wide access facility are Noted, it is not the role of this SPD to discuss these financing matters.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
13.28	A Sutton Washingborough Council	SPD	S		Washingborough Council fully supports your plans to convert the redundant Maltings site or complex. The concept to restore the site into a multi-user area is very pleasing and a lot of thought has been given into the design of the various sections but at the same time maintaining, to some degree, that of the original building. The site is a very large and significant area in Sleaford and it is very important that it is made use of and is developed in a sensitive way. The restoration of the site will enhance the town of Sleaford enormously and it should increase the commercial and business interest of the town to keep it very alive and thriving for the future. We hope that the plan does come to fruition and that there will be sufficient interest in the site from both the commercial and residential sectors for Plan to be a huge success.	Support Noted and Welcomed
14.29	M Lee	SPD	S		Support the SPD	Support Noted and Welcomed
14.30	M Lee	SPD	S		I believe the access to Maltings and design of layout are all very good. I am also in favour of a large retail outlet(s).	Support Noted and Welcomed. Developers of large Retail outlets will have to consider Town Centre locations before the Maltings.
15.31	Andrew Pritchard East Midlands Regional Assembly	SPD	S		This initiative to restore and regenerate this important historic building complex, is wholly consistent with RSS8 and in particular policies 1, 23 and 31. I very much hope your Council's preparatory work will result in firm proposals coming forward to secure the future of this regionally important historic landmark.	Support Noted and Welcomed

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
16.32	Jill Stephenson Network Rail	SPD	S		We support in principle the aspiration to restore and re-use the Maltings buildings, subject to the provision of the proposed road bridge east of the station. Congestion at Sleaford East level crossing has been an ongoing issue and we would not want to see further development in the area compounding the problem, without the bridge scheme progressing. In addition to the provision of a bridge, Network Rail would want to achieve possible closure/downgrading of the level crossing.	Support Noted and Welcomed. Suitable access to the Maltings site is achievable in a number of ways, including a Road Bridge over the railway.
16.33	Jill Stephenson Network Rail	SPD	O		Aside from the level crossing and bridge issues, Network Rail would welcome further consultation from the Council should detailed plans for the Maltings buildings be prepared. This is to ensure that any development adjacent to the railway boundary is carried out in a safe manner, with appropriate planting schemes etc.	Noted. Network Rail will be consulted when detailed major development proposals are submitted.
17.34	Anna Maloney Commission for Architecture & the Built Environment	SPD	O		No comment	<p>Response Noted. It should also be noted that the Council is having ongoing discussions on the Maltings with CABE's East Midlands Design Review Panel. The Panel is sponsored by OPUN, CABE and Regeneration East Midlands and aims to support the delivery of sustainable, high quality and well-planned developments, including infrastructure projects and the creation of public spaces. They generally support the scheme (with caveats).</p> <p>The Panel has offered to support the project, continue dialogue and comment on detailed design proposals that emerge once a developer has been confirmed.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
18.35	C E Wood	SPD	O	3.5	<p>The need for a link road between the Railway Bridge and Boston Road is clearly a necessity. However, there is a clear risk that this route would become a "rat run" not only for traffic trying to avoid Sleaford Town Centre but, of greater concern, could open up a route of traffic from the A52 onto the A17 via Mareham Lane. Consideration in the plans should be given to avoiding these, perhaps by giving access to the Maltings from both Mareham Lane and Boston Road, but not avoiding through traffic.</p>	<p>(1) The support for a link road between the Maltings and Boston Road is noted. The concerns about this becoming a rat run and also opening a route between the A52 and A17 via the rural part of Mareham Lane are also noted. The Highway Authority have been made aware of your concerns and have indicated they would monitor the scheme carefully, if implemented.</p> <p>(2) Regarding Access, the following should also be noted:</p> <p>(a) The achievement and provision of appropriate access to the site will be a key issue to resolve. The Draft SPD Map (pages 8/9) shows only an "Indicative Potential new link road and bridge Corridor" arising from conclusions of Highway Authority Sleaford-wide traffic studies, and is shown for information (to tie in with Draft SPD paragraphs 3.3 to 3.6). It is not the role of an SPD to allocate land by setting out the details of any road/access route(s) to provide appropriate access.</p> <p>(b) The building of any such potential new link road and/or new rail bridge proposal to provide improved access to central Sleaford would first require separate planning permission (after general & public consultation) before development could proceed. The design of appropriate access solutions would be subject to separate highway, listed building and railway network design requirements, and cater for walking, cycling and vehicular movements.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
18.36	C E Wood	SPD	O	5.2	There is clearly benefit to the region of encouraging Cultural and Leisure uses for the Maltings. However, it is important that any development does not have a negative impact on existing facilities in the town e.g. The Hub. Planners should make it clear that any developments of this type should be limited to those that complement, rather than compete, with existing facilities.	<p>(1) Comments regarding potential Future Uses in paragraph 5.2 are Noted. The Council would comment that the SPD already states, at paragraph 4.5: - "Any proposal would also be assessed against all other relevant national, regional and local Policies as appropriate and current at that time."</p> <p>Under this, and depending on the uses/mix of uses coming forward for this edge-of- centre site, any proposals for retail or other town centre uses (including cultural and leisure uses) described in PPS6 (paragraph 1.8) would be considered under the sequential test existing in national PPS6, as to their Impact on the vitality and viability of Sleaford town centre.</p> <p>(2) It is therefore Agreed that additional text is required to clarify this edge-of-centre site's relationship with the adjacent Town Centre. Add the following new text as new last sentence to paragraph 5.1: "Proposed new town centre uses at the Maltings site should enhance or have a positive impact on the vitality and viability of Sleaford Town Centre."</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
18.37	C E Wood	SPD	O	5.2	There is no place for a night club at the Maltings and should be discouraged. There are already two night clubs which is more than sufficient for a small town such as Sleaford and such developments would only cause trouble in an area remote from the centre of town which would be more difficult to police.	<p>Objection Noted. Paragraph 5.2 simply lists Nightclubs amongst possible Entertainment uses within the D2 use class and similar "sui generis" uses that are potentially acceptable in principle on this site, "subject to the achievement of appropriate access and protection of the amenity for existing and proposed users." Also, as paragraph 4.5 of the SPD states, the detail of "Any proposal would also be assessed against all other relevant national, regional and local Policies as appropriate and current at that time."</p> <p>As national planning policy states: "It is not the role of the planning system to restrict competition, preserve existing commercial interests or to prevent innovation." (PPS6 – Planning for Town Centres (para 1.7)). Commercial competition between uses such as Nightclubs is therefore not a planning issue. No change to text.</p>
18.38	C E Wood	SPD	S	5.2	Providing community health facilities at the Maltings could be of major benefit to the town.	Agreed - Support Noted and Welcomed. Amongst possible uses, paragraph 5.2 of the SPD states that opportunities exist for Health facilities uses here. They are therefore potentially acceptable in principle on this site.
18.39	C E Wood	SPD	O	5.2	Providing that any development does not contribute to greater Private provision. Planners should ensure that NHS provision should be given priority, with particular emphasis on the provision of NHS Dentistry by encouraging any developer to provide low cost or subsidised accommodation for such NHS provision.	<p>Comments and aspirations Noted. Paragraph 5.2 of the Draft SPD, regarding possible uses, states that opportunities exist for Health facilities uses here.</p> <p>However, Planning can not specify, limit or prioritise that the provision of a particular land use or service be limited to only one type of supplier/ provider/ or ownership (e.g. private or NHS dentistry provision only). It is beyond the remit of land use Planning, and it is not an issue we can specify in an SPD.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
18.40	C E Wood	SPD	O	General comment	Much emphasis in SPD is given to ensure any development is sympathetic to the existing structure of the Maltings, and that as far as possible, the existing structure should be maintained and preserved. This is to be commended. However, the SPD gives much less emphasis to how planners view how the site should be used. A District Council " Vision" for the Maltings as part of the SPD would encourage developers to provide facilities on the site that would benefit the community as a whole rather than those which make the greatest profit. Any vision should avoid generic terms but should give any prospective developer clear guidance as to the direction that the District council wishes to take the Maltings. This guidance is lacking in the SPD as currently drafted.	<p>The SPD and Council's aims for the Maltings in paragraphs 1.2 and 5.1 are a form of "vision", which actively seeks the preservation, restoration and re-use of these redundant industrial Grade II* listed buildings in a comprehensively planned mixed use scheme.</p> <p>There are a variety of uses acceptable here in principle in planning policy terms, including uses that would benefit the community as a whole. The Council would not, however, wish to inhibit the achievement of a comprehensive and sustainable mixed use development, by giving guidance that prescribes a precise mix of uses or sets a limited range of uses, as stated in paragraph 5.1.</p>
19.41	S Gordon Sleaford & District Civic Trust	SPD	S		Support the SPD	Support Noted and Welcomed

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
20.42	Peter D Cunningham MBE Ruskington Parish Council	SPD	O		Regrettably the timescale afforded to enable a considered response that includes local research, due publicity and a public meeting is not provided. It is reasonable to expect a minimum of ten weeks for such a project. In addition, the Response Form is inadequate and inappropriate to a Parish Council.	<p>The statutory requirement for formal public consultation on a draft SPD is for a period of between 4 to 6 weeks. The consultation period the Council decided upon lasted for 5 weeks and 5 days, near to the full extent of the SPD consultation period set by statute.</p> <p>The project has been subject to other, prior, consultation events seeking public views on potential site re-development. The other public consultation undertaken so far is described in the Consultation Statement distributed along with the Draft SPD.</p> <p>The Response Form was designed for comments from all potential respondents (including Parishes). Paragraph 3 providing space for any Further Comments. The note to Paragraph 5 clarified that those representing larger organisations (e.g. Parish Clerks) need not complete this personal information section.</p>
20.43	Peter D Cunningham MBE Ruskington Parish Council	SPD	O		Ruskington Parish Council (RPC) notes the magnitude and the importance of the project to the community, the background to current planning and the considerations for future uses. Many of the uses will have an influence, to a greater or lesser extent, on the existing retail, town centre, services and entertainment. It is, therefore, essential that a balanced outcome be achieved to prevent a decline and decay of the existing structure.	<p>Comments Noted and Agreed. All subsequent development proposals submitted will have to take into account the aims of the SPD, and be assessed against all other relevant national, regional and local planning policies as appropriate and current at that time, as stated in paragraph 4.5 of the Draft SPD.</p> <p>This would include consideration of the impact of proposed retail and other town centre uses here on the vitality and viability on the existing Sleaford town centre, under national planning policy PPS6 (Planning for Town Centres).</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
20.44	Peter D Cunningham MBE Ruskington Parish Council	SPD	O		In addition, the logic of including 'casinos' (plural) stated at paragraph 5.2 on page 12 of the SPD is not supported.	Objection Noted. However, section 5.2 simply lists all potential acceptable leisure and entertainment uses within the D2 use class, the development of which would all be first subject to planning and other appropriate controls (e.g. licensing) and public consultation. However, since the Draft SPD was published, Casinos have been re-classified as a "sui generis" use. Therefore Amend Text of Para 5.2, to relocate the word "Casinos" to after "Night Clubs" .
20.45	Peter D Cunningham MBE Ruskington Parish Council	SPD	O		Ruskington Parish Council proposes that a mandatory planning inclusion shall provide facilities for a health centre to include both a doctor and dentist amenities.	Proposal Noted. However, whilst Health Centres, Doctors and Dentists Surgeries are already listed as potential acceptable uses under SPD paragraph 5.2, there are no planning policy provisions to embody a Health Centre as a specified mandatory planning use here, or an evidence base to justify this decision.
20.46	Peter D Cunningham MBE Ruskington Parish Council	SPD	O		The completed project will be susceptible to visitors and it is considered essential that adequate parking and waiting areas for both private and commercial vehicles; the latter having prescribed routes & delivery & collection access areas.	Noted and Agreed. An adequate level of parking provision & accessibility will be required for potential occupiers, visitors and deliveries – depending on the proposed mix of uses. This will be considered when development proposals are submitted, under current Local Plan and all other relevant planning policies, as stated in paragraph 4.5.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
20.47	Peter D Cunningham MBE Ruskington Parish Council	SPD	O		It is accepted that the overall project will be a significant benefit to the community but at what financial cost? Whilst the current detail of the overall plan is supported in principal, the total projected cost and moreover, the source of the necessary finance is not provided. Questions relating to Council Tax and long-term bank loans are already being raised and it is therefore suggested that suitable publicity is provided explaining the finances. This will prevent unnecessary adverse publicity.	The SPD is a planning principles document, providing guidance supplementing existing planning policies. The SPD does not commit the Council to financial expenditure on the site's project development costs. The SPD's planning aims, together with the site championing and marketing role of the Sleaford Maltings Project Development Group (PDG), hope to attract private developers willing and able to invest substantially, and publicly, in this landmark site's comprehensively planned development and restoration.
21.48	Kevin Middleton Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	SPD	S		Having reviewed the information contained within the documents, the RSPB have No Comment.	Noted
22.49	Serena Carmichael Highways Agency	SPD	S		Redevelopment of the Sleaford Maltings is not expected to have any impact on the Highways Agency's network. I therefore have no comments to make on the document.	Comments Noted - regarding impact on the Highways Agency's road network.
23.50	Mark Talton National Farmers Union (NFU)	SPD	O		The main concern regarding the proposals was the amount of money involved in actually carrying out any type of development. Due to the age and structure of the building, obviously a significant amount of work is going to need to be done to bring the Maltings up to standard, and although we appreciate that grants would be available for much of the work concern was expressed on how much would have to be raised via an increase in local taxes.	The SPD is a planning principles document, providing guidance supplementing existing planning policies. The SPD does not commit the Council to financial expenditure on the site's project development costs. The SPD's planning aims, together with the site championing/marketing role of the Sleaford Maltings Project Development Group (PDG), hope to attract private developers willing and able to invest substantially, and publicly, in this landmark site's comprehensively planned development and restoration.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
23.51	Mark Talton National Farmers Union (NFU)	SPD	O		There were also concerns that should the Maltings be turned into a retail development, there may well be problems regarding parking in that area of town and traffic flow issues with the increased volume of customers.	<p>(1) Regarding potential Retail development, all development proposals submitted for uses will have to take into account the aims of the SPD, and be assessed against all other relevant planning policies as stated in paragraph 4.5 of the Draft SPD. This would include consideration of the impact of proposed retail and other town centre uses here on the vitality and viability on the existing adjacent Sleaford town centre, under national planning policy PPS6 (Planning for Town Centres).</p> <p>(2) Regarding Parking, the parking requirements arising from development proposals in this location will also be considered under existing Local Plan Policy T5 (Parking provision) and Policy T1 (Developments attracting significant numbers of journeys). Considerations would include whether developments provide adequate and effective measures to facilitate access to the site by all modes of transport including public transport, walking and cycling.</p> <p>(3) Regarding Traffic flow issues in the vicinity, the achievement and provision of appropriate access to the site will be a key issue to resolve. The Draft SPD Map (pages 8/9) shows only an "Indicative Potential new link road and bridge Corridor" arising from conclusions of Highway Authority Sleaford-wide traffic studies, and is shown for information (to tie in with Draft SPD paragraphs 3.3 to 3.6). This potential solution aims to improve traffic flows. The building of any such potential new link road and/or new rail bridge proposal to provide improved access and traffic flows to central Sleaford would first require separate planning permission (after general & public consultation) before development could proceed.</p>
24.52	F C Thompson Anwick Parish Council	SPD	S		Support the SPD	Support Noted and Welcomed

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
25.53	P Dryburgh Campaign to Protect Rural England (Lincs Branch)	SPD	S		Support the SPD	Support Noted and Welcomed
25.54	P Dryburgh Campaign to Protect Rural England (Lincs Branch)	SPD	O	3.2	If possible parking should be kept to a minimum but if it needs to encroach to the south of the complex then it must not compromise the setting of the buildings nor be visually dominant from the adjacent open countryside.	<p>(1) With regard to Parking, all development proposals submitted will have to take into account the aims of the SPD, and be assessed against all other relevant planning policies as stated in paragraph 4.5 of the Draft SPD.</p> <p>(2) Paragraph 3.2 of the SPD already addresses the possibility of Parking provision in this open area to the south of the complex, land that forms part of the views from the south contributing to the setting of the listed building. The visual impacts of any development proposal in this area will be considered under Local Plan Policy HE5 – “Development affecting the Setting of a Listed Building.”</p> <p>(3) The land to the south and east of the site (outside the SPD site) lies in an open countryside location outside the settlement curtilage for Sleaford, where any proposals for ancillary parking use to serve the development, or to serve the wider Sleaford area, will also be considered under existing Local Plan Policy C2 (Development in the Countryside). Parking use development proposals in this location will also be considered under existing Local Plan Policy T5 (Parking provision) and Policy T1 (Developments attracting significant numbers of journeys). Considerations would also include whether proposals provide adequate and effective measures to facilitate access by all modes of transport including public transport, walking and cycling.</p>
26.55	John Pearson	SPD	S		Support the SPD	Support Noted and Welcomed

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
26.56	John Pearson	SPD	S		My wife and myself strongly support the proposed development of Sleaford Maltings as detailed in the SPD. We feel that the site should not be left to continue its deterioration and that it provides a significant available resource for the development and enhancement of Sleaford and its surrounding area. It would be possible to continue to spend time and money in NOT doing anything - we feel that now is the right time to go ahead and get a project underway to improve the local area and provide resources for community benefit.	Support Noted and Welcomed
27.57	Barbara Jones Lincolnshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry	SPD	S		On behalf of the President and Members I have been requested to congratulate you on the production of the SPD and assure you of the Chamber's continued interest and support, particularly in relation to Serviced Office Accommodation.	Support Noted and Welcomed
28.58	Trevor Page Heckington Parish Council	SPD	S		The Sleaford Maltings SPD has been considered, under which the site would be allowed to be converted to new uses, supplementing and expanding upon particular policies within the emerging saved, North Kesteven Local Plan for the whole District and which, when adopted, would form part of the Local Development Framework for the District. Members noted this action in respect of the site in Sleaford and resolved that I should write to you to inform you that, amendments to the Local Development Framework for the District are to be welcomed in relation to the Maltings site in Sleaford.	Support Noted and Welcomed
28.59	Trevor Page Heckington Parish Council	SPD	O		It is hoped that similar sympathetic considered can also now be expected in respect of planning relating to special sites in Parishes.	Proposals for potential new SPDs covering other similar large-scale or key development sites in the District will be considered for inclusion in a future, revised, Local Development Scheme
29.60	H L Ash Bassingham Parish Council	SPD	S		Support the SPD	Support Noted and Welcomed

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
30.61	Paul McCallum Skanska UK Civil Engineering	SA	O		Object to the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the SPD, with Further Comments made on particular Paragraph Numbers of Appendix A of the SA, as set out in Representations Ref Nos. 30.62 to 30.66	<p>(1) Your SA objections are to various individual Sustainability Appraisal Criteria contained in Appendix A of the SA Report. You have used them as a 'hook' on which to make comments on potential SPD goals and development proposals.</p> <p>(2) These Sustainability Criteria and Objectives (Appendix A) are simply the Council's established sustainability analysis toolkit, derived from the existing SA of the whole North Kesteven Local Plan, as set out and explained in Section 2 of the SPD's SA Report. These Sustainability Criteria are the tools that have been used by the Council to appraise and analyse the SPD's objectives and aims. They are used to assess how compatible & effective the SPD is with integrating and promoting sustainability considerations (environmental, social and economic) into its guidance and goals for the site.</p> <p>(3) These generic SA Criteria tools, whilst relevant, do not constitute the precise aims of the SPD. However, each of your comments on the SA has a separate response, under Representation Ref Numbers 30.62 to 30.66.</p>
30.62	Paul McCallum Skanska UK Civil Engineering	SA	O	1	Appendix A. 1. Air quality. Minimal car access and reduce commuting.	<p>(1) Comment on 'Air Quality' criterion in SA Noted. Detailed access and parking arrangements will be considered under relevant local and national planning policies, as stated in paragraph 4.5 of the SPD., with emphasis on increasing travel choice away from cars. Proposals to develop this brownfield site, link it better to Sleaford town centre, and the site's proximity to the railway station, will help reduce reliance on the car, and thereby contribute to reducing emissions to air.</p> <p>(2) Considerations in the design of appropriate access solutions would include whether proposals provide adequate and effective measures to facilitate access by all modes of transport including public transport, walking and cycling.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
30.63	Paul McCallum Skanska UK Civil Engineering	SA	O	8	Appendix A. 8. South facing pitch of roofs should be mandatorally covered with solar panels. This will make the development a 'green' showcase and seriously reduce carbon fuel usage.	Comment on 'Use of Energy' criterion in SA Noted. Renewable energy issues will be considered at detailed planning and listed building application and infrastructure design stage, and under all under relevant local and national planning policies, as stated in paragraph 4.5 of the SPD. At that stage the potential effect of a solar roof panels proposal on the special interest and character of this listed building would also be considered.
30.64	Paul McCallum Skanska UK Civil Engineering	SA	O	9	Appendix A. 9. No commuting - minimal car access - no Boston Road Link.	<p>(1) Comment on 'Travel & Access & Transport' criterion in SA Noted. Detailed access and parking arrangements will be considered under relevant local and national planning policies, as stated in paragraph 4.5 of the SPD., with emphasis on increasing travel choice away from cars. Proposals to develop this brownfield site, link it better to Sleaford town centre, and the site's proximity to the railway station, will help reduce reliance on the car, and thereby contribute to reducing car-borne journeys.</p> <p>(2) Considerations in the design of appropriate access solutions would include whether proposals provide adequate and effective measures to facilitate access by all modes of transport including public transport, walking and cycling. The achievement and provision of appropriate access to the site will be a key issue to resolve.</p> <p>(3) The potential Link Road Corridor to Boston Road is purely Indicative. The building of any such potential new link road and/or new rail bridge proposal to provide improved access to central Sleaford would first require separate planning permission (after general & public consultation) before development could proceed.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
30.65	Paul McCallum Skanska UK Civil Engineering	SA	O	12	Appendix A. 12. Mainly need affordable accommodation and the developer must be forced to comply.	Comment on 'Housing – meeting needs and affordability' criterion in SA Noted. Paragraph 5.2 of the SPD states that any new residential development on this site would need to provide affordable housing, and that "The Council has concluded that 35% of new development should be affordable...". The Council will negotiate to secure this affordable housing provision on site, to contribute to the high District shortfall identified in the Housing Needs Assessment
30.66	Paul McCallum Skanska UK Civil Engineering	SA	O	17	Appendix A. 17. Essential. The town is 'proud' of the Fact that 75% of the population do not work locally. The government statistics state that 80% of this 75% will not support the town in any way! No wonder that it is dying!	Comment on 'Economy and Employment' criterion in SA Noted. The SPD encourages a developer to put forward a comprehensive mixed use development on the site, and gives the wide variety of potential uses acceptable here (under paragraph 5.2) including business and employment uses. This will hopefully promote local employment growth and improve local access to a diverse range of locally based employment opportunities, including training and re-training opportunities.
30.67	Paul McCallum Skanska UK Civil Engineering	SPD	O		Object to the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), with Further Comments made on particular Paragraph Numbers of the SPD, as set out in Representations Ref Nos. 30.68 to 30.72.	Each of your comments on individual Paragraph Numbers in the SPD has a separate response, under Representation Ref Numbers 30.68 to 30.72.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
30.68	Paul McCallum Skanska UK Civil Engineering	SPD	O	1.5	1.5 There is NO strong support for an access from Boston Road. The town poll was split 50/50. Please revisit this statement.	<p>(1) The public consultation conclusions on access described in paragraph 1.5 of the SPD actually refer to the results of the pre-SPD consultation exercises described in paragraph 1.4 of the SPD, regarding the re-use of the Maltings. The statement in paragraph 1.5 of the SPD is therefore correct.</p> <p>(2) It does Not refer to the results of the Sleaford Town Poll over a potential road link across Boston Road Recreation Ground, using land outside the SPD site. More details of the pre-SPD consultation undertaken so far and the main issues raised, are described sections 3. and 4. of the Consultation Statement report accompanying the Draft SPD.</p>
30.69	Paul McCallum Skanska UK Civil Engineering	SPD	O	3.3	3.3 A South East bypass is required. A small amount of inner relief road from Boston Road to Mareham Lane is 'Short Termist' and will solve nothing viz Boston and Grantham. The jam at the level crossing will be transferred to Boston Road. A proper traffic survey MUST be carried out and publicly reported.	<p>The Highway Authority have indicated that a "proper" and thorough traffic survey has been carried out regarding access to Sleaford town centre, the Maltings and the wider road network. This survey, and traffic modelling, has allowed the Highway Authority to continuously investigate and monitor in more detail the whole road network serving Sleaford.</p> <p>Details and information on Sleaford-wide traffic surveys, traffic model studies, and potential traffic and access options to serve Sleaford and the Maltings can be viewed separately in Highway Authority produced traffic network reports. These are publicly available for viewing from the Planning Service or the Sleaford Maltings Project Director.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
30.70	Paul McCallum Skanska UK Civil Engineering	SPD	O	3.5	3.5 There will be no lasting benefit from these works and it will be a waste of money and is a short term solution!	The achievement and provision of appropriate access to the site will be a key issue to resolve. The Indicative long term access solution conclusion described in paragraph 3.5 has been derived from Highway Authority report(s) on Sleaford-wide traffic model studies, forecasting general long-term future town-wide traffic congestion levels, and giving other access options. The building of any such potential new link road and/or new rail bridge proposal to provide improved access to serve all of central Sleaford would first require a separate planning permission (after general & public consultation) before development could proceed.
30.71	Paul McCallum Skanska UK Civil Engineering	SPD	O	5.1	5.1 A precise mix of uses must be prescribed as only the most profitable will be built and the town will NOT get what it needs.	<p>(1) Comment re paragraph 5.1 noted. Disagree – the site lies wholly within the settlement curtilage for Sleaford, where a wide range of uses is acceptable in principle under Local Plan Policy C1. The site does not have a specific land use allocation in the Local Plan, so the Council would not wish to be prescriptive and limit and inhibit the range of uses achievable here.</p> <p>(2) The SPD encourages a developer to put forward a comprehensive mixed-use development on the site, and paragraph 5.2 gives the wide variety of potential uses acceptable here in principle, including services, business and employment, residential and cultural uses. This range will hopefully promote local employment growth, local access to a diverse range of facilities, and secure this redundant large industrial listed building's preservation, repair and return to active new uses.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
30.72	Paul McCallum Skanska UK Civil Engineering	SPD	O	5.2	5.2 35% of new housing MUST be MANDATORY!!!	Comment re Affordable Housing requirement Noted. Paragraph 5.2 of the SPD states that any new residential development on this site would need to provide affordable housing, and that "The Council has concluded that 35% of new development should be affordable...". The Council will negotiate strongly to secure this affordable housing provision on site, to contribute to the high District shortfall identified in the Housing Needs Assessment Study.
31.73	P B Jowett Rail Future (Railway Development Society). Lincs	SPD	S		Whilst Rail Future (the national lobby group in support of UK Railways - Passenger and Freight) support all the efforts for the future of Sleaford's Maltings believing that there will be benefits in the long term for the railway, i.e. bringing extra passengers into the town	Support Noted and Welcomed. Agreed that the re-use of the Maltings will attract more rail passengers and visitors, due to the wide variety of potential business, employment, residential and services uses that are acceptable in principle on the site, and due to its proximity to the railway station.
31.74	P B Jowett Rail Future (Railway Development Society). Lincs	SPD	O		The efforts for the future of the Maltings will:- maybe not enhance local Freight by the nature of the fact that the project is not geared to usage which would impact on freight enhancement in this case.	Agreed that the SPD is not primarily geared to rail freight delivery or usage enhancement. The SPD aims to promote a comprehensive mixed use development of this redundant industrial listed building which protects its historical character, and brings it all into active use by people. The SPD states that a wide variety of potential business, employment, residential and service uses are acceptable in principle on the site. In its sustainable location close to the railway station, it is hoped that the re-use of the Maltings will attract more railway-using passengers and visitors to the town.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
31.75	P B Jowett Rail Future (Railway Development Society). Lincs	SPD	O		The Lincolnshire Branch does have 3 Great Concerns about the proposed link road which will cross the railway to link up to Boston Road. Again no negative views on this proposal, recognising there will be benefits to local road transport. Our concerns are that in providing a bridge over the railway 3 matters Must be addressed in support of the railway.	Provision of appropriate, adequate and safe access to serve the site, by all modes of transport, will be required (to satisfy Local Plan Policy T1); and will utilise land beyond the SPD Site boundary. The Indicative potential new link road and bridge corridor is only shown to illustrate one possible indicative solution to providing adequate access to the Maltings. Any developer's proposals for a railway bridge design will separately be subject to design requirements and considerations expressed by Network Rail and English Heritage and others.
31.76	P B Jowett Rail Future (Railway Development Society). Lincs	SPD	O		Liaising with 'Network Rail'. The height of the bridge span must be within European Requirements, i.e. Loading gauge for rail containers of 9ft plus to ensure the line to Boston Docks can accommodate future rail container traffic. Nationally rail freight is growing dramatically and our line must be able to cope.	Any developer's separate proposals for a railway bridge outside the SPD site will be subject to design requirements and considerations expressed by Network Rail, English Heritage and others.
31.77	P B Jowett Rail Future (Railway Development Society). Lincs	SPD	O		The current railway line east of Station is single track. The new bridge span and abutments when build must allow for any future return to double track between Sleaford and Heckington which could occur as the need to accommodate increases Boston freight & coastal passenger traffic.	Any developer's separate proposals for a railway bridge outside the SPD site will be subject to design requirements and considerations expressed by Network Rail, English Heritage and others.
31.78	P B Jowett Rail Future (Railway Development Society). Lincs	SPD	O		In light of previous accidents adequate safety measures before the bridge both sides and on the bridge MUST be designed to stop danger of motor vehicles leaving the road and entering railway property.	Any developer's separate proposals for a railway bridge outside the SPD site will be subject to design requirements and considerations expressed by Network Rail, English Heritage and others.
32.79	John Anderson John Anderson Planning	SPD	O		Object to the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), with Further Comments made on particular Paragraph Numbers of the SPD, as set out in Representations Ref Nos. 32.80 to 32.84.	Each of your comments on individual Paragraph Numbers in the SPD has a separate response, under Representation Ref Numbers 32.80 to 32.84.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
32.80	John Anderson John Anderson Planning	SPD	O	1.2	I think one has to bite the bullet here. We should know the maximum amount of demolition permitted. The document is too bland and will not market the site for you.	<p>(1) Comment on the SPD's aims noted. Demolition is not being promoted by the SPD. However, some developer's schemes submitted may require it. Section 3 of the SPD sets out some Design Criteria, including broad principles with regard to part demolition proposals.</p> <p>(2) The SPD deals with principles, and not prescribing all potential design details of development, which are covered by policies in the Local Plan and elsewhere. The SPD purely supplements policies in the Local Plan, but does not replace these policies, or make new policy. As paragraph 4.5 of the SPD states, the detail of "Any proposal would also be assessed against all other relevant national, regional and local Policies as appropriate and current at that time.", including PPG15 requirements</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
32.81	John Anderson John Anderson Planning	SPD	O	3.1	What will be done with the middle of the site if only the perimeter buildings, or parts of the buildings are left. I would like to see some suggestions. The document is not positive enough about new usage. You have to market the site with Ideas.	<p>(1) The middle of the site is currently occupied by the listed building, and Demolition is not being promoted by the SPD. Section 3 of the SPD sets out some Design Criteria, including broad principles with regard to part demolition proposals. The SPD deals with principles, and not prescribing all potential design details of development proposals that could come forward, which will be considered under existing policies in the Local Plan and elsewhere.</p> <p>(2) Regarding new usage, the SPD is positively encouraging a developer to put forward a comprehensive mixed-use development on the site, and paragraph 5.2 gives the wide variety of potential uses acceptable here in principle, including services, business and employment, residential and cultural uses. This range will hopefully promote local employment growth, local access to a diverse range of facilities, and secure this redundant large industrial listed building's preservation, repair and return to active new uses. The SPD is a planning principles document, the Project Development Group will market the site.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
32.82	John Anderson John Anderson Planning	SPD	O	3.2	This perspective does not give any indication of use. It certainly will not work economically with so few people! Remember you are selling this to an entrepreneur who only has time to read five pages preferably with more pictures.	<p>(1) With regard to the Artist's impression/perspective on page 7 (above para 3.2), the artist's impression is purely an illustration of one architect's ideas - it does not imply this solution is acceptable. The SPD is not a 'sales' document, but sets out principles for development to preserve the Maltings.</p> <p>(2) Note: In response to English Heritage concerns, it has been agreed to Remove the Artist's impression drawings from pages 7 and 10 of SPD. The artists proposal designs are images of one possible indicative outcome. They can be misleading as seemingly indicating a preferred design solution, whereas many design outcomes are possible.</p>
32.83	John Anderson John Anderson Planning	SPD	O	3.3a	Who is paying for all the traffic requirements?	At this stage it is not known who will be funding any traffic/access improvements to serve Sleaford and the Maltings. The SPD sets out what is required -delivery will be dependent on a number of factors outside control of the SPD. The Draft SPD Map (pages 8/9) shows only an "Indicative Potential new link road and bridge Corridor" arising from conclusions of Highway Authority Sleaford-wide traffic studies, and is shown for information. All potential access options rely on land outside the Sleaford Maltings SPD site. The building of any such potential new link road and/or new rail bridge proposal to provide improved access to central Sleaford would first require separate planning approval (after general & public consultation) before development could proceed.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
32.84	John Anderson John Anderson Planning	SPD	O	page 9	Some ideas are needed to stimulate developers. Gutting the middle and making an East Midlands Arena for sport. Intensive food production with partial demolition and glass houses, a national museum of some sort, but Retail will detract from Sleaford (Are you sure about this as it is suggested) An international centre for factory production would need special marketing plus a serious amount of demolition. This is back to point one, you are going to have to clarify this.	(1) Whilst recognising that giving project ideas will stimulate developers, the SPD is a planning principles document identifying the need to preserve the Maltings and a myriad range of uses that are achievable here. The Maltings Project Development Group will market the site. (2) Also, as the site lies outside but adjacent to the designated Town centre, certain retail proposals will have to be considered under national planning policy PPS6 as to their impact on the vitality and viability of the existing town centre.
33.85	Debbie Scott Sleaford Development Group	SPD	S		Support the SPD	Support Noted and Welcomed
33.86	Debbie Scott Sleaford Development Group	SPD	O		Is the result of the Town Poll omitted intentionally or would mention of it in section 1 under consultation add weight to the case for the principles of the SPD?	Paragraphs 1.4 and 1.5 of the SPD describe the results of public consultation exercises carried out on behalf of the Sleaford Maltings Project Development Group. The public responded to a consultation booklet specifically seeking comment on re-use of the main Maltings buildings site itself. The Sleaford Town Council Poll (Nov 2005) addressed the separate issue, on land outside the SPD site, of a potential road route across Boston Road Recreation Ground, giving an indicative new access corridor that would serve the whole south-eastern quarter of Sleaford. It was not considered appropriate to include the result of the Town Poll in the SPD , regarding land outside the SPD site. The principles and need for provision of suitable access to the Maltings (in some form) from and across adjoining land is already addressed in paragraphs 3.3 to 3.6 of the SPD.
33.87	Debbie Scott Sleaford Development Group	SPD	S		Sleaford Development Group welcomes the recognition of the need to ensure viability of the existing town centre and therefore endorses the recommendations for mixed use of the Maltings site rather than predominately single use, whatever that might have been.	Support Noted and Welcomed

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
33.88	Debbie Scott Sleaford Development Group	SPD	O		There is also the opportunity that is within the SPD to encourage uses that are not easily accommodated elsewhere in the town centre, eg, some significant leisure facilities, cinema, community space, but would not want other planning applications to be able to be turned down on the grounds 'that the Maltings is the only appropriate place for such ventures'.	The SPD addresses and promotes the re-use of the Maltings site only, and states that a wide variety or mix of uses could be accommodated. Any proposals in the rest of the District, or here, would be assessed on their own merits and be assessed against all relevant national, regional and local planning Policies as appropriate and current at that time.
33.89	Debbie Scott Sleaford Development Group	SPD	O		Disappointed that the SPD refers only briefly to the 'wider context', when that is the key to linking the Maltings to the existing town centre.	The "Existing Wider Context" Map on pages 8/9 simply puts the Maltings SPD site in its wider spatial planning context, to assist developers who are considering putting forward proposals. Access to the site and therefore linking the site to the existing Town Centre, is already recognised as a key issue to resolve (Para 3.3). The SPD does not attempt to deal with the wider issues of Sleaford Town Centre.
34.90	Ann Plackett English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SA	O		At the screening stage, we advised that as the SPD could result in significant environmental effects, which could be either negative or positive, we considered that the SA for the SPD should meet the requirements of the SEA Directive.	<p>(1) SA/SEA has been carried out. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the SPD incorporates a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), as stated in paragraph 1.4 of the SA Report. The Methodology used is set out in section 2.0 of the SA Report.</p> <p>(2) Consideration of SPD's effects: The Council consider the SA Report (incorporating the identified key SEA issues) for the SPD to have considered and assessed the overall significant Environmental effects (based on an overall negative/positive balance) of implementing the SPD's aims for this small area at a local level, including identifying the main environmental issues and impacts.</p> <p>(3) The SA Report for this SPD is therefore considered to incorporate and meet the requirements of the SEA Directive (as advised in ODPM Guidance on SA/SEA of LDDs - Nov 2005).</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
34.91	Ann Plackett English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SA	O		In general terms, while the report highlights a number of issues, we do not consider that it is rigorous enough to meet these requirements. While it presents two alternatives, which examine the options of producing or not the SPD, this does not really permit a detailed assessment of the content of the SPD and whether the proposed guidance will result in beneficial or adverse impacts on the historic assets and it does not adequately cover the need for mitigation. Any issues and mitigation measures that are identified should be addressed in more detail by any subsequent EIA, if considered necessary, or inform the detailed development of the development and transport schemes.	<p>The Council has the following comments in response to the different elements of this Representation:-</p> <p>(1) Rigorousness of SA Report: The SA Report has considered the significant environmental, social and economic effects of the range of emerging Local Plan policies it supplements, as well as the significant effects and value added to them by producing an SPD addressing this particular Site's development. The SA Report is considered appropriate, relevant and rigorous enough to meet SA/SEA requirements.</p> <p>(2) Consideration of Alternative Options: The number of Options selected for assessment (two) meets SA Guidance. It is considered that Table 2 (Options impact appraisal) of the SA Report does provide a detailed assessment of the content of the SPD and its Objectives. In particular it considers the overall impacts (a positive/negative balance) on the historic assets under the Built Heritage sustainability criteria. Paras 6.1 to 6.18 of the SA also assess how the SPD supplements Local Plan Policies with regard to effects on historic assets.</p> <p>The conclusions of the Options Appraisal are set out in section 4 of the SA Report.</p> <p>The Council therefore has undertaken a relevant Options appraisal assessment in the SA, which is considered appropriate, relevant and detailed enough for this SPD site.</p> <p>(3) Mitigation measures: Section 5 of the SA Report on "Mitigation of Negative effects" of the SA comes to the conclusion that no mitigating measures are required. This is because the assessments in Table 2 indicate the production of the SPD in</p>

RefNo Name and Organisation SPD/SA Obj/Supp Para. No. Representations

Response

Option B overall does not, overall, bring about any negative effects on the sustainability criteria.
The SA Report is therefore considered to have adequately covered the need for mitigation measures issue.

(4) Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA):

It is not considered appropriate in this instance to refer to the separate regime of EIA for applications in this SPD SA document.

At the stage when detailed development proposals are submitted, and when necessary and appropriate, the Council will require applicants to undertake EIA of their proposals in accordance with national guidance and to submit an Environmental Statement, which could contain mitigation measures.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
34.92	Ann Plackett English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SA	O		Issue that does not seem to have been highlighted by the appraisal - the impact of the proposed traffic measures, such as the bridge and the upgrade of the access road from Mareham Lane to the Maltings, on the historic assets.	<p>(1) Paragraph 3.3 of the Draft SPD highlights access as a key issue to resolve. Provision of appropriate, adequate and safe access to serve the site, by all modes of transport, will be required (to satisfy Local Plan Policy T1). Access will utilise land beyond the SPD Site boundary. Which particular land and use is not confirmed or known, and will require separate planning approvals. The Indicative potential new link road and bridge corridor is only shown to illustrate one possible indicative solution to providing adequate access to the Maltings.</p> <p>(2) Any detailed traffic proposals scheme would require separate approvals and be subject to all existing local and national policies (& perhaps EIA & TIA) that protect and consider the impact on historic assets and area. As the details of any access proposal and traffic measures solution for land outside the site is purely indicative and at the moment, it was not considered appropriate to highlight these issues in the SA.</p>
34.93	Ann Plackett English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SA	O		Issue that does not seem to have been highlighted by the appraisal - the suggested need for demolition of part of the listed building.	<p>(1) The need for demolition is not suggested in the SPD. The SPD, in Section 3, provides some guidance and design criteria on how to handle limited demolition or alteration proposals.</p> <p>(2) The SA does already highlight and address demolition and alteration issues, in the Built Heritage section of Table 2, and in paragraphs 6.3 to 6.5 & paragraphs 6.10 to 6.12 of the SA Report.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
34.94	Ann Plackett English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SA	O		Issue that does not seem to have been highlighted by the appraisal - the possible impact on the viability of the town centre and the conservation of its historic character of a large mixed use development on this site.	<p>(1) The SA does already highlight and address the possible impact on viability on the town centre, in the Vitality and Viability of centres section of Table 2, and in paragraphs 6.20 to 6.22 of the SA Report.</p> <p>(2) The SA does also already highlight and address the possible impact on the conservation of the historic character of the town and wider townscape, in the Built Heritage section of Table 2, and also in paragraphs 6.7 to 6.9, which highlight preserving the setting in the adjacent townscape and landscape</p> <p>(3) The SPD aims to encourage sensitive alterations to the listed building and new uses here that will have a positive impact on the rest of Sleaford by both linking through to and physically complementing the historic town centre positively.</p>
34.95	Ann Plackett English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SA	O		Paragraph 2.4: this should also list PPG 16.	Agreed. A reference to PPG 16 (Archaeology and Planning) will be added to paragraph 2.4 of the SA Report.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
34.96	Ann Plackett English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SA	O		Table 1: While the SPD does not directly address biodiversity, the proposals being promoted in the report could have an impact on certain species, such as bats, that would require more detailed study. This could be a finding of the SEA and mitigation may be required, e.g. to investigate and make appropriate recommendations for the conservation of any protected species.	(1) Nature Conservation/ Biodiversity (a SEA issue) was not considered, in Table 1, to experience the most direct effect of the SPD aims, and has therefore not been assessed in further detail in the SA Report (see para 2.1 on Process adopted (page 4)). (2) However, the SPD itself states at paragraph 1.6, regarding Biodiversity, that an Ecology Study of the Maltings site has already been carried out on behalf of the Project Development Group. This Ecology survey (Sept 2005) was undertaken by Lapwings Consultants, and a copy of the report is publicly available - from the Sleaford Maltings Project Director. (3) In considering biodiversity with development proposals, this would not rule out any new potential developer from carrying out a fresh investigation and survey of the site, to establish the presence of protected species and any conservation measures.
35.97	Val Smith Ashby de la Launde&Bloxholm, Temple Bruer&T Grange	SPD	S		The Council support the plan.	Support Noted and Welcomed
35.98	Val Smith Ashby de la Launde&Bloxholm, Temple Bruer&T Grange	SPD	O		(but) We would like to see more facilities for Sleaford, more car parks are required, affordable housing and diversification of small businesses.	The SPD promotes a variety of uses for the Maltings site only, including affordable housing. Hopefully the regeneration of the Maltings will promote more developers to invest more in other facilities in Sleaford.
36.99	Michael Jones Sanderson Weatherall	SPD	S		We are pleased to state that we have no objections to the SPD. However we wish to be consulted on future rounds of consultations on the Local Development Framework Documents on behalf of our client Royal Mail Group Plc.	Support Noted and Welcomed. You will be added to our LDF/SCI consultation database.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
37.100	Rose Freeman The Theatres Trust	SPD	S		The Trust commends the Council's commitment to create a variety of community uses for this interesting and complicated site. Theatre use, of course, as part of a relatively small development may make a strong contribution to the regeneration of the area and could provide a venue for creative and cultural activities. These include not just performances on stage, but foyer music and exhibitions, pre-performance talks and events. A flourishing arts scene helps give a sense of local identity and vitality, and will entertain and stimulate local residents and businesses. Audiences coming to a theatre will enliven the surrounding area in the evening, and provide regular custom for local bars and restaurants outside normal working and shopping hours. Both participation in a production or attending a performance can promote social inclusion, particularly as theatres seek to broaden their production policies and attract new audiences. However, it is important to assess the need and impact of existing theatrical provision (and for additional) within the area. A town which already has a lyric theatre within 30 minutes drive is unlikely to need another but might well have demand for an arts centre or other cultural activities.	Support Noted and Welcomed. Theatres are identified as a potential use in Para 5.2 of the SPD. Any Theatre developer will wish to assess the type, size and viability of theatre provision viable in this location.
38.101	Sally Murray The Countryside Agency-Landscape Access	SPD	S		The Countryside Agency firmly supports the pursuit of high standards of design in all development, and especially that, which respects local character and distinctiveness. The Countryside Agency believes that all development should be of a high quality design not only in terms of aesthetics but also in ways by which it incorporates the full range of sustainable development objectives I.e. economic, social and environmental.	Support Noted and Welcomed.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
38.102	Sally Murray The Countryside Agency-Landscape Access	SPD & SA	O		We feel that the SPD and SA primarily falls outside our areas of engagement however, we would, within the proposal wish to encourage design that incorporate modal shifts through the provision of bus routes, footpaths, cycle routes and cycle shortage facilities as well as creating linkages with existing green open space in the locality. If additional road infrastructure is required, consideration must be given to local character and landscaping requirements.	<p>(1) Regarding site accessibility and designing for all modes of transport , one of the SPD's aims (at paragraph 1.2) is to "Ensure that new development integrates with Sleaford town, with appropriate access." Paragraph 3.3 of the SPD also highlights that: "Access to the site will be a key issue to resolve." The SPD therefore aims to encourage better linkages of the site with the town centre. Detailed access arrangements will be considered under relevant local and national planning policies, as stated in paragraph 4.5 of the SPD. The emphasis is on Designs that encourage a variety of transport modes to the site, that increase travel choice away from cars, and provide ease of movement and Permeability between the site and Town.</p> <p>(2) The Indicative Potential New Link Road and Bridge Corridor shown on the SPD Map (pages 8/9) arises from conclusions of Highway Authority Sleaford-wide traffic studies on options to provide access to central Sleaford and the Maltings. All potential road access options rely on land outside the Sleaford Maltings SPD site. The building of any such potential new link road and/or new rail bridge proposal to provide improved access to central Sleaford would first require separate planning permission (after general & public consultation) before development could proceed.</p> <p>(3) Considerations in the Design of appropriate access solutions would include whether proposals provide adequate and effective measures to facilitate access by all modes of transport including public transport, walking and cycling. The design of appropriate access solutions would be subject to separate planning, highway, listed building, railway network design and landscaping policies and requirements, and are expected to cater for walking, cycling and vehicular movements, including links to existing green open</p>

space.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
38.103	Sally Murray The Countryside Agency-Landscape Access	SA	O		We feel that Table 1 and 2 of the SA require additional detail in Landscape/Townscape, Nature conservation, Cultural and Social, as well as Resources and Energy as these do have the potential to be affected by the SPD, this affect can, through design, be a positive.	<p>(1) The Council's Sustainability Criteria:- Landscape Character, Nature Conservation/ Biodiversity, Culture, Use of Energy (amongst others) were not considered, in Table 1, to experience the most Direct Effect (positive or negative) of the SPD's aims, and have therefore not been assessed in further detail in Table 2 of the SA Report. Paragraph 2.1 (page 4) of the SA Report explains the Process adopted.</p> <p>(2) However the Sustainability Criteria of 'Townscape' you mention was one of those considered to experience the most Direct Effect of the SPD's aims. This was examined in more detail in Table 2 of the SA Report, under the Sustainability Criteria titled "Built Heritage, Archaeology, Distinctiveness, Townscape."</p>
38.104	Sally Murray The Countryside Agency-Landscape Access	SPD	O		Any works should respect the intrinsic character of the area. Landscape character assessment provides a sound basis for guiding, informing & understanding the ability of any location to accommodate change, and to make positive proposals for conserving character, enhancing it or regenerating it, as detailed proposals are developed.	Agreed – Any proposed works should respect the intrinsic character of the area, including use of landscape character assessment as a tool for considering change. However, as paragraph 4.5 of the SPD states, the detail of "Any proposal would also be assessed against all other relevant national, regional and local Policies as appropriate and current at that time ". The effect of any proposals on the landscape would therefore include assessment under existing policies such as: Local Plan Policy LW1 (Landscape Conservation); Structure Plan Policy NE6 (Landscape Character Areas and Natural Areas); RSS8 –Policy 30 (Region's Landscape); and PPS7 (paragraphs 24 to 26).

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
39.105	Robert J C Doughty Robert Doughty Consultancy	SPD	O		The Thorpe and Asgarby Estate owns land to the south east of the Maltings complex, some of which appears on the wider context diagram in the centre of the SPD. Paragraphs 1.5 and 3.2 refer to the land & indicate that no development should take place there that would affect the view of the buildings, but the extent and parameters of the view that should be protected are not defined and this is a failing of the SPD, particularly as the SA refers to specific guidance that the SPD allegedly provides. The lack of attention to the south eastern area places an unnecessary negative emphasis on potential proposals, which may well be the key to a successful redevelopment of the Sleaford Maltings, particularly in the form of enabling development that can be accommodated without detriment to the views of the Maltings. There should be greater acknowledgement of the role that land to the south east might play in the long term proposals. Whilst this land falls outside the current development boundary, the SPD will overlap with the Local Development Framework currently underway and should allow flexibility for the future.	<p>(1) The status and role of the open countryside land to the south and east of the Maltings is considered to have been adequately referred to in this SPD.</p> <p>As paragraph 4.5 of the SPD states, the detail of "Any proposal would also be assessed against all other relevant national, regional and local Policies as appropriate and current at that time". The open land to the south and east lies outside the SPD site boundary, is considered to contribute to the Setting of the Listed Building (Policy HE5), and is designated Countryside (Policy C2).</p> <p>(2) Setting of Listed Building:-</p> <p>(a) The SA Report (paragraph 6.9) refers to the SPD providing guidance. The SPD does this in paragraph 3.2 by generally highlighting the need to preserve the setting of the building, the importance of the open views from the south, and stating that no enabling development would be appropriate in this location which affected the view of the buildings. There is Not a presumption that any development would have a detrimental impact on the setting.</p> <p>(b) Regarding preserving the Setting and views of the listed building, proposals for development in this area will therefore be considered under other existing relevant Policies, such as: Local Plan Policy HE5 - Development Affecting the Setting of a Listed Building; Lincolnshire Structure Plan Policy BE3 – Conservation of the Historic Built Environment, RSS8 – Policy 31 (Historic Environment), and national PPG15 - Planning and the Historic Environment. The Justification text for Local Plan Policy HE5 and paragraphs 2.16 and 2.17 of PPG15 already set out guidance and broad parameters of what a "setting" can encompass – which can include land at some distance from a listed building. The relationship between a listed building and existing physical townscape, landscape, trees, visual elements and quality of spaces contributes to its setting. The</p>

RefNo Name and Organisation SPD/SA Obj/Supp Para. No. Representations

Response

setting or view 'zone' can not therefore be readily and commonly defined, because an assessment of whether a building's setting is adversely affected depends on currently unknown factors such as the height, scale, design and of a future Proposal for development , and its proposed proximity to the listed building. Formal policy guidance therefore already exists regarding preserving the setting of a listed building and considering proposals.

(3) Countryside Land to the South East:-
The land to the south and east lies outside the SPD site in an open countryside location outside the defined Settlement Curtilage for Sleaford, where any proposals for other uses or ancillary parking to serve the Maltings development, or to serve the wider Sleaford area, will be considered under existing Local Plan policies such as Policy C2 (Development in the Countryside). Parking use development proposals in this location will also be considered under existing Local Plan Policy T5 (Parking provision) and Policy T1 (Developments attracting significant numbers of journeys), and national planning and transport policies. Proposals here would also be considered under listed building Setting policies described in (2) above. The long term role of this land is therefore acknowledged. It is not the aim or role of this SPD to set out all possible uses that would be acceptable in this Countryside location.

(4) Enabling Development:-
For information: In response to English Heritage concerns, and to aid clarity in the SPD, the SPD has been amended at the end of the 2nd sentence in paragraph 3.2, to add the following text:-
"and be fully in accordance with English Heritage's national policy guidance on enabling development."

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
39.106	Robert J C Doughty Robert Doughty Consultancy	SPD	O		The SPD fails to mention the use of renewable energy in any proposals and this should be added to the document to promote sustainable development. This is all the more surprising as Appendix A of the SA includes Use of Energy as one of the defining criteria (No.8 on page 20).	<p>(1) This SPD deals with general principles for these listed buildings, and does not attempt to prescribe or mention all potential development proposal and design considerations (like Renewable Energy), which are covered by existing policies in the Local Plan and elsewhere, which promote sustainable development. As paragraph 4.5 of the SPD already states, the detail of "Any proposal would also be assessed against all other relevant national, regional and local Policies as appropriate and current at that time."</p> <p>(2) Whilst the Use of Energy (and other Sustainability Criteria) will be relevant to the detailed design of development proposals, it was not considered to be one of the key Sustainability Criteria directly affected by the SPD's aims, an SPD that does not attempt to address every detailed design feature of potential developments.</p> <p>The Council's 17 Sustainability Criteria listed at Appendix A of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report are a Toolkit for use to appraise the aims and objectives of a policy or document, such as this SPD. The impact of the SPD's aims on these Sustainability Criteria is set out in Table 1. Six of the seventeen Sustainability Criteria were considered to experience the most Direct Effect of the SPD's aims. The Sustainability criterion "Use of Energy" (number 8) was Not considered, in Table 1, to experience the most Direct Effect or impact of the SPD's aims (amongst other sustainable development criteria). 'Use of Energy' has therefore been considered in the process, but has not been assessed in further or additional detail in Table 2 of the SA Report. Paragraph 2.1 (page 4) of the Draft SA Report explains the Process adopted.</p> <p>(3) Promoting sustainable development in buildings can include, for example, the use of renewable energy sources and specific energy, heating and water supply efficiency schemes &</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
						measures, and the inclusion of sustainable surface water drainage systems. Design elements such as these will therefore be considered in the light of proposals submitted for re-use of these listed buildings, and under existing planning policies that already promote them. These existing Policies include Local Plan Policies C16 (Renewable Energy) and C20 (Energy Efficiency), in which the Council encourages applicants for major developments to consider generating energy from renewable resources, and to seek to maximise energy efficiency generally.
39.107	Robert J C Doughty Robert Doughty Consultancy	SPD	O	3.2	Reference to enabling development is made without proper explanation of what this is or justification for dismissing the potential for such development to the south east of the Sleaford Maltings. There is no definition of the view that should be protected. Para 1.6 also confirms no formal visual and landscape study has been carried out as part of the SPD process, suggesting that the comments in the SPD are based on assumption. The land to the south east has great potential and the SPD is unduly restrictive by failing to consider possible uses that would be acceptable as well as complementary (other than car parking areas) and might assist in the overall project delivery.	The Response is the same as that contained in Response 39.105, regarding Land to the South East.
39.108	Robert J C Doughty Robert Doughty Consultancy	SPD	O	3.2	The SPD makes no proper reference to the potential use of renewable energy. This should be included as part of the SPD, as it is referred to in the SA (page 20) where it is claimed it has been considered. The Sleaford Maltings presents an obvious opportunity for a heating and power project using renewable energy.	The Response is the same as that contained in Response 39.106, regarding the use of Renewable Energy.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
39.109	Robert J C Doughty Robert Doughty Consultancy	SA	O	6.9	The SPD does not provide proper guidance and design criteria for the preservation and conservation of the setting of the listed buildings or landscape views. In fact, there is very limited information in this respect, but simply a presumption that any development would have a detrimental impact. Further work should be carried out and consulted upon in this respect.	The Response is the same as that contained in Response 39.105, regarding the Setting of the Listed Building.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
40.110	Ruth Walker Sport England - East Midlands Region	SPD	O		Whilst I do not have any comments to make specific to the Sleaford Maltings SPD, I would like to raise the following comment. I see from the Existing Wider Context map that there is an Indicative Potential New Link Road and Bridge Corridor proposed to cross an area shown as being Recreational Open Space use. Sport England would object to any proposed development that would lead to the loss of playing fields.	<p>(1) Comment regarding the potential loss of playing fields on Recreational Open Space land outside SPD site. The achievement and provision of appropriate access to the site will be a key issue to resolve (paragraph 3.3). All potential access options rely on land outside the Sleaford Maltings SPD site.</p> <p>(2) The Potential New Link Road and Bridge Corridor shown on the SPD Map (pages 8/9) is purely Indicative, and is shown for information only (to tie in with Draft SPD paragraphs 3.3 to 3.6). The route shown crosses Boston Road Recreation Ground land. The need for the road arises from conclusions of Highway Authority Sleaford-wide traffic studies on options to provide access to the Maltings and Sleaford generally, and would first require separate planning permission.</p> <p>(3) The detail of any development proposal for a new road outside the SPD site would be assessed against all other relevant national, regional and local planning Policies as appropriate and current at that time. Currently, this would include meeting the requirements of Local Plan Policy RST1 (Protecting existing recreational open space and built sports facilities), which would be applied to applications involving loss of playing fields or informal recreational open space. This Policy states that permission will be granted only if a replacement recreational site of equivalent or better facilities has been or shall be provided. This Policy echoes the national requirements set out in national PPG 17 – Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (2002). This states considerations would include whether any playing fields that would be lost as a result of a proposed development would be replaced by a playing field or fields of equivalent or better quantity and quality and in a suitable location. Sport England will be consulted as necessary.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
41.111	E Riley Sleaford Town Council	SPD	S		Sleaford Town Council is a partner of the Maltings Development Group	Support Noted and Welcomed
42.112	David Suiter Sleaford Town Council	SPD	O		<p>The map on page 6 gives a road wider than the road in the local press. I object in principle. However if the planning committee is inclined to accept this road, a road of no greater size and dimension than in this artists illustration with all the mature trees in place as illustrated. A road construction method that does not damage tree roots is obviously possible otherwise the partners in this project would have not have illustrated it this way. It would be better to replace this road with a footpath and cycle route, constructed by a method that minimises impact on trees. Minimisation of car journeys is the best policy.</p>	<p>(1) The road and bridge corridor shown in the Draft SPD is purely indicative. If a road link scheme were to be implemented, the precise route and highway design details would first be separately assessed by the Highway Authority, before a scheme subject to planning approval was submitted.</p> <p>(2) Regarding Access, the following should be noted: The achievement and provision of appropriate access to the site will be a key issue to resolve. The Draft SPD Map (pages 8/9) shows only an "Indicative Potential new link road and bridge Corridor" arising from conclusions of Highway Authority Sleaford-wide traffic studies, and is shown for information (to tie in with Draft SPD paragraphs 3.3 to 3.6).</p> <p>The building of any such potential new link road and/or new rail bridge proposal to provide improved access to central Sleaford would first require separate planning permission (after general & public consultation) before development could proceed. The design of appropriate access solutions would be subject to separate planning, highway, listed building and railway network design requirements, and cater for walking, cycling and vehicular movements.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
42.113	David Suiter Sleaford Town Council	SPD	O	3.3-3.5	No need for a road exit. Current use permitted on this site has a high level of traffic. Use is not specified. Why is a road across the recreation ground necessary? What is the maximum number of vehicles from the current permissions. If you do not specify the use of these buildings how do you know the road is required? Some of these uses could have a traffic impact. What would be the minimum impact of the groups specified ?	<p>(1) The road and bridge corridor shown in the Draft SPD is purely indicative. The need for a new link road and exit is a conclusion derived from Highway Authority reports on Sleaford-wide traffic model studies, forecasting general future town-wide traffic congestion levels, assuming different development scenarios, and giving out alternative potential options, solutions and conclusions on managing & relieving forecast central Sleaford traffic congestion in the vicinity of Southgate level crossing, with or without a re-used Maltings. The conclusions seek provision of improved vehicular and pedestrian access to all of central Sleaford – including a potentially re-used Maltings site.</p> <p>(2) The traffic impact forecasts used have been based on an assumed potential new mix of uses on the redundant industrial site. Details and information on the potential access & traffic options, impacts and solutions can be viewed separately in these Highway Authority reports on Sleaford traffic model studies. These are publicly available for viewing - and will be made available on the Council's website.</p>
43.114	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O		Our overarching concerns are that:- (1) The site under consideration should include the whole of the historic landscape that was the former Bass Maltings complex. (2) Full consideration should be given to aspirations for adjoining sites and to the impact of any development on the historic town of Sleaford. (3) Proposals for alteration that include the demolition of any significant part of the Maltings complex should be formulated and assessed in strict accordance with government policy guidance as set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15. (4) The scheme prepared as part of the Framework Study should not be included in the SPD as other outcomes might be possible.	<p>Overarching concerns are contained in Comments (1) to (4). The Council has Responded to each detailed further Representation that equates with each overarching Comment: -</p> <p>For Comment (1): See Response for Representation 43-116 For Comment (2): See Responses for Representations 43-116 and 43-137 For Comment (3): See Responses for Representations 43-121 and 43-136 For Comment (4): See Response for Representation 43-132.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
43.115	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	1.2, 1st bullet point	Para 1.2, 1st bullet point:- Amend whole bullet point, to read: " Preserve the site, prevent inappropriate alterations and prevent demolition of any significant part of the complex unless it has been justified;"	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
43.116	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	1.2, 2nd bullet point	Para 1.2, 2nd bullet point:- (1) Underline "whole area". (2) Comments (a)' In this context we strongly advise that the SPD should cover the whole of the historic site including the TEC Foods site and all the land to the west to the hotel. (b) Comprehensive planning for the historic environment demands the inclusion of all the listed buildings, development sites and curtilage areas.(c) Arguably the Advanta Seeds and adjoining sites on the north side of the railway line should also be included.(d) We recommend that maps of these sites, with indications of the LPA's views on development, should be included.'	<p>Comment (1): Para 1.2, 2nd bullet point: - Disagree. The Council consider there is no need to underline "whole area". Instead, amend text to read "whole site" (not underlined) - to clarify matters.</p> <p>Comments (2)(a)-(d): Regarding Comments, Advice and Recommendation: - This particular advice and recommendation is Not supported by the Council for the following reasons: -</p> <p>1.0 Extend SPD to Include Wider Area of Sleaford, including nearby potential development sites?:</p> <p>1.1 The SPD site boundary is drawn to focus on the main listed Grade II* Maltings buildings site only, in the interests of encouraging and facilitating restoration, preservation and bringing these under-used, damaged, redundant industrial buildings back into new uses, and to resist further dereliction and decay of a landmark Listed Building at Risk.</p> <p>1.2 If the SPD site was extended and physically widened to include all the other nearby potential development sites (e.g. Advanta Seeds site - to the north of the railway, Tec Foods site and land up to the hotel - to the west, potential road link land), it is envisaged the document would then become an "Action Area Plan", which would be a Development Plan Document (potentially allocating land) and not an explanatory, supplementary, SPD document.</p> <p>1.3 DPDs are subject to more extensive procedures than SPDs, including an independent public Examination before an Inspector, who issues a binding report, a process which would have a much longer lead-in time to DPD Adoption (3 years?). This would lead to a substantial delay in flagging up and promoting re-use, restoration and sensitive alterations that preserve this Listed Building at risk - not what the Council desires.</p> <p>1.4 Also, separate planning applications can come forward for other nearby sites now and be guided by existing planning policies and documents.</p>

RefNo Name and Organisation SPD/SA Obj/Supp Para. No. Representations

Response

2.0 Include All Nearby Listed Buildings and Whole Maltings Historic Landscape within SPD?:

2.1 Whilst recognising the whole historic landscape & wider historic environment that formed the Bass Maltings complex when built, the Council's aim in producing this SPD is to promote and prioritise the preservation, re-use and restoration of the particular site containing the main large Grade II* Listed Building. This building is mainly vacant, damaged, in need of repair, is at a high risk of further decay unless new uses are found, and is on the Listed Buildings at Risk register.

2.2 The SPD is therefore encouraging change to bring about the active re-use and preservation of these main redundant industrial large building blocks (forming the II* site) that are considered the most vulnerable to neglect.

2.3 The SPD is not seeking to encourage changes of use in the rest of the listed grade II buildings in the vicinity, which are mostly in active residential use*, physically separate, and are not listed buildings at risk. Therefore, the SPD site boundary as drawn does not include these. Thus, whilst these other listed buildings descriptions state they are "an integral part of this nationally important Maltings complex" the SPD is not promoting active change in them. The assessment of any development proposals that alter, change or affect these other, associated, listed buildings and their preservation, will be considered separately under all existing relevant local, county, regional and national planning and listed building policies current at the time.

*(Currently, the 8 cottages are in residential use, and the manager's house is in use as a day nursery).

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
43.117	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	2.2	Para 2.2:- Regarding phrase "integral part of the complex", Comment is: 'Precisely!'	Comment Noted, about "integral part of the complex". The Council would comment that this paragraph exists (as part of section 2.0) to provide basic information about the original Sleaford Maltings complex and its setting. The SPD does not promote new uses in these associated Grade II listed buildings outside the SPD site, as it does for the main Listed Grade II* redundant industrial building blocks – a Listed
43.118	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	2.5	Para 2.5, 1st line:- (1) Delete word "heavily".(2) Comment:' It should be pointed out that the Framework Document and architect's designs are indicative only.'	(1) Agreed. Delete word "heavily" from paragraph 2.5. (2) Agreed. Add new last sentence to end of paragraph 2.5, to read " The architect's designs contained in the separate Framework Report document are indicative only." (3) To aid clarification on supporting documentation (officer's recommendation for alteration), amend existing last sentence of paragraph 2.5 by deleting "section 7" and replacing with "
43.119	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.1, 1st bullet point	Para 3.1 (Design Criteria), 1st bullet point, last sentence:- Delete phrase: "wherever possible be reclaimed from", and Replace with "match that".	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation.
43.120	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.1, 2nd bullet point	Para 3.1, 2nd bullet point, 1st sentence: - Delete "will be" & replace with "might be", Delete "viable" and replace with "possible".	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation
43.121	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.1, 2nd bullet point	Para 3.1, 2nd bullet point - Add ADDITIONAL NEW sentence (after 'as possible'), to read:- " Strict adherence to government policy guidance on alterations and demolition, as set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15, will be essential. All developers will be expected to engage in full pre-application discussions with the local planning authority, English Heritage and other consultees."	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
43.122	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.1, 2nd bullet point	Para 3.1, 2nd bullet point - Amend current 2nd sentence to read:-" In considering any proposals for demolition the Council will want to ensure that elements of the characteristic spaces..."	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation
43.123	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.1, 3rd bullet point	Para 3.1, 3rd bullet point: - (1) Completely Delete WHOLE Bullet point (no replacement) - which currently reads : " Where demolition has taken place the Council will be prepared to consider proposals to make good the building elevations which use contemporary materials and design and clearly distinguishes the new work.". (2) EH Comment:' I don't think there should be direction on style.	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation
43.124	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.1, 5th bullet point	Para 3.1, 5th bullet point: - 1st line, Delete "Where possible"	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation
43.125	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.1, 6th bullet point	Para 3.1, 6th bullet point: - Delete (at end): " and subdivision will be acceptable.", and Replace with; "will be considered favourably as long as the special interest is preserved."	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation
43.126	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.1, 7th bullet point	Para 3.1, 7th bullet point: Completely Delete WHOLE Bullet point (no replacement) - which currently reads: " Where blocks, with the exception of block 2, retain elements of original equipment their removal will be allowed, although schemes which are able to retain these items of original equipment in situ will be supported."	Agreed. Delete text as per Representation. It is understood that later text amendments regarding potential original equipment removal and use of Block 2 (or 3), have replaced this.
43.127	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.1, 8th bullet point	Para 3.1, 8th bullet point, 2nd sentence:- Delete "use of modern materials which are clearly distinct from the existing fabric of the building and", & Replace with "schemes" ; Add "spaces and" after "existing building" and before "fabric".	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
43.128	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.1, 8th bullet point	Para 3.1, 8th bullet point: Add ADDITIONAL NEW last sentence (after "will be welcomed"), to read:- "The re-use of block 2 (or block 3) should develop a solution which does not involve subdivision of the internal spaces, including the insertion of mezzanine floors, and which can allow public access to allow the historic internal spaces, layout and equipment to be visited and viewed."	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation
43.129	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.1, 9th bullet point	Para 3.1, 9th bullet point: Add in ADDITIONAL NEW sentence (at beginning of 9th bullet point), to read: " Where blocks, with the exception of either block 2 (or block 3), retain elements of original equipment their removal and relocation elsewhere in the complex will be allowed, although schemes which are able to retain these items of original equipment in situ will be supported."	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation
43.130	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.1, 9th bullet point	Para 3.1, 9th bullet point: Amend existing 1st and 2nd sentences (retained) to read: " Within block 2 (or block 3) all original equipment should be retained and restored in situ. Where elements of original equipment not present in block 2 (or block 3) are still existing in, but will be removed from, other buildings, these should be relocated and installed within block 2 (or block 3)."	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation
43.131	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.1, 9th bullet point	Para 3.1, 9th bullet point: Delete existing last sentence, which currently reads: " The re-use of block 2 should develop a solution which does not involve subdivision of the space and which can allow pre-booked access at pre-determined times to allow the layout of the equipment to be viewed."	Agreed. Delete text as per Representation

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
43.132	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	Pages 7 & 10 - Artists Impressions	Pages 7 (before para 3.2) & 10 (before para 4.0) - Artists Impressions of a Restored Sleaford Maltings: EH Comment is: " THE ARTIST'S IMPRESSIONS ON PAGES 7 AND 10 SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED AS OTHER OPTIONS MIGHT BE PRESENTED. THESE IMAGES ARE BEST PRESENTED IN THE FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT AS ONE POSSIBLE OUTCOMES."	Agreed. Remove Artist's drawings from pages 7 and 10 of SPD. The artists proposal designs are impressions and images of one possible indicative outcome. This can be misleading as seemingly indicating a preferred design solution, whereas many design outcomes are possible.
43.133	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.2	Para 3.2: Add at end of second sentence (after "setting of the building") :- " and be fully in accordance with English Heritage's national policy guidance on enabling development."	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation
43.134	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.3 (c)	Para 3.3 (c): Add new sentence at end of paragraph (c), to read: "Preference will be given to schemes that do not involve the relocation or alteration of the historic entrance gateway."	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation
43.135	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	3.4	Para 3.4: Add new sentence to end of paragraph, to read: " On the Maltings (south) side of the railway line preference will be given to a scheme that is set as far away as possible from block 1. The bridge should be carefully designed to minimise the impact on the whole of the historic site ".	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation
43.136	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	4.5	Para 4.5: Add new sentence to end of paragraph, to read: " Particular attention should be given to government policy guidance as set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15." (Planning and the Historic Environment).	Agreed. Amend text as per Representation

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
43.137	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	5.1	Para 5.1, re Future Uses:- EH Comment is: " We think that something needs to be added to ensure that the impact of all new uses at the Maltings site will not have an adverse effect on the viability and vitality of the historic town of Sleaford."	(1) Regarding paragraph 5.1: Future Uses. Agreed that additional text is required to clarify this edge-of-centre site's relationship with the adjacent Town Centre. Add the following new text as new last sentence to paragraph 5.1: "Proposed new town centre uses at the Maltings site should enhance or have a positive impact on the vitality and viability of Sleaford Town Centre." (2) The SPD already states, at paragraph 4.5:- "Any proposal would also be assessed against all other relevant national, regional and local Policies as appropriate and current at that time." Under this, and depending on the uses/mix of uses coming forward for this edge-of- centre site, any proposals for retail or other town centre uses described in PPS6 (paragraph 1.8) would be considered under the sequential test existing in national PPS6 as to their Impact on the vitality and viability of Sleaford town centre.
43.138	James Edgar English Heritage - East Midlands Region	SPD	O	6.2	Para 6.2: (1) Completely Delete WHOLE Paragraph (no replacement). (2) EH Comment is: " EH would not be prepared to proceed on the basis of anything other than an evidence-based case for alteration, possibly including demolition of significant parts, of a Grade II* Listed Building."	Agreed. Delete text as per Representation
44.139L	Michael John Dorr Helpringham Parish Council	SPD	S - Late Reply		Support the SPD	Support Noted and Welcomed

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
45.140L	Elizabeth Bott Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	SPD & SA	O - Late Reply		<p>The Trust has concerns that neither document makes reference to the potential presence of protected species. Bats may roost in the existing buildings and birds may use the buildings and surrounding area to nest. Bats and their places of shelter or protection are protected by law. It is an offence to intentionally damage, destroy or obstruct access to their place of shelter or protection. Where there is evidence of use of a building as a bat roost, licenses may be issued by Defra to permit work. Breeding birds, their eggs and unfledged young are also protected by law.</p> <p>Developers should be required to carry out a protected species survey at the appropriate time of year prior to any works, to determine whether any bats or breeding birds are present and to ensure that mitigation measures are implemented if appropriate.</p>	<p>(1) Concerns are Noted. This SPD deals with general principles for these listed buildings, and does not attempt to prescribe all possible potential development proposal considerations, which are covered by existing policies in the Local Plan and elsewhere. The SPD does not replace these policies, or make new policy, but purely supplements certain aspects of Local Plan policies. As paragraph 4.5 of the SPD states, the detail of "Any proposal would also be assessed against all other relevant national, regional and local Policies as appropriate and current at that time."</p> <p>This, for example, would include considering proposals under the requirements of national PPS9 – "Planning for Biodiversity and Geological Conservation" (2005). Also, Local Plan Policy LW8 – "Protected Species" already requires applicants to assess whether their proposal will affect any protected species, if necessary by commissioning a survey to accompany proposals.</p> <p>It is therefore not considered necessary to make specific reference to protected species in the SPD.</p> <p>(2) Nature Conservation/ Biodiversity (a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) issue) was addressed in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the SPD, but was not considered, in Table 1, to experience the most direct effect of the SPD aims, and has therefore not been assessed in further detail in the SA Report (see para 2.1 of SA on Process adopted (page 4)).</p> <p>(3) However, the SPD itself states at paragraph 1.6, regarding Biodiversity, that an Ecology Study of the Maltings site has already been carried out on behalf of the Sleaford Maltings Project Development Group. This Ecology survey (Sept 2005) was undertaken by Lapwings Consultants, and concluded there are no protected species on the site. A copy of the</p>

RefNo Name and Organisation SPD/SA Obj/Supp Para. No. Representations

Response

report is publicly available for viewing.

(4) Thus, in considering biodiversity with development proposals, this would not rule out any new potential developer from carrying out a fresh investigation and survey of the site, to establish the presence of any protected species and any conservation measures.

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
45.141L	Elizabeth Bott Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	SPD	O - Late Reply	Section 6	The Trust strongly recommends that a paragraph is added to Section 6 of the SPD to highlight the possibility that protected species may be present on the site and which requires developers to submit a protected species survey report with planning applications.	<p>(1) This SPD deals with general principles for these listed buildings, and does not attempt to prescribe all possible potential development proposal considerations, which are covered by existing policies in the Local Plan and elsewhere. The SPD does not replace these policies, or make new policy, but purely supplements certain aspects of Local Plan policies. As paragraph 4.5 of the SPD states, the detail of "Any proposal would also be assessed against all other relevant national, regional and local Policies as appropriate and current at that time."</p> <p>(2) This, for example, would include considering proposals under the requirements of national PPS9 – "Planning for Biodiversity and Geological Conservation" (2005). Also, the existing Local Plan Policy LW8 – "Protected Species" already requires applicants to assess whether their proposal will affect any protected species, if necessary by commissioning a survey to accompany proposals.</p> <p>(3) An Ecology Study of the Maltings has already been undertaken, by consultants (Lapwings Survey and Report, Sept 2005), which is referred to in paragraph 1.6 of the SPD. This has concluded there are no protected species on the site. A copy of the Report is publicly available for viewing. However, an EIA may be required to support any planning application. The Ecology Survey would need to be updated to support this process and identify any change in the situation.</p> <p>(4) Thus, in considering Biodiversity and development proposals under existing Policy requirements, this would not rule out any potential developer from carrying out a fresh investigation and survey of the site, to establish the presence of any protected species and any conservation measures.</p> <p>(5) It is therefore not considered necessary to</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
						make specific reference in the SPD to requiring a protected species survey report with development proposals.
46.142L	Jo Penter Government Office for the East Midlands (GOEM)	SPD	S - Late Reply		Overall the draft SPD is well set out, clear and interesting. As required by PPS12 the draft SPD clearly links to policy, in this case emerging Local Plan policy.	Support Noted and Welcomed
46.143L	Jo Penter Government Office for the East Midlands (GOEM)	SPD	O - Late Reply		As the Local Plan is at the stage of awaiting the Inspector's Report, the policies to which the draft SPD is linked may be liable to change. The Council will therefore need to be aware that there may be a need to revise the SPD should the parent policies change before adoption. Also as the programme for the SPD is behind that detailed in the approved LDS, in revising the LDS this will need to be reflected.	The Council is aware that the SPD may have to be revised if the parent policies in the Local Plan change before adoption, and that the LDS needs revising. The Council will review the need to revise the SPD through the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR).

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
47.144L	Lesley Frances Kirkby La Thorpe Parish Council	SPD	O - Late Reply		<p>Although outside time limit for a response to the Draft, we would like it noted that we have concerns about the routing of traffic from the Maltings (assuming exits are over the existing playing fields onto the old Boston Road). If that exit is use, and it seems clear that it is the primary option at the present time, then we are concerned at the amount of traffic that will be forced along the old Boston Road to our village. Already we have the likely additional traffic coming our way due to the proposed Sports Stadium opposite Railway Cottages on the old Boston Road and traffic from the Maltings would increase it even further. We would ask that you note our concerns and consider respecting our village as a rural village without the desire for large amounts of traffic to be created. We already have the intrusion of the A17 that has split the village in half and do not want further inconvenience.</p>	<p>(1) Concerns about additional traffic reaching Kirkby La Thorpe village via the indicative potential new link road to Boston Road have been noted and passed on to the Highway Authority. If a road link is implemented, the Highway Authority have indicated that they will monitor and assess the effects of any major increase in traffic movements to the junction of the A17.</p> <p>(2) Regarding Access, the following should be noted:</p> <p>(a) The achievement and provision of appropriate access to the site will be a key issue to resolve. The Draft SPD Map (pages 8/9) shows only an "Indicative Potential new link road and bridge Corridor" arising from conclusions of Highway Authority Sleaford-wide traffic studies, as described in the SPD (paragraphs 3.3 to 3.6), and is shown for information.</p> <p>(b) The building of any such potential new link road and/or new rail bridge proposal to provide improved access to central Sleaford would first require planning approval (after general & public consultation) before development could proceed. The design of appropriate access solutions would be subject to separate planning, highway, listed building and railway network design requirements, and cater for walking, cycling and vehicular movements.</p>
48.145	Officer Comment North Kesteven District Council	SPD	Officer Comment	Site Map -page 4	<p>References to particular Block Numbers are given in section 3.0: Design Criteria. To add clarity, building Block Numbers should be added to the SPD Site Map titled: Sleaford Maltings Listed Buildings (page 4).</p>	<p>Officer Recommendation - Amend Map (Sleaford Maltings Listed Buildings) - to add Block Numbers 1 to 9 to SPD site.</p>

<i>RefNo</i>	<i>Name and Organisation</i>	<i>SPD/SA</i>	<i>Obj/Supp</i>	<i>Para. No.</i>	<i>Representations</i>	<i>Response</i>
48.146	Officer Comment North Kesteven District Council	SPD	Officer Comment	Para 3.3	Numerous representations have made comments related to access and transport provision for the site, and one of the SPDs aims (at paragraph 1.2) is : "The SPD aims to: Ensure that new development integrates with Sleaford town, with appropriate access". To expand on this it is considered appropriate, in this case, to add further guidance text regarding the Access issue, to Paragraph 3.3 under Design Criteria, and provide clarification and more information on what the Local Plan (Policy T1) generally expects of developers.	Officer Recommendation - Add new text to paragraph 3.3, after 1st sentence, to read:- " The Council seeks to ensure appropriate accessibility to developments. The Local Plan (Policy T1) highlights that planning permission will be granted for developments only if adequate and effective measures are taken to facilitate safe and convenient access by all modes of transport (including promoting public transport, walking, cycling); and the sites location and infrastructure serving it are satisfactory, or can be made satisfactory." End paragraph 3.3 here. Put subsequent text in new paragraph and re-number subsequent paragraphs in section 3.0.