

STAMFORD FIRST
STAMFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING FORUM
MINUTES OF MEETING MONDAY 18 JANUARY 2016

PRESENT David Taylor (Chairman) – Stamford Town Council
Steve Ingram (South Kesteven District Council)
Roger Ranson (South Kesteven District Council)
Ian Campbell – St. Martins Residents
Paul Rose – Chamber of Commerce and Town Team
John Harvey – Former Town and District Councillor
Robert Foulkes – Lincolnshire County Council
David Brailsford – Lincolnshire County Council
David Pennell – Burghley Estates
Anthony Partington – Principal, Stamford Welland Academy
Nick Rudd-Jones – Community Representative
Patricia Stuart-Mogg – Town Clerk

APOLOGIES: Max Sawyer (Stamford Town Council) submitted his apologies

1. Welcome and background – David Taylor

The Chairman welcomed the two new members of the Task Group and also confirmed that Councillor Damian Evans (SKDC Councillor) had agreed to join the team.

2. Presentation of the Stamford Capacity Study – Steve Ingram and Roger Ranson

A presentation was given on Stamford Capacity Study produced by AECOM for SKDC. The Study is a resource document which provides a long term projection of the potential parameters for future growth for Stamford. It identifies constraints and potential of areas. Areas and provides a definitive position for going forward. It has been produced using a coherent thought process. It is anticipated with the support of neighbouring councils, under the duty to cooperate, the government development quota may be delivered. The robust technical specification provided the evidence enable informed thinking to produce policies when preparing the Local Plan.

CONTEXT OF STAMFORD CAPACITY STUDY:

- *Capacity and limits to growth study commissioned for Grantham in early 2015*
- *Similar exercise commissioned for Stamford in summer 2015*
- *Aim to determine extent of land at urban edge suitable in principle for residential and employment development*
- *Capacity of urban/infill/brownfield sites captured through other work – this will be considered alongside the findings of this study*
- *Both studies are just the start of the process, the next steps include consideration of the impact of development on existing infrastructure*
- *as well as full consultation to ensure local opinion informs decisions on allocation of land for any development*

STUDY SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES:

- *Study focuses on suitability of land for development*
- *No upper limit or 'target' on extent of land*
- *Extensions to Stamford only- not other settlements*
- *'Border-blind' approach*
- *Opportunities assessed alongside constraints*
- *Technical, impartial and objective assessment*

METHOD

- *AECOM technical specialists contributed (transport, ground conditions, flood risk, landscape, heritage, infrastructure, economics)*
- *Study divided into Part A (strategic considerations), followed by Part B (specific considerations)*
- *Part A divided land at urban edge into Directions for Growth, then assessed each Direction using a traffic-light approach*

- Part A reduced the suitable land down to smaller areas which were assessed in more detail through Part B

- Part B, informed by site visits, enabled detailed judgements on land suitability by location, resulting in drafting boundaries of suitable land

DIRECTIONS FOR GROWTH: TRANSPORT

Issues considered in the transport assessment included:

- Configuration, capacity and quality of existing transport networks and facilities, linking potential growth areas to the town centre and adjacent communities and vice versa
- Corridors and nodes presenting opportunities for extension or enhancement based on travel patterns associated with the planned growth.
- Accessibility (including on foot and by cycle), public transport routes and their potential capacity and constraints, and the location of potential growth sites in terms of their ability to be served by all modes of travel, but with an emphasis on minimising travel by car.
- Results of stakeholder consultation

TRAFFIC LIGHT ASSESSMENTS

Criterion	Traffic light score	Factors taken into account
Environmental constraints	R	Flood zone 3 at edge of existing settlement; and/or Statutory designations including SSSIs, NNRs, LNRs, SACs, SPAs, National Parks and AONBs that are significant in extent; and/or Non-statutory designations including Ancient Woodland and/or Sites of Wildlife Interest that are significant in extent
	A	Agricultural Land Grade 1 and 2 and/or Flood zone 2, statutory designations, and/or non-statutory designations
	G	No insurmountable constraints found
Transport and accessibility	R	Low levels of current or planned accessibility by public transport and other means and/or significant congestion concerns
	A	Medium levels of current or planned accessibility by public transport and other means and/or some congestion concerns
	G	High levels of current or planned accessibility by public transport and other means and/or few congestion concerns
Geo-environmental considerations	R	Significant constraints such as made ground, radon, contamination, landfill, hydrogeological sensitivity, groundwater sensitivity
	A	Presence of some or all of above constraints but with some potential to be resolved / mitigated
	G	No significant geo-environmental constraints found
Infrastructure capacity and potential	R	Infrastructure needs arising from development could not be met by existing capacity or through new investment
	A	Infrastructure needs arising from development would require additional infrastructure investment
	G	Infrastructure needs arising from development could be met by existing capacity and/or existing committed investment
Landscape and topography	R	Significant and insurmountable landscape constraints
	A	Some landscape constraints but these could be mitigated through location, design and/or layout of new development
	G	No significant landscape constraints identified

Criterion	Traffic light score	Factors taken into account
Heritage considerations	R	Development would adversely impact on a designated heritage asset (schedule monuments, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, registered battlefields and conservation areas).
	A	Designated heritage assets present but impact has potential to be mitigated through location, design and/or layout of new development
	G	No significant impact on designated heritage assets
Housing need	R	Fewer barriers in accessing housing and services according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation
	A	Moderate barriers in accessing housing and services according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation
	G	Significant barriers to accessing housing and services according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation
Regeneration potential	R	Area has little or no potential for regeneration according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation
	A	Area has some potential for regeneration according to the Indices of Multiple Deprivation
	G	Area has significant potential for regeneration according to Indices of Multiple Deprivation
Economic development	R	Location is less suitable in terms of accessibility for existing and / or future employment opportunities
	A	Location is suitable to some extent in terms of accessibility for existing and / or future employment opportunities.
	G	Location is more suitable in terms of accessibility for existing and / or future employment opportunities
Spatial opportunities and constraints	R	High risk of impact on settlement character and valued landscapes (i.e. significant coalescence risks and/or lack of defensible boundaries)
	A	Some risk of impact on settlement character and valued landscapes (i.e. some coalescence risks and/or some defensible boundaries)
	G	Low risk of impact on settlement character and valued landscapes (i.e. minimal coalescence risks and/or a greater number of defensible boundaries)

PART A: SUMMARY OF TRANSPORT RESULTS

- Direction A – supported by Lincolnshire CC. Impacts on A1/A606 junction and A1/Town centre with SUE already planned. Amber rating.
- Direction B – supported by Highways England (HE), LCC and Greater Cambridge LEP. Green rating.
- Direction C – supported by HE but not by LCC due to lack of access to the A1. Impacts on A1/A606 and A1/A43 junctions. Amber rating.
- Direction D – supported by HE. LCC state that road connections from the south into Stamford town centre are poor. Amber rating.
- Direction E - LCC raise concerns that there is limited vehicular access to town centre , however good access to A1. Not supported by HE. Impacts on A1/A606 junction and A1/Town centre with SUE already planned. Amber rating.
- Direction F – Growth would impact on operation of A1 link and A1/A606. Not supported by HE or LCC – A1 would create a barrier with existing urban area. Amber rating.
- Direction G - Less impact on town centre and enabled by minor improvements to the road network. Growth would impact on A1 link and A1/A606. Not supported by HE or LCC for same reasons as Direction F. Favourable direction of growth for the Greater Cambridge LEP. Amber rating.

PART B- OVERALL CONCLUSION

- *In total, 176 hectares of land considered suitable in principle for residential and/or employment development*
- *Most appropriate indicative density on this scale is around 25 dwellings per hectare*
- *Therefore, capacity was found for 4,399 dwellings*
- *Capacity for 26.5 hectares of employment development*

Site Type	Residential (hectares)	Residential (dwellings)	Employment (hectares)
Suitable sites	99.83	2,495	0
Suitable in the longer term / contingency sites	76.12	1,904	26.48
Total	175.95	4,399	26.48

NEXT STEPS

- *The study sets out where Stamford COULD grow, not where it SHOULD grow*
- *Assess conclusions alongside other studies, such as Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Employment Land Review*
- *Test results through consultation on policy documents based on this study*
- *Consider any other relevant political or technical information outside the scope of this study*
- *Consider benefits of 'clustering' development*
- *Seek to balance new housing with new jobs*
- *Ensure close co-ordination with infrastructure providers to ensure funding is in place and impacts are clear over phases of development*

Following the presentation it was recognised that the Local Plan needs to be submitted by March 2017. So there is time to examine and debate where and how to meet the need. There is a possible 17,000 dwellings estimated to be delivered by 2036, of which 10,000 is already identified over the planned period. There is only an additional 7,000 needs to be found to meet the Government target. Stamford needs to consider how best it can deliver and meet its need strategically. The provision of infrastructure to service sizeable areas will be considered. It had been identified that public consultation for the Stamford Town Plan had identified Rhyall Road and Casterton Road as potential locations for expansion.

3. Neighbouring Parishes

The Town Clerk reported that contact had been made with the neighbouring Parish Council in the main the feedback was that they preferred to be consulted upon but not included within the defined plan. Some developers had already been in contact and would be interested to meet with the members of the Task Group. There was general agreement that greater development will be positive step to support the educational establishments.

It was proposed that the defining Neighbourhood plan to retain within the Ward Boundaries of Stamford. The Task Team will consider the greater Stamford area and consult with neighbouring parishes. It was imperative that a Householder Waste Recycling Site is identified for Stamford in light of the proposed study. This was unanimously agreed.

4. MINUTES

The Minutes of the 05 November 2015 meeting were agreed as a true representation of the meeting.

5. ADOPTION OF STAMFORD FIRST CONSTITUTION

This had been circulated for consideration. It was agreed that it embraced and captured the aims of the Forum and how it would operate. The Constitution was adopted by the members.

David Pennell observed that much of the land identified through the Study was Burghley land which had now been considered previously and he therefore at times may have a conflict of interest.

It was recognised that some elements discussed within these meetings would be confidential as they could be commercially sensitive. All members have one vote. There would be a requirement of additional persons to form part of Working Groups but these would not have a vote.

6. APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS

Following discussion the following were appointed by the members.

Chair: David Taylor

Vice-Chair: Ian Campbell

Treasurer: Max Sawyer

Secretary: Patricia Stuart-Mogg

7. Confirmation of Forum membership and roles:

There was question over the justification of some members, but it was strongly considered that all twelve members had equal valued experience and knowledge of community engagement, a necessary contribution to deliver this important project. Organisations such as the Civic Society and Health Groups would also provide a valuable contribution.

8. Work Stream and Project Planning

- In respect of meeting developers (Persimmon Homes; Lambert Smith Hampton), it was agreed that the Chairman should engage in dialogue with the developers to ascertain their thoughts. But it was too early for any formal discussions.
- Logo – Stamford FIRST, it was agreed that this represented the ethos of Forum represented the people of Stamford.
- Social Media – Communication via a website, Twitter and Facebook presence to inform and engage with residents. This was vital as the culmination of the Neighbourhood Plan will require approval by Referendum.
- Time scale – It is anticipated to deliver Stamford's Neighbourhood Plan within two years. This would be in line with SKDC's Local Plan process.

9. Future meetings:

At Burghley Estate Offices unless otherwise stated

15 February; 21 March (Town Meeting); 18 April; 23 May; 20 June; 18 July; 15 August; 19 September; 17 October; 21 November; 19 December and 16 January 2017 AGM

Chairman
(The Meeting closed at 8.30pm)