



MIKE SIBTHORP PLANNING

Planning Policy
South Kesteven District Council
Council Offices
The Picture House
St. Catherine's Road
Grantham
NG31 6TT

By e-mail: planningpolicy@southkesteven.gov.uk

17 April 2024

Our ref: MSP.1911

Dear Sir / Madam

SOUTH KESTEVEN LOCAL PLAN REVIEW:
DRAFT LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION: FEBRUARY 2024
SITE ASSESSMENTS REPORT: JANUARY 2024
REPRESENTATIONS ON BEHALF OF TRUSTEES OF HUNT MARRIS DECEASED
SITE REF: SKPR-105: LAND EAST OF DYSART GRANGE, LONG BENNINGTON

I am writing on connection with the current Draft Local Plan Consultation. In particular, this response relates to the Draft Sites Assessment Report.

In relation to my client's land situated to the east of Dysart Grange, Long Bennington; site ref: SKPR-105 (pages 403-404), the Main Findings section relating to the site states;

The site has some merit but is not proposed for allocation at this time as other more suitable sites are available to meet required need across the plan period.

The site clearly has merit and is acknowledged as such. Our concern is that the site has been rejected from consideration notwithstanding those merits. This undermines the site selection process, and excluded from consideration a site which we believe has merit when compared against other candidate sites in the village.

As an illustration of this, we note that the SKPR-105 site, utilising the council's Red / Amber / Green scoring system, actually scores higher than the preferred allocation in the village (SKLP-273; Main Road (South)(Pages 411/412).

Positive differences between SKPR-105 (Dysart Grange) site and SKLP-273 site (Main Road South)

Proximity to closest Designated Site SAC/SPA/SSSI).

SKLP-273 is classified as 0km-5km (Amber), whereas SKPR-105 (Dysart Grange) is classified as 5km-10km (Amber)

Proximity to shops

SKLP-273 is classified as 0.5-2km (Amber), whereas SKPR-105 (Dysart Grange) is classified as 0-0.5km (Green)

Proximity to public transport

SKLP-273 is classified as 0.25-1km (Amber), whereas SKPR-105 (Dysart Grange) is classified as 0-0.25km (Green)

Proximity to Conservation Area

SKLP-273 is classified as 0-0.4km (Red), whereas SKPR-105 (Dysart Grange) is classified as 1km+ (Green)

Biodiversity Ecological Network – Opportunity for Management

SKLP-273 is classified as No (Amber) whereas SKPR-105 (Dysart Grange) is classified as Yes (Green)

All other scorings are the same, with the exception of Proximity to Local Wildlife Sites, where Dysart Grange scores Red (0-1km), compared to Amber 1-1.75km) for SKLP-273. The nearest Local Wildlife Site in this case is the River Witham north of Westborough Lane. Given the location of both sites relative to this LWS, and the separation distance (with significant intervening built form), it is not considered that the development of either site would affect the LWS. This factor, in this instance, is not a reasonable criterion to distinguish sites.

Whilst the Dysart Grange site scores red in relation to surface water flood risk, we note that all of the candidate sites in Long Bennington that have been assessed have the same red categorisation, including the preferred allocation. This is not therefore a consideration that can be used to differentiate the sites.

This suggests, that against the Council's own assessment methodology, the SKPR-105 Dysart Grange site actually scores more positively than the preferred allocation. The exclusion undermines the credibility of the assessment process. We can see no harm arising from the inclusion of this site either as an alternative to the preferred allocation, or in addition to the preferred allocation, particularly bearing in mind that some Larger Villages have been earmarked for far more substantial levels of growth than Long Bennington.

We would urge the Council to review and reconsider the allocations in respect of Long Bennington as there appear to be significant inconsistencies in the site selection process.

Your sincerely

Mike Sibthorp
Mike Sibthorp Planning