

HOUGH ON THE HILL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

2014-2026

STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION

As required in Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 this document records the activities undertaken to ensure that local residents, businesses and other stakeholders with an interest in our Parish Neighbourhood Plan have been fully informed and consulted during its preparatory stages, including opportunities to put forward their views and influence the content of the final Plan.

CONTENTS

	<i>page</i>
INTRODUCTION	3
1. Designation of the Neighbourhood Plan Area	4
2. Neighbourhood Planning Project Team	4
3. Initial Consultation (June 2013)	5
4. Landscape Character Assessment	8
5. Loveden Hill: Local Green Space Proposal	9
6. Issues Consultation (January 2014)	11
7. Statutory Consultation on Draft Neighbourhood Plan	13
8. Conclusion	14
 <i>Appendices:</i>	
<i>Appendix 1: Neighbourhood Planning Project Team Terms of Reference and Membership</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Appendix 2: Letter sent to Six Landowners on and around Loveden Hill</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Appendix 3: Consultation Leaflet and Questionnaire January 2014</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Appendix 4: Contact List for Statutory Consultation</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Appendix 5: Schedule of Amendments in Response to Consultation on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan</i>	<i>21</i>

INTRODUCTION

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal requirements of Part 5, Section 15(2) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 by:

- Detailing the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan;
- Outlining how these persons and bodies were consulted;
- Providing a summary of the main issues and concerns raised;
- Reviewing how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

The aims of the consultation process were:

- To ‘front-load’ consultation and ensure that the content and proposals of the Neighbourhood Plan are informed by the views and priorities of local residents, businesses, and key local stakeholders.
- To ensure that appropriate consultation took place at all stages of the Neighbourhood Planning process, especially where key priorities needed to be set.
- To engage with as broad a cross section of the community as possible, consulting generally about matters of concern, not just land-use planning issues, in order to provide general feedback to the Parish Council.
- To ensure all consultation results were made publically available in both hard and electronic format, and utilised to inform subsequent stages of the Neighbourhood Planning process.

The programme of consultation completed is detailed below. In total, over a 12-month period, 5 publicity leaflets have been delivered to every property in the parish (including 3 questionnaires), and 2 Public Consultation Workshops have taken place.

Activity	Date(s)
Initial Publicity & Consultation Questionnaire (<i>see Section 2</i>)	June/July 2013
Landscape Character Assessment Questionnaire (<i>see Section 3</i>)	July 2013
Landscape Character Assessment Consultation Workshop (<i>see Section 3</i>)	September 2013
Letter to Loveden Hill Landowners (<i>see Section 4 and Appendix 2</i>)	December 2014
Issues Consultation & Questionnaire and Workshop (<i>see Section 5 and Appendix 3</i>)	January 2014
Letters/emails to all statutory consultees, landowners, neighbouring parishes, local authorities and other relevant organisations informing them of the draft Neighbourhood Plan and statutory consultation period (<i>see Section 6 and Appendix 4</i>)	June 2014
Statutory Consultation Leaflet to every property about the draft Neighbourhood Plan statutory consultation period (<i>see Section 6</i>)	June/July 2014

1. Designation of the Neighbourhood Plan Area

The Parish Council first considered applying for designation of the Parish as a neighbourhood planning area during 2012, and made a formal decision to apply to South Kesteven District Council at their meeting on 27th September 2012. The primary interest in preparing a Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish was to invigorate local consultation and the involvement of residents in determining which matters of concern the Parish Council should be addressing. As a large part of their activities involved responding to planning applications, it was felt that a Neighbourhood Plan, prepared with extensive local consultation, would provide a more definitive guide as to what was needed and wanted.

South Kesteven District Council accepted the application and, following a 6 week period of advertisement during which no representations were received, the Council formally designated Hough on the Hill Parish as a Neighbourhood Planning Area on 26th February 2013.

Initially the Parish Council were unsure how best to proceed, but enquiries were made amongst residents for those interested, or with any knowledge of community planning, to come forward. On the advice of a resident, the Parish Council agreed at its meeting on 23rd May 2013 to set up a small Project Team to begin to take forward the work and plan the initial consultation process. It was also agreed to seek government funding through Locality.

2. Neighbourhood Planning Project Team

The Neighbourhood Planning Project Team (NPPT) comprised 2 Parish Councillors and up to 6 local residents. Membership has changed during preparation of the Plan, but has included:

- Roger Kingscott (Parish Councillor, Chair throughout)
- Marilyn Taylor (Resident member, Secretary throughout)
- Louise Barrett (Resident member, throughout)
- Penny Milnes (Resident member from October 2013, and then as a Parish Councillor from July 2014)
- Jane Orchiston (initially as a Parish Councillor and then as a Resident member from January 2014)
- John Halton (Resident member throughout)
- Sue Morgan (Parish Councillor, April to July 2014 only)
- Roger Twelvetrees (Resident member from October 2013)

The full NPPT Terms of Reference are attached at Appendix 1. The main responsibilities are:

- fundraising and funding applications to support neighbourhood plan activity
- recommendations for commissioning of specific areas of evidence and analysis as required
- management of consultants appointed by the Parish Council
- management of expenditure within budget allocations approved by the Parish Council
- preparation and distribution of publicity
- community consultation and engagement activities
- consultation and liaison with all relevant local stakeholders and with neighbouring Parishes
- liaison with South Kesteven District Council to support the Plan's development

- scoping of the Plan's objectives
- drafting of relevant content and policies for approval by the Parish Council

In total the NPPT has held 12 meetings, all of which have been publicised on the three village noticeboards as open to the public to attend (South Kesteven District Council has also been invited to attend all meetings). A Public Forum session is held at the commencement of each meeting for residents to raise any matters of concern, and comments are also invited on each agenda item discussion. Minutes are made available on the Neighbourhood Plan website.

An **email mailing list** has also been gradually compiled from returned questionnaires and people attending consultation workshops throughout the Neighbourhood Plan preparation period. The list has grown to over 80 persons, and is used to provide regular updates and information, and to give notice of meetings and other relevant activities.

3. Initial Consultation (June 2013)

It was agreed that residents should be involved from the very start of the process of compiling a Neighbourhood Plan so the first activity organised by the NPPT was the Initial Consultation exercise in June 2013 designed to scope the issues that people would like to see addressed, either in a Neighbourhood Plan (if it was an issue relating to the use or development of land), or by the Parish Council as part of their other responsibilities and activities. This involved:

- distributing a leaflet and short survey form to every property in the Parish asking for initial views, especially about particularly good or negative features; (see below)
- setting up a **website** (www.loveden.org.uk/np) for people to find out more about what a Neighbourhood Plan was, and what was involved in preparing one; the leaflet and questionnaire were also available on the website;
- running a publicity stall at the Hough on the Hill Village Fete in July 2013
- writing to utility providers to alert them that a neighbourhood plan was being prepared and requesting their input on any relevant information that would affect the Plan
- establishing regular contact and liaison with South Kesteven District Council



Hough on the Hill, Gelston and Brandon Neighbourhood Plan

HOW DO YOU WANT YOUR VILLAGE TO LOOK IN 20 YEARS TIME?

Hough on the Hill Parish Council (including Brandon & Gelston) is compiling a 'Neighbourhood Plan' to help shape development over the coming years.

The council needs your help and ideas. For example:

- What are the good features of the area — things you value and want to keep?
- What are the negative features — things you'd like to change, or get rid of?
- Is there anything we don't have, but you would like?
- Is there anything we don't have, which we should definitely not have?

Get Involved

This is a community-led process, so the more people who get involved the better.

There are spare places on the Planning Team, so if you would like to join the group, or if you are able to help in any way, please tick the box overleaf, or contact the Parish Council.

What Next?

This leaflet is only a first step.

There will be public meetings before the plan is written and a local referendum before it is adopted.

More information will be available on the website.

Building. The plan is mainly about development (building). Because our villages have no shops or schools etc, they are termed 'unsustainable', which prevents most new building. But what do you think? Do we need new homes for young families or old people here (rather than Caythorpe, which is 'sustainable')? Is this more important than keeping open spaces and reducing traffic?

Employment. Is there enough employment locally? Where could development provide jobs without impacting the landscape or traffic?

Open Spaces. We have open spaces within villages and wide open views across the countryside. How important are these to you? What could be done to protect, enhance and make better use of these spaces?

Design. Much of Hough on the Hill is a conservation area (see map on website), where the design of building modifications is strictly controlled. Are there any design features (materials, maximum height, colour etc) that we should insist on throughout the parish?

Our plan must work within district council and national regulations—we cannot allow, or prevent, development laid down by these authorities. But we can influence where and how any development is carried out.

Once finished and adopted, our Neighbourhood Plan will become an official planning document.

Sustainability. How can we protect the environment whilst maintaining our quality of life?

The Wider View. Also consider views beyond the parish; and improving links with other villages.

What to do:

Please complete the form on the other side of this sheet, or fill in the online form.

If more than one person in your house wants to contribute (including children) please print another copy from the website, or just make notes on a piece of paper.

If you run a community organisation or business in the parish, please feel free to submit a separate sheet with your thoughts from that perspective. If you know of anyone in area who may not have had this leaflet, please let us know, or pass it on.

Hough on the Hill
Parish Council
June 2013

www.loveden.org.uk/np

Email: houghpc@gmail.com

Phone (parish clerk): 01400 251459

The survey forms were not personally collected from each property. Those responding had to deliver them to addresses in each of the three villages, or bring them to the Village Fete (or to a public event which took place in Gelston). Therefore a large response was not expected.

In the event, a total of 28 questionnaires was returned which, whilst a small percentage of the population, has provided a helpful steer on some of the main issues.

It is important to note that people were encouraged to include issues that were not necessarily within the scope of a neighbourhood plan but which might assist the Parish Council in their wider responsibilities. Also, the questionnaire didn't provide any prompts on specific issues or subjects, so all the comments were spontaneously identified by respondents.

A full analysis of all comments received from the initial consultation is shown in the table below.

<p>Character Like tranquility x14 Like unspoilt look/feel x11 Like low population density, open spaces (inc The Wilderness) x9 Like unspoilt views to/from villages & skyline x8 Like walks / cycle routes x6 Like that it's a working (farming) village x4 Like community spirit x3 Like church & historic buildings, conservation area x3 Like environment/birds/trees/hedgerows x2 Like safe play area for children (Gelston) Like Bosom Hill (sledging)</p>	<p>Transport Want more public transport x8 Dislike HGV on narrow roads (make access only) x6 Dislike potholes / maintenance x6 Want safer roads for walking/cycling/horses / more paths x6 Want lower speed/weight limit on C001 x4 Don't want road widening x2 Don't like Frieston road closure Don't like (any) street lighting Don't like speeding/dangerous junctions Don't like car parking around pub corner and Gelston Want better gritting</p>
<p>Facilities – shops/pub Want small/community shop (eg sell home grown stuff) x4 Like pub x2 Want ways to bring village together (quiz nights etc)</p>	<p>Development - Housing Do not extend village boundaries x9 No new builds (just upgrading) x8 More protection for heritage assets (inc Brandon phone box / Gelston green) x4 No infill housing x4 No large scale (>5 houses) or industrial building x3 More control of design x3 No social housing without suitable amenities/infrastructure x2 Don't like unused / dilapidated farm buildings x2 Don't like poor drainage in Brandon x2 Don't like poorly placed solar panels x2 Specific protection for open spaces in villages (EN6) Lack of affordable housing</p>
<p>Facilities - sports Improve / make more of Hough playing field x3 Want village hall/sports hall x3 Want playing field in Brandon x3 Like Hough playing field x2 Want more sports facilities Lack of community meeting place Use parish land in Brandon</p>	
<p>Others Want better broadband x10 Don't like rubbish in front gardens/dumped by road x2 Want more tree planting on empty spaces and verges x2 Want community allotments x2 Encourage home working x2 Encourage repair of stone field walls Local employment opportunities Encourage low impact renewable energy (heat pumps etc), wells Enhance tourism Want better mobile phone coverage Want telescope on the scarp to enhance long views Want shared facilities / deliveries Prevent Raves Maintain mobile library service or use Hough Church as library Improve Hough Community centre, daycare centre for elderly?</p>	<p>Development - Other No wind turbines / farms x14 Prevent/reduce kart racing & other noisy sports x7 No large/inappropriate development x3 Anything that affects views from the village / spoils character x3 Don't want bus route, shops, tea rooms, school etc x2 Don't like (Frinkley Farm) wind turbine x2 No solar farms x2 No large structures</p>

This exercise gave indications of residents' views on the following issues:

- **Landscape Character**

It was immediately clear that people's main focus was on the importance of the landscape, its tranquillity and unspoilt character, and on the history and heritage evident in all three of the villages.

- **Housing and New Development**

It was clear that those who responded did not want any change to the size of the villages, or to their look or feel. There was support for heritage and conservation measures, and for tighter controls of new build and conversion designs. Concern about wind farm development featured highly, and also dislike of motorsport noise, and generally people indicated that they did not want any large, industrial or noisy developments.

- **Road Safety**

There were quite a few comments relating to roads and transport. The physical condition of the roads and road safety issues in particular figure quite highly, along with concerns about through traffic and speeds.

- **Facilities**

There were several responses relating to community facilities, especially sports provision.

- **Other Issues**

The most consistently raised issue was the need for improved Broadband provision.

The findings from this initial survey were written up as a Summary Report and discussed by the NPPT at their meeting in July 2013 (and were also reported to the Parish Council). The NPPT used this information to guide the identification of the 'evidence' to be analysed and used in compiling the wider content of the Neighbourhood Plan, and particularly the key characteristics of the Parish, its people and its economic activity.

4. Landscape Character Assessment

It was agreed that a **Landscape Character Assessment**, to be undertaken with professional consultancy support, would be the best approach for identifying the distinctive landscape features within the Parish more clearly, and considering how these might be addressed within a Neighbourhood Plan.

With the financial aid of a Government grant (through Locality), the Parish Council agreed to the appointment of Allen Pyke Associates to carry out a landscape character assessment. This work was commissioned jointly with an adjoining Parish who were also preparing a Neighbourhood Plan in order to reduce costs for both Parishes, although each Parish was provided with a separate assessment.

The approach of the consultant was based on the need for the full and active involvement of local people. Therefore, at its commencement, a **leaflet and questionnaire** was distributed to every property in the Parish (see Questionnaire below), the results from which were used to guide the production of the first draft of the report.

**HOUGH ON THE HILL, GELSTON AND BRANDON
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

**LANDSCAPE CHARACTER ASSESSMENT
RESIDENTS QUESTIONNAIRE**

As part of the proposed neighbourhood plan, a local landscape character assessment is being prepared. A key part of this assessment is gaining an understanding of how local residents consider and experience the landscape. We would be very grateful if you would answer the following questions.

1 - Which 5 words would you use to best describe the character of the countryside within the parish?
.....

2 - What are the 5 key elements, landmarks or features that you associate with the surrounding countryside?
.....

3 - What do you value most about your local countryside? (continue over leaf if required)
.....

4 - What, if any, are the negative aspects of the surrounding countryside? (continue over leaf if required)
.....

5 - Thinking about how you experience the local countryside, what, if any improvements could be made to enhancing this experience? (continue over leaf if required)
.....

6 - How often do you use the local footpaths/bridleways etc? (please tick)
☐ Regularly (more than once a month); ☐ Occasionally (several times a year)
☐ Rarely (once or twice a year); ☐ Never

7 - Which is your favourite footpath/walk/local area and why? (continue over leaf if required)
.....

Next Steps – Workshop
The Landscape Character Assessment is being compiled on behalf of the Parish Council by landscape architects, Allen Pyke Associates. In addition to this questionnaire we would value the input of residents at a short workshop event being held on Wednesday, 18th September, 7pm at All Saints Church, Hough on the Hill.
Please provide your contact details below if you would be interested in attending this event.

Name/s –
Contact details (email/phone) –

Please return completed forms to any of the following addresses: Jubilee Cottage, Thompsons Lane, off Lower Road, Hough on Hill or 6 Gelston or Brandon Hall, Hall Lane, Brandon

Allen Pyke Associates
Landscape Architecture – Urban Design – Environmental Planning
www.allenpyke.co.uk

A **Public Workshop** was then advertised and held on 18th September 2013 at which the consultants presented their initial findings. Over 30 residents of the Parish attended this Workshop, and the discussions were helpful in refining the final Landscape Character Assessment Report. (The Report is provided as an Appendix to the Neighbourhood Plan, and includes a full summary of the results of the public consultation activities carried out.)

The NPPT were then able to draw extensively on the Landscape Character Assessment findings and recommendations in identifying the key issues to be addressed in the Neighbourhood Plan. It forms an important part of the Evidence Base utilised in the compilation of the Plan and its policies.

5. Loveden Hill: Local Green Space Proposal

One of the key issues to emerge from the consultations carried out during the preparation of the Landscape Character Assessment was the significance and importance local people attached to Loveden Hill. They advised the consultants that insufficient attention had been paid to Loveden Hill in their first draft. Therefore, in the final report, the consultants advised that the Parish Council give consideration to ways in which Loveden Hill could be provided with greater recognition, either through designation as a Scheduled Ancient Monument, and/or through seeking its designation as a Local Green Space under the new provisions introduced in the Localism Act 2011 for use in Neighbourhood Plans.

With the assistance of South Kesteven District Council Officers, enquiries were made to English Heritage regarding the potential inclusion of Loveden Hill as a Scheduled Ancient Monument, seeking both recognition and protection of the Anglo-Saxon cemetery it contains, and for the burial mound itself. However, English Heritage advised that previous excavations and ploughing activity within the area have damaged the site, and it was not therefore considered appropriate for listing in this way, although it is mentioned in the Historic Environment Record.

The NPPT therefore decided to seek views regarding the **designation of Loveden Hill as a Local Green Space** within their emerging Neighbourhood Plan. All relevant owners of land on and around the hill were identified (six in total) and sent personal letters advising them that the proposal was being considered and inviting views (see Appendix Two). They also obtained local press coverage in the Grantham Journal:



Support was received from one of the landowners, and an enquiry from the agent for another. The landowner responsible for most of the site proposed for designation was initially concerned about the proposal's impact on his working farm operation. Following liaison and a site meeting, he has agreed that the proposal should proceed on the understanding that the Parish Council will keep the legislation and its impact on his business under review, with his involvement. Arrangements for carrying out such reviews are proposed at 5-yearly intervals within the Delivery Strategy contained in Section 6 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The proposal for the designation of Loveden Hill as a Local Green Space was also specifically identified with the Issues Consultation exercise carried out in January 2014), a description of which now follows.

6. Issues Consultation (January 2014)

Attention now reverted to the Neighbourhood Plan in its entirety. With the key descriptive parts of the Plan drafted, the NPPT needed to undertake a more focused and detailed consultation exercise locally to make sure that the key emerging issues were the right ones, that emerging proposals were on the right track, and to check for any other issues that should be raised and considered in the writing of the Plan.

In January 2014 a four-sided colour leaflet (see Appendix 3) was delivered to every business and household in the Parish providing an overview of the issues being addressed within the Neighbourhood Plan, and identifying areas of concern about which further opinions and views were sought. The leaflet also contained a **Questionnaire** summarising the emerging proposals and seeking views, and also advertised a **Consultation Workshop** open to all to attend. The Workshop took place on 25th January in All Saints Church, Hough on the Hill and was attended by 33 residents (including some of the local landowning farmers).



The table below summarises both the **Questionnaire and Workshop outcomes** and shows an emerging consensus on most issues apart from new housing development where opinion was almost equally divided. There was also less consensus on two other issues: whether the Parish should create a 'local list' of positive buildings and structures in the villages; and whether the Parish should

be doing more to promote small-scale renewable energy. Both of these issues achieved approximately two-thirds support in the Questionnaire responses, with one third opposing.

Issue	Commentary
1 Design Guidance	Almost universal support for this from the Questionnaire responses (33 in favour and only 2 against). From the Workshop discussions, people would seem to favour a positive approach rather than just listing what's not permitted, and an approach that does not rule out modern design. Hedgerows were also raised as important at the Workshop.
2 Valued unlisted structures	Majority support for this proposal in the Questionnaire responses, although quite a few against it (20 in favour and 10 against). Much of what people have suggested is in fact already listed, or identified within the SKDC Conservation Area 2014 Draft Review.
3 Recreational hard-surface facilities on the Playing Field	Majority support for this proposal in the Questionnaire responses (23 in favour and 6 against) However, one of the discussion groups at the Workshop were not supportive of the proposal. Some people didn't support it because they felt it wouldn't be used, or they wouldn't themselves use it. Suggestions for other areas for recreational facilities not put forward.
4 Improved Access to the Countryside	Very strongly supported by the majority of respondents to the Questionnaire (30 in favour and 3 against) and the issue featured strongly in the Workshop discussions with widespread support. However, the challenges currently faced by our local farmers because of walkers and others not adhering to footpaths was also raised. Improved signage was suggested as a helpful approach for walkers and farmers alike. Several people have also strongly objected to the current status of the Loveden Hill track (which is a Byway Open to All Traffic), asking if this could be changed so that it is open to walkers and horse riders only.
5 Local Green Space	Almost universal support for the designation of Loveden Hill as a Local Green Space in the Questionnaire responses (32 in favour and 2 against). Several other areas also suggested, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the old Priory field in Hough on the Hill - the Wilderness in Hough on the Hill - Bosom Hill - Fox Wood - old quarry workings to the east of Hough - Brandon village green adjacent to the church - Protection Wood
6 Affordable Housing Development	Views on this issue are almost evenly divided (16 in favour and 17 against). Most of the people who support the provision of more affordable housing do so because they want a balanced community. Those against do not believe the villages are appropriate locations because of lack of public transport and other facilities. (NB it is apparent that the term 'affordable' was not fully explained, and some people think it means lowcost homes for sale.) One of the discussion groups did favour allowing one or two owner occupier starter houses to be built, affordable to young couples, in each of the villages. Inevitably some people raised previous planning applications they have made for development that have been refused.
7 Renewable Energy Provision	There is majority support in the Questionnaire returns for small-scale renewables, but only if they are not visually intrusive (21 in favour and 12 against). Some people also remain opposed to energy schemes that are unviable without subsidy. Community-energy schemes were seen as favourable at the Workshop and at the Workshop it was commented that the need for farmers to be 'carbon neutral suppliers' means they are finding it necessary to install renewable energy in the form of solar panels and turbines to meet this demand.
8 Roads & Transport	Quite a lot of support at the Workshop for trying to get speed limits (and weight limits) down on the COO1, or some more electronic warning signs. Also support for continuing to do press for action on potholes and verges – but absolutely no support for road widening. There is some support for the creation of passing lanes on verges.

This feedback was invaluable in assisting the NPPT to begin to focus on the key issues to be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan's policies, the drafting of which were to be undertaken with the assistance of independent planning consultants (utilising the Locality grant). The consultants attended the NPPT meeting in early February 2014 and in discussion worked through each of the

above 8 topic/issue areas in turn to determine how best to approach them in policy terms. The most difficult issues were inevitably those about which views had been more divided, particularly the potential for new housing development (and affordable housing), and renewable energy provision. Given the need for compliance with SKDC policy, which does not view villages in our Parish as 'sustainable locations' for new development, it was decided that the Neighbourhood Plan should not propose development or identify particular sites. The view was that with the inclusion of Design Guidance, and the identification of unlisted, but distinctive features or buildings residents identified as being of value, sufficient focus could be given to residents' concerns about intrusive and unattractive development in any proposals coming forward for planning permission. The NPPT's feelings were that change was a necessary part of Parish life, but that the Plan should provide a stronger steer on the type of developments or conversions that could add value to heritage and settings, and not detract from the value of the landscape. (NB It should be noted that at about this time SKDC undertook a re-appraisal of the Hough on the Hill village Conservation Area which linked very helpfully to these emerging ideas for the Neighbourhood Plan.)

After much debate, it was also agreed that the draft Neighbourhood Plan should as far as possible be positive about the potential for small-scale renewable energy, or community energy schemes, whilst not going against the community's well-expressed views on large-scale windfarms.

7. Statutory Consultation on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan

The NPPT continued towards producing a finalised draft of the Neighbourhood Plan, drawing on professional assistance from independent planning consultants to help draft the proposed policies, but with all other sections written by members of the NPPT. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan was finally approved for public consultation by the Parish Council at its meeting on 15th May 2014.

The period of **consultation ran from 1st June to 23rd July 2014** (thus meeting the minimum 6-week statutory period). The draft Neighbourhood Plan was made available on the website (www.loveden.org.uk/np), and hard copies were also available for viewing in each of the three villages. Every property was leafleted to provide information about the consultation, where to view the draft Plan, how to make comments, and the closing date for comments. The leaflet also provided a brief summary of the main objectives of the Plan, and explained what would happen after the consultation. The 80+ persons on the email list were also advised of the consultation process and timescale.

Letters, or emails, were sent to all relevant statutory consultees, landowners, neighbouring parishes and other relevant organisations (see Appendix 4 for the list of those contacted). The letter advised that the draft Neighbourhood Plan was out for consultation, where to view the Plan, and the closing date for any comments and observations.

Members of the NPPT also attended the Hough on the Hill Village Fete on 5th July, running a publicity stall about the draft Neighbourhood Plan consultation, and reminding people of the closing date for comments.

All comments received by the closing date (23rd July 2014) were each considered individually at the NPPT meeting held on 30th July 2014, with the majority received from SKDC and other statutory or stakeholder bodies (apart from a very helpful submission from the largest farm in the Parish). It was agreed that many of the comments made could and should be addressed by amendments to the draft Plan. However, there were a few comments, including some made by SKDC, which were more difficult to interpret and it was agreed further guidance from SKDC should be sought. Following this action, final amendments were made to the Plan. Appendix 5 provides a summary of all the comments received, and the action taken.

Work was also completed on the Basic Conditions Statement, this Statement of Consultation and the presentation of the Evidence Base – all of which would need to be approved by the Parish Council and submitted to SKDC alongside the finally agreed Neighbourhood Plan. The NPPT are indebted to the advice and assistance received from the Planning Aid Consultant provided by Locality with this stage of their work.

8. Conclusion

The publicity, engagement and consultation completed throughout the production of the Hough on the Hill Parish Neighbourhood Plan has been open and transparent, with many opportunities provided for those that live, work, and do business within the Neighbourhood Area to feed into the process, make comment, and to raise issues, priorities and concerns.

The Parish Council considered and accepted this Statement of Consultation at its meeting held on 25th September 2014 as a true record of all the consultation activities that have taken place. It is the Parish Council's opinion that all statutory requirements have been met and that this Statement complies with Part 5, Section 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Hough on the Hill Parish Council

Neighbourhood Plan Project Team

Terms of Reference and Membership

Purpose

The Neighbourhood Plan Project Team (NPPT) will take forward the production, through to examination and referendum, of the Hough on the Hill Neighbourhood Plan, ensuring that relevant consultation takes place so that the plan accurately represents the views of the residents and other stakeholders.

Role and Responsibilities

The NPPT will work on behalf of the Parish Council to undertake:

- fundraising and funding applications to support neighbourhood plan activity
- recommendations for commissioning of specific areas of evidence and analysis as required
- management of consultants appointed by the Parish Council
- management of expenditure within budget allocations approved by the Parish Council
- preparation and distribution of publicity
- community consultation and engagement activities
- consultation and liaison with all relevant local stakeholders and with neighbouring Parishes
- liaison with South Kesteven District Council to support the Plan's development
- scoping of the Plan's objectives
- drafting of relevant content and policies for approval by the Parish Council

A full report of the NPPT's activities will be made to each meeting of the Parish Council, seeking approval for any decisions required to progress the Plan. The NPPT must ensure that there is full transparency of process, at all times operating in an open and inclusive manner:

- All meetings of the group will be publicised and open for members of the public to attend.
- Notes of all meetings of the NPPT will be publically available online.
- The results of all consultations, and reports of consultation or engagement events, will also be made publically available online.

Membership

Membership of the NPPT will comprise:

- two Parish Councillors, one of whom will act as Chair
- up to six independent members who will be residents or landowners within the parish
- the quorum for meetings will be three members, one of whom must be a Parish Councillor
- all members must declare any personal interest that may be perceived relevant to any decisions or recommendations

Appendix 2

Letter sent to Six Landowners on and around Loveden Hill

Hough on the Hill Parish Council
Neighbourhood Plan Project Team
c/o Jubilee Cottage
Thompson's Lane (off Lower Road)
Hough on the Hill
Grantham NG32 2BB

17th December 2013

Dear xx,

Proposed Designation of Loveden Hill as a 'Local Green Space'

You may be aware that the Parish Council is currently preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.

What is a Neighbourhood Plan?

The Localism Act 2011 introduced a new right for Parish Councils to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan to plan the shape of future development in their local areas. An adopted Neighbourhood Plan forms part of the statutory development plan of the relevant local authority, and therefore has full weight in the determination of planning applications. Neighbourhood Plans must comply with European and national legislation and policy and be in general conformity with existing local strategic planning policy. They must therefore promote sustainable development, addressing social, economic and environmental needs. Their adoption as policy is subject to a public referendum for all registered voters within the area concerned, in which a minimum 50% vote in favour (of those voting) is required.

As part of developing proposals and policies we engaged independent consultants to prepare a Landscape Character Assessment (this report is available on request or can be viewed at www.loveden.org.uk/np). One of the issues to emerge from the consultation with local residents was the importance and significance of Loveden Hill. People have told us that this ancient hill plays a special role in our landscape character. It dominates our views and forms the setting of our villages. Its visual prominence and emotional impact is very important to many who live here, and it is a much valued heritage asset.

Under the Localism Act 2011, there is a new land designation available called a **'Local Green Space'** which is designed for areas which are demonstrably special to a local community and which hold a particular local significance, eg because of their beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity or richness of wildlife. Neighbourhood Plans can contain proposals to have particular areas designated, and we are considering the inclusion of such a proposal for Loveden Hill within our Plan for this Parish.

I attach a basic information sheet about Local Green Space designation. We have yet to determine a proposed boundary for the designation, but at this stage we are duty bound to inform all affected

landowners. We have also informed the local planning authority, South Kesteven District Council, and they have raised no objections.

If a proposal to designate Loveden Hill, or any other areas within the Parish, as 'Local Green Space' is included within our Neighbourhood Plan, the process for final approval as planning policy is as follows:

Once drafted, **the proposed Plan must be subject to a 6-week consultation** period, publicised to all people who live, work or run businesses in the neighbourhood area, plus relevant statutory consultation bodies, and inviting views and comments. Comments received should be summarised in a report and, if necessary, the proposed Plan modified accordingly.

The Plan (and the Consultation Statement) is **submitted to the local planning authority**, which checks that proper legal processes have been followed and publicises it, making it available for inspection and inviting comments (a further 6-week period).

The local authority will then appoint a person to carry out **an independent examination of the Neighbourhood Plan**. The examination will normally be carried out through written representations, but if considered necessary the examiner may invite interested parties to a public hearing. If the Plan meets the basic conditions, the examiner will recommend that it proceed to referendum, or will suggest modifications to be made by the local authority before it proceeds to referendum (the Plan can be withdrawn by its proposing body if they are unhappy with the modifications).

The **referendum** is organised, conducted and paid for by the local authority. It is open to all those living within the Plan area who are registered for voting.

If a minimum of 50% of those voting in the Referendum are in favour of the Plan, it is adopted as part of the Local Development Plan and carries statutory weight in determining planning applications.

Landowners have the right to make representations both to the Parish Council when drafting the plan, to the Local Authority when they consult on its proposals, and to the Independent Examiner.

I hope this provides sufficient information for you to be fully aware of our ideas at this stage. Please do contact us, either for further information or clarifications, or to discuss your views. You may, for example, feel it would be helpful for us to meet collectively with landowners on or around the hill, particularly to assist in formulating the boundary for the Local Green Space designation.

Yours sincerely

Marilyn Taylor
Secretary: Neighbourhood Plan Project Team
marilyn@consultmta.co.uk
01400 251462

Appendix 3

Consultation Leaflet & Questionnaire

January 2014

IDEAS SO FAR:


The primary purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan will be to set out a vision for the evolution and long-term sustainability of the Parish's historic and built environment, protecting its rural landscape character and guiding appropriate and sensitive future development.

LANDSCAPE

We commissioned a Landscape Character Assessment (available on the website) which describes the distinct attributes of our rural landscape and the importance of protecting the unique and open nature of the area which is highly valued by both residents and visitors. The spectacular views available from and to the Claydon/Gosdon ridge are highlighted for protection, as are our trees, woodlands, hedgerows and historic features such as ridge and furrow fields. There also seems to be support for improved access for walkers and horse riders.

HERITAGE

While Hough on the Hill's picturesque appearance is protected through its Conservation Area status, all three settlements within the Parish contain distinctive architecture and heritage features which should be protected. We could identify a list of other important local buildings and features in the Plan - our own local list. The preeminence of limestone, red brick/under and granite roofs provides strong visual coherence, and all new development should respect this palette of building materials. Building heights are also of critical importance to the look and feel of our settlements.



LOVEDEN HILL. You have told us that the ancient hill plays a special role in our landscape character and is very important to many of us who live here. It dominates our views and forms the setting of our villages. It is a much valued heritage asset, and you asked whether it could be further protected or given special treatment. Yes it can!

There is a new land designation available through Neighbourhood Plans. This is called a Local Green Space and is designed for areas which are demonstrably special to a local community and which hold a particular local significance, eg because of their beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquility or richness of wildlife.

WE COULD DESIGNATE LOVEDEN HILL AS A "LOCAL GREEN SPACE"

This would provide special protection against its future development

- Is this a proposal we should include in our Plan?
- Are there other areas that should be considered for Local Green Space designation?

Page 2

DECEMBER 2013

HOUGH ON THE HILL PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION FOR RESIDENTS

You can return this Questionnaire to addressees below or bring to the PUBLIC CONSULTATION MEETING (at All Saints Church, Hough on the Hill) on SATURDAY 23rd JANUARY 11am.

	YES	NO
Should the Plan provide design guidance for any new development (or adaptations / conversions of existing buildings) to ensure appropriate materials, scale and form?		
We have many Listed Buildings within the Parish, but would you like to suggest other buildings or features of special interest to go onto a local list of "positive unlisted structures" within our Neighbourhood Plan? If so please say which and why.		
Would you support the provision of new hard surface recreational facilities on the Playing Field in Hough on the Hill (future funds permitting)?		
Would you like to see improved access (paths, bridleways etc) for walkers and horse riders?		
Do you think there should be more affordable housing available within the Parish. If so, please state why.		
A Neighbourhood Plan can designate areas as "Local Green Space" (see leaflet for explanation). Do you agree that Loveden Hill should be so designated because of its unique beauty and historic significance within our Landscape Character? Are there any other areas you would like to see designated in this way?		
Do you think this Parish should be doing more to encourage homeowners and businesses develop local renewable energy provision?		
Any further comments you wish to make (continue overleaf if required)?		

(OPTIONAL - but helpful if you want us to keep you informed)

Name: _____ Phone: _____
Address: _____
Email: _____

This Questionnaire is also available online at: www.loveden.org.uk/np

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM TO: (or call 01400 251462 to arrange collection)

GELSTON: Penny Miles, Stoney Oak, Hough Road

BRANDON: Roger Kingscott, Brandon Hall, Hall Lane

HOUGH ON THE HILL: Marilyn Taylor, Jubilee Cottage, Thompson's Lane (off Lower Road)



HOUGH ON THE HILL PARISH COUNCIL IS PREPARING A NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN FOR YOUR AREA

WE WANT TO MAKE SURE EVERYONE IS GIVEN A CHANCE TO EXPRESS THEIR VIEWS

THE PLAN WILL BECOME PLANNING POLICY AGAINST WHICH ALL PLANNING APPLICATIONS WILL BE ASSESSED

SO THIS IS IMPORTANT STUFF!!

Why do we need a Neighbourhood Plan?
A Neighbourhood Plan ensures that local people have a stronger influence over the way change and development takes place, and greater certainty that the features they value will be protected and, where possible, enhanced.

Preparing the Plan provides an opportunity for consultation about how people want change to be accommodated. Clear, locally formulated policies, specific to our villages, landscape and heritage, will help the planning process work for the benefit of all.

This leaflet provides an update on how the Plan is beginning to take shape, and asks for your input on some specific issues where we need a clearer understanding of local views.



WHAT WILL BE IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN?

WHO DECIDES ON ITS POLICIES? YOU DECIDE

THIS IS YOUR PLAN

- Residents, landowners and businesses can get involved
- Proposals must reflect what local people want
- There must be full consultation
- All residents vote on the Plan in a Referendum held by South Kesteven District Council
- More than 50% of those voting must be in favour for the Plan to be adopted as local policy

PLEASE LOOK INSIDE

WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW MORE ABOUT PLEASE

Views about Future Development

The majority of residents who have commented so far clearly do not wish to see any expansion of our villages or any substantial development.

However, there are 'brownfield' sites (ie sites that have buildings on them currently, like old barns) as well as adaptations to existing homes which bring potential change to our built environment.

- What should the Plan contain to guide such future development?
- Do you think there should be more affordable housing provision, and if so, why?
- Are there sites that might be suitable for new housing?

PLEASE NOTE: Landowners with ideas for development should speak to us as soon as possible please.

Views about Recreation Facilities

Some residents have commented that they would like to see more leisure and recreational facilities. One option for the future would be to use part of the existing Playing Field in Hough on the Hill to accommodate a hard surface/fenced kick-about area or marked courts. Is this the type of facility people would value and use?

Views about Renewable Energy

The promotion of renewable energy is an important objective within the planning system. What could the Plan say to assist homeowners develop renewable energy schemes? Or what other ideas could we promote in our Plan?

CONSULTATION MEETING

Saturday Morning

25th January

11am

at All Saints Church
Hough on the Hill

Do please try and come to the Consultation Meeting (see above) as this will be run as an interactive 2-hour workshop enabling everyone to:

- Understand what is being proposed and why
- Comment on and influence the final content of the Plan
- Have any questions answered
- Raise any issues you think are not being properly addressed

**you can make your
views known**

**FILL IN AND RETURN
THE ENCLOSED
QUESTIONNAIRE**

Appendix 4

CONTACT LIST FOR STATUTORY CONSULTATION

STATUTORY AGENCIES:

The Environment Agency
Natural England
Highways Agency
English Heritage
Homes and Communities Agency
South West Lincolnshire Clinical Commissioning Group

LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND PARISHES:

South Kesteven District Council
Lincolnshire County Council
Westborough and Dry Doddington Parish Council
Stubton Parish Council
Caythorpe and Frieston Parish Council
Carlton Scroop and Normanton on Cliffe Parish Council
Hougham Parish Council
Marston Parish Council
Barkston & Syston Parish Council

UTILITY COMPANIES:

Anglian Water Services
Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board
Mobile Operators Association
Central Networks
E.ON Energy
Western Power Distribution
National Grid
Openreach (BT)

LANDOWNERS

Gelston: 4 Landowners
Hough on the Hill: 6 Landowners
Brandon: 5 Landowners

OTHER ORGANISATIONS

Heritage Trust for Lincolnshire
CPRE
Federation of Small Businesses
Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership
National Farmers Union
Greater Lincolnshire LEP
National Trust

The Woodland Trust

Appendix 5

Schedule of Amendments in Response to Consultation on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan

	ISSUE / COMMENT	DRAFT PLAN	RESPONSE	EXAMINATION PLAN
1	<u>SOUTH KESTIVEN DISTRICT COUNCIL (LPA)</u>			
a	General advise to review policies to ensure clarity		Noted and addressed through several revisions as detailed below.	
b	The plan should make clear at the outset that it sits within the statutory planning framework and therefore has to be in general conformity with NPPF and SKDC adopted strategic Local Plan policies (the Core Strategy).		Text added	Para 1
c	Refers to Dept of Transport data. Is this correct or should it be Lincolnshire County Council highways? It would be helpful for the date of the data to be added.	Para 30	Text amended and data in Evidence Base	Para 32
d	Contains inaccurate references to the SKDC Affordable Housing policy	Para 48, Table Item 6	Sentence deleted from table.	Para 53, Table Item 6
e	The Strategy seems to be a sensible and clearly set out approach. However the objectives set out here do not appear to be followed through consistently with all the policies.	Para 50	Some of the objectives that emerged from consultation cannot be met by policies, but are followed through in the delivery strategy	
f	It might make more sense if the design principles section (and any relevant policies about design, heritage and conservation) were with Section 4 so that the relationship and justification for policies was clearer.	Paras 52-91	The Design Guidance could follow this section, but the intention was that the guidance	

			was subordinate to the policy, and we think it clearer if all policies are kept together in one section.	
g	Is para 98 a policy?	Para 98	No, it's the introduction to the policies, which are laid out under subject areas, starting below para. 99.	
h	Appropriate uses –this would be better if it was defined as those listed in SP1 of the Core Strategy	HoH1	The list of acceptable uses (Para 105) are a direct quote from SP1. Para 106 confirms this.	Paras 105/106 and HoH1
i	[Development in the Conservation Area] states: "New development will be permitted ... " All the other policies reflect that the parish can only support, or not, new development. Perhaps this policy should be reworded accordingly.	HoH3	Agreed. Text changed.	HoH3
j	There is the potential for conflict with the NPPF as the references to 'harm' and 'substantial public benefits' are not consistent with the tests of harm to heritage assets in NPPF.	HoH4, 5 & 6	Sought further clarification from SKDC but decided to proceed with original wording	
k	[Affordable housing] contains reference to village envelopes although it is unclear what is meant by this, is it the built up part of villages? SKDC does not define village envelopes in its Local Plan and neither does the NP. It might be helpful to explain what is meant by this or re-phrase to be clearer. See also comment above about item 6 in the table on page 15 about brownfield sites. It should be recognised that not all brownfield sites may be suitable for development – some might be available but not suitable for other reasons (e.g. drainage or access). Para 111 which precedes this policy talks about "suitability" of a site being assessed against the 3 roles of sustainability included in the NPPF –I think this should refer to sustainability rather than suitability as suitability should be assessed by considering	Policy HoH7	Wording altered. Wording altered, adding the word 'suitable'. Wording changed.	HoH7 HoH7 Paras 116

	whether a site is actually suitable to be built on in practical terms and whether it is of an appropriate scale, size and location to meet the identified need.			and 117
l	<p>There may be issues of conformity with SKDC Policy E1 which does not restrict rural diversification schemes to brownfield sites. It should also be recognized that in reality hardly any rural diversification projects will be on brownfield sites in a rural parish.</p> <p>Please note that farmyards and agricultural buildings are specifically excluded from the definition of previously developed land in the NPPF and are therefore classed as greenfield sites.</p>	HoH8	Wording changed to clarify that it includes sites containing existing agricultural buildings.	HoH8
m	Policy talks about impact of development on views – this should clearly indicate whether this relates to the views identified in Fig 6 rather than just views in general.	HoH11	Wording amended to clarify views identified in Fig 6	HoH11
n	Renewable Energy section appears to conflict with Core Strategy and NPPF by only supporting domestic and small scale, local or community led proposals	HoH 13, 14 & 15	Larger schemes covered by SKDC policy; this policy relates only to smaller schemes.	
o	<p>Conflict with S106 tests which mean that only things which are necessary to make a development acceptable can be sought via S106. If a CIL is introduced then items in the table could be funded from the community %, but these things seem to be a wish list of desirable things and would not therefore meet S106 tests.</p> <p>The direct link between policy and delivery strategy in HoH16 should therefore be clarified in this context.</p> <p>It should also be noted that a developer cannot be asked to do something that is not related to the development proposed or to put right existing deficiencies, therefore things listed in the delivery strategy can only be sought if they are required to make the development acceptable in planning terms.</p>	HoH 15 & 16	Wording altered to make clear S106 funding will only apply where 'appropriate and feasible' and also clarifies that CIL monies would be from any 'neighbourhood element'.	HoH 15 & 16 Delivery Strategy paras 136 and 137
p	<p>Design Principles and Guidance:</p> <p>a) "Pitched roofs.... " there may occasions where a new roof cannot be both in accordance with existing building and the style of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>d) An alternative might be to locate satellite dishes on the ground in a garden</p> <p>e) Fences and walls may not need planning permission</p> <p>f) Not really a principle or guidance – just a statement</p>	<p>a)</p> <p>d)</p> <p>e)</p>	<p>Wording changed.</p> <p>Wording changed</p>	Design Guidance

		f)	Deleted	
q	<p>I note that Figure s 1, 2, 4 and 6 all use OS maps. OS have copyright restrictions which mean that specific wording about the copyright and your licence to use the mapping data should be included on all maps.</p> <p>Also I note that Fig 4 includes locations of ridge and furrow – but the purpose of the map is to show Roads and footpaths</p>	<p>Figs 1, 2, 4 and 6</p> <p>Fig 4</p>	<p>Parish Council licence obtained and all OS maps in the Plan now include the copyright permission.</p> <p>Ridge and furrow removed.</p>	<p>Figs 1, 2, 4 and 6</p> <p>Fig 4</p>
2	<p><u>English Heritage</u></p> <p>Suggest strengthening reference to settings of heritage assets. Could be usefully linked to the import views identified in the plan and conservation area appraisal. Preserving setting of listed buildings is afforded special regard in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. (see letter for further advice and info).</p>		<p>There are clear references to the settings of heritage assets being important, eg HoH 3, 5 and 6</p>	
3	<p><u>Natural England</u></p> <p>Particularly welcome policies HoH10 and 11.</p> <p>Should consider whether plan impacts any legally protected species.</p> <p>NP may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature.</p> <p>Opportunities to incorporate features into new build or retro fitted buildings which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes should also be considered as part of any new development proposal.</p>		<p>New para included within Design Guidance relating to the encouragement of wildlife</p>	<p>Design Guidance para (f)</p>
4	<p><u>NFU</u></p> <p>I can understand why new development should be sympathetic to the existing location etc but it may be difficult for new farm buildings to be sympathetic because of their practical design. If your plan can accept modern farm buildings and this policy would influence siting and colour, then that is fine. If the policy is used as a means of not allowing new farm buildings we cannot accept it.</p>	<p>HoH2, page 37</p>	<p>Plan can accept modern farm buildings.</p>	

5	<u>Highways Agency</u> Confirms no impact on strategic road network.			
6	<u>Lincolnshire County Council</u> <p>Subject to it being introduced by South Kesteven District Council the draft plan contains two references, in policies HOH15 and HOH16, to the potential use of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to help fund recreation and provide new facilities on site or contribute towards off-site facilities as required by the Delivery Strategy (which is contained within section 6 of the Draft Plan). Whilst it is not specifically stated, it is assumed that the CIL monies referred to would be the neighbourhood funding element that the Parish would be entitled to receive.</p> <p>The County Council would welcome clarification on this point and request that if this is the approach to be used in respect of CIL, that Policies HOH15 and HOH16 are amended to confirm this. Further information about CIL and Neighbourhood Planning can be found within section 4 of the Governments CIL Guide which is available at: http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/blog/guidance/community-infrastructure-levy/</p> <p>The Delivery Strategy includes a list of local infrastructure which is considered to be required in the Parish along with its level of priority, The strategy also confirms that the Neighbourhood Plan will be reviewed every 5 years and this will include a review of the infrastructure requirements to ensure it remains both up to date and relevant. The inclusion of such information within the document is considered to be helpful.</p> <p>In addition it is noted that the Delivery Strategy identifies the need to maintain and improve the safety of roads as a high priority. There is further reference to this, along with the condition of the roads in the non-planning issues element of the strategy and in both cases the draft plan states that the Parish Council will work with the County Council to address these issues. The County Council's website contains information relating to</p>	HoH15 and HoH16 and the Delivery Strategy	Wording altered that CIL monies would be from any 'neighbourhood element'.	HoH 15 & 16 Delivery Strategy paras 136 and 137

	highway maintenance and road safety and this can be found at http://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/residents/transport-travel-and-roads/ . In addition the County Council's Local Highways Divisional Office would welcome the opportunity to discuss these issues with the Parish Council.			
--	---	--	--	--

7	<p><u>Environment Agency</u></p> <p>There are areas of flood risk within the Neighbourhood Plan Boundary therefore we would recommend that a suitable policy around avoiding development in flood risk areas following the Sequential Test principles and ensuring development is 'safe' as per the exception test is included within the document. Further information can be located at https://www.gov.uk/flood-risk-standing-advice-frsa-for-local-planning-authorities#the-sequential-test</p> <p>There are also areas identified at risk of surface water flooding so again a suitable policy is regards to this flood risk source together with suitable management of surface water from proposed development which incorporates sustainable drainage systems (SuDS). SuDS provide an opportunity to reduce the risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality and to improve habitat and amenity.</p> <p>Documents such as Ciria C697 (the SuDS Manual) and Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 can provide excellent reference points for determining a suitable working practice for surface water drainage considerations. It should be noted that any such recommendations within the Neighbourhood Plan must conform to and complement the requirements and aims of local planning policy, as well as the Lead Local Flood Authority's aims in respect of their role as SuDS Approval Body.</p>		Plan amended to include information about flood risk and water quality.	Paras 38 and 39
	Hough on the Hill plan boundary does not fall within main river the boundary it is an ordinary watercourse and becomes a River further downstream at Stragglethorpe.			
	<p><u>Water Quality</u></p> <p>The Water Framework Directive (WFD) came into force in December 2000, and was transposed into UK law in December 2003. The Water Framework Directive classifies water bodies on their overall ecological status which considers water quality as well as ecological considerations. The target under the Directive is that all water bodies shall achieve good status by 2027.</p> <p>Hough on the Hill drains into the River Brant catchment with the village being served by a small Anglian Water Sewage Treatment Works. The Upper Brant is failing good status due to elevated levels of phosphate. Phosphate can cause nutrient enrichment and excessive weed growth in water bodies and the two most significant sources are from sewage treatment works and diffuse agricultural pollution.</p> <p>The lower River Brant is at poor ecological status with phosphate, macrophytes, dissolved oxygen and</p>		As above.	

	<p>invertebrates all failing to achieve good ecological status.</p> <p>The first principle of the WFD is to prevent deterioration in aquatic ecosystems. 'No deterioration' requires that a water body does not deteriorate from its current ecological or chemical classification, and applies to individual pollutants within a water body. Any future development within the Neighbourhood Planning boundary should be undertaken in a way which does not cause deterioration of the River Brant, Honington Beck or Sand Beck.</p> <p>Elevated Phosphate levels can result from diffuse pollution (both urban and rural) and from sewage effluents from both private and public (Water Company) sewage treatment systems. In order to prevent deterioration in water quality, any proposals for development within the local plan area should fully consider how foul flows will be collected and treated.</p> <p>For any proposals within the sewered area of Hough-on-the-Hill itself, the water company should be consulted to ensure that the infrastructure for collection and treatment of sewage has sufficient capacity to accommodate additional flows.</p> <p>Any new private systems should be appropriately located, designed, installed and maintained. Further information relating to small private sewage discharges can be found at https://www.gov.uk/permits-you-need-for-septic-tanks/overview and in the Codes of Practice available on the British Water website http://www.britishwater.co.uk/publications/Publications_and_Technical_Guides.aspx</p> <p>Appropriate use of SuDS (Sustainable urban drainage systems) in new developments can also help to reduce the impacts of diffuse pollution on watercourses.</p> <p>The Witham Partnership has been set up with the aim of improving the water environment across the Witham catchment. The partnership aims to involve local organisations and communities to help decide on the key water issues and best way to address those following Department Environment Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA's) catchment based approach principles. The hosts for the Witham partnership are the Lincolnshire Rivers Trust. The Trust engages with local people, communities and authorities to carry out monitoring and improvement projects and for more information please go to http://lincsivers.co.uk/</p> <p>Hough-on-the-Hill is within the area covered by the South Kesteven Water Cycle Strategy. Further information is available on South Kesteven District Council's website http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=2113</p>			
	<p>Water Resources</p> <p>There are four water abstraction licences in the Neighbourhood Plan area, these include licences that allow abstraction for storage in reservoirs and direct abstraction.</p> <p>In addition to local renewable and/or low carbon approaches to generating energy and initiatives</p>		Reference now made to water	Design Guidance

<p>aimed at saving energy, we recommend that the plan includes references to the benefits of adopting water efficiency techniques i.e. water butts and the use of water efficient devices. This should be incorporated in the document in order that it contributes to the environmental role of the plan, 'using natural resources prudently'. There may be scope to add 'water' to the renewable energy policy and design guidance?</p> <p>Anglian Water's Drop 20 Campaign provides further information: http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/environment/using-water-wisely/join-drop-20.aspx</p> <p>The presence of the village pump, water lane footpath and two local wells are features that lend themselves to highlighting the importance of water for people and the environment. This should be incorporated in the plan contributing to the environmental role of the plan.</p>		<p>efficiency in the Design Guidance.</p>	<p>Para (f)</p>
<p>Waste management</p> <p>The management of waste arising from the neighbourhood of Hough on the Hill may need to be considered within the Neighbourhood Plan. It is the function of Waste Disposal and Waste Collection Authorities to provide waste services to householders. A possible consideration is for the Plan to influence the provision of waste bins for recycling, disposal etc so as to encourage a clean sustainable environment. The Plan may be able to identify other potential good waste management practises for the neighbourhood that would lead to good environmental outcomes. A useful website for ideas is www.tcpa.org.uk/pages/towards-zero-waste.html</p>		<p>Not considered necessary.</p>	
<p>Land contamination and soil</p> <p>Please note that any reference to controlled waters includes inland freshwaters, coastal waters and relevant territorial waters plus groundwater as may be relevant for a proposed development site.</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 109 states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of water pollution. Government policy also states that planning policies and decisions should also ensure that adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, is presented (NPPF, paragraph 121).</p> <p>The proposed Neighbourhood boundary is predominantly underlain by geology of the Charmouth Mudstone Formation that is of low environmental sensitivity with regard to groundwater. However, the western part of the area is underlain by the Highfield Farm Limestone bed, which is classified as a secondary A aquifer, whilst the Chammouth Mudstone is interbedded with some more permeable layers of Brandon Sandstone and Marlstone Rock, which are also secondary A aquifers.</p> <p>Secondary aquifers are often capable of supporting water supplies at a local scale and normally provide an important source of flow to some rivers. Due to the presence of these Secondary A</p>		<p>Plan amended to include information about geology.</p>	<p>Para 40</p>

	<p>Aquifers, parts of the area are vulnerable to pollution from certain types of development.</p> <p>There are no Source Protection Zones within the proposed Neighbourhood boundary.</p> <p>We are able to provide further advice on protecting groundwater, including guidance on the use of SuDS. We would like to refer the applicant/enquirer to our groundwater policies in Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3), available from our website. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-principles-and-practice-gp3</p> <p>This sets out our position for a wide range of activities and developments including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Waste management · Discharge of liquid effluents · Land contamination · Ground source heat pumps · Cemetery developments · Drainage <p>The majority of the Neighbourhood area is rural in nature and, therefore, development on land that is potentially affected by contamination is likely to be limited. However, if Brownfield land within the Neighbourhood area is proposed to be brought back into beneficial use, we recommend that developers should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11, Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, when dealing with land affected by contamination. 2. Refer to the Environment Agency Guiding Principles for Land Contamination for the type of information that we require in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site. The Local Authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health. 3. Refer to the Anglian River Basin Management Plan. 4. Refer to our website at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guidance-for-the-safe-development-of-housing-on-land-affected-by-contamination for more information. <p>The Environment Agency is not aware of any current or historic landfill sites within the proposed neighbourhood planning area</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>Mitigate and adapt to climate change</p> <p>In April 2012 we took on full responsibility for the governments Climate Ready support service which provides advice and support to businesses, the public sector and other organisations on adapting to climate change. The aim is to ensure businesses and services assess how they will be impacted by a changing climate so that they are both resilient and can thrive in the future. The Climate Ready pages of our website (http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/137557.aspx) provide information including guidance on carrying out impact assessments and evaluating adaptation strategies.</p> <p>The UK Green Building Council has also published a series of documents to help Local Authorities and developers to understand sustainability issues. These documents are available on their website at: www.ukgbc.org/content/advice-planners-and-developers</p>		Noted	
	<p>Net Gains for Nature</p> <p>Landscaping proposals should demonstrate that thought has been given to maximising potential ecological enhancement. Paragraph 9 of the NPPF sets out that planning should seek positive improvements and includes an aim to move from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature in line with the Natural Environment White Paper (2011). In determining planning applications Local Authorities are asked to conserve and enhance biodiversity and encourage opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments (Para.118). This presents an opportunity to provide multi-functional benefits - providing open space for residents, sustainable transport links, wildlife/ecological value, climate change resilience, improved water quality and flood risk management.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure, defined as a network of new and existing multi-functional green space and features, such as ecological corridors or other appropriate planting, should therefore be considered as part of the development. Such measures can provide the range of benefits outlined above, including for example providing shade to the built environment to reduce overheating, and intercepting rainfall and reducing flood risk. But there is evidence that the inclusion of such features can also provide further economic benefits, such as encouraging inward investment, increasing property values and increasing visitor spending in an area. More information on this and Green Infrastructure in general is available on the Natural England web pages: www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/planningdevelopment/greeninfrastructure/default.aspx</p> <p>Incorporating green and/or brown roofs and walls can be a particularly effective measure. They provide valuable urban habitats, increased energy efficiency of buildings and attenuation of rain water. Research from the journal '<i>Environmental Science and Technology</i>' claims that green walls deliver cleaner air at street level where most people are exposed to the highest pollution. They can also add to an attractive street scene if designed well – a good example of this is the Transport for London</p>		Noted	

	Green Wall near Blackfriars station.			
	<p>Environmental permitting</p> <p>The Plan must have a consideration for pollution prevention measures that ensure that the environment is protected. We recommend that a review of the Environment Agency's Pollution Prevention Guidelines is carried out to identify the types of situations and measures that need to be considered. These Guidelines are at https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/pollution-prevention-guidance-ppg</p>			
8	Anglian Water: No comment			
9	<p><u>Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board</u></p> <p>Some of the lower parts of the area of interest fall within the Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board's District, see the attached plan. More information about the Board can be found on the website 'upperwitham-idb.gov.uk '. Most of the existing property has been built on higher ground outside the District although there are a number of properties on Brandon Road that are within the Board's District in an area that can be considered at risk of flooding.</p> <p>It should also be noted that there has been some flooding/ground water issues in the village of Brandon.</p> <p>The area of interest is situated in an area where the watercourses are unable to accept any increase in the rates of discharge; therefore any development must prove the existence of a surface water drainage route and provide adequate proposals to make certain that flood risk is not increased elsewhere as a result of any proposed development.</p> <p>It is suggested that the Neighbourhood Plan should support the idea of sustainable drainage and that any proposed development should be in accordance with National and Regional Flood Risk assessments and Management plans.</p> <p>No new development should be allowed to be built within flood plain. The 'Flood Maps' on the Environment Agency website provides information on areas at risk, information can be found by searching 'EA flood maps'. Also risk from surface water flooding should also be considered, information can also be found on the Environment Agency website. It can be found by search using 'EA surface water flood map'</p> <p>Under the terms of the Land Drainage Act. 1991 and the Board's Byelaws, the prior written consent of the Board is required for any proposed works or structures in, under, over or within 6 metres of the top of the bank of any watercourse within the District. This is independent of the Planning Process.</p> <p>Also under the provisions of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, and the Land Drainage Act. 1991, the prior written consent of the Lead Local Flood Authority (Lincolnshire County Council) is</p>		Plan amended to include information about flood risk and water quality.	Paras 38 and 39

	required for any proposed works or structures in any watercourse outside those designated main rivers and Internal Drainage Districts. In this area the Board acts as Agents for the Lead Local Flood Authority and as such any works, permanent or temporary, in any ditch, dyke or other such watercourse will require consent from the Board.			
10	<p><u>Resident</u></p> <p>We wish to register that we do NOT support any property / residential development in the village of Hough on the Hill nor parish, including sustainable housing, other than converting existing buildings.</p> <p>We FULLY endorse the local Character Assessment contained within the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		Noted.	
11	<p><u>Farmer & Landowner</u></p> <p>Need to reflect the contribution of local farmers to the landscape and wildlife.</p> <p>As the last family of farmers and contractors resident in Hough on the hill we are responsible for approximately 70% of the land area within the parish. This responsibility has been passed down the generations. Over those years the countryside and wildlife that are now present are the result of the careful management that has occurred. This has not occurred because there has been legislation in place but because of a deep love, understanding and respect for the wildlife and countryside that we live in. Many of the archaeological features that were present are still present now. An example of this is the Rig and furrow land which is highly important, proving a very good environment for the nesting and rearing of lapwings as well as being a very visual aspect to our local landscape.</p> <p>During the last 4 decades at least 10 copses and spinneys have been planted. In recent years the Protection and Foxcovert woods have been partially felled and an extensive replanting scheme has taken place. On an annual basis between 1000 and 1500 hedging plants of varying species are planted to maintain and improve the existing hedges. As a farm we are responsible for over 30 miles of hedges and over 8 miles of dykes.</p> <p>As a result of many of the conservation projects that are carried out on the farm we have had great success in increasing the number and diversity of birds and mammals that are resident or visitors to the parish. Over the last five years all of the Barn Owls that have been reared in the Owl boxes have been tagged. This total now stands at a very commendable total of 48 Barn Owl chicks tagged.</p>		New section added to reflect contribution of local farmers to landscape and wildlife.	Paras 25 and 26
	<p>Need to recognise the needs of working farm, in terms of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy/slow traffic • Movement of animals 		Noted.	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modernisation of buildings • Minimising (direct or indirect) bureaucracy <p>While much of the above has shaped the landscape that is a now a prized part of the parish in which we live, I would like to take this opportunity to remind the committee that we are a fully working farm business and employer within the parish. We cannot function without Lorries both delivering and collecting from our farm. Tractors both to and from Eastfield farm must travel through Hough on the hill. As a mixed farm the movement of sheep around the village is also a common occurrence. All of these activities have been happening for many years and for us to remain as a viable business must be allowed to continue. In future years there will be a need to modernise our farm buildings, much of this is led by legislation regarding the safe production and storage of food products.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that when producing the Neighbourhood Plan, consideration will be given to allowing the farm, not only to coexist with the village but we must be able to evolve and adapt to the modern demands that are placed on us as food producers. Unfortunately we cannot see into the future, I would respectfully ask you to consider this when you are formulating the Neighbourhood Plan. I do not know what will be required in the future of me as a food producer. I do know that the policies that are in the Plan will affect my livelihood and have an impact on the farm business. I am</p> <p>aware that the plan has a five yearly review, but five years, at the pace that legislation changes do come from the European Commission could be quite prohibitive.</p> <p>Need to be positive wherever possible.</p> <p>On a personal note my hopes of the Neighbourhood Plan are that we can preserve what we have, a very nice place to live. But this must be combined with the realisation that things need to evolve or they start to decay and die. Practically every house in the village has been modernised and extended, these are due to the expectations of modern day living. I believe we must not be afraid to allow change, not all things change for the worst. Controlled, yes, but let's try not to make the first answer "NO". Instead I believe we should be thinking "How can we make this work? "</p>			
	I don't think they found any evidence in recent excavations at Temple Hill	Para 10	Wording amended	Para 10
	The Quakers no longer farm at Brandon.	Para 16	Wording amended	Para 16

	You can also see 3 turbines, the large storage depot at Newark and also the Recycling Station at Lincoln.	Para 18	Wording amended to include Recycling Station	Para 18
	The Gelston end of Hough is also not on mains drainage.	Para 36	Already clear in text that not all the village is on mains drainage.	
	Upvc windows, this statement is a subjective view	Para 63	Wording amended.	Para 68
	You say you want to protect jobs, but fail to say that you will support local business.	Para 50	'Local Business' added to the objectives	Para 55
	Please be aware that each of the five section heading will affect all the farmers in the Parish, not just the present, but future generations.		No response, statement of fact.	