

# **Leasingham and Roxholm Neighbourhood Plan**

## **COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**

### **REGULATION 14(1) AND 14(2)**

## **APPENDIX**

## Leasingham and Roxholm Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 (1) Consultation Comments

Consultees	Location	COMMENTS	ACTIONS TAKEN
NKDC	General	It is recommended that paragraph numbers are added to assist with navigation of the plan. This will be particularly useful when preparing applications and when quoting from the plan.	Having received favourable comments from parishioners about the layout and clarity of the NP, it was decided to leave it in its present format.
NKDC	Page 3 bullet 2	The wording should be amended slightly to reflect the wording of the regulations: "They must be in general conformity with strategic policies..."	Amended.
NKDC	Page 4 para 1 line 8	The adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan has a plan period of 2012-2036. This sentence references 2040, which is the proposed end of the plan period for the new Local Plan which is currently being prepared. Given that this new Local Plan is not expected to be adopted until 2021, it is recommended that this plan uses 2036 as an end date in your neighbourhood plan.	Amended to 2012-2036 on page 4 and throughout the plan.
NKDC	Page 7 para 3 & 4	As per the above, the current Local Plan runs until 2036, not 2040 – please amend.	See above.
NKDC	Page 22 para 3	As per the above, the current Local Plan runs until 2036, not 2040 – please amend line 2 accordingly. Also, in the 3rd line there appears to be a typo where it says "th12".	See above. Amended.
NKDC	Policy 1	This policy is considered to meet the basic conditions.	✓
NKDC	Policy 2	This policy is considered to meet the basic conditions.	✓
NKDC	Policy 3	There are a couple of minor typos in this policy and bullet points c, f, g and h do not flow with the others and so could benefit from a minor rewording, but it is otherwise considered to meet the basic conditions.	Comments taken onboard and policy re-worded. Errors corrected.

NKDC	Page 26	In the table on Page 26 there is a list of eight heritage assets. It is worth noting that there are thirteen listed buildings in the parish. This does not affect the basic conditions but might be beneficial to clarify this in the text.	The remaining 5 heritage assets are on private land and hidden from view. The above sentence has been added to NP.
NKDC	Policy 4	This policy is considered to meet the basic conditions.	✓
NKDC	Policy 5	This policy is considered to meet the basic conditions.	✓
NKDC	Policy 6	This policy is considered to meet the basic conditions, provided that the sites meet the criteria in the NPPF for Local Green Spaces.	The sites meet the NPPF criteria for Local Green Spaces.
NKDC	Map page 33	Some of the green spaces on the map are not clear – this map will need to be improved before the plan is submitted in order for it to be used. This should be on an OS base map, or could be on multiple maps if necessary, to show the areas clearly.	A clearer map has now been added.
NKDC	Policy 7	This policy is considered to meet the basic conditions. It would be beneficial if this policy could be accompanied by a map showing the public rights of way.	Map showing PRoW now added.
NKDC	Policy 9	Part 1 of this policy is considered to meet the basic conditions. Part 2 would benefit from some minor rewording and separation of two separate points to make it clearer for decision makers. The following is recommended: 2." Proposals for new retail use within the village will be supported where the site is not likely to result in conflict with existing neighbouring uses, and where safe access and parking is available", and where 3. Proposals that would result in the loss of [ <i>continue as existing</i> ] Part 3 is considered to meet the basic conditions.	Plan amended in line with comments.

<b>Beeswax Dyson Farming Ltd (BDF)</b>			
<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>ACTIONS TAKEN</b>
<b>BDF</b>	Page 1 para 3	Omission of notification of Regulation 14	Apology email sent.
<b>BDF</b>	Page 2 Para 1	The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) appears to have used the wrong plan period.	Plan period amended. NKDC also noted discrepancy.
<b>BDF</b>	Page 2 Para 2 Policy 1	The draft NP does not include any potential allocations and appears to rely on Policy 1 to help deliver growth. Policy 1 needs amending to facilitate growth outside the developed footprint.	NKDC have indicated that Policy 1 is considered to meet the basic conditions and does not preclude some development near the village boundary.
<b>BDF</b>	Page 2 Para 4	The developed footprint: The NP should also include allocations to direct development to appropriate locations and to highlight issues that should be addressed in any development proposal.	Comments noted. It is clear that some owners of land at the edges of the village would be happy to develop it for housing subject to the 9 homes limit specified in the CLLP for medium villages.
<b>BDF</b>	Page 3 para 5  Page 4	Policy 6 Local Green Spaces: quotes criteria for Local Green Spaces in NPPF. Questions lack of evidence for the sites chosen.  <b>Site submission form.</b> You describe Leasingham as a <u>large village</u> .  P 3. Land to the west of Roxholm Road.	1. As you agree, all sites are in 'reasonable proximity' to the communities they serve. 2. Each of the designated sites holds at least one of the qualities mentioned in the eyes of residents. 3. All are local and are not extensive, providing outdoor meeting and play spaces close to homes, ideal for residents with mobility issues etc and children to socialise outdoors. The LGS all contain trees which fulfil an ecological function and are now listed as an integral part of the new NPPF. Evidence can be found on the L& RNP website in Questionnaire responses.  In the CLLP Leasingham is classified as a <u>medium village</u> and Roxholm as countryside – as such it is not subject to allocations via CLLP and is subject to the 9 homes limit per site specified in the CLLP. Roxholm is subject to the specific conditions for building in the countryside. There are potential building constraints as it lies underneath the RAF Flight Path, Cranwell.

Savills Representation on behalf of Warrendale Farms Ltd		COMMENTS	ACTIONS TAKEN
4.2	Alteration 1	<b>Alteration 1:</b> Policy 1 should correspond more directly with Policy LP2 and Policy LP4 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. This will ensure greater clarity on growth within Leasingham. It may also be useful to provide clarification on more specific matters within the policy to help steer future growth, including but not limited to, the 15% growth 'aim', the exceptional circumstances relating to delivering community facilities and a viewpoint on appropriate location in the context of Leasingham.	After much discussion, given that the CLLP is in the process of being amended we felt it appropriate to wait until the plan is clarified.
	Alteration 2	<b>Alteration 2:</b> Alternative wording to Policy 3 could be ' <i>developments should aspire to adhere to the following criteria as set out in 1, a to h, as far as possible, unless site specific circumstances indicate otherwise</i> ', to enable a degree of flexibility for design to respond to site specific circumstances.	We considered your suggestions but thought that the present wording provides enough flexibility for changes to be made.
	Alteration 3	<b>Alteration 3:</b> Alternative wording to Policy 7 could be ' <i>where the cost of doing so is proportionate to the scale of development, proposals should incorporate adequate and safe pedestrian links to the existing footpath network</i> '. This again would enable a degree of flexibility for design to respond to site specific circumstances.	We feel that we have addressed PROW's and Pedestrian Access correctly.

<b>Residents</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Replies</b>
Resident 1	Development seems to be the only key issue that residents are concerned about.	The purpose of the NP is to give the neighbourhood a say in the development of the parish. It cannot seek to stop development but to manage it up to the % increase required by the CLLP.
Resident 2	I agree that future development should be confined to the present footprint of Leasingham.	It may be necessary to consider developments near the settlement boundary if sites within the village boundary are not forthcoming.
Resident 3	Thank you to everyone who worked so hard putting our Neighbourhood Plan together.	Thank you.
Resident 4	What if anything is going to happen to the Hall, it is becoming an eyesore rather than an asset to the village.	The future of the hall is predominantly in the hands of the owners. If they wish to develop the Hall, they will have to go through the planning process.
Resident 5	An easy to read and comprehensive document.	Thank you.
Resident 6	Surely local planning rules should protect the village.	The NP process is part of the planning system and will when "made" will become a policy of NKDC.
Resident 7	I hope the plan will protect the unique nature of the parish and protect it from inappropriate developments.	Thank you.
Resident 8	Are the dates for the term of the plan correct?	Dates have been amended to 2012-2036.
Resident 9	Can anything be done to curb speeding through the village?	Comment passed to PC.
Resident 10	We do not have the infrastructure to support too much development. We do not have a doctors' surgery and the school is over subscribed.	Comment noted.
Resident 11	I was pleased to see that Green spaces have been designated in the plan.	Thank you.
Resident 12	A comprehensive well set out document which we fully support.	Thank you.

**Leasingham and Roxholm Neighbourhood Plan  
Agreed Responses to Regulation 14 (2) Comments**

Consultees	Comment Ref	COMMENTS	Responses
NKDC	<b>General</b>	It is recommended that paragraph numbers are added to assist with navigation of the plan. This will be particularly useful when preparing applications and when quoting from the plan.	Having received favourable comments from parishioners about the layout and clarity of the NP, it was decided to leave it in its present format. Consultees who have responded to Regulation 14 have not mentioned any difficulty navigating the plan.
NKDC	<b>Page 7 para 2</b>	The NPPF was updated in July 2021. References in this paragraph, and elsewhere, will need to be updated accordingly. Your Basic Conditions Statement will need to be prepared against this new version of the NPPF.	The LRNP and Basic Conditions Statement have been amended accordingly.
NKDC	<b>Policy 1</b>	In part 1 presumably it should read “the developed footprint of the village” or villages. The term should be specifically defined as it is in the Local Plan or should be mapped and directly linked in the policy.	Leasingham is a village with a developed footprint. Roxholm is classed as countryside without a footprint, hence the word Parish. Map included.
NKDC	<b>Policy 1.b</b>	Should include “significance” as a criteria for a heritage asset not to be harmed.	Amended.
NKDC	<b>Policy 1.c</b>	Should it also include future occupiers of the proposed scheme as well as neighbours?	Amended.
NKDC	<b>Policy 1 part 2</b>	The reference to Policy LP55 in the Local Plan in part 2 will age the policy when the new Local Plan is adopted. As the Local Plan and the draft plan provide adequate protection for best and most versatile agricultural land, it is recommended that this part of the policy is deleted instead placing reliance on the local plan.	Amended.
NKDC	<b>Policy 1 part 3</b>	The policy requires residential development proposals to provide a mix of housing. This will not always be possible or appropriate, ie a very small site for one or two dwellings could not necessarily in itself provide a mix, and it might not be appropriate for all locations, taking in to account character. As such it is recommended that this part of the policy is amended so that schemes “contribute to providing a housing mix in the neighbourhood area” or similar.	Amended.

NKDC	<b>Policy 1 part 4</b>	<p>In part 4 of the policy phasing is always chronological as, by its very nature, it delays delivery on some areas. Therefore “spatially or chronologically” should be deleted. It should be noted that it is not always possible, particularly in small developments to secure all infrastructure required. Whilst there is no objection to such a policy it may be better if this is only applied to major developments of 10 or more dwellings.</p>	Amended.
NKDC	<b>Policy 2</b>	<p>It would be beneficial if the policy were accompanied by a map showing the area it applies to and directly linking to the map in the policy. One alternative could be to provide definition in a description but may not be possible. Without further clarification, it makes the policy imprecise and does not provide clarity for occupants, decision makers or the community as to whether a scheme will be impacted by it.</p> <p>Additionally, this policy could arguably prevent a householder extension from being approved. Presumably this is not the intention of this policy. As such it may be preferable to add an additional sentence such as “<i>Any development proposals in these gaps should be accompanied by evidence of the visual impact of the proposed scheme in relation to the gap</i>”. This will allow applicants the opportunity to demonstrate that their proposal will not reduce the gap.</p>	<p>The intention of the policy is to provide a buffer zone between the two areas that will NOT be built on. Map added.</p> <p>This policy is supported by the proposed Sleaford Neighbourhood Plan.</p>



NKDC	<b>Policy 3</b>	<p>The wording in a number of the bullet points does not flow with the opening sentence in part 1 of the policy. For example as worded it reads “All development proposals must deliver high quality design through the development must be appropriate for the site”, etc this must be reviewed.</p> <p>In 1.a, in what way will a scheme be adjusted to be appropriate for the site? This should be clarified.</p> <p>1.d should be storey not story.</p> <p>In part 4 it is recommended that this part of the policy is revised to take closer account of the wording in the NPPF (para 134b).</p>	<p>Reviewed.</p> <p>Amended.</p> <p>Amended.</p>
NKDC	<b>Policy 4</b>	<p>Generally, this policy does not offer anything above the local plan policy and as such its value is questionable. Neighbourhood Plan policies provide greater value when they are specific to their area – is there a locally specific requirement that is needed above and beyond the local plan policy.</p> <p>The wording at the end of this policy would be improved if it read “historic interest and other designated and non-designated heritage assets.”</p> <p>There is no schedule of proposed non-designated heritage assets in the built heritage paper. Do you intend to identify any? If so, it is highly recommended that you contact the NKDC conservation officer to discuss criteria that can be applied.</p>	<p>Reviewed following contact with Conservation Officer. Listed on Neighbourhood Plan website. <a href="http://www.leasinghamnp.co.uk">www.leasinghamnp.co.uk</a></p> <p>Amended.</p> <p>Conservation Officer contacted. See above.</p>

NKDC	<b>Policy 5</b>	<p>The wording of this policy stands out as being different to other policies and it introduces some ambiguity. Instead of being worded “Development should be supported...” it should be amended to “Wherever possible, development proposals should:”</p> <p>In part 1.a. “well-established” could introduce some ambiguity to the policy and it is recommended that this is removed.</p> <p>In part 2 the removal of “significant and” would also help simplify the policy and remove risk of misinterpretation.</p>	Changes made as per suggestions.
NKDC	<b>Policy 6</b>	<p>In part 1 what are “appropriate uses”? This is unclear and should probably be removed.</p> <p>Also see comments against policy 8 – do they need to be separated?</p>	Amended. Policies 6 and 8 will remain as individual policies.
NKDC	<b>Policy 7</b>	<p>The wording of part 1 of this policy should be amended to more explicitly link to the map. This should be achieved by numbering the map and directly referencing the map in the policy. Alternatively, each site could be named and then shown on the map. The second sentence in part 1 is not needed and should be removed with part 2 of the policy providing the policy position for how development proposals on LGS will be treated. If it is not removed it will introduce conflict with part 2 and is not considered to meet the basic conditions.</p>	Amended as proposed.
NKDC	<b>Policy 8</b>	<p>Whilst this policy is generally considered to meet the basic conditions, it is unclear why it is separate from policy 6 which does a very similar job – perhaps the two policies should be merged.</p> <p>In part 2 “clearly” should be removed, it will either be visible, or it will not so this should not be added. It should also add “where necessary” at the end of the paragraph as it may not always be necessary to include soft landscaping.</p>	“Within Leasingham” has been added to the policy heading. Roxholm is classed as countryside which ties it into policy 6. Changes to text made as suggested.

NKDC	<b>Page 38</b>	Lincolnshire County Council is the Highways Authority. As such it is recommended that they are added to the last paragraph before the pictures on this page.	Additions made,
NKDC	<b>Policy 9</b>	<p>Part 1 of this policy is considered to meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>Part 2 is unclear as to how a, b and c relate to the preceding paragraph and this needs to be amended to meet the basic conditions to ensure it is clear and concise. It should also be noted that the draft local plan includes the identification of the village centre in the proposed retail hierarchy. You may want to consider whether this will impact what you want to say in this policy. It is also important to recognise the changes to the Use Class Order of 2020 which have now amalgamated a number of uses into a new E Use Class.</p> <p>In part 3 it is unclear as to what use this will be applicable to – is it community facilities, shops? This needs to be clarified in order to meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>Also in part 3.a – how would a “better size” be determined. Also, it would be very challenging to understand whether the layout is better. This bullet can be improved through simplification to “a replacement facility in a suitable location”.</p> <p>In part 4 there is a lack of clarity about what this would apply to – is it public open space, house types and sizes, This needs to be clarified.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Amendments and clarification made.</p> <p>Comments noted. Amendments and clarification made.</p> <p>Comments noted. Amendments and clarification made.</p> <p>Comments noted. Amendments and clarification made.</p>

Consultee	Comment Ref	COMMENTS	Responses
<b>Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust</b>	Policy 5	<p>We are supportive of Policy 5; but would suggest the following highlighted amendments to the wording in order to better capture aims for biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>1. Development should <b>only</b> be supported where it can demonstrate it meets the following criteria:</p> <p>c. Plan positively for the protection, enhancement <b>and extension</b> of existing green networks <b>with native biodiversity</b>, and the creation of new green networks to improve connectivity.</p> <p>2. If there is significant and unavoidable loss of trees and shrubs <b>and other wildlife rich</b> habitat as part of development, new provision will be expected elsewhere on the site.</p> <p>3. Development proposals should plan positively for the protection, enhancement and creation of networks to improve the connectivity, of green infrastructure for both wildlife and people while providing sanctuary for nature where possible.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and assurance with biodiversity within the Parish.</p> <p>Changes have been made to Policy 5 as per your comments.</p>
<b>NHS Lincolnshire</b>		Thank you for your continued hard work and commitment.	Thank you for your comment.
<b>Historic England</b>		<p>The area covered by your Neighbourhood Plan covers a number of important designated heritage assets. In line with the national planning policy, it will be important that the strategy for this area safeguards those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets so that they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area.</p> <p>If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the planning and conservation team at your local planning authority together with the staff at the county council archaeological advisory service who look after the Historic England records.</p>	Conservation Team contacted.

Consultee	Comment Ref	COMMENTS	Responses
<p><b>Cllr Robert Oates, Chairman Sleaford Neighbourhood Plan Working Group</b></p>	<p>Policy 2</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft NP for Leasingham and Roxholm. Your comments focus on Leasingham village and its relationship with the town of Sleaford.</p> <p>We support your plan to preserve the distinct identity of Leasingham by maintaining visual and physical separation from Sleaford and nearby villages. We also understand and support your aim of providing controlled growth while at the same time maintaining, as far as possible the character of the built environment and the rural aspect of the village. We understand why over the last 40 years modern expansion has occurred on the periphery of Leasingham, especially on the side nearest to Sleaford. But we support your aim to preserve Leasingham with a distinct identity. That identity is supported by the separation of the village from the town of Sleaford by a 1 kilometre section of farmland land.</p> <p>We support your Policy 2 Maintaining Separation as maintenance of this 'green buffer' is important to preserving the character of Leasingham as a village separate from Sleaford. It would be undesirable for that 'green buffer' to be built on and turn Leasingham into a 'greater Sleaford' conurbation. We look forward to working with you to preserve the 'green buffer' which contributes to the distinct character of our two communities. Although we share your aim to maintain the separate characters of our two communities, we also share your aim of having a range of transportation options between our communities to allow our residents to visit each other. We are keen to see the preservation and hopefully enhancement of the current sustainable transport options that connect us including the walkways and cycleway from the north of Sleaford along the A15 and the public footpaths across farmed land toward Leasingham, as well as the continuation and hopefully enhancement of the public bus service.</p> <p>Finally, we congratulate you on producing your draft NP and hope to produce ours in 2022.</p>	<p>Thank you for your support, it is very much appreciated. We take this opportunity to wish you well with your plan and hope that you can achieve your target date without too many delays. If we can help in any way please let us know.</p>

Consultee		Comments	Responses
Steve Flanagan Page 3	Background & context page 3	“They must not breach, and they must be compatible with EU obligations” were correct when we were part of the EU but we have now left, so I think this is no longer relevant.	EU obligations have been changed to “retained EU obligations”.
Page 10	Community, Character & Style. 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence	Starts “The results of the questionnaire”. Other than a brief sentence in the Foreword this is the first time the questionnaire has been mentioned, I feel it needs a brief introduction as to what the questionnaire is and who it was sent to as when I read it cold, I wondered what it was referring to.	Questionnaire: Agreed paragraph has been inserted in relevant page.
	1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph	“The Village Hall is booked to capacity”. Absolutely correct before lockdown but it has been forcibly closed due to covid 19 restrictions – should the sentence be caveated re covid 19 restrictions.	The plan has been updated to present day. The Village Hall is now fully operational.
	4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph	“St Andrews Church, being open every day of the year” should it be caveated as above.	Covid restrictions have been mentioned, the main problem has been that we have not been able to proceed with the NP as quickly as we would have liked.
Page 16	Leasingham Property Values Table Bar Chart	Figures from Zoopla are from 2019 and are a bit outdated. Checked Zoopla today and the figures for Leasingham June 2021 are now: Detached: £263,801 Semi-detached £162,906 Terrace 146,268 Suggest use updated figures and revise the bar chart accordingly.	The NP has been updated.
Page 22	Location of Development 1 <sup>st</sup> Sentence	Ending doesn’t make sense to me ie “& the community is diverse” Suggest replacing “is” with “remains” or “becomes more diverse”.	Amended accordingly.

Page 22	Final paragraph	“The old chapel area in chapel Lane, are being developed. “This is now finished, and I believe is occupied as a house so remove the comment.	As previously indicated the NP has been updated.
Page 35	Map	<p>The narrative on page 34 suggests reasons why an area should be classed as a Local green Space, and Policy 7 states the NDP designates 9 sites. I strongly feel that the front field of Leasingham Hall should be included as a 10<sup>th</sup> site for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 It is included in the Land Use Categories map on page 23 as an excluded site from potential development sites and is classed as a Visual Amenity Area on this map.</li> <li>2 In the Central Lincs local Plan it is highlighted as an “important Open Space” and as such development should be discouraged.</li> </ol> <p>If it is so important to be included in the Local Plan, then surely it should be protected and included in the NDP.</p>	<p>We have designated 9 LGS within the village that the public has access to.</p> <p>The area at Leasingham Hall is on private land so for the purpose of the NP will remain an Important Open Space, previously referred to as a Visual Amenity Area and is listed as an excluded site on the map.</p>
Page 36	Public Rights of Way. Addition	Rookery Lane is a public bridleway (signs at both ends) and I’d guess not the only one in the parish. By definition a Public Bridleway is a PRow but I wondered if some mention should be made on Public Bridleways in Policy 8? Would suggest after PRow you may wish to add (including footpaths and bridleways).	Noted and amended where necessary.
Page 37	Traffic & Transport Final Sentence	Needs updating. States a “Community Speed Watch will start in early 2020. Amended: started early 2020.	Noted and updated.
Page 41	Community Assets Policy 9 No 2	After 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence it then lists 3 reasons as a, b and c but doesn’t state whether they are all needed or just one of them – needs clarity (similar to point 3). May just need the word “and” inserting after the sentence but before the 3 reasons?	Noted and amended. Thank you for your comments.

Kay Brown Resident 1	Thank you for preparing this excellent plan which must have taken many hours to produce to such a high standard.	Many thanks for your kind comments, Kay, these will be passed on to the steering group. We still have a way to go but at long last we can see light at the end of the tunnel.
Resident 2	Thank you to everyone who worked so hard putting our Neighbourhood Plan together.	Thank you.
Resident 3	What if anything is going to happen to the Hall, it is becoming an eyesore rather than an asset to the village.	Leasingham Hall. Is now being developed into 7 apartments. The new owners are responsible for the upkeep of their land.
Resident 4	An easy to read and comprehensive document	Thank you.
Resident 5 Roxholm	Our villages and countryside need protecting from the adverse effects of both humans and nature – more buildings with impermeable surfaces surrounding them will lead to increased flooding affecting both residents and wildlife. The removal of trees also contributes to this as well as depriving wildlife and farm animals of homes and shelter. The land we own is used at various times of the year for sheltered grazing and hay making and it is our own intention that this will continue.	Thank you for your support and comments.



## Leasingham Hall Comments and Responses - Neil Jones Planning

Location	Comments	Responses
Page 2 Paragraph 1-3	It is rightly identified at page 7 of the NP that the CLLP Policy 4 identifies an anticipated level of growth in the Parish of 15% which equates to 108 dwellings up to 2036. The draft NP at page 22 identifies that a further 11 homes have been approved and 5 built. Leaving a residual growth target of 92 homes over the plan period.	The number of new homes to fulfil the anticipated level of growth is calculated from 2012. In October 2021 this stood at 35 homes either built or with planning permission. This therefore leaves a residual target of 73 homes not 92 as stated in your representations.
P2 Paragraph 4-6	<p>In this respect it is noted that planning permission (ref 20/0577/FUL) has recently been granted to the west of the land adjacent to Leasingham Hall for development of 9 new homes.</p> <p>The development of the approved housing pursuant to planning permission 20/0577/FUL will have the effect of extending the built up area of the village to the west, toward the A15 Lincoln Road.</p> <p>Consequently, the land adjacent to Leasingham Hall (as shown in red outline on the attached Location Plan) will be an infill site within the boundary of the built-up area of the village, and will therefore represent, in sequential terms a preferable and sustainable location for new residential development in the village, given that there are no brownfield sites available within the village.</p>	<p>Re planning permission ref 20/0577/FUL – this has not yet been taken up and will expire on 10/12/23.</p> <p>We dispute that the land will be infill and that it comes within the built up area of the village. See page 6 in LRNP</p>
P2 Paragraph 7-9	<p>Land Use Categories Map Page 23</p> <p>The Land Use Categories Map on page 23 identifies “Potential Development Sites” with associated Policy 1: Location of Development, subsection 2 setting out that Local Plan Policy LP5 provides for agricultural land designated as grade 3 (which includes the land adjacent to Leasingham Hall) to be considered for development. The identification of the land adjacent to Leasingham Hall as a potential site is supported.</p>	It is appropriate but not compulsory to allocate sites for development and we have decided not to do so.

<p>P2 Paragraph 7-9 Continued</p>	<p>However, in accordance with the NPPF and NPPG (paragraph:042 ref ID: 41-042-20170728), it is appropriate for the NP to specifically allocate sites for housing development. In the case, it is considered that there is justification for the specific allocation of suitable sites for housing in the NP to meet the Local Plan growth target, as to do so on sustainably located sites within the settlement boundary, or immediately adjacent to it, will help to “<i>encourage the retention of a tight village nucleus, avoiding further ribbon development</i>” which is specifically identified as a core part of the Vision of the Parish in the draft NP, as set out on page 20.</p>	<p>See previous responses.</p>
<p>P3 Paragraph 2</p>	<p>In terms of capacity, a scheme of lower density family housing is considered appropriate for the site, reflecting the existing densities of the village whilst also having regard to the heritage sensitivities outlined above. However, the site also represents one of the very few remaining infill sites within the village and provides an opportunity to accommodate a variety of housing types, which can meet the needs of young families seeking to remain in the village rather than being forced to move away due to lack of suitable supply or unaffordable prices. Therefore, at this stage it is considered the site can sensitively accommodate in the region of 25-30 new homes, which would equate to an overall density around 20-25 dwellings per hectare. The appropriate scale, massing, and density for new development on the site will rightly be assessed in detail as part of a detailed design process that will inform future planning application.</p>	<p>Leasingham is a Medium Village (CLLP Policy LP2 2017) and as such development proposals of up to and including 9 properties only will be considered.</p>
<p>P3 Paragraph 5-7</p>	<p>Section 1 of policy 1 states that Development proposals within the developed footprint of the parish will be supported. This statement is supported in principle. However, there does not appear to be any accompanying plan or map in the NP which identifies the extent of the developed footprint and therefore this policy is ambiguous and unclear.</p> <p>As set out above, the land adjacent to Leasingham Hall is contained within the footprint of the parish, as a result of the granting of planning permission 20/0577/FUL and therefore comprises “infill” land in the village. Consequently, the site is considered to be in the “developed footprint of the parish” for the purposes of policy 1. This should be made clear in the redrafted version of the policy.</p>	<p>A map of the “developed footprint” has been inserted on page 6 of the NP and the proposed new development does not come within the footprint.</p> <p>A definition of “developed footprint” can be found in the CLLP 2017 on page 11 (policy LP 2.8).</p>

<p>P4 Paragraphs 1 and 2</p>	<p>Page 26 refers to the need for more housing for young families and the lack of affordable housing, as well as demand for units suitable for first time buyers and young families, with a preference stated for smaller house types, with no real enthusiasm for units larger than 3 bedrooms. As set out above the land adjacent to Leasingham Hall has the potential to provide for a range of housing types, including family homes. In this regard it comprises a suitable infill site that can meet the specific needs of the existing and future residents of the village, as identified in the research for the NP.</p> <p>Policy 3, part 1a sets out that proposals must deliver high quality design and must be “appropriate for the site”. This ambition is supported in principle and reflects the Governments ambition for “beautiful buildings”. However, reference to “appropriate for the site” is considered to ambiguous and open to interpretation to be considered a sound wording. The policy should therefore be redrafted to be more clearly worded, defining what makes development appropriate for the site context. This will enable the policy to be appropriately used when assessing the quality of future applications for development in the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>	<p>There is no “demonstrable evidence of clear local community support” for a site of this size – evidence can be found in the Table of Results from the Questionnaires.</p> <p>“Appropriate for the site” is defined in Policy 3.1.</p>
--------------------------------------	---	--

Locality Site Assessment	Indicator of suitability	Assessment by Neil Jones planning	LRNP Response
Page 2	Existing land use.	Greenfield infill site.	The site is not considered to be a greenfield infill site.
Page 4 Paragraphs 1 and 2	Flood Zone? Site is at risk of surface water flooding.	Flood Zone 1 – less than 15% of the site is affected by medium or high risk of surface water flooding – Low risk.	In view of the increased flooding in general perhaps your comments should include a forward projection on the risk of future flooding.
Page 4 Paragraph 4	Does the site contain habitats with potential to support priority species? Does the site contain local wildlife rich habitats?	No.	There are a number of protected/priority species within the area which could be affected by building or flooding. Ref GLNP.
Page 5 Paragraph 1	Is there existing vehicle access, or potential to create one on site	Yes, from Captains Hill and/or Sleaford Road.	Access would be difficult from either location.
Accessibility Page 6	What is the distance to the following facilities?  Town/local shop/centre Bus stop Train station Primary School Secondary school Open space/ recreation facilities Cycle route	  <400m <400m >1200m <400m <1600-3900 <400m <400m	Public transport is poor and infrequent – rush hour, no evening/weekend service. School buses term time only, not for general public use.  Nearest station 3862.43 metres from Leasingham Hall (Google maps).  Village school over subscribed.  Distances quoted do not necessarily apply to all residents.
Indicator of suitability Page 10	Is the site: Greenfield A mix of greenfield – previously developed land?	Greenfield (infill) land No.	It is not infill. Yes, depending on the design and character of the development.
Indicators of Viability Page 12	Is the site subject to any abnormal costs that could affect viability, such as demolition, land remediation or relocating utilities?	No.	Probably.