

Branston and Mere Neighbourhood Plan



**BRANSTON
& MERE**
Parish Council
2020 - 2037



Consultation Statement

1 Introduction

What is the Branston & Mere Neighbourhood Plan?

- 1.1 The Branston & Mere Neighbourhood Plan (NP) has been prepared in accordance with the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Localism Act 2011, the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 and Directive 2001/42/EC on Strategic Environmental Assessment. The Plan establishes a vision of the future of the Parish and sets out how that vision will be realised through planning and controlling land use and development change.
- 1.2 This NP is a new type of planning document prepared by Branston & Mere Parish Council on behalf of its residents. It is a legal planning policy document and once it has been 'made' by North Kesteven District Council (NKDC) it must be used by:
 - a) planners at North Kesteven District Council in assessing planning applications; and
 - b) by applicants as they prepare planning application for submission North Kesteven District Council.
- 1.3 Planning applications must be decided in accordance with North Kesteven District Councils adopted planning policies (including this NP).
- 1.4 To carry this much influence in planning decisions this NP will be examined by an independent examiner who will check that it has been prepared in accordance with planning law, be in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework, Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and be approved by a simple majority of votes (i.e. over 50% of those voting) in a local referendum.
- 1.5 The NP has been prepared by the Branston & Meres' Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. It encompasses the whole area covered by the Parish and is intended to cover the period 2020-2037.

What is the Consultation Statement?

- 1.6 This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations sets out that a Consultation Statement should contain:
 - Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood plan;

- Explain how they were consulted;
- Summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- Describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

1.7 Provided in this statement therefore is an overview and description of the consultation period on the Branston & Mere Draft Neighbourhood Plan that ran from the 2nd December 2019 to the 27th January 2020.

2 Methodology

2.1 This section of the Consultation Statement outlines the approach taken by the Parish Council and the NP steering group to consult on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. Several methods were adopted to ensure that all relevant bodies and parties were informed of the consultation period, as well as ensuring that local residents were made aware of the consultation period and provided with opportunities to provide their views and comments.

Website

2.2 Preceding the commencement of the consultation period on the 2nd December 2019, the Neighbourhood Plan website was updated explaining the Draft Plan and the consultation period. A downloadable version of the Plan itself was also uploaded to the website, along with important contact details and various methods on how to comment on the Draft Plan to encourage as many responses as possible.

2.3 The Neighbourhood Plan website is accessible on the link below:

www.branstonpc.co.uk/neighbourhood-plan/

Contacting Interested Bodies & Individuals

2.4 On the 26th November 2019 an email was sent to statutory consultees informing them of the commencement of the consultation period. These contacts involved numerous bodies and individuals that the Parish Council believe will be affected by the Neighbourhood Plan for Branston & Mere, such as neighbouring parish councils, neighbouring district councils, key bodies such as English Heritage, Natural England and the Environment Agency, and also local business owners and land owners as well as those people who have expressed an interest in being informed on the progression of the Plan. A list of those contacted can be seen in **Appendix A** of this document, minus interested individuals and landowners/businesses whose details need to remain confidential due to data protection.

2.5 This email notified recipients of the Neighbourhood Plan's availability on the NP website and highlighted several methods available to submit comments on the Draft Plan. The contents of the email sent can be seen below in **Appendix B** of this document.

Documents

2.6 In addition to the digital copies of documents found on the Neighbourhood Plan website and North Kestevens' Council website, hard copies of the Draft Plan and key supporting documents were also placed at the community Library facility and were available to view throughout the consultation period. A leaflet drop to every household in the Parish was organised expressing the need for resident participation to view and comment on the document.

Consultation Event

2.7 An event was organised for the 11th January running from 10.30am to 12.30pm at the Community Library. This was run as a drop in event enabled local residents to come and see the Draft Plan and supporting documents and speak to members of the Steering Group who were in attendance. Residents were invited to make comments on the Draft Plan and its contents and these were recorded by Steering Group members. A number of Steering Group members helped run the event engaging with members of the public. They listened to their comments and views on the Plan's proposals. All comments received during the event were recorded and approximately 45 residents attended.

Advertising

2.8 The drop in Consultation event in the Libraries, along with the consultation period, were advertised in the local village magazines, on the Parishes' Facebook pages and website, together with a banner in a prominent place in the village, as well as the leaflet drop to every premises in the Parish.

3 Responses

3.1 This section of the Consultation Statement contains the responses and comments received on the Draft Branston & Mere Neighbourhood Plan throughout the Consultation period running from the 2nd December 2019 to the 27th January 2020, from both local residents and those interested bodies/parties who were contacted.

Drop In Session at Branston Community Library Consultation Event

- 3.2 Comments from local residents attending this event were recorded by the Steering Group member present and are summarised below. The majority of these comments were made by more than one local resident however for greater clarity these comments are only listed once in the list below.

Comment Number	Comment	Changes Made to the Plan
1	Map 14 Land off Station Road should read Sleaford Road	Amendments have been made to map.
2	One major benefit of new housing is we no longer have to go outside for a phone signal and the Wi Fi has improved greatly.	Thank you for your comment.
3	Policies 2 & 3: Policy 2 refers to 9 houses whilst Policy 3 refers to 11.	Thank you for your comments. The policies relate to different types and scale of development. Policy 2 is for windfall development and policy 3 relates to large scale development over 11 houses on housing type and mix. Therefore, the policy has not changed.
4	Concerns with regard to the traffic volume along the main road through Branston.	Thank you for your comment. The plan

Comment Number	Comment	Changes Made to the Plan
		highlights that this has been raised as a concern through public consultation in paragraph 7.7. A specific policy has not been created for public transport as these issues are dealt with by Lincolnshire County Council.
5	Support an extension of the Jungle conservation area up to Sycamore Close, Branston.	Thank you for your comment. This is included within the Neighbourhood plan as LGS 3.

Interested Bodies/Parties Responses

3.3 Responses were received from 5 Interested Bodies that were emailed regarding the consultation period on the Draft Plan; summaries of their comments can be found below.

Local Resident

Comment Number	Comment	
6	<p>Section 8 Additional Residential Development This section highlights that the majority of those responding to consultation on the plan displayed little support for any further development than that already granted permission on the 3 large sites. However, there is support for additional growth on smaller sites within Branston. Paragraph 8.4 suggests that sites, which may be available for development, could accommodate no more than 9 – 10 properties, with the majority only being able to accommodate a smaller number of properties. The plan sets out the criteria for housing developments to meet, across 2 policies (Policies 2 and 3), and also splits between proposal of 9 dwellings or less, and 11 dwellings or more.</p> <p>I would suggest that it would be more useful to bring Policies 2 and 3 together to set out clear and precise criteria for all housing proposals (and also ensure that those for 10 dwellings are captured in some way!). As the majority of housing that it is predicted will come forward is for sites of 9 houses or less, they will not be caught by Policy 3, which is a missed opportunity for them to contribute to the housing type and mix that the community actually needs.</p> <p>Policy 2 Additional Residential Development in Branston and Mere</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The comments you have made are similar to those made by other respondents to the consultation. Please note changes have been made to the policy and policy 2 and 3 are now policy 1 and 2.</p> <p>Policy 2 has changed with regards to your comments and the threshold is now 10 and this is to guide housing mix, size and it also deals with affordable housing. Policy 1 has been developed to deal with small-scale housing of 9 or less but unless allocated within the neighbourhood plan it is difficult to specify the housing mix on a site therefore the plan has not been able to address this.</p> <p>Inline with your comments policy 1 has now been revised.</p>

<p>Proposal for residential development, including conversion of existing buildings over and above the allocated sites on Map 3, will be supported if the following criteria are met.</p> <p>Proposals for 9 dwellings or less in Branston, and 4 dwellings or less in Branston Booths, will be supported if they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Are situated within the existing settlement boundaries (development footprint); b) do not harm or alter the built character and appearance of the settlements as identified in the Branston Village Appraisal; c) do not harm or alter the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside or rural setting of the settlements; d) provide parking within the curtilage of each dwelling as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 spaces for dwellings with up to 3 bedrooms • 3 spaces for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms (A garage can count as one space if it is 2.6m x 5.6m internal width) e) do not create or exacerbate existing environmental or highway safety problems; f) do not cause any unacceptable negative impact[1] to the private amenity of any nearby residential properties; g) demonstrate how the proposal is helping to meet the need for 1, 2 and 3 bedroom properties, to cater for the needs of first-time buyers, young families and accommodation for older people. <p>Proposal for 10 dwellings or more in Branston may be supported if they, in addition to meeting criteria a-g above, also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> h) provide 35% of affordable housing to meet the needs of the parish on site, which must be fully integrated and aesthetically indistinguishable from the market housing; 	<p>Policy 1 (former policy 2) now states</p> <p><i>"Proposals for residential development, including the conversion of existing buildings, will only be supported if the development proposal:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) is proposing no more than 9 dwellings (unless otherwise demonstrated in part 2 and part 3 of this policy) per site in Branston or no more than 4 dwellings per site in Branston Booths;</i> <i>b) will be situated within the existing developed footprint of Branston or Branston Booths (for Branston, this is illustrated on Map 3) unless otherwise justified through part 2 of this policy;</i> <i>c) provides adequate off-street parking provision in relation to the number of bedrooms proposed, per dwelling, as part of the proposal;</i> <i>d) does not create significant or exacerbate existing</i>
--	---

<p>i) provide a community benefit; j) can demonstrate that the proposal has gained the support of the community* etc etc</p> <p>The criteria in 1 a)-f) reads more like a check list of what a design and access statement should cover, rather than a strongly worded policy to guide developers on what will and will not be approved. For example, criteria “d) provides adequate off-street parking provisions” - to be effective this needs to prescribed how many off street parking spaces are required, otherwise it is open to interpretation. The same interpretation could be applied to the phrases “significant harm” and “unacceptable negative impact”. As mentioned above, it would also be more effective to incorporate the ‘Housing Type and Mix’ criteria into this Policy so that it is all in one place and applies to all applications.</p> <p>As the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan only includes high level strategic policies on these types of issues, the Neighbourhood Plan should be delivering the detailed criteria policies. In respect of the parking, for example, it could be specifying: Parking within the curtilage will be provided as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 spaces for dwellings with up to 3 bedrooms • 3 spaces for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms <p>A garage can count as one space if it is 2.6m x 5.6m internal width.</p> <p>I believe even more parking needs to be provided than the example outlined above as inevitably residents will not use garages for the purpose for which they were built (most are eventually converted into additional living accommodation under permitted development rights), and they will also acquire more vehicles than they have parking space for! Until the village has a more frequent bus service that goes directly down to the city centre (as opposed to the scenic route around Heighington</p>	<p><i>environmental or highway safety problems; and</i></p> <p><i>e) does not cause any unacceptable negative impact to the private amenity of any nearby residential properties.</i></p> <p>An in depth review of the parking issues has not been undertaken as this would have required a significant amount of work to support the neighbourhood at this late stage.</p> <p>Please note some of the community services and facilities recorded in the plan show these facilities at a snap shot in time, when the survey work was undertaken. Unfortunately this means the community services and facilities may not reflect what is actually on the ground at the time of the plan being published. The plan aims to protect the areas/buildings that these uses are operating from.</p> <p>In line with your comments and recent planning approval for</p>
--	---

<p>and Washingborough) the preferred mode of transport for most village residents is likely to remain the private car.</p> <p>Section 9 Providing an Appropriate Housing Type and Mix Policy 3: Housing Type and Mix</p> <p>As mentioned above, I believe this policy should be applicable to all applications made for housing in order to meet the needs of the community.</p> <p>If it is not incorporated into one policy for all housing applications, I would suggest that the first sentence should be replaced with “All applications for housing should demonstrate how the proposal satisfies the identified need for 1, 2 and 3 bedroom properties”.</p> <p>It may also be prudent to amend criteria c) to specifically say what the minimum requirements are and that a higher level is encouraged, for example “providing the minimum level of affordable housing (where 11 dwellings or more are proposed the percentage sought is a minimum of 20%) required and a high percentage where possible to meet the needs of people in the Parish.”</p> <p>I note that the affordable housing contribution specified in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan is stated to be 20%. However, it does appear feasible that this Neighbourhood Plan Policy could require a minimum of 35% given that a contribution of 35% was secured from site CL417, and a subsequent challenge to the viability of that scheme was rejected by North Kesteven District Council (see application ref: 15/1189/S106BA). 35% was also secured from site CL4666 (see application ref: 14/0833/OUT). This will make a greater contribution to sustaining a fair and balanced housing market, which the plan seeks to achieve.</p> <p>I include below a draft of the amalgamated policy I am suggesting, which I hope will be useful to you:</p>	<p>residential development policy 11 has now been removed from the plan.</p>
---	--

	<p>Policy 5 Development and Design Principles As mentioned above, the issue of parking within new development proposals must, in my opinion, be address in prescriptive detail if developments are to comply. To require “an adequate level” is open to interpretation and will likely result in schemes with minimal off-road parking being put forward and an increase in the unacceptable levels of on-street and dangerous parking that we currently experience in the village.</p> <p>12 Neighbourhood Centres and Other Community Facilities Paragraph 12.6 refers to the retail area off Beech Road including Brookfields newsagent and a Post Office. It is many months since this has been replaced with an Indian takeaway and the Plan should be amended to more accurately reflect the current retail offering in this location. This is particularly relevant as the village has lost an essential service in the Post Office and should be striving to encourage its return.</p> <p>Policy 11 Development of a New Community Facility I note from paragraph 15.8 that the plan states that Taylor Wimpey reserved “land at Silver Street” to the Parish Council within site CL418 “for the sole purpose of creating additional community facilities for the benefit of the community” and the location of this is shown on Map 14. I am therefore surprised to see that a recent planning application has been submitted to North Kesteven District Council (ref: 19/1633/FUL) for the erection of 9 dwellings on this land as shown on Map 14. The supporting statement to this application claims that this land was originally anticipated to be a doctor’s surgery and was subject to condition 4 of the outline permission requiring the site to be marketed for a period of 2 years for D1 use classes. Having done this, Taylor Wimpey appears to be of the opinion that it has</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>discharged its obligation in this respect and is now proposing further housing on this land.</p> <p>As disappointing as this is, I think that the Neighbourhood Plan appears to be misleading residents in respect of this land and should therefore be updated. The text as written does not appear to accurately reflect what the land was intended for under the Taylor Wimpey permission, and is not likely to come forward for the benefit of the community.</p> <p>As you mention in Paragraph 5.16, the development of the Neighbourhood Plan has been very lengthy and, as such, much of its content really needs updating to reflect the current position. I hope that it is not too late for you to undertake such an update as I think it would be a missed opportunity for our neighbourhood to try and progress this plan to adoption as currently drafted.</p>	
--	---	--

Nigel Price Resident

<p>Comment Number</p>	<p>Comment</p>	
<p>7</p>	<p>To consider the use of term “Older” rather than “Elderly”.</p>	<p>Plan updated with the term older</p>

Cyden Homes

Comment Number	Comment	
8	<p>Cyden Homes are a stakeholder in the area and have a keen interest on the future prosperity of the community in Branston. We are pleased to see that the Parish Council recognises the benefit that can be gained through the development of quality new homes for the community and local businesses, and note that in chapter 4.11 you encourage and welcome early dialogue with landowners and developers looking to build within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>We note that in chapter 8.1 that there is some support for additional residential growth within the Neighbourhood Plan area and that in draft Policy 2.2 you consider that additional development land could come forward where it abuts the development footprint of Branston and is around 1 ha or 25 dwellings. Such sites to offer a community benefit and can demonstrate that the proposal has gained the support of the community.</p> <p>At present we understand that you are not proposing any further housing allocations other than those already shown within the Central Lincolnshire Adopted Local Plan, however we are aware that the other two housing allocations identified in the Neighbourhood Plan are now substantially developed and occupied. Our land at CL4666 is due to be developed next year in accordance with the approved plans however you will be aware that it follows an unusual shape, one that has not been defined by any existing boundary or feature but just following the previous Outline Planning Permission boundary that was subsequently used to confirm the sites allocation in the Local Plan. We believe that there is an opportunity to further</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and the map provided. At this late stage the Neighbourhood plan will not consider allocating an additional site for development as the community through consultation do not wish to see any further substantial housing growth. Therefore the plan as it currently stand will not be amended to include this site.</p>

	strengthen the northern boundary of Branston in this area by creating a landscaped vista along a more defined edge and attach a plan showing where that could be accommodated by adding a further area of development encompassing just over 1 Ha of land to accommodate 30 dwellings of various sizes from 2 to 4 Bedroom Homes.	
--	---	--

Natural England

Comment Number	Comment
9	Natural England has reviewed the draft Branston & mere Neighbourhood Plan. We have no specific comment to make but welcome the commitment to sustainable development and green infrastructure in the plan.

North Kesteven District Council Regulation 14 Comments

Comment Number	NP Section	Comment	
10		<p>Para 8.3 The speech marks appear to be in the incorrect place. The quoted text from the Local Plan is that which is italicised. It would appear that the first line in paragraph 8.3 should be deleted and the speech marks should be moved to the start and end of the italicised text.</p> <p>Policy 1 It is pleasing to see previous comments have been taken on board and it is considered that this policy meets the basic conditions.</p> <p>It should be noted that site CL4666 had full planning permission and that conditions are in the process of being discharged. This policy is</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>Para 8.3 amended</p> <p>The NP group have decided to remove policy 1 within the draft neighbourhood plan as suggested.</p>

	<p>therefore likely to be of very limited value. You may wish to reconsider the inclusion of this policy at the time of finalising the plan for submission to take account of whether or not building work has started on site.</p> <p>Policy 2 Policy LP2 of the Local Plan sets out what is termed as ‘appropriate locations’ and the ‘developed footprint’ and these are included in this policy, but without any explanation of their meaning. This could introduce some problems with application of the policy. It is recommended that these definitions are lifted from the Local Plan and inserted either into a glossary (which this policy could then reference) or added as footnotes to the first instance of the term’s appearance in this policy. This will help to avoid ambiguity.</p> <p>One additional point of note is the proposal to only allow other sites of no more than 9 dwellings in Branston. Whilst it is noted that an assessment of possible sites within the village has been undertaken that has indicated that there is no opportunities for larger sites within the developed footprint, it should be noted that this policy would have potential to prevent acceptable schemes and reduce opportunities for affordable housing delivery if a site in the village were to come forward. However, this is just a note and NKDC will not object to the policy on these grounds.</p> <p>The first part of this policy (under the heading Allocated Housing Development) is a little problematic. Firstly, only the first paragraph of this part of the policy relates to allocated housing sites, despite the subtitle within the policy. Secondly, the wording around windfall is not policy wording and it is considered that the same aims of the policy as</p>	<p>Agreed. The suggested text added to part 1 of Policy 2.</p> <p>Thank you for your comment and the neighbourhood plan wish to keep the policy as it is as this reflects the public’s comments and wishes.</p> <p>The policy has been amended inline with the comments received in the last four paragraphs of the comments. Please refer to policy 1</p>
--	---	--

	<p>drafted can be achieved if it is amended to read: “Development proposals for any additional dwellings outside the identified allocations will be subject to the below criterion:”. Arguably, this wording would be better suited under the second sub-heading within the policy “Other residential development opportunities”, before the numbered list.</p> <p>The first part of the text under part 1 is redundant as it duplicates the wording above. This can be resolved by deleting the wording “over and above the allocated sites on Map 3”.</p> <p>It is considered that the wording of part 1 could be made clearer as follows:</p> <p>“1. Proposals for residential development, including the conversion of existing buildings, will only be supported if the development proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) is proposing no more than 9 dwellings (unless otherwise demonstrated in part 2 and part 3 of this policy) per site in Branston or no more than 4 dwellings per site in Branston Booths; b) will be situated within the existing developed footprint of Branston or Branston Booths (for Branston, this is illustrated on Map 3) unless otherwise justified through part 2 of this policy; c) retains the core shape of the settlement;...” <p>Part 1a) of the current policy (and bullet point c in the above comments) is considered to be redundant as the policy is required to be within the developed footprint and therefore the shape would be unaffected. This could be moved to be an additional consideration under part 2 of the policy.</p>	<p>as the numbering of the policies have been amended.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>In Part 2, how would a community benefit be demonstrated? This is a very subjective thing and could mean very different things to different people. It adds an additional layer to Local Plan policy and it is considered to add a degree of ambiguity that would render it difficult to deliver for applicants and to consider concisely for decision makers. This either needs to be clearer about what would be considered a community benefit or to be removed.</p> <p>As a result of changes made to earlier parts of this policy since the previous draft was reviewed by NKDC, part 3 would benefit from a further minor rewording at the start to make it more streamlined and clearer as follows: “Proposals for residential development on non-allocated sites outside of the developed footprint of Branston and Branston Booths must be accompanied by a consultation statement to demonstrate...”</p> <p>Also in part 3 is it reasonable for someone who is submitting an application for a small scheme or a single dwelling outside of the developed footprint to consult the entire community within the parish? This should include some clarity for what would be required for differing scales or reference to a “thorough, but proportionate” exercise as it says in the Local Plan to allow the decision maker to decide if it has been proportionate for the scale of the scheme.</p> <p>The requirements of part 3, in relation to having the scope agreed by the parish first causes some difficulties – is it proportionate to require this from very small schemes? Perhaps it would be preferable to set</p>	<p>The community benefit criteria has been added to the policy.</p> <p>Agreed. Part 1c removed from Policy text as suggested.</p> <p>Agreed. The reference to “community benefit” has been removed from the policy text.</p> <p>Agreed. Text amended in part 3 of Policy 2 (now policy1).</p>
--	--	---

		<p>out what is expected from schemes of 0-9 dwellings and for schemes of 10 and above (for example) in the appendix to take out this potentially arduous stage of process.</p> <p>In part 4, it is worth noting that NKDC could not refuse to validate a planning application that was not accompanied by a consultation statement. It would be preferable if the wording were changed to “should” from “must”.</p> <p>Policy 3 It is unclear why this relates to 11 or more, should it not be 10 or more to align to what is ‘major’ development and therefore requires a design and access statement to be submitted.</p> <p>Furthermore, the wording of the first part of the policy would benefit from improvement to help it deliver the aims of the policy. As currently worded all the policy seeks is some written explanation of the housing mix of the scheme rather than seeking for the need for smaller dwellings to be met through a scheme. As such it is recommended that part 1 is amended as follows:</p> <p>“1. Development proposals should deliver a mix of housing sizes, including smaller homes of 3 or fewer bedrooms. Any proposals for 10 or more dwellings which do not include provision of homes of 3 or fewer bedrooms should demonstrate why smaller dwellings would not be suitable for the site and how the proposal is contributing to a diverse mix of housing types and tenures to help meet local needs. Applications which fail to demonstrate to a satisfactory level why</p>	<p>Agreed. It is important that any consultation is proportionate to the development proposed. Policy text has been amended to reflect this change. The word must has also been removed.</p> <p>Agreed. Change made to the Policy text and it is now 10 dwellings.</p> <p>Agreed. Changes made to the Policy text as suggested.</p> <p>Agreed. Change made to the Policy text as suggested.</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>smaller dwellings cannot be incorporated into the scheme will not be permitted.”</p> <p>Policy 4 It should be noted that this policy is inconsistent with Policy LP5 of the Local Plan. Whilst Policy LP5 is a strategic policy, it is considered that the provisions within this policy do not undermine the strategic elements of policy LP5.</p> <p>It is suggested that parts 3 and 4 of the policy might be better suited to being extracted from Policy 4 to create a separate policy as it is relating to tourist and other recreational and rural activities rather than traditional employment.</p> <p>Policy 5 This policy is considered to meet the basic conditions. Map 8 Given the importance of the facilities shown on Map 8 it will be essential to make sure that the facilities are all clear to read and see on the map on both electronic and paper copies of the plan. It may be beneficial to accompany the submission of the plan with a separate document containing high resolution versions of all of the maps, possibly at a larger paper size (A3) so that these can clearly be seen.</p> <p>Policy 6 There remain concerns about parts 1a and 1b of this policy in how they could reasonably be delivered.</p> <p>In 1a, given that most facilities are small scale, delivery of replacement facilities in advance of development may not be possible if this policy were to be triggered, and this might be to the detriment of the community – it is recommended that this is reviewed to remove the prior commencement availability requirement.</p>	<p>The comments have been taken on board but this policy remains one policy with a clearer distinction between the differing employment types and uses.</p> <p>Agreed. A separate document that includes all the maps will be included in the submission version of the plan.</p> <p>Agreed. The word “prior” has been removed from the Policy.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>In 1b it is unclear how this would be demonstrated – it is effectively covered by parts 1c and 1d, but it introduces some ambiguity, so it is recommended that this is removed.</p> <p>Policy 7 This policy is considered to meet the basic conditions. Policy 8 This policy is considered to meet the basic conditions. Policy 9 This policy is considered to meet the basic conditions. Para 15.8 This paragraph is somewhat inaccurate as the land has not been reserved to the parish council, but was subject to a condition requiring the site to be marketed for community uses for a set period of time. In order to avoid any misleading, it is recommended that this wording be reviewed and revised. Policy 10 Previous concerns about this policy remain and it is considered that there is some risk attached to it as currently worded if proposals came forward to improve or extend the pavilion. Furthermore the wording requires some improvement as North Kesteven District Council could not refuse to consider an application for any other use.</p> <p>From reading the supporting text, it is reasonably clear what the policy intends to achieve and therefore it is suggested that the following wording would be more appropriate to deliver the ambitions:</p> <p>“Development proposals at Moor Lane Sports field for the redevelopment or enhancement of the existing sports Pavilion building will be supported only where the proposal relates to the continued use of the facility being used for its intended sports, leisure and community</p>	<p>Agreed. Part 1b has been removed.</p> <p>This paragraph in 15.8 is no longer in the document.</p> <p>Agreed. Policy 10 amended with the suggested text.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>purpose. Proposals that also deliver a wider community benefit will be welcomed.”</p> <p>Policy 11 This policy is considered to meet the basic conditions. Ideally a more precise location would be used to show the location. At very least it is recommended that a caption be added to Map 14 to clarify that the star indicates the location for the community facility.</p> <p>Map 14 In the title, presumably it should be Sleaford Road, not Station Road.</p> <p>See also above comments re: adding a caption.</p> <p>Appendix A The link to the Village Appraisal appears not to be working.</p> <p>Appendix B For the Local Green Spaces in Appendix B it is recommended that the assessment is amended to be a closer reflection of the provisions of the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF stipulates in paragraph 100 the criteria that must be satisfied in order to be considered for designation as Local Green Space, specifically:</p> <p>“a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.”</p>	<p>This policy has now been removed from the document due to a recent planning approval.</p> <p>Map 14 has now been removed in-line with the policy removal.</p> <p>Agreed. The size area has been added and the map shows the proximity to the settlement. None of the LGS are considered to be an extensive tract of land and this is demonstrated by including the site area.</p>
--	---	--

		<p>The detail included in Appendix B builds up the picture in relation to bullet point b above, but does not include any consideration of proximity or scale. As such it is recommended that two additional columns are added to the assessment to cover these topics.</p> <p>In relation to proximity, all sites are within or adjacent to their community and so this is very straight forward to justify.</p> <p>In relation to scale this will need to demonstrate that each area is not an extensive tract of land (a term that is not detailed much further by government) so will need to include the area of each site and commentary of why it is not an extensive tract of land. This will obviously be more challenging and important for sites DLGS2 and 3 which are the largest. The types of justification can include the area being enclosed, not open, and its use being clearly defined from neighbouring fields for example.</p>	
--	--	---	--

5 Summary

The recommended amendments in the preceding section of this document will now be made to the Neighbourhood Plan, which will then be subject to a Sustainability Appraisal before finally being submitted to North Kesteven District Council.

7 Appendix A: List of Bodies/Groups contacted

Statutory Consultees

- North Kesteven District Council

Neighbouring Authorities

- Boston BC
- East Lindsey District Council
- Lincoln City Council
- Newark & Sherwood District Council
- South Holland District Council
- South Kesteven District Council
- Lincolnshire County Council
- Nottinghamshire County Council

Neighbouring Parish Councils

- Nocton
- Potterhanworth
- Waddington
- Bracebridge Heath
- Canwick
- Washingborough
- Heighington
- Bardney/Stainfield
- Fiskerton

Other Agencies and Organisations

- The Homes and Communities Agency
- Natural England
- The Environment Agency
- English Heritage/Historic England
- Forestry Commission
- Network Rail Infrastructure
- The Highways Agency

- The Marine Management Organisation
- Mobile operators in the NK district area

Locally based organisations

- Primary Care Trust/CCG
- Western Power Distribution
- National Grid (Gas)
- Anglian Water
- Witham Drainage Board
- Diocese of Lincoln
- All Saints Church Branston
- NFU
- Police
- Branston Infant School
- Little Pickles Nursery
- Branston Academy
- Local District Councillors

8 Appendix B: Email sent to Statutory Consultees on the 26th November 2019

Good afternoon

Since our draft Neighbourhood Plan has recently come back from SEA screening, we are now about to commence our consultation period. As part of the process we have to inform the statutory consultees.

Please see link to the plan <https://www.branstonpc.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/Branston-Draft-Neighbourhood-Plan-2pdf.pdf>

Regards

9 Appendix C: Advertisements

Leaflet



Neighbourhood Plan Consultation

Please visit our website at <https://www.branstonpc.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/Branston-Draft-Neighbourhood-Plan-2pdf.pdf> in order to view the draft document

Or for those who would rather speak with the group...

Drop In Session

Your chance to check the Branston and Mere draft Neighbourhood Plan Document prior to its final submission and an opportunity to talk to members of the steering group.

Saturday January 11th 2020 10.30am to 12.30pm

Branston Academy Library, Station Road, Branston





You may recall that some while ago we informed you that we were going through the process of applying for a neighbourhood plan to protect our Parish from over development. We sent you a questionnaire asking for your opinion and thoughts on how you wish to see the community develop and thank you to those of you who took the time to respond. Based on the results of the questionnaire the community suggested they wanted Branston and Mere to develop sensibly and sustainably with the necessary infrastructure in place to keep growth with the pace for the next 18 years.

A draft Neighbourhood Plan has been produced by members of the steering group and we are now at the stage of the process referred to as the Consultation, where the final draft document has been prepared, screened by professionals and returned to us in order we can consult with you, the residents, to see if you agree with the content, based on your comments, requirements and thoughts obtained via the questionnaire.

It is really important that you view the document and provide us with any comments that you wish to make, so we encourage you to view the document by visiting

<https://www.branstonpc.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/Branston-Draft-Neighbourhood-Plan-2pdf.pdf>

For those of you who are not comfortable using technology to view the document we will be holding a drop in event, to be held on Saturday January 11th between 10.30am and 12.30pm at the Branston Library, located in the grounds of the Academy, where it will be possible for you to provide feedback to members of the steering group.

It is really important that you take an interest in the document as this will have an effect on our community for years to come and is your chance to help shape the future.

Ultimately there will be a formal referendum, similar to an election, organised by NKDC where you will be invited to attend a Polling Station and vote for the implementation of the plan.

Please remember, this is being done for YOU so please take the time to read this document and take interest in your village to ensure it remains the village that you want it to be, ensuring your quality of life.





Magazine Articles

Draft Neighbourhood Plan

The consultation period for the Draft Neighbourhood Plan is in full swing and the document can be viewed online <https://www.branstonpc.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/Branston-Draft-Neighbourhood-Plan-2pdf.pdf> For those of you who are not comfortable using technology to view the document there are copies in Branston Community Library. It is really important that you take an interest in the document as this will have an effect on our community for years to come and is your chance to help shape the future. We will be holding a drop in event on Saturday January 11th, between 10.30am and 12.30pm at the Branston Library, located in the grounds of the Academy, so why not pop in and share a coffee and any thoughts you may have about it with members of the steering group, who will be happy to discuss the next stages of the Plan.

ranston Parish Council News...Branston Parish Council News...Branston Parish Council News...Branston Parish

Branston Parish Council News



Emergency Team
Branston's Emergency Team is not only being held as an example across Lincolnshire - it is now AWARD WINNING!
Branston & Mere has won the Resilient Community of the Year Award, presented by Ian Reed, Head of Emergency Planning & Business Continuity Manager at Lincolnshire County Council at the Resilient Communities conference in October.
This is an amazing achievement for

DALE GARNER

Branston and a credit to Andy Marchant who has spent many hours putting the plan together and amassing over 100 volunteers willing to support the community should the worst ever happen.

If you are interested in becoming a volunteer, please contact Andy Marchant on clr.andy.marchant@gmail.com or on 07734 431215. There are no restrictions on age, resources or skill sets. All that is required is the willingness to help the community in its hour of need.

*** Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Event ***
Our Neighbourhood Plan which has been produced by Branston and Mere Parish Council, together with the Steering Group and members of the community is now ready to go out for consultation. This consultation is your last opportunity to let us know if we have included the right things in the Neighbourhood Plan, before we submit the Plan to North Kesteven District Council where it will be independently examined. If successful, the community will vote in a public referendum (yet to be organised) on whether you would like North Kesteven District Council to use the Neighbourhood Plan when determining future planning applications within Branston & Mere.
Remember, a Neighbourhood Plan can only influence planning related activity, so not everything raised at the public consultation events can be included in the Plan. A consultation event is being held in the Library on 11th January 2020 10.30am until 12.30pm please join us for a cup of coffee and share your thoughts on your village's future.

will be closed and fenced off. Please ask your children to respect the fencing and be patient while work is carried out for their benefit.
The Parish Council is very grateful to Lovell Homes for stepping up to carry out this work - what good neighbours they are!

Astro Court
A new booking clerk for the Astro Court will be needed from April 2020. Someone to hold the mobile phone, take bookings, hand out keys to hirers and take the payment. Could that be you?
Commission is paid and you would be supporting a valuable community facility.
Call Sarah on 853269 for more information.

The school holiday special offer of £5 an hour during the day will be available again during the Christmas break - please don't climb over the fence. It's really not worth breaking your neck for the sake of £5!
Book the Astro Court for families and friends to get together OR why not book it with the Pavilion for a children's party or family get-together.
Contact Eunice on 07531 671768 or at branstonastro@hotmail.co.uk. Please leave a message and your number and Eunice will call you back as soon as possible.

Lock your doors!
Opportunists entered a bungalow on Abel Smith Gardens, through an unlocked door, just after 5pm at the end of October. They asked the occupant for money but left empty-handed when their lifeline device was activated.
Please be safe - keep your doors locked at all times - don't make it easy for thieves.
Think about fitting a key safe by the door to make access for your chosen visitors easy

Facebook Posts on The Branston & Mere Parish Council page and the Branston & Mere Neighbourhood Plan page

Branston and Mere Neighbourhood Plan

6 January at 16:36 ·

Join us at the Drop in session at the Library Saturday 11th January 10.30 till 12.30. Your chance to check the Branston & Mere Draft Neighbourhood Plan Document prior to its final submission and an opportunity to talk to members of the steering group over a cuppa and a biscuit. It is really important that you view the document and provide us with any comments that you wish to make. It's your chance to have a say in the plan which sets out a vision of the future for the village. It is available online and in the Library <https://www.branstonpc.co.uk/.../Branston-Draft-Neighbourhood...>



The drop in session at the Library for the Draft Neighbourhood Plan consultation on Saturday was a great success with a good turnout. Clearly the need for the plan is important to you as it will have an effect on our community and our vision for the future. Your thoughts and comments are appreciated and will be considered when the Steering Group meets next, to move the plan to its next stage in the process. The consultation period finishes on the 27th January so if you were unable to make it on Saturday or have not yet had a chance to look at it and wish to comment, there are several copies available to view in the library or alternatively it's available online <https://www.branstonpc.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/Branston-Draft-Neighbourhood-Plan-2pdf.pdf>

