

Policy 1 – Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (Local Plan) Policy LP2 is definitive in respect of Branston being a Large Village and not a Medium Village, in which case exceptional circumstances relate to developments of not more than 25 dwellings. The Local Plan places no size restriction on development within Large Villages by way of appropriate infilling, intensification or renewal.

Please can you point me to the specific evidence in support of restricting non-exceptional development in the Large Village of Branston to 9 dwellings. (NB, I note that NKDC has commented partly in this regard and you may also wish to comment on this).

When you draw a line around the existing “developed footprint” of the village, it was agreed that there would be very few available areas where you could infill for more than 9 dwellings. However, we also acknowledge that the CLLP does not identify a threshold for the scale of infilling and therefore accept that there is a conflict with Policy LP2.

Policy S4 and S1 in the draft CLLP consultation July 21 seeks to limit development outside the sites allocated by the LP to up to 10 houses in large villages which is very close to the 9 proposed in our draft NP. I would be happy to go with the 10 in the draft CLJLP if that helps to bring our NP into line with the CLLP.

National policy and Local Plan Policy LP55 provide for all kinds of development in the countryside, including the conversion of buildings for housing. Please can you point me to the justification for the apparent conflict with relevant planning policy in this regard (whereby Policy 1 appears to seek to prevent such development).

We do not seek to restrict those developments in the countryside that would apply to National or Local Policies and in those circumstances. We also note that the recent changes to permitted development rights may also apply in some circumstances.

Our concern is the anomaly LP2 that restricts the development of new dwellings in the countryside; however, in conjunction, LP7 sustainable visitor economy and LP55 development in the countryside allows the same development if defined as ‘leisure /visitor economy’ instead of ‘dwelling’. Our NP seeks to address this anomaly and restrict unsuitable development in the countryside.

Please can you point me to the evidence in respect of what “adequate” car parking comprises, what a “significant” highway problem is; and what the “existing” environmental and highway problems referred to comprise.

Adequate parking standards are those identified by the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. Significant highway issues relates to the volume of traffic and parked cars along some streets in Branston. We want to avoid situations where new developments create or exacerbate these issues within the village. The community feel it is important that new development contribute positively towards the village and do not lead to additional traffic or parking problems within the area.

I note S48 along with appendix 2 of the draft LP ‘parking provision’ seeks to define adequate car parking and to require ‘on plot’ parking provision except in exceptional circumstances

Part 3 of the Policy appears vague (“where appropriate...meet household recreation needs...in scale...be appropriate”) and the privacy requirement appears to raise scope for conflict. This appears to raise issues in respect of deliverability, e.g. how/whether the

Policy is viable and deliverable. Please can you point me to evidence in support of the Policy.

All this is trying to achieve is a suitable level of garden space for new houses which is linked to the size of the property. I.e. if a new house is considered a family dwelling, then you'd expect some outdoor space to support the needs of those residents.

Rather than a one size fits all policy our NP seeks to define the various identifiable character areas Map 6 of design style within the village and require development that is sympathetic to existing development in that area

Policy 2 – Is it the intention of Policy 2 to apply to all residential development, or just to developments of 10 plus dwellings ?

This applies to developments of 10 or more dwellings.

Para 8.4 of the NP states up to 4 in BB and 9 in Branston. I think policy 2 relates to all development over and above the village housing allocation.

Policy 2 also seeks to define community support but I note the draft LP looks to set a side the community support requirement in return for a reduction in acceptable further development from 25 to 10 houses. Do we need to address this now?

Policy 3 – If Policy 3 relates to *all* new employment development, why does it single out wide-ranging specific uses? It is not a definitive list, just examples of likely local employment developments.

When will (what type of) development be “appropriate” re: use and scale to its setting, who will judge this and on what basis? i.e, criterion a) appears vague, please can you point me to information in support of this criterion.

This relates to both the type of use(s) and its location. i.e. would the location of a proposal be considered a ‘good-neighbour’.

Please can you point me to a definition of “positive contribution” and evidence in support of why this is a requirement, as opposed to, for example, respecting local character.

This is related to the proposal and its impact on the character of the area. We would be happy for the wording to be changed to include “respecting local character”.

Policy includes development in open countryside and positive contribution should refer to landscape as well as local character.

Criterion c) appears to stray into planning condition requirements. Please can you point me to information in respect of what will be “unreasonable” and when, and who will be the judge of this and on what basis ? This will be for the Planners to judge on the detail of a planning application. If a proposal for an animal rendering plant is proposed directly next to a residential area, then would those impacts from that development be considered an acceptable use within that area. The group feel it is important to consider that certain types of employment development could have a greater impact on the community than other types. This policy should direct employment uses to the most suitable and appropriate areas for their proposed use(s).

LP55 part E c and S5 part E c

Is the last part of the Policy intended to refer to rural buildings that are currently in employment or community use? If not, please can you point me to the justification for a policy that appears to conflict with national policy and the Local Plan in respect of the re-use of rural buildings.

Yes, it is intended to refer to rural buildings that are currently in employment or community use.

Careful. This could be used to set aside the community asset register if the only requirement is to market for 12 months prior to applying for change of use. Needs to reference the register of community assets and policy 5?

Policy 4 – Whilst it is not a requirement for the Neighbourhood Plan to include a Conservation Area policy, NKDC has commented in this regard – you may wish to comment on this.

Policy 6 appears to conflict with permitted development rights – is this the intention of the Policy? Please can you point me to evidence in justification of the approach set out.

This policy was created prior to the recent changes to the permitted development rights, so the group are happy for this to be updated or revised accordingly.

Primarily the purpose is to protect and promote the neighbourhood centres as retail/commercial areas to provide for the growing community and to help mitigate unnecessary travel with all the environmental implications that entails. Where permissive development conflicts with that ideal I would want to be able to challenge that permissive development.

Policy S34 of the draft CLLP defines both Station Rd and Beech Rd as Teir 4 local and Village centres. Policy S39 defines permissive E use class in local and village centres.

Do we have a marketing requirement anomaly requiring 12 months in policy 3 and 6 months in policy 6?

Policy 7 – The requirements of the Policy appear vague and raise issues in respect of deliverability/viability and noting the plan referred to, the Policy appears to require the vast majority of Branston to be “enhanced” and “preserved.”

I note that most planning applications tend to be for small-scale development, such as householder applications. Further, there does not appear to be any detailed information demonstrating why every area defined as a private garden comprises green infrastructure. I note that gardens in Branston vary significantly.

Taking the above into account, please could you point me to evidence in justification of the approach set out. We included private gardens, along with public space on the map to demonstrate the level of green space around the village. We are happy for the map to be revised and exclude private gardens.

Please could you point me to information in respect of “where opportunities exist” – ie, what, specifically, are these opportunities? It might make it clearer to remove “Where opportunities exist” and just start with “proposals”

Is it the intention of the Policy not to support footpath improvement development that does not also include “connections to other parts of the village” ? Is it possible to explain the intention of part 2) of the Policy.

The intention of this part of the policy is to support improvements/ connections to existing footpaths where development makes an impact. For example, where two development sites are being built next to one another, there may be an opportunity for a new connection to be create between them. We want to avoid isolated developments that are not connected to existing parts of the village.

Branston suffers from poor connectivity and sustainable transport links within the built area. The intention is to improve existing and create new links. Suggest ‘where they provide better accessibility **and or** connections to other parts of the village’.

Pre-empt draft CLLP policy S52 movement and S47 walking and cycling infrastructure.

Is there any information in respect of why every new connection must be “well-lit,” regardless of location within the Neighbourhood Area ? To make spaces safer, we feel that public space and connections should be lit. There are areas that are not lit within the village and this has led to areas not being used to their full potential. People feel safer where there is lighting.