

THORPE ON THE HILL

Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation Statement

May 2017

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Thorpe on the Hill Parish Council, as qualifying body as defined by the Localism Act 2011, has submitted its Neighbourhood Plan to North Kesteven District Council for independent examination. This Consultation Statement meets the requirements of Regulation 15 to provide a detailed description and record of the pre-submission consultation required by Regulation 14. It also contains an outline of earlier consultations carried out while developing the Thorpe on the Hill Draft Neighbourhood Plan (the Draft Plan).
- 1.2. Section 15(2) of the Regulations states that a Consultation Statement is a document which:
 - (a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
 - (b) explains how they were consulted;
 - (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
 - (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.
 - (e) This Consultation Statement summarises all statutory and non-statutory consultation undertaken within the local community and with other relevant bodies and stakeholders in developing the Proposed Plan. In particular, it describes how some of the concerns that arose during the statutory pre-submission consultation have been addressed and what changes have been made to convert the Draft Plan into the Proposed Plan.
- 1.3. The Parish Council established a formal Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (the Steering Group) made up of Parish Councillors and members of the community, and asked it to lead the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan, on the Council's behalf.
- 1.4. The various consultation activities on the Draft Plan carried out prior to the pre-submission consultation are summarised in Section 2 of this Consultation Statement. The main documents used to publicise the consultation activities, any tools used during these consultation activities and their outcomes are presented in the Appendixes.
- 1.5. The statutory pre-submission consultation on the Draft Plan and its resulting development into the Proposed Plan are described in Sections 3. The main documents to publicise the pre-submission consultation, any tools used during these consultation activities and their outcomes are presented in Appendixes.
- 1.6. The result of the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal scoping exercise are presented in Section 4.
- 1.7. The Proposed Plan differs from the Draft Plan only in respect of changes made as a result of comments received during the pre-submission consultation period; these changes are summarised in Section 5.

2. Activities that contribute to the pre-submission final draft

Activity Log

Date	Activity	Involved Stakeholders	How it has been publicised
29 October 2012	Community Meeting	All residents of the Parish, 140 attended	Website advertisement Leaflets
November 2012 - May 2013	Thorpe On The Hill Parish Council Questionnaire	233 households in the Parish, 99 forms returned	Questionnaire distributed to all 233 household addresses
Winter 2013	Formation of the Neighbourhood Planning Group	All those who expressed interest at the Community Meeting October 2012	Call for interest at 2012 Community Event
7th May 2016	Pre-submission meeting to finalise Vision, Objective and discuss Draft Policies	All resident of the Parish invited, 30 attended	Website advertisement Leaflets Published in the View from the Hill publication
May 2016	Business questionnaire	Over 30 questionnaires sent. 5 responses	Questionnaire sent to businesses email or regular address
19th November 2016	Drop-in event to review the Pre-submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan and make comments	All resident of the Parish. 26 attended	Website advertisement Leaflets Published in the View from the Hill publication

Community Meeting October 2012

2.1.1 Purpose: Initiate the work on the Neighbourhood Plan and understand the community's views on the ground that the Plan should cover.

2.1.2 Consultation Technique: A Community Meeting at Oliver Roper Hall was organised, with all residents invited to participate.

2.1.3 Outcomes: Approximately 140 residents attended. The community encouraged the Parish Council to produce a Neighbourhood Plan, but there was also support for a stronger community voice in many issues of local concern. It was agreed at that meeting that the Parish Council would organise a questionnaire within the village to establish the issues of greatest concern to the community.

Thorpe On The Hill Parish Council Questionnaire, November 2012 - May 2013

2.2.1 Purpose: Gather residents' opinions on the current situation, needs and aspirations regarding nine main themes (Who are we; Why we value our community; Village services; The village environment; Housing and development; Highways and transport; Leisure; Talking to each other; Priorities for the future).

2.2.2 Consultation Technique: A questionnaire composed of over 40 open and closed questions. A final question allowed consultees to mention = elements which had not been covered in the questionnaire and gave them the opportunity to provide additional comments.

2.2.3 Outcomes: 99 questionnaires were returned, meaning a 43% return rate (See Appendix 1 for additional information).

Formation of Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, Winter 2013

2.3.1. Purpose: Create a group to analyse questionnaire results and write them up in a form that would be useful in the subsequent stages of Plan production.

2.3.2 Consultation Technique: All the residents who expressed interest in joining the group at the October 2012 Community Meeting were contacted and invited to join the group. Participation has also been open to all other residents who expressed an interest

2.3.3 Outcomes: A Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group was formed. In March 2014 the Group reviewed responses to the questionnaire and produced a Proposal Document called "Our Village Plan" in October 2014, finally published in December 2014 (see Appendix 1 for additional information).

Pre-Submission Event, May 2016

2.4.1 Purpose: Discuss the proposals contained in the "Our Village Plan" Proposal Document, finalise a Vision and Objectives for the Plan, and discuss draft policies for the Plan.

2.4.2 Consultation Technique: Community Event at Oliver Roper Hall was organised, inviting all residents to participate

2.4.3 Outcomes: Over 30 residents attended the event. Decision to have Thorpe on the Hill designated as a "small village" within the Local Plan, revision of the village curtilage, introduction of Tourism among the main themes to be covered by the Plan (See Appendix 2 for additional information).

Business Questionnaire, 2016

2.5.1 Purpose: Collect information on the businesses currently active in the Parish and their future development expectation

2.5.2 Consultation Technique: A questionnaire of 16 questions was sent to over 30 businesses active in the Parish

2.5.3 Outcomes: 5 businesses completed the questionnaire. Their responses have been used to inform the Policy on Employment in the Plan (See Appendix 3 for additional information).

Drop-in Event, November 2016

2.6.1.Purpose: Present and explain the Pre-submission Consultation Draft Neighbourhood Plan and collect comments from residents.

2.6.2.Consultation Techniques: Members of the Steering Group made themselves available at Oliver Roper Hall to present the Pre-submission Consultation Draft Neighbourhood Plan, answer questions, explain the pre-submission consultation process and collect comments from residents (See Appendix 4 for additional information).

2.6.3 Outcomes: 26 people participated in the Drop-in Event. Their comments were considered in the Pre-submission Consultation review

3. Regulation 14 Pre-submission Consultation

3.1 Consultation with the community and statutory bodies on the final Draft Plan began on 11th November 2016 and ended 24th December 2016.

3.2 The Consultation exercise involved a survey asking consults to state whether they support or do not support each of the six policies presented in the Draft Plan, the Character Assessment and Design Guidance, and the twenty Parish Priorities (the latter has been considered but not included in the comment log below because they are not part of the Neighbourhood Plan, as they cover non-planning issues).

3.3 The survey was prepared and distributed using 'SurveyMonkey', and the link was sent to all statutory and non statutory consultees. The survey was also available in hard copies at the Village Hall during the November community drop-in events (See Appendix 5 for additional information).

3.4 Below is the complete list of consulted bodies:

- The Environment Agency
- The Homes and Communities Agency
- Natural England
- The Coal Authority
- Forestry commission
- Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd
- Anglian Water
- Highways Agency
- Historic England
- Mono Consultants
- National Grid
- Western Power

- Lincolnshire West Clinical Commissioning Group
- Upper Witham Drainage Board
- North Kesteven District Council
- Lincolnshire County Council
- Doddington and Whisby PC
- Eagle and Swinethorpe PC

- Swinderby PC
- South Hykeham
- North Hykeham
- Witham St Hughs PC
- Aubourn and Haddington PC

3.5 An email containing the link to the survey and information on the drop in events was sent to the all residents and businesses via email. The consultation was also publicised on the Parish website, View from the Hill and advertised through leaflets.

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Section 1	NKDC	<p>Paragraph 1.1. For Plan 1, whilst it does say in the text above that the neighbourhood area corresponds with the Parish boundary, it would be helpful to add this to the title for Plan 1 too, i.e. “Plan 1: Map of Thorpe on the Hill Parish boundary and Neighbourhood Area boundary.”</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3 The wording in the second sentence would benefit from a slight amendment to avoid confusion about the status of the Local Plan, as it currently could be read that the Local Plan also becomes part of the development plan when the neighbourhood plan is approved at referendum. It should also be noted that the neighbourhood plan does not become part of the development plan as soon as it is approved at referendum, but it has to be formally ‘made’ by the Council. The wording of this sentence is therefore suggested to be revised to: “Once approved at a referendum, the neighbourhood plan will formally be ‘made’ by the District Council, at which point it will become part of the statutory development plan, alongside the Local Plan. The development plan is used to make decisions on planning applications and as such this neighbourhood plan will be central in guiding these decisions on planning applications in our area.”</p> <p>Paragraph 1.4 · As a minor note, and whilst not necessarily incorrect in its current form, the list of the basic conditions do not exactly reflect the basic conditions that are applied to neighbourhood plans. It would be preferable, for the avoidance of any doubt, to revise the list to reflect the basic conditions as set out in the Localism Act and supplementary regulations: “- Neighbourhood plans must have regard to national policy and advice; - They must contribute to the delivery of sustainable development - They must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan; - They must not breach, and they must be compatible with EU obligations; and - They must not have a significant effect on a European site (as defined in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2012).</p> <p>Paragraph 1.5 · The reference to the neighbourhood plan regulations is incorrect and should be read as “the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)”</p> <p>Paragraph 1.9 · This will need updating or removing following the outcomes of the SEA Screening.</p>	All noted	Amended accordingly.

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Section 2	NKDC	<p>Paragraph 2.4 London Midland and Scottish Railway.” The reference to the Empire seems a little out of place in this context. Presumably this paragraph should end in “...towns or cities” given that Lincoln is a city</p> <p>Paragraph 2.6 This paragraph starts with “Along with this major trend...” but the previous paragraph talks about the church being on a site since the 11th Century. Presumably this is referring to the paragraph 2.4?! This wording should be reviewed as it seems out of place.</p> <p>Paragraphs 2.20 and 2.27 There seems to be some conflict between these two paragraphs in terms of cycle routes and this may benefit from being reviewed.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.25 The use of the word “biodiverse” here would be better if it instead referred to “diverse” – this will mean more to the reader.</p>	All noted	Paragraphs amended accordingly.
Vision & Objectives	NKDC	<p>The vision and objectives are meant to be important part of the plan, but at present they seem to blend into the surrounding text. It is recommended that these are drawn out from the surrounding text, such as by placing them in a box or by making the text a larger font or putting it in bold.</p> <p>The vision, as worded, is not really a vision. It does not flow at present and it does not appear to be very aspirational. A vision should set out how the plan writers want the area to be throughout and at the end of the plan and the core values that will be apparent in the area. The vision should link through the objectives to the policies with the policies aimed at ensuring the vision is achieved, as is suggested in the wording in paragraph 3.3. It is recommended that the vision is revisited.</p>	Noted.	Vision reworded and presentation of objectives amended.
Policy 1	Resident 5	Other areas (Witham st Hughes adn South Hykeham) will be covered by mass housing. Keep TOTH small	Noted	No change required.

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Policy 1	Resident 8	I approve of it all. We need the affordable housing at Hill Close Farm	Noted.	No change required.
Policy 1	Resident 9	I support this policy but wondered if we can achieve 0 further development for the next 20 years	The allocated sites, which have planning permission still need to be developed out so the parish will see development over 20 years as these sites are built out.	No change required.
Policy 1	Resident 10	<p>New Housing being considered for the older generation, giving a possibility of existing occupants being able to stay in the village and downside to smaller accommodation but still remain in the village. There comes a time in life when our houses become too much to manage. Paying out for your garden to be maintained and rattling round a house that is too big. Would free up 3/4 bedroom houses for others and a small development like on Doddington Road, small bungalows, open areas gardened and fantastic community spirit for the residents to help each other.</p> <p>[PARISH CLERK - 2 other comments at the pre-consultation event supported this]</p>	The allocated sites already have planning permission so there is limited scope for the Plan to influence the mix of housing to incorporate smaller sized units.	No change required.
Policy 1	Angian Water Services Ltd	<p>Policy 1: Residential development It is noted that it is proposed to allocate a number of sites which currently have the benefit of planning permission (HOU1, HOU2, HOU4, HOU5 and HOU6). Please note that improvements to the water supply network are expected to be required to accommodate the development of these sites. It is also proposed to allocate site HOU3 for affordable housing only. Currently there is capacity within the foul sewerage network for sites HOU1, HOU2, HOU3, HOU5 and HOU6 assuming that a gravity connection is utilised. However if the foul flows are pumped there may be a need to make improvements to the foul sewerage network. There is expected to be a requirement for improvements to the foul sewerage network to serve site HOU4.</p>	Noted	No change required.

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Policy 1	Lincolnshire County Council	<p>We support the policy Public Health support the reference to the importance of being able to walk ('walkability') not just for exercise but also to keep community connected and for active travel. There could be other green policies included such as a requirement for electric vehicle charging point(s) with all new developments.</p>	Noted.	No change required.
Policy 1	NKDC	<p>Table 0-2 should include a column for either market housing or total housing on the site so that it more accurately reflects what has been approved. It should also be noted that an application for the erection of 5 self-build houses has been submitted on this site. This application should be monitored and it may be necessary to amend your plan to reflect the latest situation on the site when you come to submit.</p> <p>The Tables in the policy are referenced as "Table 0-1" and "Table 0-2", but in part 3 of the policy it only refers to "Table 1 or Table 2" and these should be revised so that the reference numbers are consistently applied.</p> <p>In part 3 of the policy it refers to up to date local survey evidence of a specific housing need. In order to make this element of the policy deliverable it is advised that the supporting text should be accompanied by some explanation and possibly examples of what form this data could take and how it should be interpreted by decision makers. How would an applicant be expected to demonstrate this and how should a decision maker define whether or not it demonstrates a need?</p> <p>Part 4 the policy cross-references other policies – this is not necessary as the policies of the development plan as a whole should be taken into account. However, if you want to make it clear that these criteria apply over and above the other policies in the development plan, it is recommended that amended wording is used – for example, something along the lines of:</p> <p>"In addition to satisfying the requirements of other relevant policies in the development plan, proposals for the conversion or redevelopment of non-residential buildings to provide housing must satisfy the following criteria:..."</p> <p>It is noted that this policy refers to the village curtilage. The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan is removing curtilages, however, a neighbourhood plan can reintroduce this, provided the policies of the neighbourhood plan would deliver adequate housing to meet the strategic need. As such it is recommended that your plan either includes a separate policy to designate the village curtilage, or that the village curtilage is designated through this policy, with either clearly referencing a clear map to indicate the extent of the boundary. This map will also need a key to clarify what the village curtilage is, i.e. is it the beige areas on Map 2?</p>	Noted.	<p>Tables in Policy 1 captioned to read "Table 1" and "Table 2" .</p> <p>Column added to Table 2 to indicated market housing.</p> <p>Additional text added to justification re demonstrating housing need.</p> <p>Part 4 of Policy 1 amended to remove cross-reference to other policies.</p> <p>Village curtilage designated through additional text added to part 3 of Policy 1.</p> <p>Map 2 revised with village curtilage added to the key.</p>

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Policy 2	Resident 5	Internet etc. would have to improve thought. Could cause congestion and parking problems	Noted. Criteria related to parking included in the policy. Broadband connection not an issue that planning policies can address directly.	No change required.
Policy 2	Resident 8	But must avoid over development of businesses	Noted	No change required.
Policy 2	Lincolnshire County Council	Public Health recognises the important impact having employment has on health and wellbeing. Having the flexibility of being able to work from home (communications infrastructure) is positive for both work/life balance and also to start up new employment opportunities	Noted	No change required.
Policy 2	NKDC	Bullet point a) of both parts of this policy cross-references policies of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, and as stated in the response to policy 1, this is not necessary. If it is considered to be important to clarify that the requirements in this policy are over and above others in the development plan it is recommended that the policy is reworded to something like: "In addition to satisfying the requirements of other relevant policies in the development plan, proposals for ...will be supported provided that: The proposal will not ..."	Noted.	Cross reference to other policies removed from both parts of Policy 2.
Policy 3	Resident 1	Maintains the village curtilage and protects open spaces and views	Noted	No change required.
Policy 3	Lincolnshire County Council	It is worth noting the health and mental wellbeing benefits of people having access to the natural environment in addition to protecting, preserving and enhancing biodiversity. It is also good to see mention of mitigating against climate change and renewable energy in paragraph 6.4 but this should be embedded in the policies.	Noted	No change required.
Policy 3	Resident 6	TPO's should be renewed periodically to ensure the tree size not having an adverse effect on neighbouring properties	TPOs are outside Neighbourhood Plan scope and regulated by Natural England.	No change required.

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Policy 3	NKDC	<p>The opening sentence includes cross-references that are not necessary and should be removed. In this case it is recommended that there is no need to include any form of cross-reference, but instead could be reworded to:</p> <p>“Development proposals should not cause harm to local ecology and wildlife, and they will be viewed favourably where measures are taken to enhance local biodiversity and strengthen local ecology by:...”</p> <p>In the first bullet point, after ‘designated sites’, could “such as those shown in Map 3” be added to link the map in?</p> <p>The third bullet point refers to the Open Space Audit. Not all open spaces in the audit will have biodiversity value and not all will necessarily be worthy of protection in all cases. If this is to be used, it is recommended that a map showing the open spaces in the neighbourhood area, possibly based on the audit, is included in the supporting text to make it clearer for the decision maker and applicant which areas are being referred to</p> <p>SUDS are ‘Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems’ and the text should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>There is nothing in policy 3 relating to much of the content of this paragraph and as such it is recommended that it is reviewed as to whether it is appropriate to retain.</p>	Noted.	<p>Cross reference to other policies removed from Policy 3.</p> <p>Reference to Map 3 added to first bullet point of Policy 3.</p> <p>Reference to Map 3 added to second bullet point and as part of justification text.</p> <p>Reference to SUDs removed (added to Policy 6).</p> <p>Paragraph 6.4 removed.</p>
Policy 4	Resident 1	Enhances the link the link between the village and nearby surrounding countryside	Policy 4 and CP5 are intended to preserve and improve connection with the surrounding countryside	No change required.
Policy 4	Lincolnshire County Council	Public Health support the recognition of the importance of the infrastructure linking the green spaces (cycle paths, walk ways, bridleways, etc.) and the associated benefits listed e.g. health and wellbeing, connectivity within and in/out of village, active travel etc. There is no specific mention of designating Local Green Spaces or of how use of the Green Spaces might be maximised (e.g. sports and play facilities, community growing space). Nor is there any specific mention in this section (as opposed to elsewhere in the Neighbourhood Plan) of Whisby Nature Park and Tunman Wood, which are assets for recreation as well as biodiversity and landscape.	The important green areas that we have identified are currently protected by an existing layer of policy/ designation. For this reason, the Steering Group do not feel it is necessary to designate Local Green Spaces.	Reference to Whisby Nature Park and Tunman Woods added to justification.

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Policy 4	NKDC	<p>The cross reference to other policies are not needed and the start of the policy as it stands is a duplication of the bulleted list. As such, the start of the policy should be reworded to</p> <p>“Proposals will only be supported where development: · ...”</p> <p>As worded the policy would require all forms of development proposals to meet all of the criteria, including householder extensions and this is not appropriate. The wording of the policy should be amended to be clear about what form or scale of development this would apply to or make it clear that it is referring to only relevant schemes and that contributions can be proportionate to allow decision makers to consider this appropriately.</p>	Noted.	<p>Cross reference to other policies removed from Policy 4.</p> <p>Policy4 wording amended to make clear that the policy does not apply to householder development and that proportionate contributions would be expected where relevant.</p>
Policy 5	Resident 1	The plan carefully documents the existing landscape and view to be maintained	Noted	No change required.
Policy 5	Resident 8	<p>In bullet point 4, I’m not sure what “unique enclosure landscape” means. I would like to see the “hill top location” emphasised. In bullet point 5, I think we should be mentioning views from within the parish not just from the built up areas etc. Linking in with the “hill top location” mentioned above, we should also include views from outside the parish.</p>	<p>Views related to hill top location shown on map 6.</p> <p>Views from outside of the parish can only be protected if the development is seated within the Parish, thus views from the boundaries of the Parish are sufficient in that sense</p>	<p>Text added to provide further clarity on what is meant by “enclosure landscape”.</p> <p>Location and direction of views added to Map 5.</p>

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Policy 5	NKDC	<p>Are all of the bullet points to apply or only some? At present it is not clear as there is no “and” or “or” in the list.</p> <p>The cross-reference in the first bullet point is not needed and it actually serves to weaken the position with sites outside of the village curtilage, as such the bullet point should be removed. If you want to indicate that these criteria are in addition to other relevant policies, which is not necessary, this would be more suitably achieved by including wording in the opening paragraph of the policy such as the following:</p> <p>“Outside of the defined village curtilage, priority will be given to protecting and enhancing the countryside from inappropriate development. Where development proposals come forward outside of the village curtilage, in addition to satisfying the requirements of other relevant policies in the development plan, proposals will only be supported where:</p> <p>It will not ...”</p> <p>What is an “enclosure landscape” in bullet point 4 and how should the impact be judged by a decision maker? Whilst it is noted that the supporting text goes some way to explaining the term, it is not clear how this landscape should be specifically considered for impact. Would it specifically relate to the loss of the enclosure boundary trees or is it something else? The policy and supporting text should make this clear.</p> <p>Has an assessment of the views been undertaken as just about every site that could come forward would have some impact on some view from one public vantage point. It may be necessary to prioritise the views through an assessment, or if not then make it clear that it relates to where development would not have an unacceptable impact on the distinctive views...etc. Paragraph 6.14 suggests that the parish has identified important views, but these views are not included in the policy. Somewhat unconnected comes the later Information Box 1 which details specific views from a parish publication. It is unclear what relation this has, if any, to the plan and how or whether it should be considered by decision makers. This all needs to be clarified in the final plan.</p> <p>The final bullet point ends in a semi-colon suggesting that the list of criteria is not finished.</p>	Noted.	<p>“And” added to the list of criteria.</p> <p>Cross reference to other policies removed from Policy 5.</p> <p>Criteria relating to the protection of the enclosure landscape expanded to provide clarity on the features that the policy is protecting.</p> <p>Map 5 updated to show the location and direction of the most distinctive views and reference to map 5 added to Policy 5. Information Box 1 removed and additional information added at Appendix 2 to support the identification of the views.</p> <p>Semi-colon at end of final bullet replaced with full stop.</p>

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Policy 6	Lincolnshire County Council	<p>It is also important for all designs to consider access to current walkways, bridleways, cycle paths, etc. to ensure good links with green spaces and active travel within and in/out of the village. Design could also include maximising choice for older people to downsize given the large proportion of single older person households (e.g. Building For Life, higher building regulation access standards, adaptability, dementia friendly layout of developments and homes).</p>	<p>It is considered that policy in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan adequately covers this matter.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>
Policy 6	NKDC	<p>The cross-reference at the start of this policy is not necessary. Please see other suggestions about rewording this if you wish to emphasise that that this policy is over and above others, but it could simply be removed and replaced with “Development proposals should complement the established...”</p> <p>The bulleted list needs to be made clear about whether all elements are applicable or one some, by adding “and” or “or” after the last semi-colon</p> <p>In the first bullet of the policy it refers to important views, but it does not specify where these views are, or what the quality of them is. It is noted that the Design Guidance document lists these views, but this bullet point should either explicitly state that these views are in that document or provide detail of the views in the supporting text with a clear link in the policy so that decision makers and applicants do not need to guess where they are. Furthermore, the list in the design guidance is little more than a list of the views, and it would strengthen this policy if there were an assessment of the views, possibly with photos, to demonstrate why they are so valuable.</p> <p>In the second bullet point, it is recommended that it is reworded slightly to be clearer: “the visual impact of materials used for external walls and roofs, ideally selected from a locally distinctive palette;”</p> <p>It is recommended that the last bullet point is reworded to be clearer about how this element should be dealt with: “locally distinctive architectural features and styles that can be incorporated into the construction of new buildings.”</p> <p>Changes will need to be reflected in the Design Guidance Document.</p> <p>The suggestion that Design and Access Statements should demonstrate how these criteria have been met could be brought into the policy at the end of policy 6, to make it clear how the compliance with the criteria are expected to be demonstrated in an application.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Cross reference to other policies removed from Policy 6.</p> <p>“And” added to the penultimate bullet point.</p> <p>Reference to Design Guidance added to first bullet point. Map of views and photographs added to Design Guidance document.</p> <p>Second bullet point of Policy 6 amended as suggested.</p> <p>Last bullet point of Policy 6 amended as suggested.</p> <p>Reference to Design and Access Statement added at the end of Policy 6.</p>

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Character Assessment & Design Guidance	Resident 2	<p>An excellent piece of work, very detailed and informative. No comments on the substance or views expressed but noted the following minor typos in the Character Assessment draft document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - page 23, last para, reference to 'The eastern pair of houses whilst the eastern pair - page 32, references to 13a, 11 and 13 'Lincoln Lane' to change to 'Main Street. - page 43, 2nd para, 3rd line '....demolished, which south of...' laid south of? - page 45, 1st para, 'Fosse Lane' - not 'Foss' 	Noted.	
Character Assessment and Design Guidance	Resident 3	<p>With reference to the comments and observations made in the “Thorpe on the Hill Design Guidance Draft November 2016”: 14 Main St. The house is called “The Roper House” and not The Oliver Roper House. We understand up to the time of his death in the 70’s the house was occupied/owned by Herbert Roper who we believe to be a cousin of Oliver. The rear part of The Roper House is in fact the oldest part of the house and our surveyor suggested that it is in fact likely to be Georgian. The comment regarding the cast iron fencing to the road frontage is confusing, saying it is a “lesser” feature in one sentence, but then goes on to say it should be repaired rather than replaced. We are surprised to read subjective comments throughout the report. Also surprised to find sentences beginning with a conjunctive!</p>	Noted	No change to draft plan, but Character Assessment has been corrected accordingly.

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Character Assessment and Design Guidance	Resident 4	My concern is about the detailed analysis of the current housing stock. I think it would be better if any final document only had charts (design features summary) and not the written comments about each house or development. It seems to me that the written comments are too "value" loaded. It reads as though the village had a few properties of value and the rest are rather disappointing. I worry that it gives future planners the wrong impression and also that many householders will be so distressed by the description of their homes that any referendum may not get a majority. I have similar concerns about some aspects of 'design and character of development' 2.2 Materials Palette and Distinctive Characteristics' I am sure that we live with facilities that past generations could not even dream about. Victorian houses had spectacular chimneys because they were heated by open fires modern houses may not even need chimneys. Every generation build houses that reflected the times and used the most up to date available materials. What I would like in this section is the plan to argue even more strongly for good design, no crowding of properties and appropriate modern materials for both any individual build and any collective development.	The Character Assessment and Design Guidance provides a qualitative analysis of the design features and character of Thorpe on the Hill, based on architectural and design principles but also influenced by the unavoidable biases of the researchers. To balance and address these intrinsic errors, a group composed of different people has been involved in the realisation of the Assessment and Guidance.	The documents have been redrafted correcting the most subjective comment.
Character Assessment and Design Guidance	Resident 8	The Character Assessment is a very impressive and thorough piece of work but unnecessarily subjective in places	Noted.	The documents have been redrafted correcting the most subjective comment.
Character Assessment and Design Guidance	Resident 11	It is a most comprehensive and thorough document which, in general terms, we fully support. However, we would question the accuracy of some of the data. For example, with reference to our own property (30 Lincoln Lane), there are two mis-statements i.e. the roof tiles are described as (1) dull, greyish, concrete tiles & (2) roof colour - dark grey. In actual fact, it is red, albeit now faded. The windows are described as "bespoke, hardwood casement", whereas in reality, they are light-oak UPVC double-glazed units.	Noted.	The documents have been corrected accordingly.
General Comment on the TOTHNP	Address outside Parish boundaries	On page 11 of report you need to correct the 1846 London Midland and Scottish Railway reference - it was the Midland Railway line from Nottingham to Lincoln (first line to Lincoln in fact). The LMS wasn't formed until 1923. I am impressed with the document and fully support it.	Noted.	Reference corrected.

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
General Comment on the TOTHNP	Highways England	Highways England comments - as future housing will be very limited and therefore will have no impacts on the operations of the SRN. We have no further comments to provide	Noted.	No change required.
General Comment on the TOTHNP	Upper Witham Drainage Board	Section 11 Flooding page 31 I would be very careful about putting 'there is a zero chance of flooding from' in a published document. The current EA flood maps are not showing any but they could be revised in the future and show some. It may be prudent to say there is very low risk and refer to the EA maps.	Noted.	Sentence changed accordingly.

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
General Comment on the TOTHP	Lincolnshire County Council	<p>Thorpe on the Hill Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission Consultation Supplementary response by Lincolnshire County Council (contact details and Public Health comments are on the Response Form)</p> <p>The following comments are on matters not covered by specific policies in the Neighbourhood Plan, although they may be mentioned in Section 1.</p> <p>Flood risk</p> <p>Flood risk does not seem to feature as a key theme as evidenced by para. 2.28 'There are no flooding constraints in the parish'.</p> <p>LCC would like to see Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) at least referenced in Policy 1 – Residential Development and Policy 7 - Design. They are arguably more appropriate here than Policy 3. It would also perhaps be useful to see an expansion on the explanation of SuDS in the main part of the neighbourhood plan as it will form a key design criterion of any future permitted development. As an aide memoire the following gives some background. It does not all necessarily needs to be included but at least some broader reference should be made that it is being considered as required in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>Any development, not just housing, should have a drainage strategy to say how surface water will be managed. Planning applications should also provide a flood risk statement for smaller developments, or a flood risk assessment for larger developments, to show how flood risk to the site and from the site will be managed, although currently, only major development (10+ houses or an area of greater than 1 ha) is required to consider SuDS. When considering planning applications, Local Planning Authorities should ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • flood risk is not increased elsewhere and • only consider development appropriate in area of flood risk if site-specific FRA demonstrates that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk - development is flood resilient and resistant - safe access and escape routes are available - residual flood risks can be safely managed and - development gives priority to sustainable drainage 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>MENTION Lincoln Southern Bypass (LSB), ESPECIALLY IN CONNECTION WITH REDUCTION OF SPEEDING (ELIMINATING THE RAT RUN) AND OF HEAVY VEHICLES IN THE AREA</p>	<p>SUDS referenced in Policy 6.</p>

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
General Comment on the TOTHNP	Lincolnshire County Council	<p>Minerals and Waste</p> <p>The County Council, as Mineral and Waste Planning Authority, is responsible for producing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan for the County. The first part of this document, the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (CSDMP), has been completed and was formally adopted by the Council on 1 June 2016. This document therefore forms part of the "development plan" for the county. As you may be aware, it is a statutory requirement that Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan, including the minerals and waste policies. LCC would therefore ask that you have particular regard to the proposals and policies in the CSDMP that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguard existing minerals and waste sites from incompatible development; • Safeguard Mineral Resources to prevent unnecessary sterilisation by development; and • Identify the locational criteria and Areas of Search for future minerals and waste development. <p>The Second part of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, the Site Locations Document (SLD), is still in preparation, but a Draft document identifying the preferred sites and areas for future mineral working/waste management was published in December 2015. Any policies and proposals in your Neighbourhood Plan should not conflict with the proposed allocations set out in the draft SLD. LCC would therefore ask that you assess your proposals against the adopted CSDMP and draft SLD. These documents can be found at www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste If there are any conflicts, the County Council should be contacted at mineralsandwaste@lincolnshire.gov.uk</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>There is no mention of the Lincoln Southern Bypass (LSB). The parish only covers what will be the very westerly part of the LSB: the existing roundabout on the A46 which it is expected will be widened as part or in advance of the LSB. There should be reference to the LSB because this will have an impact on Thorpe on the Hill and LCC hope it will be a positive one by ensuring resilience in the network, which is therefore likely to overcome the issues mentioned in the Neighbourhood Plan around traffic diverting from the existing bypass.</p>	<p>The Steering Group has assessed the plan against the the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (CSDMP), and site location study. The Study identifies an important site for waste management just south of the parish boundaries but it is not considered to have any impact that requires addressing through this Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Noted</p>	<p>No change required.</p> <p>Reference to the southern bypass added to the Parish Priorities.</p>

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
General Comment on the TOTHNP	Lincolnshire County Council	<p>Education</p> <p>It is noted that the objectives refer to supporting and protecting community facilities including education, but there is no mention of this under the policies. As only one allocation of over 10 dwellings is proposed there would be limited impact at present, but LCC may request contributions to education funding from any large future developments.</p>	The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan provides a sufficient policy framework for the protection of community facilities so no need for duplication here. The Parish Priorities also identify non-planning related actions that will be taken to achieve the objective.	No change required.
General Comment on the TOTHNP	NKDC	<p>The plan is well presented with good formatting and good use of illustrations and the policies standing out well from surrounding text.</p> <p>The use of paragraph numbering is helpful in navigating and using the plan, and is supported.</p> <p>As a point of consistency, should it be “Thorpe on The Hill” or “Thorpe on the Hill”, the plan seems to suggest a lower case t on the, but the Parish Council website has a capital T.</p>	Noted.	All references amended to “Thorpe on the Hill”.
General Comment on the TOTHNP	Historic England	Further to our letter of the 12 th January [on the Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Report - Ed.] we have no further comments.	Noted	No change required.

4. SEA & HRA

4.1 The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) screening processes were managed by North Kesteven District Council. The scoping study concluded that the Thorpe on the Hill Neighbourhood Plan will not have significant environmental effects and therefore does not need to be subject to a full SEA or HRA.

4.3 The screening included consultation with relevant stakeholders. No comment has been raised on the study.