
BILLINGHAY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2015-2025

Consultation Statement – December 2017



Introduction:

This Consultation Statement is a legal requirement to summarise the community engagement programme and the Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation that was undertaken for the Billingham Neighbourhood Development Plan (November 2017). It shows how the requirements of Regulations 14 and 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 have been satisfied.

This Consultation Statement has been developed in accordance with guidance in “*How to write a Consultation Statement: Putting the Pieces Together*” (Planning Aid England), and with guidance from Urban Vision Enterprise CiC.

The Consultation Statement summarises:

The people and organisations consulted about the proposed Billingham Neighbourhood Plan (BCP); how they were consulted; a summary of the main issues and concerns raised through the consultation process, and descriptions of how these issues and concerns were considered and addressed in the proposed Billingham Neighbourhood Plan.

This document is structured in two main parts:

- Part 1: Consultation that influenced development of the pre-submission BCP
- Part 2: Formal Regulation 14 Pre- submission consultation on BCP

Samples of consultation evidence is available in a separate appendix document. The appendix document is not exhaustive and does not contain all information, which can be made available on request. Evidence documents in the Appendix are listed in Table 7 at the end of this Consultation Statement and are referenced throughout. Throughout the Billingham neighbourhood planning process all information, minutes of meetings, maps and photographs have been available, on request, via Drop-box or at Billingham Parish Office.

Part 1: Consultation that influenced development of the Regulation 14 pre-submission BCP

This section focuses on the consultation that led to the decision to develop a Neighbourhood Plan, to understand what was important to Parish residents, to quantify those issues and to inform development of BCP’s pre-submission.

In early 2011, the Department for Communities and Local Government invited applications from Local Authorities for “Neighbourhood Planning Vanguard”. North Kesteven District Council elected to submit a bid for Billingham, recognising that the parish had significant experience of community collaboration having recently created a Parish Plan, would embrace the opportunity to shape future development, and had much to gain from being part of the process. The bid was successful and £20,000 of grant funding to support the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan was awarded. After a previously stalled attempt at developing a neighbourhood plan, the

Parish Council decided to re-start the Neighbourhood Planning process in July 2014, when an initial meeting of interested residents was called and the neighbourhood development plan began again. All residents who had been involved in the earlier neighbourhood plan or had shown interest in developing a neighbourhood plan for Billingham were cordially invited, by letter or email, to attend a meeting. Posters were also displayed on the 3 village notice boards and in the Billingham Times newsletter. Please see Appendix 1 in the separate Appendix document.

Billingham Neighbourhood Plan is built on thorough and robust community engagement and the views of residents, businesses and groups throughout. Classed as a complex neighbourhood plan, Locality funding has allowed BCP to seek specialist advice from Urban Vision CiC and AECOM, in addition to the support from NKDC throughout the neighbourhood development planning process.

In November 2014 the boundary for the neighbourhood plan was agreed by the residents and BCP committee, and on 15 July 2017, the designated area was agreed with North Kesteven District Council (NKDC).



Billingham Parish: Map of the designated area as agreed by residents, Parish Council and North Kesteven District Council on 17 July 2015

On Wednesday 26th August 2015 Billingham Parish Council and BCP committee attended a Policy Mapping Workshop facilitated by Urban Vision to agree the best way to plan for and develop our Neighbourhood Plan. Please see Appendix 2.

People and Organisations Consulted:

- Residents and children of Billingham Parish;
- District and County Councils;
- Local Councillors;
- Local Businesses, which includes landowners; and
- Local Organisations

How they were consulted:

Extensive publicity of BCP along with community engagement events were carried out throughout the entire process. Details of the publicity and some of the events can be seen in Appendix 3. Merchandise such as BCP mugs, pens, memory sticks, fridge magnets and gym bags were also used to aid promotion of and interaction with the neighbourhood planning process.

In December 2014, residents, groups and businesses were consulted about what areas they would like Billingham Community (Neighbourhood) Plan to focus on. Out of 1,000 questionnaires sent out, 45 were returned. The top three responses were:

1. Facilities - leisure and medical;
2. Travel and transport and safety; and,
3. Planning and Fen Road.

Three sub-committees were then set up to explore these areas.



Table 1, below, shows who was consulted and how they were consulted: (Please see Appendix 4 for a full list of consultation methods)

Group	How they were consulted
Residents and children of the Parish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial survey to establish the areas that residents would like the Plan to address using paper and social media • Subsequent surveys – Housing Needs; Fen Road (Lafford High School site). • Attendance and face to face consultation at local events, e.g. Summer Show, Q & A session, to publicise the Plan and seek opinion • Using interactive maps for choosing site allocations • Using every opportunity to publicise the Plan – Social Media, Websites, Parish Newsletter and Sleaford Target & Standard etc. • Flyers to each home in the Parish • To obtain children’s views the Plan was available at special events such as the Easter Egg Hunt, Knowledge Hunt, and World Youth Day Celebration • Travel Diary • All BCP meetings and Parish Council (PC) meetings open to the public for discussion of the Plan • The wishing well and “Your one wish for Billingham” slips.
District & County Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Throughout the process, there has been close contact with NKDC for their expertise and advice, including the emerging local plan, NK Arts and NK Community Initiatives • Lincolnshire County Council have been involved as the specific landowner on one of the key sites included in the Plan. They have also provided guidance regarding compliance with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan • District Councillors and the County Councillor for Billingham were invited to attend all committee meetings and copies of agendas and minutes emailed to them • Face to face meetings with NKDC Departments such as Economic Development; and Business Advisors and their attendance at a business breakfast

Local Councillors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included in all resident surveys • Parish Councillors were updated each month with progress and the latest version of the Plan and asked for their comments and approval
Local Businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified from Parish Council and NKDC lists with subsequent amendments. • Specific survey to establish what they thought the Plan could do for them to improve their business • Business Breakfasts when the Plan was open for discussion
Local Organisations and Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified from Parish Council records • Specific survey to establish what they thought the Plan could do for them. • Community Breakfasts when the Plan was open for discussion • Meetings with Billingham Primary School, Sure Start Children's Centre, the Parents' Forum, and Daisy Chain Nursery. • Meetings with Billingham Medical Centre and attendance at Patient Participation Group meetings with BCP updates made. Please see Appendix 5 • Attendance at organisations AGMs and other meetings, e.g. swimming pool, tennis club, village hall, walking group. Please see Appendix 6 • Representatives from local organisations and stakeholders attended BCP meetings, such as Head Teacher, GP, Village Hall and Swimming Pool committee representatives • Landowners were consulted as either residents or businesses
Specific and Statutory consultation bodies that may be affected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor consultation regarding specific issues.

Summary of results

Consultation with residents:

Every resident in Billingham was invited to complete a resident survey. (Appendix 7) These were available in the *Billingham Times* newsletter which is delivered to every property in the village, and also online via Survey Monkey. Although it was expected that individuals would complete these, anecdotal evidence shows that one survey tended to be completed per family.

- Residents like that Billingham is friendly, community spirited, in a rural location and quiet. Respondents felt safe and thought the doctors provided a good service;

- Respondents did not like the lack of shops, the lack of facilities, the poor transport links, or the park/lack of children’s facilities.
- Traffic, speeding and parking were considered problematical;
- The appearance of the village was a concern for some residents;
- Improvements to public transport, shops, the children's playing area/park, and the sports facilities were considered the most important by the majority of the respondents;
- Residents take part in a wide variety of activities in Billingham. The most popular being: swimming, walking, running, tennis, cycling and going to the park;
- A gym or sports hall was the most popular choice for a leisure activity/facility in the village; followed by keep fit classes and all
- Lincoln, Boston and Sleaford were the places most respondents would like to travel to via public transport;
- Respondents would like to see butcher, baker and greengrocer shops in Billingham;
- The majority of residents live in Billingham because they were born here or have family living in the village. The community feel and size of the village were also important factors, whilst others live here because they work in the village. The cost of housing was also a reason why people chose to live in Billingham.

How this consultation has informed BCP Policies

Based on the results of the survey and other resident consultations, opportunities to improve the safety and wellbeing of residents by developing facilities for shopping, sport, recreation and leisure; to improve playing areas and to improve travel and transport can be found throughout the Plan. For example: EEG1: Conversion of Residential Property to Commercial Property; Policy CFA2: Community Facilities; Policy SA1: Former Lafford High School Site; Policy SA2: Land off Sprite Lane (for allotments); Policy TT1: Access for Pedestrians and Cyclists, and TT2: New Development and Sustainable Modes of Transport.



Consultation with Billingham businesses:

Billingham is the base for 82 businesses. This section summarises the issues and concerns raised through the business surveys, (Appendix 8) and face to face consultations, such as at the business breakfast:

- The majority of business owners have chosen to site their business where they live. This reflects the high number of residents who run their businesses from home, and also the lack of public facing business opportunities;
- Business owners felt that better facilities, in the village, including retail facilities, would attract customers to their business. More housing and more pride in the village were also considerations;

- 50% of the customers using Billingham businesses reside within Lincolnshire; 25% live within 10 miles and 25% live in the UK.
- Almost all business owners felt that commercial premises were essential to attract new businesses to Billingham. Pride in the village was also considered important. Housing, better public transport and improved infrastructure were also considered important to attract new businesses to the village;
- Several Billingham businesses are multi-award winning and the majority of businesses appear to be settled in the village. A quarter of businesses need larger premises to encourage them to stay in Billingham. It is known from talking to owners who rent business units in Billingham that Billingham units are not large enough to allow for growth and therefore they have to relocate to Metheringham Business Park, or elsewhere, if they wish to expand;
- 42 business owners said they would need new or larger premises within the next 10 years;
- Mill Lane and the A153 were considered to be the most suitable sites for locating a business park in Billingham. Other sites suggested were Fen Road, West Street and the centre of the village;
- The majority of business owners did not feel that parking or transport links would help develop their business, reflecting the on-line or “party plan” nature of several businesses. For others though, transport and parking would be required to promote their business development;
- The majority of business owners felt that “keeping it local” would support their business within the community. Being positive, improved communications and support for new development were also considered to have some importance.

How this consultation has informed BCP Policies

Employment and economic growth are important for the residents and businesses based in the village and the Plan hopes to encourage business and economic growth. The Plan contains policies and has allocated sites to allow for the set-up of new, innovative and entrepreneurial businesses and also to allow the expansion of existing businesses. These can be seen in: Policy EEG1: Conversion of Residential Property to Commercial Property, especially for properties that have previously been business premises or shops; Policy EEG2: Enterprise Units; Policy EEG3: Digital and Communications Infrastructure; Policy SA1: Former Lafford School Site; Policy SA3: West Street, and Policy SA5:A153 Corridor.

Consultation with Billingham groups:

This summary is based on the results of the Group Survey (Appendix 9) that was sent out to all village groups, clubs and societies.

- 50% of groups have members who travel from within Lincolnshire to Billingham to take part in their sessions. 29% quarter of the members reside in Billingham with 21% living within 10 miles of the village;

- 22% of groups thought better facilities and space was considered the most important way to attract new members to village groups, although signage, and increase in population and a wider range of activities were also considered important. 23% thought more volunteers were needed;
- 22% of groups thought better facilities and space was considered the most important way to attract new members to village groups, although signage, an increase in population, and a wider range of activities were also considered important.
- 23% thought more volunteers were needed to support the groups;
- The majority of groups did not feel they needed additional facilities to support their group;
- Although 72% of the venues were considered satisfactory, 21% of venues do require improvement;
- 67% of groups did not feel they would need larger premises within the next 10 years, although the expansion of the village may not have been factored into this decision. 20% of groups felt they would need a larger venue and 13% were unsure;
- 22% thought the Fen Road site was the most popular site for relocating the venue of their group. 7% thought West Street would be the best location;
- 86% of groups did not feel that parking would help their group. However, for others, including the swimming pool, improved parking was considered essential due to limited parking allocation and the distances their members travel;
- 21% of groups felt that improved transport links would help their group;
- Almost all of the groups felt that they would like to see more members from the community support their group. Volunteers and better advertising are also required;
- Some groups would like to see a range of differing groups for differing ages, which included gardening, art, and family history.

How this consultation has informed BCP Policies

The BCP committee recognises the hard work the volunteers do to run the clubs and organisations, and the positive impact the activities have on the health and wellbeing of residents of all ages. To enable groups to develop and expand to meet the needs of a growing village, and to have improved facilities with better parking facilities and easier access Policy CFA2: Community Facilities was written and sites allocated in SA1: Former Lafford High School Site, Fen Road and SA3: West Street.

Housing Needs Survey



No housing needs analysis had been completed since 2007, so, with agreement from NKDC Housing Department, in December 2015, housing needs surveys were delivered to every home in Billingham. The closing date for returns was 8 January 2016. Collection boxes were left at strategic points throughout the village, including: Billingham Medical Centre, The Parish Office, Twells of Billingham (garage and petrol station); Chip off the Old Block (chip shop), Billingham Children's Centre, Co-op convenience store, the Spar Shop on Walcott Road and The Old Butcher's Tea Room and Bistro. Alternatively, the completed surveys could be collected by a member of the of the BCP team on request to the Parish Council.

According to NKDC, 190 homes in Billingham are Local Authority and considered by NK to be "hard to let." Evidence suggests that tenants use Billingham housing as a "stepping stone" and then move on to other areas with more amenities and facilities.

The results of the housing needs survey can be seen in Appendix 10.

59 surveys were returned and the details below were extracted from them:

Tenure

The majority of the surveys returned came from owner occupiers. A high ratio of these were from people with no mortgage. The number of children in these households only totalled 20 and the majority (13) of these were in the owner occupied (with mortgage) category. Of the 59 responses, 9 were currently on the NKDC Housing Register.

17 of these households had moved to a property in Billingham during the last 5 years and the reasons for choosing the area were varied. The two main reasons could be summarised as:

- To be nearer family;
- More house for your money compared with similar villages.

What types of new properties should the new homes in Billingham be?

Residents came up with a wide range of types of home that they felt should be built in the village. There was a wide demand for family homes although there was also support for helping younger people get on the housing ladder with starter homes and affordable housing. There was also support for self-build plots.

Moving home

Only 16 respondents thought that they would be likely to move in the next six years. The majority of these residents plan to move away from the village rather than move to another property within the village.

Reasons for wanting to move house

There was wide variation but the main reasons are summarised below:

- Independent living (moving out of the parental home);
- Wanting to move nearer to family;
- Needing to downsize;
- Needing adaptations and facilities for disabilities and older age.

The wish for better facilities and employment opportunities are factors that emerged in nearly all fact finding exercises conducted in the village, although these do not show up as the main reasons in the survey.

What are the respondents wanting to move looking for?

- 3 bedroomed family homes appeared to be the most sought after.

Tenure sought

- The most favoured tenure is owner occupier (although several people chose more than one category)

Type of dwelling sought

- A range of dwellings were sought, including new build houses, bungalows, sheltered/retirement home, a multigenerational home and a self- build.

If you wish to move but cannot

Some people expressed a wish to move but were unable to do so, for the reasons below:

- Lack of suitable housing at preferred location;
- Unable to afford to buy;
- Lack of social housing;
- Unable to afford rent;
- Unable to sell own home;

- Lack of private rental accommodation;
- Family reasons;
- Unable to afford the cost of moving.

Have people in your household moved away?

Out of the 59 responses, people had moved away from only 10 of the households. This consisted of 11 people in total. Their reasons for leaving are summarised below:

- Employment (the main reason);
- Higher or further education;
- Family reasons;
- Lack of suitable housing.

People wanting to move to Billingham

- People who responded to this question knew of 5 people who wanted to move to Billingham. In each case the reason was family connected or an earlier attachment to the village.

Other comments

The final part of the questionnaire asked people to make further comments and each one of those is detailed below. It is apparent from these comments that there is scepticism among the current residents that the infrastructure and amenities of the village are sufficient to support large scale housing development and that this is an important factor in future planning;

1. Billingham needs larger houses to make the village attractive to families. Such people will spend their money in the village. In addition, gardens should be bigger and there should be off road parking;
2. The village has lots of small and terraced houses. Needs larger executive and family homes or plots supplied for self-build of this type of property;
3. It would be a shame to build more houses in Billingham. Village is big enough without spoiling more countryside;
4. Why do we need more housing when there are no shops and an inadequate bus service?
5. Have two children at home who want a place of their own (new build with off road parking). Hurry up and build the new homes so they don't have to move. Please build affordable houses for first time buyers;

6. Various types of housing are required to attract different people to the village. However, I have major concerns that current facilities and services can cope with the influx of extra residents. e.g. school, medical centre and sewage system;
7. More housing would require improved facilities and more frequent transport links;
8. No more housing required as total lack of facilities, no employment prospects and inadequate public transport;
9. Family homes required not just social housing for people who contribute nothing to the village;
10. I feel the village will become too large with no proper plans in place for young people re jobs, higher education and transport;
11. Before more houses are built we need to address the lack of shops and transport. Also can the school and doctors cope?
12. Billingham is not the place to build more social housing due to lack of facilities, bad transport links and no employment available in village;
13. Lafford School should not have closed as it brought money into the village. More shops needed and a better bus service;
14. We need affordable 2/3 bedroom houses with parking spaces but not too much growth which will ruin the village;
15. Want to move due to the noise from HGVs running night and day;
16. Encouraging shops and restaurants to open in Billingham would make a great difference to village life for both residents and visitors;
17. It would be great if there was the opportunity to build our own home in Billingham. It is a lovely friendly village. The houses tend to be small and those on the new estate have small gardens and are overlooked by other properties.

How this consultation has informed BCP Policies

Based on the resident survey and other consultation with the residents and NKDC, Policy H1 was designed to address local housing need. Policy H2: Housing Design ensures that the rural nature of Billingham and its historic core are maintained and enhanced whilst providing a balanced mix of new homes which are built to high standard of design and sustainability.



Travel and Transport Survey:

Public transport in Billinghay is very limited, with no direct bus routes to Lincoln or any other nearby towns or villages, except Sleaford. However, the National Express bus does stop at Billinghay (on the A153) on its route linking Hull with London. Residents do use the Call Connect service, but this has to be registered for, journeys booked in advance and the routes required are not always available. There is a strong reliance on cars which causes issues with parking in several areas of the village as mentioned below, but particularly on the High Street and the Field Road estate. In some households, one car per family member with a current driving license appears to be the norm, due to the need to travel out of the village for work, pleasure, leisure and medical reasons.

The Travel Survey was undertaken by LCC and the Parish Council in 2014. Every resident was encouraged to record their journeys over one month in a travel diary. 171 residents completed travel diaries and placed them in drop boxes located at the Parish Office, the Co-op, the Medical Practice, the Children's Centre, SAT stores, and Billinghay Primary School. The results of the survey can be seen in Appendix 11.

Conclusions from the travel survey

1. The priority is for a bus service to go through Billinghay direct to (i) Lincoln and (ii) Boston, with sensible return times;
2. The 65A to Sleaford comes through the village four times a day but residents are not happy with the return times;
3. As there is no direct bus to Lincoln, a service to Metherringham to link up with onward buses or trains is necessary;
4. A meeting should be arranged in the near future with LCC and relevant providers to discuss possibilities, and residents should be informed via all media that this is taking place as a result of the Travel Diaries;
5. If and when a bus service(s) is granted, this should be advertised widely and timetables displayed via all media within the village.

Other travel and transport issues

Feedback from residents and complaints to the Parish Council highlighted the following:

- Speeding throughout the village, especially along Walcott Road, has been an ongoing issue for residents. This is especially worse between 6.30 and 8.30 and between 3.30 and 5.30 (coinciding with the school run and the local RAF base start and finish times);
- Parking – especially on Fen Road at school drop off and pick up times; along the High Street and the Field Road estate where double parking is the norm, and parking on the double yellow lines outside the Co-op;
- Transport can be problematical to sixth form, further and higher education if undertaken in Horncastle, Lincoln and Boston
- Anecdotal evidence also shows that parents with teenagers move out of the village to access public transport for improved links to social activities, further and higher education and employment for the young people.

Outcome of the travel and transport consultations:

- In December 2014, LCC, for one month, arranged a bus from Billingham to Metheringham to link with either the bus or train from Metheringham to Lincoln. Lack of publicity and the lack of a bus from Billingham directly to Lincoln meant that, despite the efforts of BCP and the Parish Council, the uptake for the bus was not as good as was envisaged and the bus was stopped. Public transport to Lincoln and our other local towns remains an ongoing issue;
- A school safety zone has been put in place on Fen Road and part of West Street. Although this is respected, parking for the school, children's centre and nursery, and swimming pool remains an ongoing issue, which it is hoped the development of the Fen Road site will alleviate;
- A speed indicator device has been purchased by the Parish Council and is in use in speeding "hot spots" around the village, as advised by BCP research, and in conjunction with the Lincolnshire Road Safety Partnership. Sleaford Rural Policing Team are also involved and undertake regular speed checks in the village.

How this consultation has informed BCP Policies

The difficulties of travel and the lack of public transport is addressed in the Plan in Policy TT1: Access for Pedestrians and Cyclists; and Policy TT2 New Development and Sustainable Modes of Transport. Issues around speeding and parking are dealt with in Policy TT3: Mitigation of Traffic Impacts and H2: Housing Design, which discusses integrated car parking for housing and the approach to accessing public transport.

Children and Young People:

The voices of the children and young people were captured during events throughout the consultation process, such as at the Easter Egg Hunt and the celebration of World Youth Day. The Scouts and Guides took an active part in the process, for example the Guides made a video of what they liked and did not like in the village and they completed a resident survey (Appendix 12). Their views were used to inform the policies within the Plan.

At the Easter Egg Hunt on 5 April 2017, children and young people told us their ideas for the Fen Road site. This included:

- A solar farm for sustainable energy which could heat the school, swimming pool, nearby houses and the children's centre;
- A wind farm;
- Trees, as these were considered beneficial for both appearance, "look what it did for Woodhall [Spa]" and improving air quality;
- An indoor football pitch;
- Move the village hall to the site;
- Have a gym (6 requests) and a running track (3 requests);
- Move the doctor's surgery "to be more central";
- Play-park – more central and beside the school, in better view, and may possibly be better kept;
- Allotments – "could keep chickens";
- Arcade – "would be different and would draw people to the village";
- Dog park – "the dogs would love it";
- Skate park;
- Adventure playground – "near the school but no concrete – this is a rural village";
- Hedge maze "suitable for all ages";
- Cinema like the Kinema [at Woodhall Spa]; or a drive in cinema;
- McDonalds or a KFC.

On Wednesday 27th March a BCP Question and Answer session was held at Billingham Children's Centre followed by a meeting of those involved or interested in the facilities and activities for the younger residents of the village. Please see Appendix 13 for the minutes.

Summary of issues for the Children and Young People

- Although children under the age of 11 are well catered for by Brownie, Guides and Scouting Associations, there is a need for activities and sporting/leisure activities and equipment for the younger residents and those aged 11+;

- The play-park is considered too isolated and far away from many of the residents' homes (For example, no play equipment was built on the Field Road estate);
- The children's play area at the Village Hall is in a poor state of repair;
- The Scout Hut, a former school Portacabin, is over 40 years' old and needs replacing;
- The location of the Scout Hut across the A153 is a concern in terms of children crossing a main road (the A153).

How this consultation has informed BCP Policies

Following consultation, community facilities for children, young people and all residents has been included in the Plan. Please see Policy CFA2: Community Facilities and site allocation Policy SA1: Former Lafford School Site, Fen Road.

Meeting with NKDC Economic Development

On Monday 20 April 2015, BCP met with Harry Attrill, Business Adviser from NKDC Economic Development Team to discuss the economic growth and development of Billingham.

Issues and outcomes of this meeting

- Billingham is the same size as it was in 1980;
- Billingham has 5/6 business units located on Wes Street (leased from Lindum by NKDC, then sub –let). All units are occupied; one business has 2 units;
- There is a strong need for units in Billingham due to full occupancy and private sector speculating;
- Lindum are in discussing concerning a new site for the animal feed mill located on West Street (this may move out of Billingham).

Billingham in terms of future growth

- Business growth in Billingham should work well but would need the right businesses, well located and well serviced, such as alongside the A153 for better access;
- Business units would require about 10,000 sq. feet of space to be divided into about 10 units, such as for traditional micro-businesses for example, running an eBay business or furniture restoration businesses;
- NKDC also support with tourism. It was noted that the bed and breakfast in Billingham was often full and that people visited the parish church from as far afield as Australia;

- Talk to developers re 106 money (or equivalent). i.e., if you build these houses we would like you to build a row of shops. The developers would build but not run the shops;
- All would need to pull in the same direction;
- BCP and the economic development team will not be able to change habits and are currently at a cross roads with the need to move forward. For instance, the “clock cannot be turned back” but new ventures can be encouraged; and,
- Need to avoid all houses and nothing else

The minutes of this meeting can be seen in Appendix 14.

How this consultation has informed BCP Policies

The need for economic development, not just housing, including the potential for tourism in Billingham formed the basis for the following policies: EEG1: Conversion of Residential Property to Commercial Use; Policy EEG2: Enterprise Units; Policy EEG3: Digital and Communications Infrastructure; Policy HT1: heritage Sites and Assets; Policy HT2: Skirth Navigation, and site allocations SA1: Former Lafford High School Site, Fen Road; SA3: West Street and SA5: A153 Corridor.

Summary of meeting with Billingham Early Years’ Partnership

In December 2015 an initial meeting was held with Billingham C of E Primary School, the Sure Start Children’s Centre and Daisy Chain Nursery. All three are located on the Fen Road site adjacent to the swimming pool and the site of the former Lafford High School. Following this, regular contact was made with Lincolnshire County Council and the early years’ providers, and Mr. Allen, Head Teacher, attended BCP committee meetings. BCP committee are also in receipt of letters from school detailing the number of pupils on the roll and the changes made within the school and to classes to accommodate these increasing pupil numbers.

Issues for the Children’s Centre

- They are currently at capacity due to the increased area they have been allocated. There has been an increase in RAF families attending. They would like 1 more room and a larger outdoor space (this is currently the size of a patio). Any development on the Fen Road site could trigger Section 106 funding for CC. The car parking is under review. During 2016 the Parents’ Forum drew their plans for extending the outside space and applied for funding to achieve this.

Issues for Billingham Primary School

- To cope with an increase in pupils, the computer suite could be used as a classroom but more toilets would be needed. By 2017, the school was at capacity in some year groups and the computer suite and library have been converted to classroom space;
- Children move in to the village and then leave – this strengthens the claim by NKDC that Local Authority tenants use Billingham as a “stepping -stone” during the house swop process;
- Parking is an issue – lack of parking at the site and parking issues on Fen Road and West Street. Since this meeting a School Safety Zone has been created on Fen Road and West Street, but this has not solved the issues with unsafe parking on the former Lafford High School site especially at school drop- off and pick-up times;
- The school would always need a turning circle for buses on the Fen Road site.

Issues for Daisy Chain

At this time, the nursery is under capacity. Since the nursery relocated to the Fen Road site, staff have been parking on the Children’s Centre and Swimming Pool car park.

How this consultation has informed BCP Policies

- BCP have allocated the former Lafford High School car park site for the extension of the Early Years’ facilities, and allocated 30 parking spaces for the use of staff, parents and visitors to the school, children’s centre, nursery and swimming pool, on the same site. This can be seen in Policy SA1: Former Lafford School Site, Fen Road;
- On working with Billingham Parish Council, the educational settings and Lincolnshire County Council, a school safety zone is now in place on Fen Road and West Street in the vicinity of the school entrance to ensure the safety and wellbeing of staff, visitors, parents and pupils.

Summary of Consultations with Billingham Medical Centre and Patient Participation Group (PPG)

The Medical Centre have been actively involved during the BCP process- with representation being made at BCP committee meetings by a GP and by BCP representation at every PPG meeting which are attended by the Practice Manager.

Issues facing the Medical Centre

- Since 2015, 200 new patients have registered with the practice;
- The practice is over capacity will not be able to cope with the increase in population due to the 500+ new homes proposed for Billingham in the current Local Plan;
- The practice is writing to 200 patients, who live furthest away from the surgery, to ask them to find alternate medical provision
- Patients travel from as far away as Sleaford, Metheringham and Woodhall Spa to access Billingham Medical Centre;
- Lack of car parking at the Medical Centre- there has been one accident on the car park involving a car and a patient. A “Have Your Say” comment received by the Medical Centre on 7 October 2017 reads: *Car parking facilities I feel are not accommodating for the amount of people using the surgery and feel at times it is quite dangerous.*
- The currently footprint of the surgery and its car parking do not allow for expansion of the building or car park;
- The Medical Centre have written to over 160 patients informing them of the need to find an alternative medical provision;
- PPG members (and residents) consider that Billingham has an excellent Medical Centre with excellent staff and appreciate the ability to have “same day” appointments;
- PPG members from the neighbouring villages with no medical centre facilities (e.g., Walcott and North Kyme) are concerned that with an increase in housing in Billingham that they will no longer be able to access Billingham Medical centre for their own health needs;
- PPG members told us that they would like to be the Medical Centre to have additional facilities- such as being able to carry out minor surgeries and have physiotherapy treatments;
- Having a dentist in the village was another related consideration.

How this consultation has informed BCP Policies

- Allocated a site adjacent to the current medical centre, for the possible extension of the Medical Centre. This can be seen in Policy CFA: Medical centre Expansion, in the Plan;
- Allocated alternative sites on Fen Road and West Street for the potential relocation of the Medical Centre and its expansion which can be seen in Policy SA1: Former Lafford School Site, Fen Road and Policy SA3: West Street, in the Plan.

Consultation on the Fen Road (former Lafford High School) site:

The Fen Road site has been a central and contentious site throughout both before and during the BCP process. Both the closing of the Lafford High School and subsequent demolition of the school was strongly opposed by residents in the local community. Lincolnshire County Council (LCC), owners of the site, had agreed to find out the views of the Parish Council and public before determining the future of the site.

The County Councillor at the time, had agreed that a public building would be available and residents petitioned for parts of the school to be saved, such as the gym and computer suite. Both the footprint of the school, car-parking and playing fields have been enclosed by metal fencing since the school was demolished with no access to the public.

2015: Face to face consultation at the May Day Fun Day 2015 and Summer Show 2015, with maps, voting boxes and “wishing well” slips. Please see Appendix 15 for some of Fen Road (and other Billingham) “wishes” and comments;

12 March 2016: Online, social media survey undertaken, entitled: “Do you want more housing on the old Lafford site on Fen Road”;

99 responses received: 91 against housing and 8 in favour of housing;

November 2016: Survey Monkey question on the change of use application by LCC. “Would you support a change of use to residential for the Lafford High School site? Out of 103 results, 82% of respondents said “no”;

2016: A bid by Billingham Community Group (BCG) to make the school site an asset of public value was declined by NKDC, as the site had not been in public use for the previous five years;

February 2016. The Parish Council agreed for BCP to ask a local architect to draw an alternative plan for the Lafford site. This drawing included 16 dwellings (none encroaching on the playing field), parking for 30 cars, a large community hub, access to the playing field and the required access for the school bus, and maintained the belt of trees and green space that fronts the site and links the plot with Fen Road. Please see Appendix 16;

February and March 2017: The Parish Council/BCP BCG made written and verbal representations in opposition to the proposal by LCC to build 16 houses on the former Lafford School site (which included part of the playing field).

How this consultation has informed BCP Policies

The Fen Road site is a central and integral part of this Plan, as discussed in SA1 Former Lafford High School Site and other policies.

Summary of all concerns and issues

- The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036 proposes 563 dwellings to be built in Billingham with no proposed improvement in infrastructure;
- The infrastructure of the village needs to develop - Billingham cannot just have new housing, as facilities such as the school and medical centre are currently at capacity;

- Billingham Primary School and Children’s Centre both need to expand to meet current demand and the needs of an increasing population;
- Billingham Medical Centre and its parking provision need to expand or relocate to meet the current and future demands of a growing population;
- Businesses wanting to expand have to leave the village for sites in Metheringham or further afield. A minimum of 30 parking spaces are required for the Fen Road site (early years education provision and swimming pool);
- Billingham is a remote and geographically isolated village requiring additional and improved facilities and amenities;
- The Village Hall needs to be expanded and upgraded- or relocated to a more central location within the village;
- The Scout Hut needs to be improved or replaced with a new building, possibly on a new site within the village curtilage;
- Lack of public transport, facilities and amenities is causing social isolation and forcing some residents to move out of the village
- Speeding and parking issues occur throughout the village;
- Flooding and sewage issues were concerns for some residents in some areas of the village and these need to be addressed
- Lack of facilities and activities for children and young people;
- With a growing population, public green spaces need to be safeguarded and sites, such as the Lafford High School playing fields maintained for the leisure pursuits residents, groups and educational facilities.

Conclusions

- The Fen Road site (former footprint of the Lafford High School building and its playing field) offer the best opportunity to improve the amenities and facilities of the village, with the playing field offering a central public green space for sport and leisure;
- The infra-structure must be improved, including: public transport, community facilities and amenities, for all ages, in order to prevent social isolation and to improve health and wellbeing, and to encourage residents to settle in the village;
- BCP needs to allocate sites for start- up business and enterprise units and for existing businesses to expand;
- Speeding and parking issues throughout the village need to be addressed;
- Improved facilities and amenities, especially those for children and young people need to be more accessible, located more centrally and the current facilities maintained and updated;
- BCP needs to work within the parameters of the most up to date Local Plan for Billingham;
- All development must reduce the risk and potential for flooding and sewage problems;
- The historic character of the village must be preserved and enhanced;
- The rural setting of the village must be maintained.

How consultation has informed BCP Policies

- The results of all surveys and consultations were collated, analysed and discussed at BCP meetings;
- The evidence gathered was used to inform and shape policies in Billingham Neighbourhood Plan, in agreement with Billingham Parish Council. Any non- planning matters, such as speeding, were referred to the Parish Council, and/or other relevant agency, for their attention.

Challenges faced whilst preparing BCP

- Up until April 2017 the plan had to meet the requirements of both the former and emerging Central Lincolnshire Local Plans;
- Local Plan consultation had not begun when initial surveys were sent out by BCP; therefore it is unclear if residents, businesses and groups realised what possible impact the building of over 500 new homes would have on the village when they completed their surveys;
- Trying to ensure that the infrastructure and amenities for the village would meet the needs of a growing community when no provision, other than housing, has been proposed for Billingham in the Local Plan;
- During the preparation of the neighbourhood plan, landowners were applying for planning permission on sites allocated within the BCP. For example, the Fen Rad site, and a site on Walcott Road that had been considered as a possible site for a new cemetery;
- Although responses to written surveys were low, residents, including local land owners, businesses, and groups were provided with multiple opportunities to engage with the neighbourhood planning process and the draft plan was available to view and comment upon on request at the Parish Office, online, or in Drop Box;
- A great deal of time was spent on consultation for the Fen Road site both with LCC and the village community. This delayed progress of the plan.

Developing the Regulation 14 pre-submission Billingham Neighbourhood Plan

The results of the extensive consultations, questionnaires, surveys and face to face discussion was collated and analysed by the BCP committee, and the evidence used to inform and develop the policies within Billingham Neighbourhood Plan. The agreement of the Parish Council was sought and gained throughout at monthly Parish Council Meetings and Parish and District Councillors attended BCP meetings.

Preparing for Regulation 14 pre-submission of Billingham Neighbourhood Plan

Throughout the neighbourhood planning process expert advice and guidance was sought from NKDC, Urban Vision, Locality, The Community Land Trust, and AECOM. Committee members underwent training and attended workshops on writing a Neighbourhood Development Plan facilitated by the Local Association of Lincolnshire Councils (LALC), Urban Vision, and NKDC.

NKDC provided comprehensive and helpful feedback which included comments on typographical errors, the layout and length of the planning document, improvements to aid clarity, recommendations to remove the Fen Road (Lafford High School) site policies, to remove or combine other policies; and helpful suggestions to ensure we met with current planning regulations and the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. (For a time, BCP was working in line with both the former and emerging, now current, Local Plans). Please see Appendix 17 for an early review of the draft Plan.

Part 2: Regulation 14: Pre-submission public consultation of Billingham Neighbourhood Plan

Regulation 14 Consultation

This section focuses on who we consulted on the pre-submission Community (Neighbourhood) Plan, how we evaluated the feedback and agreed modifications in developing the submission version of the Plan. We have split this into specific areas as detailed below:

Following receipt of the SEA Screening Report, indicating that an SEA was not required, the Neighbourhood Plan proceeded to the statutory six-week consultation period. This ran from 2 May 2017 to 30 June 2017. (The period was extended to 30 June, as not all consultation emails were sent out on the 2 May 2017, to ensure it met the statutory 6 week period of consultation.)

Over 140 statutory consultees, such as local businesses and landowners, together with neighbouring local authorities and parishes, service providers and other interested parties were contacted directly either email or by post, when no email address was available, and invited to respond to the consultation. 500 copies of the draft Plan, comment slips and boxes for the return of comments were left at various locations around the village, including the medical centre, parish office, school, children's centre, village shops, hair salons, public houses, fast food outlets, businesses and the swimming pool. An article in the *Billingham Times* and an invitation to attend the Annual Parish Meeting was sent out to every household on 28 April 2017 and also promoted on social media. A covering letter and a comments/response form was either emailed to residents or delivered by hand. The covering letter included details of where to obtain a copy of the Neighbourhood Plan, either electronically or in printed form, and information about where to view the draft Plan. Copies of the draft Plan and comments slips and boxes were available for viewing and comments at three public meetings: the Annual Parish Meeting on 22 May 2017, the Community and Business Breakfast on 5 May 2017 and the Community Connections Café on 31 May 2017. Links to the Plan were available on the Billingham App,

Facebook and Twitter, the BCP website and the Parish Council website. Over 70 residents attended the Annual Parish Meeting, 7 individuals representing village groups and businesses attended the Community and Business breakfast, and 8 individuals attended the Community Connections Café. Documents pertaining to the Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation can be found in Appendix 18.

All comments received from stakeholders were evaluated by the BCP committee and any changes made following consultation with the Parish Council. The Parish Council agreed with the final draft of the Plan which has resulted in a submission version of the Plan that reflects and has responded to the statutory Regulation 14 consultation.

The consulted bodies were

- 02, EE, Three, Vodafone & Orange mobile networks and Mobile Operators Association and Openreach
- Anglian Water
- Anglican Church
- Anwick Parish Council
- Baptist Church
- Schools (Barnes Wallis Academy, Billingham Church of England Primary School, Carries Grammar School, KSHS, St. George's Academy
- Boston Borough Council
- Digby Parish Council
- Dogdyke, Chapel Hill and Tattershall Parish Council
- Dorrington Parish Council
- East Lindsey District Council
- Historic England
- Homes & Communities Agency
- Lincoln City Council
- Lincolnshire County Council
- Lincolnshire Police
- Lincolnshire West Clinical Commissioning Group
- Methodist Church
- National Farmers Union
- National Grid
- Natural England

- Network Rail
- Newark & Sherwood District Council
- North Kesteven District Council & SustainNK
- North Kyme Parish Council
- Nottinghamshire County Council
- Ruskington Parish Council
- Sleaford Police
- South Holland District Council
- South Kesteven District Council
- Sport England
- The Coal Authority
- The Environment Agency
- The Highways Agency
- The Marine Maritime Organisation
- Walcott Parish Council
- West Lindsey District Council
- Western Power Distribution

Table 2, below shows who was consulted and how they were consulted:

Group	How they were consulted
Residents and children of the Parish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special presentation and exhibition of the Draft Plan at the Annual Parish Meeting on the 22nd May 2017 at the Village Hall • 500 copies of the draft plan with comments forms were distributed around the village at key sites e.g. Medical Centre & Parish Office, residential homes and fast food outlets. • Community Connections Café on 31 May 2017 at the Methodist Church
District & County Councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Throughout the process, there has been close contact with NKDC for their expertise and advice and they were sent copies of the latest draft as part of the consultation process.

Local Councillors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updated each month with the progress with the latest version of the Plan and asked for comments. Provided with a copy of the draft pre-submission plan and a comments form.
Local Businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Breakfast when the Plan was available for discussion and comments • Provided with a copy of the draft plan and a comments form during the consultation period
Local Organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Breakfasts when Plan was open for discussion • Received copies of the draft plan and a comments form during the consultation period
Specific and statutory consultation bodies that may be affected.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sent copies of the draft plan and asked for their comments.

The tables below show the responses received to the Regulation 14 consultation:

Table 3: Local Businesses and Organisations and Councillors (personal emails removed)

Who	Comments Received	Overall View	Review	Impact on Plan
Dr. Leeper	On Health Watch Lincolnshire website BMP is currently voted top NHS service for any Lincolnshire Parish (despite having the highest deprivation score in SWL CCG). The proposal in CFA1 to expand parking sideways onto the Waterside development is eminently sensible. Support from our landlords and SWL CCG would be needed and we would need help developing a robust business plan. For info: The patients that have been asked to leave were living in areas such as Quarrington, Ruskington, Leasingham, Holdingham, Woodhall Spa, Rauceby, Metheringham, Coningsby, Tattershall, Heckington and beyond. A significant reason for this action was to keep local patients safe when visits were needed to these peripheral patients - rare but dangerous when they did happen.	For	Comments noted	Plan unaltered
Johnathon Wilcox	Change listed use of Old Wesleyan Chapel in West Street in Heritage Statement removing the word "chemical" under Storage Use	For	Comment refers to AECOM report	No action
Mr. E South	I have been informed by my relatives who have viewed the Neighbourhood Plan that under the above policy you have identified land that I own on West Street for retail uses.	Objection	Noted	No action. Full consultation has taken place throughout the neighbourhood

	<p>Firstly, I find it rather upsetting that this is the first I have heard of this and that someone did not approach me to discuss this before identifying it in a public document. It is easy to identify landowners, especially in a village location by speaking to other residents or contacting the Land Registry. I would have thought it a common courtesy to at least mention it to the landowner what you are intending to suggest. Secondly, as a result of the Adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan the village is set to grow by approximately 563 dwellings through allocated sites. Whilst I recognise the importance of retail facilities and having lived in the village for my entire life, I have seen the village services and shops dwindle over the years, I cannot see why there is a need to warrant additional retail units (perhaps the expansion of existing units would be a better idea, relocating the co-op to a larger site etc.). All the retail outlets that have closed have generally been turned into residential units because it has been proved through the planning process that there is no demand for small independent shop units in Billingham. Whilst substantial for Billingham, in general terms an additional 563 houses will not change this situation. This is perhaps due to a lack of support from those that live in the village who shop elsewhere, but also due to the high costs of setting up and running such a business. You state in the policy that due to West Street being one of the larger sites that new retail units should be focused here. If this is the case and that as a result of the development site on West Street</p>			<p>development plan process.</p>
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------

	there is a need (which I doubt due to the limited number of dwellings proposed in comparative terms – I understand that you normally need at least 3,000 new dwellings to warrant a new convenience store), this new development site should provide you with shop units on the frontage of the site, it is in a similar location to my land and will have the benefit of the uplift of the land to provide you with such units (again should it be demonstrated they are needed).			
Sleaford Police	Sleaford Police support the proposals	For	No action	No action
History Group	<p>P14 - "Awaiting Community input" - is this still a valid comment?</p> <p>P 22 ENV 3 Last Para - where will the Parish Council get the land from?</p> <p>Policy TT2 - is it possible to be more specific about parking spaces such as a minimum of 2 per house.</p> <p>P10 & P29 - the figures re residents do not add up.</p> <p>P32 Although the plan is heavily centred on the Fen Road site, surely there are enough signs that it may be a non-starter. Should we not have a fall-back plan relating to the development of the Village Hall site. There should also be a proviso that any development at Fen Road should ensure sufficient parking for the School, Children's Centre and Swimming Pool.</p> <p>P34 Agree re Medical Centre but cannot see the land being made available nor might the landlord/owner of the current building want to buy?</p> <p>P37 H1 Agreed but would be happier if we</p>	For	Most points already being considered as part of an overall review.	Changes being made to incorporate development of the Village Hall, but Fen Road site to remain in the document.

	<p>incorporated a proviso re Affordable Housing limits (another word for social housing?) so we do not become the NKDC dumping ground for "problems".</p> <p>SA1 Same comments as P32.</p> <p>SA3 Nice idea but it bucks the common trend everywhere else where despite growing population, smaller shops are closing.</p>			
Cllr. Ron Chatten	<p>Page 9 - Where is the list of items included in the supplementary report such as the Billingham Heritage & Character? Page 10 - If there is 33.6% of the population in full time employment then it is assumed that this = 1225 residents. Page 29 - If this is correct the population of Billingham would be in excess of 5000. Which figures are correct Page 10 or Page 29. Page 14 - Supplementary heading is on Page 50 not Page 58. Page 20 - add "that" between "island" and "has" on first line. Page 31 Policy 3 sub para 2 - what is meant by new identical and economic? Page 32 - Maps need to be included to show the location of pathways and/or cycle paths. Also, to clearly state whether or not they are already Public Rights of Way or on private land. Page 34 - Figure 27 - is the arrow for the location of the Medical Centre & Car Park correct? Should the description include "Proposed"? Page 36 - Policy CFA4 needs a clear description= same as CFA1 & CFA2 on Pages 34 & 35. Page 40 - Site Allocation - How will the land at Waterside be purchased to extend the Medical Centre and Parking facilities and where is the finance to carry out the work - see Fig 29. Page 41 Fig 30 - The</p>	Neutral	Comments noted in line with other advices	Plan altered where necessary

	<p>Coach & Horses pub is shown but is likely to be closed. Why the Ship which is now thriving is included. Page 43 - is there a public footpath from the Field Road Estate to the Lafford site? Page 45 - Policy SA2 - what is the anticipated cost to purchase the land off Sprite Lane for allotments and from where would funding be obtained? Policy SA3 - there is already a Planning Application to develop this site for housing. No mention of any facilities in this application for retired, leisure or medical facilities.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

Table 4: North Kesteven District Council Response and recommended actions

Section/ Policy	Comments	Response	Action
General	<p>The plan is well presented with good use of colour, boxes, images and fonts and styles.</p> <p>It would be beneficial to add paragraph numbering to the plan before it is submitted to enhance its usability.</p> <p>There are a number of occasions throughout the plan where the wording does not scan correctly. It is recommended that prior to submission the plan is thoroughly reviewed to rectify these areas. There are occasions where the formatting of headings needs to be reviewed to ensure it does not lead to a lack of consistency in the document structure (e.g. under the Environment section of the policies where “Purpose:” above Policy ENV1 is in a higher level font, and between sections where some headings are blue and some are black but seem to be the same level).</p> <p>The policies are all in different coloured boxes, whilst they are drawn out from the surrounding text to make it clear what can be classified as policy and what is not, it might be beneficial to have them in a single colour, or at least in colours common with other policies in the section.</p> <p>The Explanatory Text that accompanies each policy could be improved, it is recommended that these are expanded a little.</p> <p>The wording of the Purpose section accompanying each policy is to explain what the intention of the policy is and the Explanatory Text section should then build on this to make it clear why this is important for Billingham.</p> <p>The map and illustrations should be reviewed as there are cases where they go out of sync. · Some of the maps will need to be replaced in order to ensure they are legible, particularly where a policy is reliant on a boundary on the map</p>	<p>These points have been fully discussed and investigated. It is agreed that changes need to be made.</p>	<p>Changes will be made in line with other alterations with the aim of producing a consistently designed document.</p>

Contents	It is recommended that a list of the policies and their page number is included on the contents page.	Agreed	Will be done
Chapter 3	This chapter provides some useful context for Billingham that will be useful to ensure that the Examiner is able to familiarise themselves with the area easily. However, it would be beneficial to improve the map used in figure 3. It would be better if it showed roads to provide more context, but more importantly it is unclear what the squares on the map are and this should be rectified	Agreed	We are obtaining a better map to make details clearer
Billingham Conservation Area and Historical sites of Interest	The boundary shown on figure 5 shows the conservation area boundary and refers to changes to the boundary. The neighbourhood plan cannot change any of these boundaries and this map should only be showing the current conservation boundary.	The changes referred to on the map relate to the last extension of the Area.	A better map, without numbering, has been obtained from NKDC and used in the Plan.
Demographics	The statistics used in the draft plan have been reviewed and there seems to be some anomalies with those provided by ONS. It is recommended that these are reviewed in advance of submitting the plan. This information is available at https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/home/detailedstats.asp . Graphs and commentary may also need amending to deal with this. If any assumptions have been made based on inaccurate statistics these should also be reviewed to consider whether the correct statistics require a different approach in the policies or raise different issues.	Agreed and the point has been made by other consultees.	Up to date figures are being obtained and will be inserted.
The Fen Road Site (formerly Lafford School)	It is important to note that there is a live application on this site for 16 dwellings. Whilst this does not preclude a different scheme including community facilities from coming forward it is recommended that this section is amended to be clearer of the position. The opening sentence of the second paragraph does not seem to make sense and it is recommended that this be reviewed. In the last sentence of the second paragraph it refers to	Has been reviewed	Changes being made to the wording, as required. However, as NKDC informed us, it is possible for other planning applications to be made for this site.

	<p>'Supplementary Reading (page 58)' apparently in relation to an Aecom report. However, when you go to page 58 of the plan this report is not listed (although it seems to be referred to on page 50), although it is not clear where these documents can be viewed. If there are reports being referred to in the plan at submission, these should either be included as part of the submission or should be hosted clearly on your website with a clear, working link included in the report.</p>		<p>The site features as a central location in the Billingham Vision Document.</p> <p>A working link is available on the BCP website and Parish Council website.</p>
Transport	<p>In this section Lincoln is referred to as a town when in fact it is a city.</p>	Agreed	<p>"Town" changed to "city".</p>
Vision	<p>The Vision is broadly supported in being a positive, aspirational statement about what the plan intends to achieve</p>		
Aims	<p>The Aims provide a set of suitable objectives for the plan and these are generally supported. They are linked to the both policies and the vision.</p>		
Growth Strategy	<p>The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan was adopted on 24 April 2017 and the text in the first bullet point should be amended to reflect this. All other references to the Local Plan should be checked to ensure this is taken into account.</p>	Agreed	<p>Plan amended throughout following adoption of the Local Plan in April 2017.</p>
Land Use Policies	<p>In the second paragraph, there is reference to site allocations and it then says "(see Site Allocations)". Should this not be "(see Site Allocations section)"?</p>	Agreed	<p>Wording amended as required.</p>
Policy ENV1 Agricultural Land	<p>The first sentence in the policy is problematic for a number of reasons. Firstly, the least versatile agricultural land is grade 5 not 3b so the wording is factually inaccurate. Secondly, just because land is less versatile than other areas of land does not mean that it will not have some value for farming. As such it is not considered that this sentence would meet the basic conditions and it is recommended that it be deleted.</p>		

	<p>In the second sentence the word “land” is missing the “l”. In the first sentence of the explanatory text the wording is written as though it were policy, as highlighted earlier this should be more about explaining why this policy is important for Billingham. Furthermore, this wording should be amended in accordance with the comments on Policy ENV</p>		
<p>Policy ENV2 Energy</p>	<p>In the Purpose section preceding this policy it appears that the first two paragraphs are included by mistake as they do not relate to the policy and this should be rectified. The Government introduced a restriction on the development of wind turbines in a Written Ministerial Statement in 2015 so that they should only be granted permission in an area identified as suitable for wind energy generation in a local or neighbourhood plan; and where its planning impacts identified by local communities have been addressed and the proposal has their backing. Whilst the first part of the policy is not in itself contrary to this Written Ministerial Statement, it should be referenced in the supporting text and it may be beneficial to align the policy more closely to the wording of the statement. Furthermore, the definition of what is ‘small-scale’ in terms of this policy will need to be clarified. Without this it will be difficult for decision makers to properly assess whether a scheme meets the policy requirement or not (it could result in larger scale than intended) – this can be in supporting text. The Government has introduced changes to what technical standards can be sought in Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans, including limiting what can be required by policy in terms of energy efficiency. As such we are now limited to reliance on Part 6 of the Building Regulations 2010 in relation to energy efficiency of buildings. However, as worded, this policy is promoting the use of alternative renewable energy sources, rather than setting a standard. As such, the second part of this policy is considered to be appropriate in its current wording.</p>		<p>Replicated paragraphs removed.</p>

Policy ENV3 Natural Environment	The general thrust of this policy is supported and the wording is considered to be deliverable in practice.	For	No changes required.
Policy ENV4 Flood Risk	This policy is generally a repeat of national policy and policy in the Local Plan with it not adding anything substantive. It is recommended that Policy LP14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan is reviewed to consider whether this satisfies the needs of Billingham. If it does then this policy should be deleted and it is only if something specific to Billingham is needed to build on top of Policy LP14 that a policy such as this should be included. As such it is recommended that this policy is deleted. If this policy is retained it should also reference the exceptions test, i.e. "...through a sequential test and an exceptions test".		Flooding and sewage issues are a concern for many Billingham residents. On review it is considered essential to keep this policy in place. The wording has been changed to that suggested and to reflect the comments of Anglian Water.
Policy HT1 Heritage Sites & Assets	<p>There is some concern over the potential implications of this policy on heritage assets. It is difficult to assign a "tourist value" in most cases in Billingham and as such this could result in inconsistent application of this policy. It is also questionable what this policy adds to higher level policy and it is recommended that Policy LP25 of the Local Plan is reviewed to see whether this satisfies the requirements for Billingham. It is recommended that this policy is deleted unless it can be made more locally specific to meet any specific requirements for Billingham. If it is to be retained it should also refer to the significance of a heritage asset along with setting, heritage value and historic interest.</p> <p>The wording in the second paragraph of the explanatory text should be reviewed, firstly it is not "applications that affect heritage sites" that need to be accompanied by a design and access statement and secondly, they do not only have demonstrate how the proposal will make a positive contribution to enhancing heritage assets. The requirements for when a design and access statement is required is set out in the Planning Practice Guidance</p>		<p>Billingham, is situated in the centre of the county and with close links to Sleaford, Lincoln, Woodhall Spa, Boston and other tourist areas. Historic interest includes the swimming pool, Old Vicarage Cottage Museum (which could be re-opened as a museum), the Roman Car Dyke, the Skirth, and links to the WW1 author Bernard Gilbert. Local businesses would benefit from tourism. The Plan has been amended to show how it fits in with LP25 of the current local plan and how the Plan follows the recommendations made in the AECOM Heritage and Character Report (2017).</p>

Policy HT2 Skirth Navigation	The general thrust of this policy is supported however, as worded it is too definite in stating that any scheme would be approved regardless of other impacts. As such it is recommended that this be reworded as follows: <i>“Proposals for high-quality development which will improve access to and help regenerate the Skirth Navigation will be supported, provided it will not result in any unacceptable impact.”</i> This provides an important caveat to allow decision makers to weigh up the planning balance should a scheme be likely to result in some harm.		Wording amended as appropriate.
Policy TT1 Access for Pedestrians & Cyclists	This policy is supported and is considered to be fit for purpose. Upon reflection a slight amendment to the wording may be slightly beneficial in the first part of the policy: <i>“Proposals for the development of new residential or business units should maximise the use of pedestrian and...”</i>	For	Wording amended as suggested.
Policy TT2 New Development and Sustainable Modes of Transport	This policy is generally supported. One question is whether “incorporating new technologies...” should be in a separate bullet point? There is little in the Purpose and Explanatory Text to accompany this policy to justify the car parking requirements here. It is recommended that this is reviewed and included.		Wording amended, an additional explanation added, as appropriate.
Policy TT3 Mitigation of Traffic Impacts	This policy is broadly supported, however, it is recommended that “highway” be added before “infrastructure” on both occasions within the policy.		Wording amended as appropriate.
Policy EEG1 Conversion of Residential Property to Commercial Property	This policy is generally supported.		

<p>Policy EEG2 Enterprise Units</p>	<p>This policy can be considered to be broadly in line with Local Plan Policy LP5 with the relevant part of the Local Plan policy being that relating to “Other Employment Proposals”. However, it is recommended that Policy LP5 be specifically referred to in the supporting text to this policy. It is recommended that you should include some additional text to the Explanatory Text to clarify whether, in the case of Billingham, all elements of the relevant part of LP5 should apply, particularly the first bullet point which requires “a clear demonstration that there are no suitable or appropriate sites or buildings within allocated sites or within the built up area of the existing settlement”. This should be made clear for the decision maker.</p> <p>It is also recommended that the term Enterprise Units be more clearly defined in the supporting text, could any employment proposal be termed as an Enterprise Unit? It should be very clear for decision makers and applicants what is and what would not be counted as an enterprise unit. · Finally, if this policy is only referring to parts of the A153 and Mill Lane near to the village it should be accompanied by a map identifying where is acceptable for this development, otherwise it may result in isolated developments a significant distance from anything</p>		<p>Referral to LP5 has now been added to the Plan. Enterprise units will include start-up and micro-businesses. As a village of entrepreneurs, new businesses will be encouraged. The Plan has been amended to reflect this.</p>
<p>Policy EEG3: Digital and Communications Infrastructure</p>	<p>The wording in part 2 of this policy does not make sense and should be reviewed. Presumably “identical and economic” should be replaced with “residential and economic developments”? Subject to the above wording change, this policy is generally supported.</p>	<p>For</p>	<p>The wording has been amended as suggested.</p>
<p>Policy CFA1: Medical Centre Expansion</p>	<p>Outline planning permission has been granted for the development of the Waterside site. As such this policy is not deliverable and should be removed. It could be altered to be more general, supporting the expansion, or replacement, or relocation of the medical centre should the opportunity arise.</p>		<p>This policy has been retained because: Increased parking, and an extension to the medical centre is essential to cope with the number of the patients now and the increased number when the new homes are built.</p>

			Although planning permission has been made, alternative plans could also be agreed for this site.
Policy CFA2: Community Facilities	The listing of community facilities to which the policy applies is very useful in helping the application of this policy and the wording of the policy is considered to be fit for purpose. However, there is some concern over the deliverability of this policy in relation to the Fen Road Site. There is a live application on the site which does not include community facilities and the Secretary of State has not raised any concerns with the loss of playing fields. Therefore, this policy cannot be seen as deliverable. To rectify this the Fen Road site should be removed from the list preceding the policy. Provided this amendment is made, there are no concerns relating to this policy. It is recommended that alternative means are pursued to achieve the goals for the Fen Road Site.		Retained. The Fen Road site is in the centre of out village. The planning application only uses a portion of one tennis court. The rest of the playing field is not included in the planning application. Green space is essential for health and well – being. No other green spaces will ever be available for future playing fields or as an open public green space. This site is seen a safe, due to its proximity to the other Fen Road facilities such as the school and swimming pool.
Policy H1 Housing Types	There are no concerns with the wording of this policy, however, without seeing the identified local needs in the Consultation Statement it is difficult to understand precisely whether this policy will work in practice. Does the explanatory text relate to this policy? This should be reviewed.		Reviewed.
Policy H2 Housing Design	There is no Purpose section preceding this policy. Generally speaking, this policy is supported, however there are some areas of concern which need to be addressed as detailed below. Bullet point 3 is duplication of Policy H1 and therefore this should be removed – it is also not a design consideration further warranting its deletion here. Furthermore, Starter Homes may not end up being introduced. This part of the policy should be deleted.		Purpose now added to the Plan and changes made as appropriate.

	<p>In bullet point 4 is this referring to physical connections, for example for pedestrians, or is it referring to visual connections, or other types of connection. In order for this to be usable it needs to be made clearer.</p> <p>In bullet point 5 it is not clear how “a balanced approach to accessing public transport” could be defined or demonstrated. It is considered that this part of the policy is already covered in policies TT1 and TT2 and therefore is not needed here, as such it is recommended that this bullet point is deleted. There is duplication and also conflict between bullet point 11 and Policy TT2. Policy TT2 seeks to primarily have off-street parking but rightly allows for some flexibility should some on-street parking be needed, whereas this policy requires developments to cater for parking needs on plot – how would a decision maker decide which policy applies? Furthermore, the minimum of 2 spaces per dwelling is not a design consideration and would be better if located in Policy TT2. Would 2 spaces always be suitable, for example in a studio apartment? What evidence backs up this threshold? It is recommended that this part of the policy be stripped back to the design element to read “Integrate car parking with landscaping so that it does not dominate the streetscene.”</p> <p>Bullet point 13 is largely duplication of bullet point 1 and as such it should be removed.</p> <p>Bullet Point 15 is not deliverable or appropriate to include and would not be enforceable. As such it should be deleted.</p> <p>Other parts of the policy are broadly supported and are considered to be fit for purpose.</p>		
<p>Policy SA1 Former Lafford School Site, Fen Road</p>	<p>As has been highlighted earlier in this response, whilst the ambitions for this site are sensible, there is a live application on this site which does not include the community facilities talked about in this policy. As such it is highly likely that this policy will not be deliverable and therefore should be removed. It is recommended that alternative means for delivering this site are pursued such as through discussion with Lincolnshire County Council over the potential purchase of the site.</p>		<p>Retained. As outlined above this site is essential for the village and its community.</p>

<p>Policy SA3: West Street</p>	<p>There are a couple of issues with this policy. Firstly, the first part of this policy is not policy wording and should be relocated to supporting text. Secondly, the first paragraph talks about the importance of West Street as a link, but the street itself is outside of the site allocation area. Some of the wording does suggest that this policy is not relating to the site allocated in the Local Plan (e.g. “Close proximity to 132 proposed residential dwellings”) but the map shows it as being the allocated site. This must be clarified if any policy is to be retained. Thirdly, and more importantly, (assuming this policy does relate to the site with permission) this site has outline planning permission and this permission does not include facilities being referenced in the policy. As such this policy is not deliverable and should be deleted. Should the Working Group wish to amend this policy to either bring it in line with the permission, or to make it clear that it applies to an area outside of the allocation this may be acceptable. If any policy is retained it will need to be far clearer about what and where it applies to and any requirements must be deliverable.</p>		<p>Amendments made as appropriate.</p>
<p>Policy SA3 A153 Corridor</p>	<p>There are two main issues with this policy: Firstly, it is titled the A153 Corridor, but the map shows only a single site to the east of the A153. The policy should be renamed and should reference the map in fig. 33. Secondly, if you are allocating a site you should already have determined through your site evaluation that it will not result in unacceptable impacts such as those referenced in the policy. Proposals on the site would still be subject to the other relevant policies in your plan and the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and as such the bullet points in the policy should be deleted (although this will require some rewording of the first sentence). Furthermore, the site is in Flood zones 2 and 3 and as such would need to be subject to a sequential test and possibly an</p>		<p>Reviewed and re-worded as required, also taking into consideration the feedback from Anglian Water.</p>

	<p>exceptions test. Have these assessments been undertaken? They would need to clearly demonstrate that this development needs to occur on this site and that it will not result in increased risk on site or elsewhere. There may be some flexibility for flood risk to be dealt with in this policy (as is detailed in the following bullet point) if you have not assessed this, but there is no guarantee that an examiner will accept it.</p> <p>Taking into account all of the above concerns, if you want to allocate this site, the wording should be amended to be as follows: “Land to the east of A153 as shown on Fig. 33 is allocated for employment development within use classes B1, B2 and B8 subject to proposals satisfying a sequential test and exceptions test.”</p> <p>The annotation to Fig. 33 references B3, this appears to be in error</p>		
<p>Policy SA6 Land off Mill Lane</p>	<p>Under the “Why Mill Lane?” heading it suggests that there are a number of business units on the site, but the site appears to be an undeveloped field – this is unclear and should be rectified. As with SA5 above there is a lack of clarity over the relationship between this policy and EEG2 – why are they both needed? This should be addressed when amending your plan.</p> <p>Also as with SA5, if your plan is allocating sites, the necessary assessments should have been undertaken to ascertain that the proposed development is suitable for the site. Proposals will still be subject to other relevant policies in your Neighbourhood Plan and the Local Plan so there is no need to reference this here and as such the bullet points should be deleted. As with SA5 this will require some rewording to the first sentence in the policy. Finally it is noted that the site has permission for B1, B2 and B8 Uses, but that the plan seeks to add D2. This may be undeliverable as worded and so would need to be rectified. If this policy is to be retained it should be amended to read:</p> <p>“Land west of Mill Lane, as shown on Fig. 34 is allocated for development of B1, B2 and B8 uses. Other uses may be</p>		<p>Mill Lane already has business units and there is a live application to build more units, which this Plan supports based on the consultation with local businesses.</p> <p>Different but similar policies are used to make the Plan requirements clear. However, wording has been amended as appropriate.</p>

	<i>considered subject to other policies of this plan being satisfied.”</i>		
Supplementary Reading	Is there a reason why there is a Supplementary Reading Section and a separate Bibliography with repetition of documents? This should be reviewed.		The Supplementary Reading section includes the reports to be read in conjunction with the Plan. However, they have now been incorporated with the bibliography section as recommended.
Glossary	The glossary has not been reviewed, but it is recommended that this be checked prior to submission to ensure accuracy and consistency with the NPPF and the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan glossaries.		The NPPF and central Lincolnshire local Plan glossaries were used in the creation of this glossary.

Table 5: Statutory and National Bodies responses

(a) Environment Agency

Comments	Response	Action
<p>Flood Risk We appreciate that flood risk has been taken into account in the Neighbourhood Plan and it has been listed as a criterium to consider the suitability of site to meet local housing need, so avoid areas at risk of flooding. All of the potential development sites are within flood zone 1. If any development is proposed within flood zone 2 and/or 3 they will need to consider sequential and exception tests and apply mitigation within these areas. Some of the study areas appear to be next to a main river. Therefore, they may require a permit under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) (Amendment) (No. 2) Regulations 2016 from the Environment Agency for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within eight metres of the top of the bank of the River Billingham Skirth, Car Dyke, Dorrington Dyke and New Cut Drain, designated as ‘main river’. This was formerly called a</p>	Noted	Plan amended accordingly

<p>Flood Defence Consent. Some activities are also now excluded or exempt. A permit is separate to and in addition to any planning permission granted. Further details and guidance are available on the GOV.UK website: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmentalpermits</p>		
<p>Water Quality</p> <p>The Water Framework Directive (WFD) came into force in December 2000, and was transposed into UK law in December 2003. The first principle of the WFD is to prevent deterioration in aquatic ecosystems. No deterioration requires that a water body does not deteriorate from its current ecological or chemical classification. In addition, water bodies are required to reach ‘good’ status by 2027.</p> <p>Billingham designation area includes the following main rivers: Billingham Skirth (water body GB105030056180) and Carr Dyke (water body GB105030056180) with an ecological status of ‘moderate’; Dorrington Dyke (water body GB105030056175) and New Cut Drain (water body GB105030056175) with an ecological status of ‘moderate’.</p> <p>Partners collectively have a duty to ensure that suitable infrastructure planning takes place to serve sustainable development within environmental limits. As the lead competent authority for carrying out the Water Framework Directive (WFD) in England and Wales, our aims are to prevent deterioration in the water status; promote the sustainable use of water; and help reduce the effects of floods and droughts. In addition to no deterioration, there must be progress towards an improved water status.</p> <p>Whilst we advise local planning authority’s (LPAs) that development needs to be planned carefully so that it does not compromise WFD objectives, LPAs are ultimately responsible for managing the impacts of development on the environment and applying related WFD legislation.</p> <p>Further to this, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that Water is a precious resource and the planning system should ensure that its use in new development is sustainable. The NPPF recognises that water resources need to be planned strategically (Para 156). In assessing future infrastructure requirements LPAs should, in discussion with other authorities and service providers, assess the quality and capacity of water supplies (Para 162 and 180).</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No action</p>

<p>Pollution Prevention It is important that any development would not have any negative impact on the status of waterbodies in this catchment. Government guidance contained within the national Planning Practice Guidance (Water supply, wastewater and water quality – considerations for planning applications, paragraph 020) sets out a hierarchy of drainage options that must be considered and discounted in the following order: 1. Connection to the public sewer 2. Package sewage treatment plant (adopted in due course by the sewerage company or owned and operated under a new appointment or variation) 3. Septic Tank</p>	Noted	No action
<p>Sewage treatment capacity We are actively promoting water infrastructure planning to secure sustainable development. We also have concerns that, if adequate infrastructure planning is not forthcoming, a lack of infrastructure planning and the time required to implement the necessary measures could result in environmental limits being exceeded. A major potential constraint to new development is therefore headroom capacity for sewage treatment in the area and the long lead in times needed to plan, develop and commission new facilities. Connection to foul sewer is the expected route of disposal where such a system exists and connection is possible. A lack of capacity in either the sewer network or at the receiving works is not an acceptable reason not to connect, in our view. Temporary arrangements can be considered where capacity in the sewerage network is planned but not yet available. Such temporary arrangements will only be considered where it has been confirmed by the sewerage undertaker that a deliverable Growth Plan, including a realistic timescale, is in place. Please note that the same permitting and regulatory regime that applies to any other private system, with the same in-river targets as for water company installations, must also apply to temporary arrangements. Variable loadings, and generally a relatively small baseload, mean that achieving a consistently acceptable effluent quality from temporary installations can be difficult and expensive, therefore posing a greater risk to the receiving watercourse. We remain committed to ensuring that where proposals meet identified needs, these come forward within environmental limits. We therefore look forward to</p>		

continuing our close working with your Authority, Anglian Water Services and the Applicant to resolve matters arising.		
Waste The inclusion of waste management in a proportional approach within a community neighbourhood plan could provide a local steer towards maintaining a clean and sustainable environment.		
Review of Documentation and Further Work We do have a voluntary charged-for service where we can provide more detailed pre-application advice. As part of this service we can provide a dedicated project manager to act as a single point of contact to coordinate any problems, data requests or review technical documents. Should the developer wish us to undertake a detailed review of a Flood Risk Assessment we can do this as part of our charged service.		

(b) Anglian Water

Comments	Response	Action
<p>Policy SA1: Former Lafford School Site, Fen Road We note that it proposed to develop A1, D1 and D2 uses on this site. There is expected to be a need to make improvements to the foul sewerage network to accommodate the flows from this site. Therefore, it is proposed that the following additional wording be included in Policy SA1 (to follow the following text 'Funding for...Billingham'). 'Evidence to demonstrate that adequate foul water treatment and disposal already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.'</p>	Comments noted.	Proposal incorporated
<p>Policy SA5: A153 Corridor We note that it proposed to make improvements to the foul sewerage network to accommodate the flows from this site develop B1, B2 and B8 uses on this site. There is expected to be a need to.</p>	Comments noted.	Proposal incorporated.

<p>Therefore, it is proposed that the following additional wording be included in Policy SA5 (to follow the following text ‘There is no adverse impact on amenity’).</p> <p>‘Applicant provides evidence to demonstrate that adequate foul water disposal already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.’</p>		
<p>Policy SA6: Land off Mill Lane</p> <p>We note that it proposed to develop B1, B2, B8 and D2 uses on this site. There is expected to be a need to make improvements to the foul sewerage network to accommodate the flows from this site.</p> <p>Therefore, it is proposed that the following additional wording be included in Policy SA6 (to follow the following text ‘There is no adverse impact on amenity’).</p> <p>‘Evidence to demonstrate that adequate foul water disposal already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development.’</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Proposal incorporated.</p>

(c) National Grid:

Comments	Response	Action
<p>National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No action required.</p>
<p>About National Grid</p> <p>National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operate the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our</p>		

<p>customers. National Grid own four of the UK's gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London.</p> <p>To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.</p> <p>Specific Comments</p> <p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate and High Pressure apparatus.</p> <p>National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure Whilst there is no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites. If further information is required in relation to the Gas Distribution network please contact plantprotection@nationalgrid.com</p> <p>Key resources / contacts</p> <p>National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity and transmission assets via the following internet link: http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/</p> <p>The electricity distribution operator in North Kesteven District Council is Western Power Distribution. Information regarding the transmission and distribution network can be found at: www.energynetworks.org.uk + Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure.</p>		
---	--	--

(d) **Historic England**

Comments	Response	Action
<p>Thank you for consulting Historic England about your Neighbourhood Plan. Your Neighbourhood Plan falls within the boundary of the Billingham Conservation Area and includes a number of designated heritage assets including 1 GI building and 10 GII listed buildings. It will be important that the strategy you put together for this area safeguards those elements which contribute to the importance of those historic assets. This will assist in ensuring they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area and make sure it is in line with national planning policy.</p> <p>The conservation officer at North Kesteven District Council is the best placed person to assist you in the development of your Neighbourhood Plan They can help you to consider how the strategy might address the area's heritage assets. At this point we don't consider there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the development of the strategy for your area.</p> <p>If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the staff at Lincolnshire County Council who look after the Historic Environment Record and give advice on archaeological matters. They should be able to provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway (www.heritagegateway.org.uk) (http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society, local history groups, building preservation trusts, etc. in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan. Your local authority might also be able to provide you with general support in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>National Planning Practice Guidance is clear that where it is relevant, Neighbourhood Plans need to include enough</p>	Noted	No action required.

<p>information about local heritage to guide planning decisions and to put broader strategic heritage policies from the local authority's local plan into action at a neighbourhood scale. If appropriate this should include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions. Further information and guidance on how heritage can best be incorporated into Neighbourhood Plans has been produced by Historic England. This sign posts a number of other documents which your community might find useful in helping to identify what it is about your area which makes it distinctive and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. These can be found at:- http://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-yourneighbourhood/</p>		
--	--	--

Table 6: Local Residents' Comments

Resident	Comments	Overall View	Review	Impact on Plan
Resident 1	<p>All building plots/new builds should count against the total housing needs detailed in the Local Plan. Any derelict and unoccupied houses should be brought into occupation. Infrastructure is needed before housing. We need dentists, vets, petrol station, opticians, larger supermarkets and better road system. What will be the effects of the massive additional vehicular movements on Park Lane/Mill Lane? Phasing of Building must depend on high percentage of occupation before the next phase starts. Otherwise squatters, drug users, vandalism, theft may</p>	For	Comments considered relevant as infrastructure problems are already known.	No changes to plan

	<p>be the norm. Considering Sleaford, Ruskington & Metheringham have increased housing, who will come to live in Billingham. More vision is needed and more flesh on the bones. Billingham is in danger of losing its identity under these proposals. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to get this village right. I only hope the committee have the courage to stand firm and produce a well-balanced future.</p>			
Resident 2.	<p>CFA1 The addition of housing to this plan was the late addition (January) and the first knowledge we had was from the NKDC Planning Dept. Map shows 33 dwellings but Application says 49 (Evidence Surveys & Reports for 3) Should not need to build on green land on edge of the village as visible from A153 Main Road and unsightly.</p>	Neutral	Appears to be confusion between Local and Neighbourhood Plan	No action
Resident 3	<p>TT1 Safe cyclist crossings are commendable but we, as a village, must also address safe cycling. At present adults are often cycling around with no lights or helmets - scary for drivers. Youngsters often play "chicken" crossing the roads at speed without looking. Safe cyclist crossings may encourage this behaviour.</p>	For	Noted	No action
Resident 4	<p>Agree Doctor's Car park needs to be bigger. Also, greater need for parking off road if Waterside Development goes ahead. as junction will reduce current number on the High Street. Before more houses are built, a</p>	For	Infrastructure comment	No action

	bigger shop is needed as well as a larger Medical Centre.			
Resident 5	Page 14 - proof reading error Page 21 third para is duplication of 2nd para on Page 18	For	Noted	Plan amended
Resident 6	ENV3 Agree but how to vandal proof? TT2 Shouldn't every new house have at least two parking spaces. EEG1 Should be offered to the Community first. Page 41 Why not a Farmer's market in the Market Square? SA1 - Strongly agree.	For	Points discussed	Plan supports comments
Resident 7.	TT2 Need more buses especially to Lincoln. EEE1 Need more shops for people who have no transport of their own.	For	Infrastructure	No change to Plan
Resident 8.	Speeding is appalling in Church Street. Need speed bumps from Market Square to the Bridge. More dog bins needed on the Skirth Bank with appropriate warning signs re dog fouling.	Neutral	Points accepted	No change to Plan
Resident 9	Plan says no objections to proposed new housing but we objected. Need smaller houses for younger people and old people to downsize. Waterside development is on green land. Infrastructure will not support the development. Skirth Road gets flooded now. No bus services. Waterside development access could be dangerous for cars emerging onto High Street and there will be an increase of 80plus cars. parking on High Street will be reduced by new junction.	Objects	Objects to specific application. The point refers to a comment regarding the Local Plan not the Neighbourhood Plan	No action
Resident 10	Plan says no objections to proposed new housing but we objected. Need smaller	Objects	Objects to specific application. The point	No Action

	houses for younger people and old people to downsize. Waterside development is on green land. Infrastructure will not support the development. Skirth Road gets flooded now. No bus services. Waterside development access could be dangerous for cars emerging onto High Street and there will be an increase of 80 plus cars parking on High Street will be reduced by new junction.		refers to a comment regarding the Local Plan not the Neighbourhood Plan	
Resident 11.	Very happy to see we may be getting a gym. My only concern is dog fouling on the footpaths across the fields. The grass is used for animal feed and dog waste is an issue with illness in cows, sheep and horses.	For	Infrastructure issue	No change to Plan
Resident 12	The Neighbourhood Plan highlights concerns raised by residents having regard to the village's drainage and sewerage systems and that policies are included with the plan to accommodate this issue When reading I could not see any policy which relates to this matter and only that of flooding. I know this is a large concern for a high number of residents, so if it has been covered, please could you point me in the right direction.	For	Alerted Committee to omission from Plan.	Rectified in accordance with Anglian Water comments.
Resident 13	Page 56 -There is no access to the Public Footpath from Carre Square or Shire Close	For	Agreed	Change made – Shire Close reference removed.
Resident 14	CFA1 Local Services are very important to our village and, if more housing goes up then all our local services will need extra help etc.	For	Infrastructure	No change made

	Enlarging health facilities and schools to maintain a happy balance.			
--	--	--	--	--

Table 7. List of appendices as found in the separate Billingham Neighbourhood Plan Appendix Document

Appendix	Title of Document
Appendix 1	Poster and letter sent out to promote the 2015-2025 Plan
Appendix 2	Minutes of Policy Mapping Workshop with Urban Vision
Appendix 3	Examples of promotional posters for public consultation events
Appendix 4	Full list of public consultation methods
Appendix 5	Example of a BCP update presented to Billingham Patient Participation Group
Appendix 6	Minutes of discussion with NK Health Walking Group
Appendix 7	Resident Survey Results
Appendix 8	Business Survey Results
Appendix 9	Group Survey Results
Appendix 10	Housing Needs Survey (blank)
Appendix 11	Travel and Transport Survey
Appendix 12	Resident Survey completed by Billingham Guides
Appendix 13	Minutes of meeting regarding support for Billingham's younger residents
Appendix 14	Minutes of Meeting with North Kesteven District Council Economic Development
Appendix 15	A few resident "wishes" and comments for the Fen Road site and Billingham
Appendix 16	Alternative development plan for the Fen Road/former Lafford High School site
Appendix 17	NKDC early review of the draft Plan
Appendix 18	Documents pertaining to the Regulation 14 Pre-submission public consultation

