

OSGODBY
NEIGHBOURHOOD
DEVELOPMENT PLAN
2017 - 2036

Consultation Statement

PREPARED BY OSGODBY
PARISH COUNCIL



TABLE OF CONTENT

1. What is the Consultation Statement?.....	3
2. Consultation Summary	4
3. Regulation 14 Pre-submission Consultation	11
4. Appendix A: Pre-submission Consultation Material	86
5. Appendix B: Statutory Consultees.....	103
6. Appendix C: Consultation with Businesses.....	109
7. Appendix D: Consultation with Landowners of sites submitted as part of the Call for Sites	112
8. Appendix E: Consultation with Local Green Spaces Landowners.....	113
9. Appendix F: Potential Development Sites & Policy Intentions	Separate Document at the end of the Statement
10. Appendix G: Presentation at the community event of 18 th of March 2017.....	Separate Document at the end of the Statement
11. Appendix H: Presentation at the community event of 29 th of July 2017.....	Separate Document at the end of the Statement

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Activity Log	4
Figure 2. Regulation 14 Consultation – Statutory Consultees	12
Figure 3. Regulation 14 Consultation – Local Residents	46

1. What is the Consultation Statement?

- 1.1. This Consultation Statement document has been prepared to support the submission of the Osgodby Neighbourhood Development Plan (the Plan), prepared for the Parish of Osgodby, for the period 2017 – 2036.
- 1.2. This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations sets out that a Consultation Statement should contain:
 - **Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;**
 - **Explain how they were consulted;**
 - **Summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;**
 - **Describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan.**
- 1.3. The Pre Submission Draft Osgodby Neighbourhood Development Plan was made available for consultation in accordance with Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations from 24th July to the 04th September 2017. This document provides a description of the amendments made to the document based on the comments received.
- 1.4. The following section of this document, the 'Consultation Summary' sets out chronologically the consultation events that have led to the production of the Draft Osgodby Neighbourhood Development Plan. This consultation formed the basis of the Neighbourhood Policies contained within the Plan.

2. Consultation Summary

Figure 1. Activity Log

Date	Activity	Involved Stakeholders	How it has been publicised
Nov 2014	Parish Council resolves to form a NP steering group	Parish Council and all residents	Call for volunteers to form a steering group published in parish magazine delivered to every home
May-June 2015	Questionnaire to confirm parish wished to have a NP	Parish Council and all residents, 19 forms returned	Questionnaire to every household
August 2015	More detailed questionnaire	250 households in the parish, 84 forms returned	Questionnaire to every household
October 2015	Drop-in event at Village Hall	All residents, 26 attended	Leaflet to every household. Website notice
December 2015	Drop-in event at Village Hall	All residents invited, 24 attended	Prominent signboards in Osgodby & Kirkby villages. Website notice
March 2016	Call for nominations for development sites	All residents and non-resident landowners	Letter to every household and to non-resident landowners
July 2016	Drop-in event at Village Hall – map of nominated sites and draft policy intentions displayed for comment	All residents, 42 attended	Leaflet to every household Website notice
March 2017	Presentation on criteria-based policy approach to site allocation	All residents, 30 attended	Leaflet to every household Website notice
June 2017	Stand at Summer Fete displaying draft policies and diagrams of developed footprint of settlements	All residents, 22 attended	Fete advertised in parish magazine, posters, website, local press

July 2017	Regulation 14 consultation event at Village Hall – paper copies of Pre-submission plan and questionnaires provided	All residents, 29 attended	Leaflet to every household Website notice
-----------	--	----------------------------	--

Parish Council Meeting 10 November 2014

Purpose: To resolve on the preparation of a Neighbourhood Development Plan by calling for volunteers to form a steering group.

Consultation Technique: The Council resolved unanimously to initiate a NP by placing an article in the parish magazine received by every household in the parish (Appendix A, paragraph 4.1.).

Outcomes: Five councillors and five other residents volunteered to assist in preparing a NP and attended training events to assist them in doing so.

Preliminary Questionnaire, May 2015

Purpose: In view of the delay in actually making a start on the plan, to confirm that there was still public support for preparing a NP and to call for more volunteers as some of the initial group did not wish to continue.

Consultation Technique: Brief questionnaire delivered to every household asking if they would like a NP for Osgodby, if they would assist in preparing it, and inviting contact details (Appendix A, paragraph 4.2.); each returned form would be entered into a draw for a bottle of champagne.

Outcomes: Although a low response of 19 forms returned, unanimous response was in favour of a NP and several volunteers came forward.

Questionnaire on what should be in NP, August 2015

Purpose: To learn which issues parishioners considered important, what scale of development they favoured and where they would prefer it to be.

Consultation Technique: A questionnaire composed of 17 closed and open questions with opportunity to add anything not already covered in the questionnaire (Appendix A, paragraph 4.3.); a map of the parish on which possible sites for development could be marked. Forms were delivered and collected by members of the steering group.

Outcomes: 84 forms were returned (Appendix A, paragraph 4.3.) – a response rate of 33%. A total of 84% favoured growth of 10% to 20% and there was clear support for addressing in the plan most of the issues suggested in the questionnaire.

Drop-in Event at Village Hall, Friday 30 October 2015 4 – 7p.m.

Purpose: To update residents on work undertaken so far, discuss draft policy proposals, invite comments on the direction the plan was taking, maintain public interest and involvement in the plan.

Consultation Technique: Displays of questionnaire results, potential areas of policy which could be included in the plan, sites within the parish which may be of concern as flood risk areas, development sites, places which people may wish to be protected by the plan. Members of the steering group in attendance to listen to residents and discuss concerns. Refreshments (cheese & wine, etc.) were provided to encourage people to spend longer looking at documents and discussing with group members. The event has been advertised through Leaflet to every households (Appendix A, paragraph 4.4.) and a notice on the Parish website.

Outcomes: Total of 26 attended the event over the course of the evening. Most wanted to learn more about what a NP

could offer and some questioned why the Parish Plan (published 2010) was not sufficient. Broad agreement for some growth but not unrestricted and Osgodby Village was favoured as main area for any development. Suggestion that brownfield sites should be first to be developed. Strong interest in preserving the green rural character of the parish.

Drop-in Event at Village Hall, Saturday 12 December 2015 10 a.m. – 1 p.m.

Purpose: To consult residents on their views on the design and character of potential development sites in the parish.

Consultation Technique: Displays of photographs of nominated sites and flood risk areas, paper copies of the design and character report provided for people to look at more closely. Members of the steering group in attendance to listen to residents and discuss concerns. Refreshments (tea, coffee, mince pies) provided to encourage people to spend longer looking at documents and discussing with group members.

Outcomes: Residents expressed strong concern that the rural and green character of the parish should be maintained. Infill of brownfield sites was favoured and in a manner which would not conflict with the character of neighbouring properties. Developments which extended the footprint of the village behind the current street frontage were not favoured because such sites would essentially be greenfield. Off-street parking was mentioned as important in Osgodby village because of the existing problems with school parking. The number of properties on any development site should be limited and should not look like “mini-estates”.

Call for Land Letter, March 2016

Purpose: To invite everyone who owned land in the parish to nominate sites to be included in the NP for allocation for development.

Consultation Technique: Letter (Appendix A, paragraph 4.5.) delivered to every household in the parish and posted to every non-resident landowner identified as owning land in the parish

Outcomes: A total of 29 sites were identified by the responses to this letter and historically from planning applications and consultation in drafting the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan; these sites had potential for over 70 new homes.

Drop-in Event at Village Hall, 29th July 2016 7.30 p.m.

Purpose: To present residents with map of nominated development sites and draft policy intentions and to listen to their views and comments on these.

Consultation Technique: Invitations sent to every home in the parish (Appendix A, paragraph 4.6.); 42 people attended. The event centred on a map which showed the location and size of nominated sites. Copies of a draft leaflet (Appendix F) were provided for all attendees to stimulate discussion (though this leaflet was not used as a consultation technique in itself due to inaccuracies in the map of sites). Members of the group and Luke Brown of WLDC were present to answer queries and listen to comments.

Outcomes: The map was prepared on the group's behalf by WLDC and was not available before the event; when it was revealed at the event, members of the group immediately recognised that there were inaccuracies on the map. Whilst it was 90% accurate there were some sites missing and some should not have been included (these were crossed off the main map). Attendees were asked to comment on those sites shown, and the majority favoured those within the built-up form of Osgodby Village; there was less support for more isolated sites and sites in Kirkby. Concerns were expressed about flood risk areas and about the number of houses which might be built on any one site. There was broad support for the policy intentions with particular concern expressed for protecting local facilities and green spaces.

Presentation at Village Hall, Saturday 18 March 2017 11 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.

Purpose: To present latest proposals on where and on what scale development should take place and listen to residents' views on these.

Consultation Technique: Invitations sent to every home in the parish (Appendix A, paragraph 4.7.); 30 people

attended. Slide show of maps, diagrams and explanatory texts (Appendix G) delivered by consultants, Open Plan, on behalf of and with support of the steering group. Followed by session of questions and comments from residents.

Outcomes: The majority of those present (by show of hands) were in favour of the approach outlined in the presentation, namely that a criteria-based policy should be used rather than allocating specific sites for development. The proposal that development should be confined to just Osgodby Village was not so well supported with few of those present wishing to exclude any development in Kirkby Village, though a proposal to limit development to one house per site in Kirkby was favoured by the majority – the draft plan was later amended to reflect this. Issues such as affordable housing were discussed though there was little consensus on how this could be achieved or the actual level of need. There was continuing strong interest in promoting employment opportunities and in protecting local facilities and green spaces and in preserving the individual characters of the settlements in the parish.

Stall at Summer Fete Saturday 10 June 2017 12 – 4 p.m.

Purpose: To inform residents of the latest draft policies and proposals for areas of development and invite comments and questions.

Consultation Technique: Fete is historically a well-attended event which a broad range of residents attend which gave an opportunity to reach those who might not choose to attend a NP event; the event was advertised on the parish magazine (Appendix A, paragraph 4.8.); 22 parishioners approached the stall to enquire about and discuss the NP. The stall was sited in the Village Hall close to the refreshments counter and comprised of a large display of the draft policies; a computer slideshow of the March presentation was continually running and the Parish Council chairman was in attendance for the full period to explain and answer questions.

Outcomes: Many of those who looked at the display and spoke to the chairman had not been to any other NP event. Most expressed understanding of, and agreement with, the policy for deciding where development should occur. The dark skies policy was commented on favourably. There was strong interest in protecting local facilities, in particular

the village pub. None of the feedback gave cause to consider changes to the draft policies.

Regulation 14 Pre-submission Consultation Event at Village Hall, Saturday 29 July 2017 10.30 a.m. – 2 p.m.

Purpose: To provide residents with an opportunity to view the pre-submission plan on paper and complete a questionnaire on-line or on paper.

Consultation Technique: Invitations sent to every home in the parish (Appendix A, paragraph 4.9.) and advertised on the Parish Website (Appendix A, paragraph 4.10); Displays of the policies (Appendix H) and paper copies of the pre-submission plan and supporting documents were provided with paper copies of the Regulation 14 consultation questionnaire (Appendix A, paragraph 4.11.). Laptop computers were available for those who wished to complete a questionnaire on-line. Members of the steering group in attendance to explain the contents of the plan and assist in completion of questionnaires and to transport any resident who may need assistance getting to or from the event.

Outcomes: Most who attended had already looked at the plan on-line but wished to examine it more closely on paper or have some elements explained. Satisfaction with and approval for the plan was the predominant opinion though no-one chose to complete a questionnaire at the event. Paper copies of the questionnaire were taken away for completion at home and some people undertook to complete the questionnaire on-line later.

3. Regulation 14 Pre-submission Consultation

- 3.1. Consultation with the community and Statutory Consultees on the Draft Osgodby Neighbourhood Development Plan began on 24th June 2017 and ended 4th September 2017.
- 3.2. The Consultation exercise included a survey, available both online and in paper format, asking Consultees to state whether they supported or did not support the Vision and Objectives of the Draft Plan, each of the policies, Community Aspirations, the Design and Character Assessment, the Local Green Space Assessment and the Capacity Study (Appendix A, paragraph 4.11.).
- 3.3. Statutory Consultees were also emailed to inform them of the Regulation 14 Consultation (Appendix B, paragraph 5.2.): the Neighbourhood Development Plan and Consultation Form were attached to the email (for a complete list of Statutory Consultees, please refer to Appendix B, paragraph 5.1.). The email also provided a link to download all the other evidence based documents (i.e. the Design and Character Assessment, the Local Green Space Assessment and the Capacity Study) and to access the SurveyMonkey consultation form. The letter provided contact details to respond to the survey in writing or to receive additional information, and informed Consultees that hard copies of the Draft Plan and evidence based document where available at the Village Hall and Post Office. The email also informed Consultees of the drop-in consultation event held at the Osgodby Village Hall (Mill Lane, Osgodby, Market Rasen, LN8 3TB) on the 29th July 2017, between 10:30 am and 2:00 pm.
- 3.4. Landowners that replied to the initial the Call for Sites run by the Steering Group, as well as landowners of proposed Local Green Spaces, were emailed or notified by regular mail in case no email address was available. To add clarity, the emails and letters to landowners that replied to the initial the Call for Sites explained the

reasoning why no land allocations have been included in the Neighbourhood Development Plan (such email is available in Appendix D); the letter to landowners of sites proposed as Local Green Spaces specified what a Local Green Space is and directly quoted the NPPF (such email is available in Appendix E

- 3.5. A list of business active in the Parish were compiled (available in Appendix C): letters were emailed, send by post or delivered by hand to all the businesses in this list.
- 3.6. All houses in the Parish were informed with leaflets containing the information specified in paragraph 3.3.
- 3.7. Comment received in response to Regulation 14 Consultation are presented in the table on the following page. For each comment, the Steering Group’s response and any subsequent changes to the Draft Plan are presented.

Figure 2. Regulation 14 Consultation – Statutory Consultees

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Summary of Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
General	Brattleby Parish Council	Good work! My Council offers you our full support.	Support Noted	No change required
General	Environment Agency	I have reviewed the plan and find that it raises no concerns for the Environment Agency. We therefore have no comments to make.	Support Noted	No change required

General	Middle Rasen Parish Council	The Council have reviewed the documentation as outlined in your e-mail below and support the elements of the plan as laid out.	Support Noted	No change required
General	Network Rail	From the information provided within your neighbourhood plan, there seems to be no proposals that will affect the safety of the operational railway.	Support Noted	No change required
General	Nottinghamshire County Council	Thank you for consulting Nottinghamshire CC Planning, we have no comments to make at this stage of the plan.	Support Noted	No change required
General	West Lindsey District Council	The name of the parish requires consistency, is it Kirkby cum Osgodby or just Osgodby Parish? Please amend accordingly to accommodate all the references.	The name of the Parish is Osgodby Parish	The Plan has been amended to always read Osgodby Parish

General	Mineral and Waste Authority	<p>As you may be aware, it is a statutory requirement that Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan, including the minerals and waste policies. I would therefore ask that you have particular regard to the proposals and policies in the CSDMP that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguard existing minerals and waste sites from incompatible development; • Safeguard Mineral Resources to prevent unnecessary sterilisation by development; and • Identify the locational criteria and Areas of Search 	<p>The Neighbourhood Development Plan have regard of the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Development Plan does not have Policies that, directly or indirectly, could cause sterilisation of mineral resources or impede identification or search of future minerals and waste sites. No existing mineral sites and waste sites are present within the Parish.</p>	No charge required

		for future minerals and waste development.		
General	Mineral and Waste Authority	The Second part of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, the Pre-submission Site Locations Document 2016 (SLD), identifying the preferred sites and areas for future mineral working/waste management was subject to examination in public in June 2017. The inspectors final report is currently pending however any policies and proposals in your Neighbourhood Plan should not conflict with the proposed allocations set out in the draft SLD.	No preferred sites neither areas for future mineral working/waste management have been identified in the Parish. The Steering Group considered the Pre-submission Site Locations Document 2016 (SLD) and did not identify any inconsistency nor conflict with this document.	No change required
General	Sport England	A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the	The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan makes provision for playing pitches and indoor/outdoor sport facility and produced its own evidence gathering study and reports regarding the above. Osgodby Neighbourhood Development Plan gave	No change required

		neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.	consideration to such studies and supports the recommendations and actions set in the CLLP's policies	
General	Sport England	In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to	The Steering Group gave appropriate consideration to the way new development will provide opportunity for people to lead healthy lifestyles: Housing development have been concentrated in the Village Centre, in close proximity to services; protected existing footpaths, bridleways, open	No change required

Maps	West Lindsey District Council	<p>lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities.</p> <p>Maps – The overall mapping needs to be reviewed at this stage, specific comments in relation to the following maps;</p> <p>Figure 1 – Would this be better presented with an OS base map layer? It is hard to distinguish the settlements from the current map.</p> <p>Figure 5 - The listed building and schedule monument map is very unclear, to the extent that it is difficult to identify the property/area to which the legend relates. Could this be done at a more detailed scale?</p> <p>Figure 6 - The sites of Environmental Value map is again unclear. The above approach could be taken.</p> <p>Figure 7 – The comment at</p>	<p>recreation spaces and green infrastructures.</p> <p>The Steering Group contacted WLDC to discuss the changes required to the maps. The following changes have been performed</p> <p>Figure 1- The Steering Group asked WLDC to provide a different map for Figure 1</p> <p>Figure 5 - The Steering Group believes that Figure 5 Listed Building and Schedule Monument is no longer required, as no policy refers specifically to Listed Building and Schedule Monuments and detailed and updated maps are available on the Historic England Website</p> <p>Figure 6 – The Steering Group believes that the best way to increase the clarity of this map is to split it into two maps, the Eastern and Western side of the Parish. The colour of the</p>	<p>Figure 1- the map provided by WLDC has been substituted to the original map.</p> <p>Figure 5 - Listed Building and Historic Monument Map have been removed from the Plan.</p> <p>Figure 6- Map has been divided into 2 Maps. The colours of the features have been changed to increase clarity. "Important Open Space" label has been corrected with "Local Green Space (CLLP)".</p> <p>Figure 7 – A map at a more detailed scale have been added.</p> <p>Figure 9 – A map at a more detailed scale have been added.</p> <p>Figure 10 – A map at a more detailed scale have been added.</p>
------	-------------------------------	--	--	--

		<p>figure 5 is relevant.</p> <p>Figure 9 – Only needs to show the settlement so could be done at a more detailed scale.</p> <p>Figure 10 – Same applies as figure 9.</p> <p>Figure 12 – More detailed scale is required.</p> <p>Figure 13 - More detailed scale is required.</p> <p>Figure 14 - More detailed scale is required.</p>	<p>feature has also been changed to increase clarity</p> <p>Figure 7 – The Steering Group agrees to include a map at a more detailed scale.</p> <p>Figure 9 - The Steering Group agrees to include a map at a more detailed scale.</p> <p>Figure 10 - The Steering Group agrees to include a map at a more detailed scale.</p> <p>Figure 12 - The Steering Group agrees to include a map at a more detailed scale.</p> <p>Figure 13 - The Steering Group agrees to include a map at a more detailed scale.</p> <p>Figure 14 – The Steering Group agrees on amending the map with a map of green infrastructures provided by WLDC</p>	<p>Figure 12 – A map at a more detailed scale have been added.</p> <p>Figure 13 – A map at a more detailed scale have been added.</p> <p>Figure 14 – a map provided by WLDC has been added instead of the previous map.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Maps	West Lindsey District Council	<p>Could the plan contain separate maps focused on the settlements and then an overall parish map as an appendix or vice versa? This would allow the decision taker to define the exact boundary of the area when determining application which could impact upon these sites.</p>	<p>The Steering Group agrees on retaining two maps focusing on the two settlements and added an overall Policy Map of the whole Parish to allow the decision taker to define the exact boundaries and elements of the Plan when determining applications.</p>	<p>An overall Policy Map of the Parish has been added before Section 8.</p>
Foreword	West Lindsey District Council	<p>"Localism Act 2012" needs replacing with 2011 - The neighbourhood planning provisions are contained in the Localism Act 2011</p>	<p>The Steering Group amended the Foreword as suggested</p>	<p>The Foreword now reads "Localism Act 2011"</p>
Section 1. What is a Neighbourhood Development Plan?	West Lindsey District Council	<p>1.2: There are two further points which could be added – "C) Also to be used by parish council in consideration of planning applications in the parish. D) Wider use by residents and stakeholders"</p>	<p>The Steering Group amended paragraph 1.2 as suggested</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.2 now reads "c) Parish Councils in consideration of planning applications in the Parish; and, d) Wider use by residents and stakeholders"</p>

<p>Section 2. Why Prepare a Neighbourhood Development Plan</p>	<p>West Lindsey District Council</p>	<p>2.4. Please provide all the named documents so they can be displayed on the district council website.</p>	<p>The Steering Group has provided all the named documents to WLDC</p>	<p>No change required</p>
<p>Section 5. The Present</p>	<p>West Lindsey District Council</p>	<p>Change to "Listed Buildings" The headings for Figure 5, 6 and 7 need placing on the correct page to where the respective maps are located.</p>	<p>The Steering Group believes that Figure 5 Listed Building and Schedule Monument is no longer required, as no policy refers specifically to Listed Building and Schedule Monuments and detailed and update maps are available on the Historic England Website. The Steering Group agrees on the changes to the heading of Figure 6 and 7.</p>	<p>Figure 5 Listed Building and Historic Monument has been removed from the Plan. Paragraph 5.6 now reads "The Parish contains several Listed Buildings, mostly concentrated in Kingerby, Kirkby, Osgodby and Usselby, as well as the Sware, and English Heritage Scheduled Monument. A complete and up-to-date list and map of Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments is available on Historic England online database, the National Heritage List for England</p>

				<p>(https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/map-search)."</p> <p>Figure 6 and 7 have been renamed Figure 5 and 6 respectively. The reference for these figures is now https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/central-lincolnshire/policies-map-and-interactive-map, linking to the correct page where the respective maps are located</p>
Section 5. The Present	West Lindsey District Council	<p>Figure 6: It would be useful to know the source of the sites of high environmental value eg. local green space is from the CLLP. Has the NPG used Natural England's magic website to source info? Although outside parish, Kingerby Beck SSI impact risk zones fall within the parish, could this be included on the map? Kings Wood is also not shown on the map, could this be included?</p>	<p>The Steering Group amended paragraph 5.7 to detail the source of each designation presented in the Map</p> <p>Kingerby Beck has been added to the Map, although the Steering Group does not believe necessary to add the impact risk zones as this element has been addressed in the Scoping report for the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>The Steering Group does not believe there is a wood named "Kings Wood" within</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.7 now reads "There are several sites of high biodiversity and ecosystem value in the Parish, even though the poor network of public rights of way make them difficult to access. Figure 5 shows the following designations, as presented in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Interactive Map (https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/central-lincolnshire/policies-map-and-interactive-map/) and Magic Website (http://www.natureonthemap.natureengland.org.uk/home.htm):</p> <p>a) Ancient Woodlands (Magic Website); and,</p> <p>b) Local Wildlife Sites (Greater</p>

			or adjacent to the Parish of Osgodby.	Lincolnshire Nature Partnership 2014-2015); and, c) Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership 2014-2015); and, d) Local Green Space (Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, Policy LP23); and, e) Area of Great Landscape Value (Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, Policy LP17); and, f) Sites of Special Scientific Interest (Magic Website)."
Section 5. The Present	West Lindsey District Council	5.8: Could the plan go into more detail about risk categories, do the NPG feel that it is necessary to explain the difference?	The Steering Group agrees to explain in more details the difference between Flood Risk Zone 2 and Flood Risk Zone 3, using the Environmental agency definition.	Paragraph 5.8 now reads "The flood zones are prepared by the Environmental Agency and are based on the likelihood of an area flooding, with flood zone 2 areas least likely to flood and flood zone 3 areas more likely to flood. Areas within flood zone 3 have been shown to be at a 1% or greater probability of flooding from rivers in any year, while flood zone 2 within have

				between 0.1% – 1% chance of flooding. The majority of the Parish lies in Flood Risk Zone 1, and only a small proportion of the Parish is in flood zone 2; however, some parts of the parish are located in flood zone 3 which runs to the North and the West of the Parish. Flood risk data is constantly updated and is available to view on the following website, https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/
Vision and Objective	West Lindsey District Council	Vision – the vision gives mention to “individual settlements” but does not identify the names, could there be a reference to make it more locally distinctive?	The Steering Group mentioned the four settlements of Osgodby, Kirkby, Usselby and Kingerby in the Vision	The first sentence of the Vision now reads “In 20 years’ time, Osgodby will continue to be a green and pleasant parish made of the distinctively individual settlements of Osgodby, Kirkby, Usselby and Kingerby, set in a rural environment” The following sentence has been added to the Vision:
Vision and Objective	West Lindsey District Council	There is no specific reference to economic development or tourism, yet these issues are highlighted as a key issue in the consultation on page 25 and in the objectives	The Steering Group added a sentence referring to economic development and tourism in the Vision.	“Employment opportunities and economic development in different sectors, including tourism, will be supported”

Vision and Objective	West Lindsey District Council	Objectives – Is there an objective missing off the bottom? It looks like the text box has cut off one of the objectives, this could be a formatting issue	The 7 th Objective has not been included in the list due to a formatting issue, which the Steering Group have addressed.	The 7 th Objective is included and reads "7. Support the improvement of Public Transport opportunities"
Policy 1	West Lindsey District Council	Remove "Proposed Submission" – the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan is adopted.	The Steering Group removed the "Proposed Submission".	Paragraph 8.1 now reads "The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 28) recognises the importance of allowing and making provision for a certain level of growth in small villages, to sustain the viability of these rural centres. The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan implements these principles in the form of a hierarchy of settlements and a specific minimum growth rate per settlement, as per Policy LP2."

Policy 1	West Lindsey District Council	8.2 – The correct 10% growth figure for Osgodby is 14 dwellings. Please amend accordingly.	The Steering Group changed the figure from 13 to 14.	First sentence of paragraph 8.2 now reads “Osgodby and Kirkby are identified as two independent small villages, and are expected to grow in the next 20 years by a minimum of 14 and 6 dwellings respectively”
Policy 1	West Lindsey District Council	8.4 – This point needs clarification. The Parish Council conducted a call for land consultation to invite landowners to submit their land to be considered as part of the neighbourhood plan. WLDC completed a site assessment for these sites, along with the sites that were submitted to be considered as part of the local plan SHLAA. The parish council then completed, or commissioned, a capacity study. Please amend the details.	The Parish Council conducted a Call for Sites among Parish residents in March 2016, and WLDC completed this list adding sites that have been considered as part of the Local Plan SHLAA. WLDC completed a site assessment for these sites. A total of 29 sites were identified, which had potential for over 70 new houses. Sites were presented to the local community on a public event held on 20th June 2016, asking residents to comment on these sites. The majority favoured those within the built-up developed footprint of Osgodby Village Parish Council, and little support for isolated sites and	Paragraph 8.4 and 8.5 now read: “8.4 The Parish Council conducted a Call for Sites among residents in March 2016, and WLDC completed this list adding sites that have been considered as part of the Local Plan’s Strategic Housing and Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). West Lindsey District Council performed a Site Availability Study of all the 29 sites identified, which had potential for over 70 new houses. Sites were presented to the local community on a public event held on 20th June 2016, asking residents to express their comments. The majority favoured those within the built-up form of Osgodby Village Parish Council, and little support for isolated sites and sites in Kirkby was registered. Following this event, the

			<p>sites in Kirkby was registered. The Steering Group decided to explore a criteria-based policy structured upon Policy LP2 of the CLLP alongside an allocation-based approach, and commissioned a consultant to prepare a Capacity Study to understand if CLLP minimum target could be reached using such an approach. The Capacity Study concluded that there are enough suitable potential sites to meet the CLLP minimum target, and that a criteria-based policy would allow for a more organic growth in the Parish. Both options (allocation-based policy and criteria-based policy) were presented to the community on a public event held on March 18th 2017. The majority of those present were in favour of the criteria-based policy, rather than allocating specific sites for development.</p>	<p>Steering Group decided to explore a criteria-based approach alongside the allocation-based option, considering that it would allow for a more organic growth of the villages while still preserving the character of the settlement and meeting the aspirations of the residents. The Steering Group commissioned a consultant to prepare a Capacity Study to understand whether or not the CLLP minimum target could be reached using a criteria-based approach. The Capacity Study concluded that there are enough suitable potential sites to meet the CLLP minimum target, and that a criteria-based policy would allow for a more organic growth in the Parish.</p> <p>8.5 A further community event was held on the 18th March 2017 in the Village Hall, presenting both the allocation-based approach and the criteria-based approach. Residents expressed a support for growth in the Parish to help sustaining existing services and revitalise the villages, attracting young residents and families to the area. The group was</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			The Steering Group agrees to amend paragraph 8.4 and 8.5 to better clarify this process.	also in favour of a criteria-based policy that allows development to come forward organically. It was also recognised that a criteria-based policy should steer development in the right direction, rather than restrict development to a small number of allocated sites, whose actual deliverability could not be guaranteed."
Policy 1	West Lindsey District Council	8.14, 15 & 16 – These points seem to be trying to inform the community support element, but they are not contained within the policy. If the NPG want these criteria to inform the development then the points need to be contained within the policy. Taking into account that the concept of community support is already a requirement of the CLLP. Policy diagram 1.1 and 1.2, please create these maps at a smaller scale so that	The point raised in paragraphs 8.14 and 8.15 are examples that clarifies how to engage the community in order to produce "demonstrable evidence of clear local community support", as requested in Section 4 of Policy 1 and Section 5 of Policy 2. This bullet points are included in the Justification Text to provide additional clarity to developers, although it is acknowledged that developers identify different, yet thorough, consultation techniques and/or provide	The first sentence of paragraph 8.14 has been amended to read "In keeping with Policy LP2 of the CLLP, sites that result in a growth of over 25 dwellings in the life of the Plan will need to demonstrate community support together with compliance with this Policy. The local community should be presented with at least information on:" The first sentence of paragraph 8.15

		individual plots can be identified clearly, with ease.	different information from those listed in paragraph 8.14 and 8.15. For these reasons, the Steering Group does not believe Policy 1 and Policy 2 should be amended to include these points. The Steering Group amended the wording of paragraph 8.14 and 8.15 to clarify the above	has been amended to read "The local community will need to have the opportunity to express their opinion on the development, for example in the form of:"
Policy 1	West Lindsey District Council	There doesn't appear to be many references to affordable/accessible housing yet this was identified as a key issue.	As the Policy restricting development to a maximum of four dwelling in each site, the Steering Group believes that a provision requesting affordable houses would be unreasonable and difficult to enforce. For this reason, it has been agreed that no change to the Policy is necessary. Moreover, future development of the Bells Almshouses will naturally provide additional affordable and accessible housing.	No change required

Policy 1	West Lindsey District Council	<p>WLDC encourages NP's to add a local dimension to the CLLP, therefore the term 'preferred locations' is a concept that WLDC would like to see incorporated. However, there are concerns about the use of the terms 'appropriate locations' and 'developed footprint' as they are already defined within the CLLP.</p> <p>There is no need to re-write the definitions of the terms 'developed footprint', 'appropriate locations' and the 'sequential test', as these are already set out within the CLLP. Although some overlap is inevitable, the NP should be adding to the CLLP.</p>	<p>The definition of "appropriate location" and "development footprint" as presented in Policy 1 are in line with the definition of these term presented in the CLLP, but at the same time they do not simply re-write the definition set out in the CLLP. On the contrary, they add a local dimension to these terms.</p> <p>The appropriate location definition in Policy 1 serves the purpose of differentiating sites from sites in "Preferred Location", which is effectively a subcategory of sites in "appropriate location".</p> <p>The development footprint definition in Policy 1 permits to interpreter Diagram 1, which is an Osgodby-specific approach to define the distinction between the built-up area and the open countryside (through a</p>	No change required
----------	-------------------------------	--	--	--------------------

			<p>continuous transition rather than an abrupt change).</p> <p>Considering the presence of a subcategory of appropriate location (i.e. preferred location), the sequential test for Osgodby Parish is different from the one laid down in the CLLP, adding a local dimension to it while at the same time being in line with the CLLP provision. The Steering Group believes the sequential test laid down in the policy is necessary to explain how to assess sites based on this new subcategory.</p> <p>The Steering Group believes that the definitions of 'developed footprint', 'appropriate locations' and the 'sequential test' contained in Policy 1 are relevant and necessary to explain the local dimension of this term in the context of Osgodby Parish.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

Policy 1	West Lindsey District Council	<p>We would have liked to have seen the plan identify some of the preferred locations, similar to the information contained within the capacity study. Which would see you defining your preferred location (development footprint) and within this, identifying appropriate sites and a priority order of development. This approach was used in the capacity study. Adopting this approach would make it clear to developers where the community would like to see development within the village.</p>	<p>Following consultation with the local residents, the Steering Group opted for a criteria-based policy rather than an allocation-based policy. It is believed that the former will allow a greater opportunity for sites to come forward, and will set the guideline to select the best among them without having to choose from a limited pool of nominated sites. As few of the nominated sites happen to be located in preferred locations, the Steering Group believes that showing the map of potential sites in preferred locations contained in the Capacity Study may give the wrong impression that such sites have been allocated.</p> <p>The information contained in the capacity study in term of sites are purely notional, and</p>	No change required

			no availability or suitability study has been carried out for these sites. Although the map of appropriate sites in priority order contained in the Capacity Study is a useful tool to identify where the community would like development to happen, the Steering Group does not believe appropriate to include it as part of Policy 1 as it may be misinterpreted by developers and residents.	
Policy 2	West Lindsey District Council	How have the group assessed Usselby as a hamlet? Have the group used the approach contained within LP2? If so, could this be defined by a map? WLDC is of the opinion that it does not meet the criteria and is therefore defined as 'open countryside'.	<p>The Steering Group initially considered Usselby an Hamlet, as it is perceived by local residents as a proper settlement in its own right and it is composed of 15 dwelling.</p> <p>Following WLDC comments, the Steering Group agrees that, although Usselby have a dwelling base of 15 dwellings, such houses are not "clearly clustered together to form a single developed footprint". The Steering Group</p>	<p>Paragraph 8.9 of the Justification text now reads</p> <p>"Following the definition contained in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, Usselby and Kingerby do not qualify as Hamlets, and they are thus regarded as open countryside. Development in these two settlements is regulated by CLLP Policy LP2 and LP55. An explanation of the criteria used and of the assessment of these two settlements in contained in the Capacity Study."</p>

			agrees to consider Usselby as open countryside for the purpose of the Neighbourhood Development Plan and remove reference to it from Policy 2 and from the Capacity Study .	<p>Section 2 of Policy 2 has been removed</p> <p>The Capacity Study now reads:</p> <p>“The only small settlement in Osgodby Parish that meets the number of dwellings necessary to be classified as an Hamlet is Usselby, (approximately 15 dwellings around St Margaret Church). These dwellings, however, are very scattered around the village, and we believe it is not possible to identify in the settlement a proper continuous built up form, and thus set a “development footprint”. Since a Hamlet should have “dwellings clearly clustered together to form a single developed footprint”, we conclude that Usselby should be considered open countryside following the CLLP’s definition.”</p>
Policy 2	West Lindsey District Council	The plan does not define what level of the settlement hierarchy Kingerby is, could this be incorporated into the	The Steering Group consider Kingerby open countryside. The justification text and Capacity Study has been	<p>Paragraph 8.9 of the Justification text now reads</p> <p>“Following the definition contained in</p>

		Neighbourhood Plan? This would be supported by WLDC.	amended to define the settlement hierarchy of Kingerby.	the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, Usselby and Kingerby do not qualify as Hamlets, and they are thus regarded as open countryside. Development in these two settlements is regulated by CLLP Policy LP2 and LP55. An explanation of the criteria used and of the assessment of these two settlements is contained in the Capacity Study." The capacity Study now reads "Kingerby is not composed of 15 dwellings clustered together, thus not qualifying as a Hamlet either. The settlement should be considered open countryside following the CLLP's definition."
Policy 2	West Lindsey District Council	Policy 2: 1.a. & 1.b. both refer to the term 'appropriate locations'. Whereas one should be 'Preferred locations'	The Steering Group amended this typo	Section 1.a of Policy 2 now reads "preferred location in Kirby Village"
Policy 3	West Lindsey District Council	Clarification is required as to if the policy is referring solely to residential development, or all	The Policy refers to any typology of development, as not only residential development but also commercial, industrial and agriculture buildings that may	Section 2 of Policy 3 now reads "All typologies of proposed developments that": First sentence of paragraph 9.6. now reads:

		development	erode the area of separation and eventually result in the merging of Osgodby and Kirkby, impacting on their character as two individual settlements.	"Development of any typology (residential, employment site, services etc.) will need to demonstrate how its size, density, design and location do not significantly impact and reduce the undeveloped area in between the two villages."
Policy 3	West Lindsey District Council	<p>The area of separation has effectively been created by the Plan creating a preferred location (developed footprint) for both Kirkby and Osgodby.</p> <p>Is there the need to have an area of separation between Kingerby and Kirkby?</p>	<p>The Steering Group believes that, although the preferred location around the development footprint is an effective tool to restrict development for both Kirkby and Osgodby, applying solely to residential development it is not enough to restrict other typologies of development (employment sites, agriculture sites etc.) in the area of separation.</p> <p>The gap between the villages is so important for the individual character of the settlement that a specific policy safeguarding it is considered necessary by the Steering Group and by the</p>	No change required

			<p>local residents, which identified it as an important element in several consultations.</p> <p>For this reason, the Steering Group is willing to retain the policy and make no changes to the Plan.</p>	
Policy 3	West Lindsey District Council	<p>The green area on the map should stretch all the way between Kirkby and Osgodby. The undeveloped gap starts at the end of the settlement, therefore the area of green should be tight with the settlement boundary. The map in its current form suggests that the area of land on the North side of the road towards Kirkby does not classify as the undeveloped gap. Could this suggest that</p>	<p>The distinction between undeveloped and developed land must not be interpreted as a hard line, but rather as a continuous transition. The Area of Separation follows such approach, being an indicative representation. For this reason, it cannot be "tight with the settlement boundary", as the settlement boundary (or development footprint) is not defined by a hard line either. It is believed this approach leaves the Planning Authority with the element of discretion while providing useful guidelines to identify the area of separation.</p>	No change required

		it is available for development? More clarity is needed.	Regarding the northern side of the road toward Osgodby, Policy 2 discourage development in such a location, and it is described in paragraph 9.2 as part of the rural area separating Kirkby from Osgodby, thus not being available for development. It is believed that including this area in the Diagram would give the wrong impression that the diagram is formed by hard boundaries, rather than being an indicative location. For this reason, the Steering Group does not believe amending the Diagram is necessary.	
Policy 4	West Lindsey District Council	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 5	West Lindsey District Council	The NP objectives seek to promote tourism but there appears to be no reference to this within this section.	The Steering Group agrees that tourism should be mentioned in Policy 5	Section 2 of Policy 5 now reads "Proposals for the development of new local employment sites, proportionate expansion of existing business sites, and change of use into employment class uses, in particular

				in the tourism sector, will be supported provided that:"
Policy 6	West Lindsey District Council	Kingerby Wood – Located over 2km away from the main settlement of Osgodby and 1.5km from Kirkby, and not accessible by any identified public rights of way. It is therefore not in close proximity, nor accessible, to the community it serves. This potential designation does not meet the above criteria and therefore should be removed from the plan.	The Steering Group disagrees with the recommendations of WLDC regarding Kingerby Wood. The settlements of Kingerby and Kirkby are within a mile of the wood and the western end of Osgodby village is less than half a mile beyond those. Although it may not be crossed by a public right of way, the wood is visible for the entire length of the bridle way from Kingerby which is well used by parishioners. It also defines the southern border of the parish and shields the villages from the A1103. A short walk from Kingerby, at the junction to Gulham the outstanding nature of the wood is abundantly evident where it frames the view of Lincoln Cathedral. It is also the	No change required

			<p>defining landmark of the parish when approaching from the West.</p> <p>The importance of Kingerby Wood to the community is in its position and appearance. Serving the whole community in the Parish, rather than simply the settlements of Kirkby or Osgodby, the wood is considered in relative close proximity to the community it serves.</p>	
Policy 6	West Lindsey District Council	<p>Gravel Pits – Located over 1km from Osgodby and 1.3km from Kirkby, and not accessible by any identified public rights of way. This proposed designation is not in close proximity to the community it serves, nor is it reasonably accessible. This potential designation does not meet the above criteria and therefore should be removed from the plan.</p>	<p>The Steering Group agrees with the comment of WLDC and removed Gravel Pits from the Local Green Space Assessment</p>	<p>Gravel Pits has been removed from the Policy, Map and Local Green Space Assessment</p>

Policy 6	West Lindsey District Council	Sand Lane Water Hole – Located over 1.1km from Osgodby and 2.4km from Kirkby, and not accessible by any identified public rights of way. This proposed designation is not in close proximity to the community it serves, nor is it reasonably accessible. This potential designation does not meet the above criteria and therefore should be removed from the plan.	The Steering Group agrees with the comment of WLDC and removed Sand Lane Water Hole from the Local Green Space Assessment	Sand Lane Water Hole has been removed from the Policy, Map and Local Green Space Assessment
Policy 6	West Lindsey District Council	The maps need amending – please complete at a smaller scale so the exact boundaries can be identified with ease.	The Map has been amended with an additional Map focusing on the Osgodby Village, one focusing on the West Side of the Parish and East Side of the Parish	The three policy maps have been added to the Plan

Policy 7	West Lindsey District Council	Support. Again the map does not show the exact extent of the green infrastructure linkages.	The Steering Group agrees of amending Figure 14 with a map prepared by WLDC	Figure 14 has been amended with a map prepared by WLDC
Policy 8	West Lindsey District Council	Could the community facilities named within the policy be identified on a map?	The Steering Group agrees that a map of community facilities would be beneficial to clarify Policy 8.	A map of community facilities mentioned in Policy 8 has been added to the Plan
Policy 9	West Lindsey District Council	15.6. - Please correct the spelling of "lees", on the first line. 15.6. - Please insert the word "asked" instead of "ask" on the second line.	The Steering Group corrected the typos.	Paragraph 15.6 now reads: "Only when it is demonstrated that less harmful alternatives are not feasible; developers will need to propose mitigation solutions to minimise the impact of the scheme. In doing so, the developers will be asked to present feasible and achievable mitigation solutions, assess the cost of such intervention, and provide a details implementation

				plan (including timetable). Mitigation solutions should address both visual amenity as well as impact on nocturnal wildlife.”
Policy 9	West Lindsey District Council	15.4 through 15.7 builds on this simple statement to a degree that is neither appears warranted nor proportionate	Paragraph 15.4 through 15.7 is meant to clarify to developer how the sequential test for the identification of magnitude of impact-alternative solutions-mitigation solutions-compensation works. Such a sequential test approach is typical of planning practice. The Steering Group leaves to the discretion and expertise of the Planning Authority the role of setting the degree of details such sequential test should require, what mitigation solutions are available, as well as the responsibility to judge whether or not mitigation solutions are feasible and the typology of compensation required to developers.	No change required

Policy 9	West Lindsey District Council	<p>A determination ought to have appropriately considered the desire to eliminate unnecessary lighting and in doing so considered any need for additional assessment and justification; whereas parts C, D & E of the proposed Policy 9 appear onerous in its demand for information. If adhered to this could impede, indeed remove the element of discretion necessary for an overall determination that balances need, good design, suitability and viability.</p>	<p>The Steering Group believe that the information required as per paragraph C,D, and E are justified and flexible enough to leave the element of discretion in the hand of the Planning Authority. The Steering Group believe that it is not possible to demonstrate that a lighting scheme is unavoidable (requirement 1.a.) without having explored mitigation solutions and considered implementation of those feasible. The Steering Group leave to the discretion and expertise of the Planning Authority the role of ascertaining what mitigation solutions are available, as well as the responsibility to judge whether or not mitigation solutions are feasible and the typology of compensation required to developers.</p> <p>The Steering Group highlight the fact that such provisions</p>	No change required
----------	-------------------------------	---	--	--------------------

			only applies to big lighting schemes which require planning permission, and that the rationale is to protect residents and wildlife from inappropriate lighting schemes that would harm the character of the area and the wellbeing of the above	
Community Aspirations	West Lindsey District Council	Would these aspirations be better presented on a map? For example where is the Churchwarden's land?	Community Aspirations are not part of the official Neighbourhood Development Plan as they deal with future plans and interventions that are not part of the remit of development management. In virtue of the fact that Parish Council will be actively involved in planning and delivering such projects involving all residents and stakeholders, and that the	No change required

			details of such projects have not yet been decided, the Steering Group does not deem it necessary to add a map of aspirations	
--	--	--	---	--

Figure 3. Regulation 14 Consultation – Local Residents

Draft Plan section or Policy	Consultee	Comment	NP Steering Group Response	Change to the draft plan
Vision and Objective	Resident 1	<p>Support Vision</p> <p>Support Objectives</p> <p>Broadly approve, but not sure if tourism is necessary or welcomed</p>	<p>Promotion of tourism has been indicated as one of the objective of the Plan by the majority of respondents in the August 2015 questionnaire.</p>	No change required
Vision and Objective	Resident 2	<p>Support Vision</p> <p>I think we should avoid building in farm land that will be needed to grow food for future generations.</p> <p>Objective (other)</p> <p>Support the statement with the provision that Q3 "appropriate is defined as appropriate to the majority of the Parish i.e. a broiler unit of 0.5 million birds may seem appropriate to</p>	<p>Provision to restrict and regulate development on farm land and on the most productive agriculture land are contained in the NPPF and in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, and are implement in this Plan through Policy 1, 2, and 3 that aims of concentrating residential development in and around the developed footprint of the villages and preserving the rural area in between Osgodby and Kirkby</p> <p>The term appropriate in the Objective refers to the wellbeing and sustainable development of the Parish as a whole, based on the wording of the Vision, and not</p>	No change required

		farmer but not to the wider parish	to the definition of appropriate of a specific typology of residents.	
Vision and Objective	Resident 3	<p>Support Vision</p> <p>Growth is good but It is a difficult vision to imagine without commercial provisions in place I.e shop, pub etc.</p> <p>Support Objectives</p> <p>Very important that heritage assets are maintained and new construction of buildings are vernacular in nature.</p>	<p>Promotion of commercial provision is included in the Vision and Objectives and directly promoted through Policy 5. In an indirect way, supporting residential development in appropriate location Policy 1 and Policy 2 aims to attract new residents to the Villages, which is widely regarded as the first step to attract commercial provisions and activities.</p> <p>Heritage and Vernacular building style and design are protected and promote through Policy 4 and the Character Assessment.</p>	No change required

Vision and Objective	Resident 4	Support Vision Support Objectives	Support Noted	No change required
Vision and Objective	Resident 5	Support Vision Support Objectives	Support Noted	No change required
Vision and Objective	Resident 6	Support Vision Support Objectives	Support Noted	No change required
Vision and Objective	Resident 7	Support Vision Support Objectives	Support Noted	No change required
Vision and Objective	Resident 8	Support Vision Support Objectives	Support Noted	No change required
Vision and Objective	Resident 9	Support Vision Objectives (other) Natural growth should be allowed	Policy 1 and Policy 2 are criteria-based policy meant not to artificially restrict growth to certain location but to allow for an organic growth of the village following certain guidelines, to	No change required

			ensure the sustainable and appropriate growth of the village.	
Vision and Objective	Resident 10	Support Vision Support Objectives	Support Noted	No change required
Vision and Objective	Resident 11	Support Vision Support Objectives	Support Noted	No change required
Vision and Objective	Resident 12	Support Vision Support Objectives	Support Noted	No change required
Vision and Objective	Resident 13	Not supported Vision Not supported Objectives	Support Noted	No change required
Vision and Objective	Resident 15	Support Vision Support Objectives	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 1	Resident 1	Support Sympathetic consideration could be given to application for elderly resident for small dwelling for their own allocation. Where this would release a large property for occupation	Provision for the promotion and support to residential dwelling design solutions suited for elderly residents has been added in Policy 4: Design and Character of the Development	Section 4 have been added to Policy 4: Design and Character of the Development. The Section reads "4. New development designed to meet the housing need of an aging population would be supported."

Policy 1	Resident 3	Support In principle but if a large developer is involved a section 106 agreement must be put in place to benefit the school, village hall etc..	Policy 1 and Policy 2 restrict residential development to a maximum of 4 dwellings per plot, avoiding the occurrence of large development. Section 106 agreement may be still signed between developers and WLDC to comply with requirement of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan as well as this Neighbourhood Development Plan.	No change required
Policy 1	Resident 5	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 1	Resident 6	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 1	Resident 7	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 1	Resident 8	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 1	Resident 9	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 1	Resident 10	Support	Support Noted	No change required

Policy 1	Resident 11	Support If development is permitted at a site that borders the edge (lightest shaded area) of the footprint I would not wish the footprint to be extended beyond the new development thus extending the footprint.	The developed footprint of the Village, as defined in Policy 1 and Policy 2, is the build up areas as at the time of the production of the Neighbourhood Development Plan and as presented in Diagram 1 and Diagram 2. Additional houses built at the edge of it will not extent the development footprint, and additional application will be considered based on the original development footprint and the Diagrams.	No change required
Policy 1	Resident 12	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 1	Resident 13	Not supported	Noted	No change required
Policy 1	Resident 15	Support Provide allowing development adjoining to the development footprint doesn't result in creep of the village	The developed footprint of the Village, as defined in Policy 1 and Policy 2, is the build up areas as at the time of the production of the Neighbourhood Development Plan and as presented in Diagram 1 and Diagram 2. Additional houses built at the edge of it will not extent the development footprint, and additional	No change required

			application will be considered based on the original development footprint and the Diagrams.	
Policy 2	Resident 1	Support Sympathetic consideration could be given to application for elderly resident for small dwelling for their own allocation. Where this would release a large property for occupation	Provision for the promotion and support to residential dwelling design solutions suited for elderly residents has been added in Policy 4: Design and Character of the Development	Section 4 have been added to Policy 4: Design and Character of the Development. The Section reads "4. New development designed to meet the housing need of an aging population would be supported."
Policy 2	Resident 3	Support In principle but homes should not be built with plastic windows, this is a deterioration of any architectural merit.	Policy 4 and the Design and Character Appraisal set the general characteristics of the buildings in each neighbourhood area. Although Neighbourhood Policy does not aim to be overly prescriptive in determining materials or architectural features, Section 1f of Policy 4 make provision for consideration to the visual impact of materials used for "external walls and	No change required

			roofs, and the desirability of selecting these from a locally distinctive palette”, which would effectively require the preservation of traditional material for windows and door where possible.	
Policy 2	Resident 5	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 2	Resident 6	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 2	Resident 7	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 2	Resident 8	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 2	Resident 9	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 2	Resident 10	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 2	Resident 11	Other I have some reservations: If development is approved in a lighter shaded area I would not	The developed footprint of the Village, as defined in Policy 1 and Policy 2, is the build up areas as at the time of the production of the Neighbourhood Development Plan and as presented in Diagram	No change required to the Plan

		wish this to become the established footprint of the village enabling further development beyond that point. Where is Osgodby Road? I do not agree with allocating land at the south western end of Kirk Hill appropriate for development. Kirk Hill properties 'stand alone' and building to the SW would greatly extend and change the village footprint.	1 and Diagram 2. Additional houses built at the edge of it will not extent the development footprint, and additional application will be considered based on the original development footprint and the Diagrams. Development in Kirkby in appropriate location is only allowed for one dwelling, so the Steering Group does not believe that, even if approved and carried out, such development would greatly extend and change the village footprint, and properties on Kirk Hill will continue to stand alone	
Policy 2	Resident 12	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 2	Resident 13	Do not support	Noted	No change required
Policy 2	Resident 15	Support Would prefer not to build on greenfield sites	Brownfield sites are preferred and given priority over greenfield sites, however it is not possible for the Neighbourhood Development	

			Plan to completely rule out development on greenfield sites as this would be against the provision of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.	
Policy 3	Resident 1	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 3	Resident 3	Other The gap should be provided as a communal space or social area whereby no future development can take place, preserving it for the future.	The undeveloped gap is in private ownership and cannot be transformed in communal space or social area without the owner's agreement. The area does not meet the requirement as a Local Green Space. However, Policy 3 will protect the undeveloped gap and ensure the villages of Osgodby and Kirkby remain separate and distinct settlements.	No change required
Policy 3	Resident 5	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 3	Resident 6	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 3	Resident 7	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 3	Resident 8	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 3	Resident 9	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 3	Resident 10	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 3	Resident 11	Support	Support Noted	No change required

		Heartily agree!		
Policy 3	Resident 12	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 3	Resident 13	Not supported	Noted	No change required
Policy 3	Resident 15	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 4	Resident 1	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 4	Resident 3	Other Whilst these are admirable they are rarely enforced unless within a conservation area and therefore not legally enforceable, if a number of requirements were imposed initially such as timber windows, clay tiles, brick or stone facade etc. This would go some way..	The element contained in the Policy are enforceable to all planning application, even outside of a Conservation Area. Planning application will need to demonstrate how elements of the development (including windows, tiles, façade material etc.) are in keeping with local character and with the conclusion of the Character Assessment	No change required
Policy 4	Resident 5	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 4	Resident 6	Support	Support Noted	No change required

Policy 4	Resident 7	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 4	Resident 8	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 4	Resident 9	Not Supported Individuality should be encouraged	The policy does not dictate a single style or development typology to all development, but set some guidelines to ensure new development contribute and enhance the existing character of the settlement.	No change required
Policy 4	Resident 10	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 4	Resident 11	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 4	Resident 12	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 4	Resident 13	Not supported	Noted	No change required
Policy 4	Resident 15	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 5	Resident 1	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 5	Resident 3	Support Only concern is what happens to the public house	The re-opening of the public house in Osgodby or of other public houses would be supported by this policy.	No change required

Policy 5	Resident 5	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 5	Resident 6	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 5	Resident 7	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 5	Resident 8	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 5	Resident 9	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 5	Resident 10	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 5	Resident 11	Support If 'live/work' units are ever proposed there should be clear evidence that that is what they will be used for and there should be a restriction on them being sold on and/or converted to a purely residential	Change of use from employment uses to residential uses is restricted as part of Section 3 of Policy 2, and this applies also in the case of live/work units.	No change required

		property.		
Policy 5	Resident 12	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 5	Resident 13	Not supported	Noted	No change required
Policy 5	Resident 15	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 6	Resident 1	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 6	Resident 3	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 6	Resident 5	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 6	Resident 6	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 6	Resident 7	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 6	Resident 8	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 6	Resident 9	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 6	Resident 10	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 6	Resident 11	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 6	Resident 12	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 6	Resident 13	Not supported	Noted	No change required
Policy 6	Resident 15	Support Yes generally but would like to see Young Wood	Several proposed Local Green Spaces have been removed from the Draft Plan following Regulation 14 Consultation,	No change required

		in Kingerby included if possible: mature trees are scenic feature of the road from Young Wood to Kingerby	based on the recommendations of WLDC which believe them not to be in close proximity to the community they serve, not accessible through public right of way. The Steering Group agreed with most of this recommendations (please see above) and believe Young Wood would not meet the criteria of proximity and accessibility to the community it serves.	
Policy 7	Resident 1	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 7	Resident 3	Other Consideration needs to be given for developments which are confirmed to be carbon neutral i.e. hemp or straw bale buildings or timber frame eco houses or chalets etc.which may contribute locally to tourists or visitors.	Sustainable buildings techniques and solutions	No change required
Policy 7	Resident 5	Support	Support Noted	No change required

Policy 7	Resident 6	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 7	Resident 7	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 7	Resident 8	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 7	Resident 9	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 7	Resident 10	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 7	Resident 11	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 7	Resident 12	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 7	Resident 13	Not supported	Noted	No change required
Policy 7	Resident 15	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 8	Resident 1	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 8	Resident 3	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 8	Resident 5	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 8	Resident 6	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 8	Resident 7	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 8	Resident 8	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 8	Resident 9	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 8	Resident 10	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 8	Resident 11	Support	Support Noted	No change required

Policy 8	Resident 12	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 8	Resident 13	Not supported	Noted	No change required
Policy 8	Resident 15	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 9	Resident 1	Support This should apply to existing development also	It is not possible to apply development management policy to existing dwellings and buildings, but only to future planning application.	No change required
Policy 9	Resident 3	Support The majority of properties in the village have PIR security lighting and this is adequate.	PIR security lighting would normally not require planning permission, so the requirement of such policy do not apply in such situation.	No change required
Policy 9	Resident 5	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 9	Resident 6	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 9	Resident 7	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 9	Resident 8	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 9	Resident 9	Support	Support Noted	No change required

Policy 9	Resident 10	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 9	Resident 11	Support Vital that the dark policy is made as strong as possible.	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 9	Resident 12	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 9	Resident 13	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Policy 9	Resident 15	Support Important to safeguard our Dark Sky	Support Noted	No change required
Community Aspirations	Resident 1	Support Reconstruction of footpath on Low Road, this should not disturb rare plants in the grass verge. Expert identification should be sought.	Policy 7 promote development that contribute to the protection and provision of green infrastructure linkages and green spaces, and will be applied to applications for the construction of a footpath on Low Road so that rare plants and verges are retained.	No change required
Community	Resident 3	Support Changes to the primary	Policy 4 on Design will apply to any change to the primary school that requires planning permission,	No change required

Aspirations		school must be in keeping with the original building style or a complete contrast but an architecturally appealing style. The building has been ruined by plastic windows and poor design in the past...	and will ensure that the character of the building and of the whole village is considered and enhanced by the work	
Community Aspirations	Resident 5	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Community Aspirations	Resident 6	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Community Aspirations	Resident 7	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Community Aspirations	Resident 8	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Community Aspirations	Resident 9	Support	Support Noted	No change required

Aspirations				
Community Aspirations	Resident 10	<p>Other</p> <p>I do not support the improvements to pedestrian safety as there is no current evidence of usage by Hill House residents, as there is nowhere for them to go. The footpath along to A46 is a complete waste of public money - is there evidence of need? A cycle shelter by the bus stop might be more appropriate - suggested by Cllr Strange some time ago.</p>	<p>Support for this improvement has been registered as part of the consultation process.</p> <p>The Steering Group introduced a phasing approach to the extension of the footpath on the northern side of Low Road, based on incremental improvement to the quality of the footpath provided that need for such improvement can be demonstrated.</p> <p>Moreover, the Steering Group introduced an additional paragraph regarding the construction of a bicycle shelter near the bus stop on the A46.</p>	<p>The Community Aspiration section now reads:</p> <p>17.3 To extend the footpath on the northern side of Low Road as far as possible towards the A46 to enhance pedestrian safety and to facilitate access to the bus stops on the A46 for the only scheduled bus service in the parish. If necessary, construction should be phased so that in –</p> <p>i. Phase 1 the footpath will be extended eastwards on the northern side of Low Road by at least 100 metres so that pedestrians are able to leave the footpath at a safe distance from the junction with Sand Lane;</p>

				<p>ii. Phase 2 the footpath will be extended eastwards by 500 metres from Sand Lane so that pedestrian access to the main entrance to Osgodby Wood is made safer;</p> <p>iii. Phase 3 the footpath will be extended for the maximum achievable distance towards the A46, preferably for the entire length of Low Road.</p> <p>17.4 To construct a bicycle shelter at the eastern end of Low Road, near the bus stops on the A46, to enable members of the public to secure and shelter their bicycles while using the bus service.</p>
Community	Resident 11	Do not support Few if any wheelchair	Support for the construction of a footpath along the length of Sand Lane and on the northern side of	The Community Aspiration section

Aspirations		<p>users from Hill House use this lane. Constructing a footpath would be a waste of public money. A footpath to the A46 is also a huge waste of money. Few if any local people walk that far to the bus. School children certainly don't. The provision of a secure bicycle store at the end of Low Road would be much better value for money. A number of the village footpaths are in a very poor state of repair and the verges poorly maintained (eg Kirkby to Kingerby footpath and Kirkby to Lincoln Lane) presumably due to cost - if the footpaths we already have can't be maintained to an acceptable level why would we be asking for</p>	<p>Low Road has been registered as part of the consultation process.</p> <p>The Steering Group introduced a phasing approach to the extension of the footpath on the northern side of Low Road, based on incremental improvement to the quality of the footpath provided that need for such improvement can be demonstrated.</p> <p>Moreover, the Steering Group introduced an additional paragraph regarding the construction of a bicycle shelter near the bus stop on the A46.</p>	<p>now reads:</p> <p>17.3 To extend the footpath on the northern side of Low Road as far as possible towards the A46 to enhance pedestrian safety and to facilitate access to the bus stops on the A46 for the only scheduled bus service in the parish. If necessary, construction should be phased so that in –</p> <p>iv. Phase 1 the footpath will be extended eastwards on the northern side of Low Road by at least 100 metres so that pedestrians are able to leave the footpath at a safe distance from the junction with Sand Lane;</p> <p>v. Phase 2 the footpath will be extended eastwards by 500 metres</p>
-------------	--	--	---	--

		more to be built?		<p>from Sand Lane so that pedestrian access to the main entrance to Osgodby Wood is made safer;</p> <p>vi. Phase 3 the footpath will be extended for the maximum achievable distance towards the A46, preferably for the entire length of Low Road.</p> <p>17.4 To construct a bicycle shelter at the eastern end of Low Road, near the bus stops on the A46, to enable members of the public to secure and shelter their bicycles while using the bus service.</p>
Community Aspirations	Resident 12	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Community	Resident 13	Not supported	Noted	No change required

Aspirations				
Community Aspirations	Resident 15	Supported But do not want to see too much gentrification in the countryside	Support Noted	No change required
Design and Character Appraisal	Resident 1	Support Innovative development that support sustainability should not be precluded simply on the ground that there is no precedent in the village.	The NPPF set that "local planning authorities should not refuse planning permission for buildings or infrastructure which promote high levels of sustainability because of concerns about incompatibility with an existing townscape, if those concerns have been mitigated by good design." By complying with the NPPF, the Neighbourhood Development Plan supports such provision.	No change required
Design and Character Appraisal	Resident 3	Support A useful comment would be that any traditional buildings which were constructed using lime	The Design and Character Appraisal set the general characteristics of the buildings in each neighbourhood area. Although Neighbourhood Policy cannot dictate building methods,	No change required

		mortar must be re-pointed/re-rendered using the same method/material otherwise the result will be detrimental to the buildings.	Section 1b of Policy 4 make provision for consideration to the visual impact of materials used for "external walls and roofs, and the desirability of selecting these from a locally distinctive palette", which would effectively require the preservation of traditional cladding material when re-rendering/ re-pointing.	
Design and Character Appraisal	Resident 5	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Design and Character Appraisal	Resident 6	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Design and Character Appraisal	Resident 7	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Design and Character Appraisal	Resident 8	Support	Support Noted	No change required

Design and Character Appraisal	Resident 9	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Design and Character Appraisal	Resident 10	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Design and Character Appraisal	Resident 11	Cannot access this document	The document was available in pdf format on the Parish Council website, and at the time of the questionnaire appears to be accessible by member of the Steering Group and other respondents.	No change required
Design and Character Appraisal	Resident 12	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Design and Character Appraisal	Resident 13	Not supported	Noted	No change required
Design and Character Appraisal	Resident 15	Supported	Support Noted	No change required

Local Green Space Assessment	Resident 1	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Local Green Space Assessment	Resident 3	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Local Green Space Assessment	Resident 5	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Local Green Space Assessment	Resident 7	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Local Green Space Assessment	Resident 8	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Local Green Space	Resident 9	Support	Support Noted	No change required

Assessment				
Local Green Space Assessment	Resident 11	Cannot access this document	The document was available in pdf format on the Parish Council website, and at the time of the questionnaire appears to be accessible by member of the Steering Group and other respondents.	No change required
Local Green Space Assessment	Resident 12	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Local Green Space Assessment	Resident 13	Not supported	Noted	No change required
Local Green Space Assessment	Resident 15	Other I think the wood to the west of the Parish (not Young Wood) and the road from there to Kingerby which is lined with mature ash tree should be included as	Several proposed Local Green Spaces have been removed from the Draft Plan following Regulation 14 Consultation, based on the recommendations of WLDC which believe them not to be in close proximity to the community they serve, not accessible through public right of	No change required

		these are at risk from neglect and cutting down to make way for lorries. The mature ash trees are the feature of this rural area and Kingerby should be allocated and protected.	way. The Steering Group agreed with most of this recommendations (please see above) and believe the mentioned site would not meet the criteria of proximity, accessibility, and value to the community they serve.	
Capacity Study	Resident 1	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Capacity Study	Resident 3	Other In principle. but it is very unreasonable that only 16 dwellings will be built in 20 years unless family units are to migrate. Planning policy will always favour development if they see a need for housing in a particular area, a local plan is unlikely to change this..	The Capacity Study aims to demonstrate that a criteria-based policy will be able to accommodate the minimum development set by the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan in the next 20 years, not to restrict development to the target. The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan does not set a maximum for growth, the NPPF has a presumption in favor of sustainable development, meaning that "local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the	No change required

			development needs of their area". However, that does not mean that a Neighbourhood Development Plan cannot influence this. Policy 1 set a provision for developer to demonstrate community support for schemes that, alone of cumulative with previous schemes, increase the number of dwelling in the Parish to more than 25.	
Capacity Study	Resident 5	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Capacity Study	Resident 7	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Capacity Study	Resident 8	Support A little confusing over whether these sites are real or just examples of how the plan could provide room for growth	The second paragraph of the Capacity Study explain that the sites are purely notional, and work as example of how the a criteria-based policy could influence growth scenario in the villages "The study focuses on suitability of sites according to the policy context; no account has been given to site availability or landowners intent to develop their sites. The opportunities identified are, in	No change required

			<p>effect, only theoretical: however, the study helps identifying which sites (and approximately how many dwellings) would be acceptable according to the current policy principles of the CLLP, and thus to understand the growth scenario resulting from a criteria-based residential development policy. “</p> <p>The Steering Group believes that is made sufficiently clear in the Capacity Study</p>	
Capacity Study	Resident 9	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Capacity Study	Resident 10	Support	Support Noted	No change required
Capacity Study	Resident 11	Cannot access this document	The document was available in pdf format on the Parish Council website, and at the time of the questionnaire appears to be accessible by member of the Steering Group and other respondents.	No change required
Capacity Study	Resident 12	Support	Support Noted	No change required

Capacity Study	Resident 13	Not supported	Noted	No change required
Capacity Study	Resident 15	Support	Support Noted	No change required
General	Resident 14	<p>I attended a public consultation evening held on June 20th 2016 at the village hall and was somewhat dismayed that my land had not been included and the public were being asked for their preference regarding sites for development. It later transpired the Neighbourhood planning group were aware of this omission prior to the event but chose to go ahead with it and thus misled the public. WLDC latterly proved my land had not been submitted to them by the</p>	<p>The Steering Group believes the matter of the incomplete map at that event was fully addressed in the report which Vic Mason, the then chairman of the Neighbourhood Development Plan Group, gave to the Parish Council on 11th July 2016. The report has been available on the Parish website since July 2016 (http://parishes.lincolnshire.gov.uk/Files/Parish/380/July_20161.pdf).</p> <p>The Steering Group duly submitted the site to WLDC, although has not been included in any correspondence between the resident and WLDC and it is thus unable to comment further on this exchange of information.</p>	No change required

		Osgodby NPG for inclusion on the maps for the public consultation event.		
General	Resident 14	To this date I have received no communication regarding the land I submitted, other than an email with a photo seeking clarification it was the land I had submitted (it wasn't !) I duly forwarded photos of said land and still await acknowledgement from the group.	A Steering Group representative approached the resident after the 11 th July Meeting to confirm that the photo of the site previously emailed was the correct one. The representative of the Steering Group received a verbal confirmation that the photograph was indeed the correct site.	No change Required
General	Resident 14	This is the first written correspondence I have received regarding this matter, other than a confirmation email from the then clerk of the	Several public consultation events followed the call for site. Since the event on 20th June 2016 there have been two further NP consultation events, one on 18th March 2017 and another	No change required

		<p>parish council on March 30th 2016 when I responded to the councils call for land.</p> <p>Having received no correspondence and given the gross incompetence regarding the consultation event I presumed the Neighbourhood Plan Group maybe felt they lacked the necessary skills to produce such a document and had chosen to discontinue their intentions to produce a plan?</p> <p>However, it would appear the intention to produce a plan is still 'live'.</p>	<p>on 29th July 2017. Those events were advertised by the delivery of leaflets by hand to every home in the parish; notice of the first event was also given in the Spring edition of the Parish Pump which is also delivered by hand to every home. Posters were put up around the parish and one of these was displayed on a telegraph pole, near your home, at the northern end of Sand Lane. In addition, at the Summer Fete on 10th June 2017 there was a NP consultation stand attended throughout by the chairman of the parish council.</p> <p>Progress reports on the NP have been given at every parish council meeting and at the Annual Parish Meeting on 24 April 2017; minutes of those meetings have been placed on the parish notice boards and on the parish website. The website also has minutes of NP Group meetings and relevant documents, including the map showing all</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

			<p>nominated sites (which has been there for the best part of a year).</p> <p>The Steering Group believes that the engagement process and publicity of the development of the Plan up to Regulation 14 Consultation has been as thorough and extensive as possible, thus capable of reaching and informing every resident in the Parish.</p>	
General	Resident 14	I have looked at the so called 'on-line' maps and even with a good knowledge of the area it is not possible to ascertain the details the maps seeks to convey.	The comment on the clarity of the map has been noted. Please refer to the WLDC's comment on the maps and subsequent changes in the Table of Comments from Statutory Consultees.	Please refer to the WLDC's comments on the maps and subsequent changes in the Table of Comments from Statutory Consultees
General	Resident 14	It is my understanding in order for Neighbourhood Plans to succeed the independent examiner must be satisfied the plan	The Steering Group believes to have carried out the engagement process with the residents in a open and transparent way, meeting all the requirements set by the legislation. The first section of this Statement of Community	No change required

		documents and records clear evidence of engagement with all stakeholders.	<p>Consultation present all the events preceding Regulation 14 Consultation held as part of the engagement process, detailing the publicity and advertisement techniques employed, the methodology and material used as part of the consultation exercises and events, the outcome of each of these activities and the way they influenced the development of the Plan.</p> <p>The Appendix to this document present all the material used as part of the engagement process as well as the outcomes of each activity, providing evidence of this thorough and extended process.</p>	
General	Resident 14	I would therefore please ask that you now clarify exactly where the land I submitted is on the map/plan.	At the beginning of 2017 the NP Group decided to explore a criteria-based approach as an alternative to a allocation-based approach. The Steering Group commissioned a consultant to prepare a Capacity Study to understand if CLLP minimum	No change required

			<p>target could be reached using such approach. The Capacity Study used notional sites to illustrate how the criteria might operate in the context of Osgodby and Kirkby; although there may be overlaps between these notional and theoretical sites and nominated sites, the maps contained in the Capacity Study are not allocation maps and do not seek to display any residents' nominated site.</p> <p>These maps were presented on a consultation event held on the 18th of March and widely advertised across the Parish (see part 1 of this Consultation Statement) with the local residents. Registering support for the criteria-based policy over the allocation-based policy, the Steering Group opted the former in the Neighbourhood Development Plan. It is believed that this approach will allow for greater opportunities for site to come forward, and will set the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>guideline to select the best among those without having to select from a limited pool of nominated sites.</p>	
General	Resident 15	<p>Paragraph 5.2 "Overall house prices is more expensive than Market Rasen, Tealby and Middle Rasen".</p> <p>This statement possibly inaccurate: RightMove prices average for area Osgodby 275,000 £, Tealby 345,000 £</p>	<p>The source of the information contained in Paragraph 5.2 is the Osgodby Neighbourhood Development Scoping Report produced by WLDC, which reads</p> <p>4.11 Osgodby, has an overall average house price of £384,833 which is more expensive than nearby Market Rasen (£146,112), Tealby (£261,273) and Middle Rasen (£173,450).</p> <p>The report mentions Right Move as a source as well 09/11/2015</p>	No change required
General	Resident 15	<p>Paragraph 5.6 Would be helpful to clarify what the Sware is if people outside the parish are to understand it there are no other references to it</p>	<p>The Steering Group added a link to the Schedule Monument webpage for the site identified as the Sware</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.6 now reads "The Parish contains several Listed Buildings, mostly concentrated in Kingerby, Kirkby, Osgodby and Usselby, as well as the Sware, and English Heritage Scheduled Monument</p>

General	Resident 15	<p>on internet</p> <p>Paragraph 5.8 Think this is misleading "however more of the Parish is in Flood risk 3"</p> <p>Suggest majority of the Parish is in flood risk 3 but majority of the Parish is in Flood risk area 1</p>	<p>The Steering Group agrees with the comment and modified Paragraph 5.8 to clarify the issue</p>	<p>(https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1018902)."</p> <p>Paragraph 5.8 now reads</p> <p>The flood zones are prepared by the Environmental Agency and are based on the likelihood of an area flooding, with flood zone 2 areas least likely to flood and flood zone 3 areas more likely to flood. Areas within flood zone 3 have been shown to be at a 1% or greater probability of flooding from rivers in any year, while flood zone 2 within have between 0.1% – 1% chance of flooding. The majority of the Parish lies in Flood Risk Zone 1, and only a small proportion of the Parish is in flood zone 2; however, some parts of the parish are located in flood zone 3 which runs to the North and</p>
---------	----------------	--	---	--

				the West of the Parish. Flood risk data is constantly updated and is available to view on the following website, https://flood-map-for-planning.service.gov.uk/ .
--	--	--	--	--