

# Methodology for site selection – Corringham Neighbourhood Plan

## 1. Introduction

1.1 This report outlines how local criteria have been identified to select the sites which will be included as allocations in the Neighbourhood Plan (NP). It develops and interprets the findings of the independent (AECOM) Sites Assessment, which is acknowledged as a comprehensive and sound evaluation of potential sites based on national guidance and established practice.

1.2 The growth requirement for Corringham, in the adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP) is based on a calculation using 15% of the existing housing stock, (163 dwellings (recently revised)). It is for a minimum of 24 new dwellings (gross). The net figure takes account of completions and commitments. The latest West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) Monitoring of Growth in Villages report (Feb. 2020), recorded 10 commitments (a single dwelling and a site of nine). **The net requirement in the current CLLP is therefore, 14 dwellings** but, it may be advisable to consider the options for a slightly higher number, linked to the possible impact of the longer Plan Period in the review of the CLLP.

1.3 However it is likely that, during the course of consultation on the Draft NP, Submission and the Referendum (which, because of COVID-19, is unlikely to take place until mid-2021), a new draft CLLP may be published which could be adopted shortly after the Corringham NP is Made.

1.4 The capacity of the sites assessed by AECOM as being suitable for development (either whole or in part) is considerably in excess of this figure. Therefore, in accordance with the principles of Localism to: *“...ensure that decisions about housing are taken locally,”* and to *“enable a Parish Council...to say where they think new houses...should go.”* (DCLG Plain English Guide to the Localism Act November 2011), the Corringham NP will apply evidence based local criteria to select the preferred locations for new housing.

1.5 The following section outlines the (proposed) local criteria which will be applied and the Appendix contains details of the basis for the criteria, including the AECOM report, NP community engagement, the NP Character Study, the CLLP and recent consultation with external bodies on the AECOM report.

## 2. Local Criteria

2.1 The table below sets the proposed criteria noting how/where there have been derived. The criteria reflect national guidance and suggestions put forward in the AECOM site assessment on matters that need to be considered by the NP Steering Group and Parish Council, e.g. community consultations and the Character Study. Weight is also placed on the July 2020 external consultation on the AECOM report.

Criteria	Derivation
1: AECOM Classification	Sites Assessment Report
2: NP Consultation – Brownfield/Greenfield	2016 Community Consultation
3: NP Consultation – Infill	2016 Community Consultation
4: NP Consultation – Small Site	2016 Community Consultation
5: CLLP Sequential Test*	Adopted CLLP (2017)
6: NP (Draft) Vision	2019 Community Consultation
7: NP (Draft) Objective 1 (types of housing sites)	2019 Community Consultation
8: NP (Draft) Objective 5 (open spaces and landscape)	2019 Community Consultation
9: Retain landscape edges of village & appearance of gateways	2019 Character Study
10: Retain rural character of roads and lanes	2019 Character Study

<b>11:</b> Retain views of St Laurence’s Church (all directions).	2019 Character Study
<b>12:</b> Reflects the relevant village Character Area (Nos. 1 to 7**)	2019 Character Study
<b>13:</b> Retain view from the village to wider open countryside	2019 Character Study
<b>14:</b> External consultee comments (LCC highways and access)	June/July 2020 Consultation on Sites Assessment report
<b>15:</b> External consultee comments (WLDC Policy concerns)	June/July 2020 Consultation on Sites Assessment report
<b>16:</b> External consultee comments (LCC Heritage/Archaeology)	June/July 2020 Consultation on Sites Assessment report
<b>17:</b> External consultee comments (LCC Rights of way)	June/July 2020 Consultation on Sites Assessment report
<b>18:</b> External consultee comments (STW & Anglian drainage)	June/July 2020 Consultation on Sites Assessment report

\* See Policy LP4, categorised as: 1 -Brownfield or infill within village footprint, 2 - brownfield edge of settlement and 3 - Greenfield edge of settlement

\*\*Character Area 8, Aisby, is not applicable to Corringham village.

2.2 A points system is used to create an overall score for each site: (**Red 0, Amber 3 and Green 6**). The use of a Red, Amber and Green (traffic light) classification mirrors that used by AECOM in the Sites Assessment report. The maximum number of points that could be scored is 108 (18 x 6). *A score of over 70 means that a site is a preferred location, a score between 40 and 70 means that a site (either in whole or in part) may be considered, but a score of less than 40 means, that a site is definitely not suitable. The views expressed by external consultees in the consultation on the AECOM report are significant.* Even if a site scored highly in other categories, a highways objection may mean that it cannot be selected. In three instances where AECOM suggested that a larger site is unlikely to be suitable, but a smaller area (adjoining the village) may be acceptable, that is taken into account.

2.3 In addition to the above criteria it is also important to take into account other site or location specific factors that may affect longer term success of housing sites, for example:

- The pedestrian access from the site to village facilities (school, church, village hall and public house).
- The relationship between new houses and adjoining/established uses, e.g. businesses or farms.

2.4 The above criteria will be applied to each of the seven sites identified in the Call for Sites and included in the AECOM Sites Assessment report. The outcomes will then be made the subject of a community consultation and engagement with the landowners and developers concerned.

### **3.Conclusion and Next Steps**

3.1 The selection methodology seems to be fair and robust, incorporating informal comments from WLDC. However, the proposed criteria need to be agreed by the NP Steering Group and Parish Council for a local consultation. Following consideration of comments received, the preferred sites will be incorporated into a full Draft NP, with polices on design, sustainability and housing mix. This will be subject to a full 6-week consultation in accordance with Reg.14 of the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations, prior to an appropriately revised version of the NP being submitted to WLDC for examination.

# Appendix – Background and Inputs

## 1. AECOM Report

**Disclaimer** - This document is intended to aid the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan and can be used to guide decision making and as evidence to support Plan policies if the Qualifying Body (QB) so chooses. It is not a Neighbourhood Plan policy document. It is a 'snapshot' in time and may become superseded by more recent information. Corringham Neighbourhood Plan is not bound to accept its conclusions. If landowners or any other party can demonstrate that any of the evidence presented herein is inaccurate or out of date, such evidence can be presented to Corringham Neighbourhood Plan at the consultation stage. Where evidence from elsewhere conflicts with this report the QB should decide what policy position to take in the Neighbourhood Plan, and that judgement should be documented so that it can be defended at the Examination stage.

**Exec. Summary** - CLLP - Corringham is defined as a Small Village in the adopted Local Plan. Small Villages are expected to accommodate small scale development of a limited nature in appropriate locations and Corringham is permitted to grow by 15%, equating to 33 dwellings (24 net). However, it will be necessary to reflect emerging CLLP and the agreed revision on Corringham base figure - in the WLDC Monitoring of Growth in Villages report; Feb. 2020 it is recorded as 163 dwellings (reduced from 223).

From the shortlist of potentially suitable sites identified in this report, the Parish Council should engage with West Lindsey District Council and the community to select sites for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan which best meet the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan and the housing need for the plan area.

A Landscape Character Assessment has been prepared for the Parish Council to inform the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. This identifies significant views and areas of special landscape character which form an important part of the setting of Corringham. The assessment of sites includes consideration of whether development would have an adverse impact on views and the surrounding landscape.

A site appraisal pro-forma has been developed by AECOM to assess potential sites for allocation. It has been developed based on National Planning Practice Guidance: Site Assessment for Neighbourhood Plans: A Toolkit for Neighbourhood Planners (Locality, 2015) and the knowledge and experience gained through previous Neighbourhood Planning site assessments. The purpose of the pro-forma is to enable a consistent evaluation of each site against an objective set of criteria, as follows.

General information:

Site location and use; and

Site context and planning history.

Context:

Type of site (greenfield, brownfield etc.).

Suitability:

Site characteristics;

Environmental considerations;

Heritage considerations;

Community facilities and services; and

Other key considerations (e.g. flood risk, agricultural land, tree preservation orders).

Availability.

A 'traffic light' rating of sites, based on whether a site is appropriate to be considered for allocation, was used. The traffic light rating indicates 'green' for sites that show no constraints and are appropriate as site allocations, 'amber' for sites which are potentially suitable if issues can be resolved and 'red' for sites which are not currently suitable. The judgement on each site is based on the three 'tests' of whether a site is appropriate for allocation – i.e. the site is suitable, available and achievable).

Sites Included – Uses the Call for sites and cross reference to CLLP. *(In addition, there is a need to consider the ACIS site but not as a potential allocation. Despite the recently lapsed planning permission it should be regarded as replacement affordable or social housing (4 dwellings, for those demolished as a result of subsidence) should and when development occurs. This can be covered in the text of the NP).*

Three sites are suitable for allocation and a further three are potentially suitable either in their entirety or in part, subject to constraints being addressed and to due consideration of Local Plan policy. These constraints consist of access issues, environmental considerations and the rural character of the village. One site is considered unsuitable for allocation due to major constraints that are unmitigable.

**CNP1 North of Church Lane** - NP Call for Sites Residential 4.76ha. 142 (estimated). Greenfield. The site is potentially suitable for partial allocation, constituting a small area of development adjacent to the existing built footprint of the village. Development on the whole site would exceed the upper threshold of housing growth. Therefore, partial allocation is subject to mitigation of the impact on the character of the village and important views as well as physical constraints such as access and drainage ditches.

**CNP2 Land South of Corringham High Street** - NP Call for Sites Residential 0.85ha. 5. Greenfield. The site is potentially suitable for partial allocation, constituting a small area of development adjacent to the existing built footprint of the village, subject to mitigation of impact upon the views into and out of the village and consultation with the Highways Authority. If partial allocation is chosen, it is recommended that the western side of the site is allocated to be in keeping with the current built form of the village.

**CNP3 Land North of Corringham High Street** - NP Call for Sites Residential 0.5ha. 5. Greenfield. The site **is potentially suitable for partial allocation, constituting a small area of development adjacent to the** existing built footprint, subject to mitigation of impact upon the views into and out of the village and highways consultation

**CNP4 Land to the North of East Lane** - NP Call for Sites Residential 0.55ha. 9. Greenfield. This site is suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.

**CNP5 Land East of Poplar Lane** - NP Call for Sites Residential 0.23ha. 2. (and existing dwelling retained) Previously developed land. This site is suitable for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan.

**CNP6 The Old Hall, East Lane** - NP Call for Sites Residential 0.12ha. 3. Greenfield. **Site unsuitable** for allocation due to considerable constraints (impact on heritage assets, priority habitats and disconnect).

**CNP7 Corner Farm** NP Call for Sites Residential 0.3 ha 7 Previously developed. The site is suitable for allocation.

## Conclusions from AECOM report

The Corringham Neighbourhood Plan intends to include allocations for housing, to direct development to sustainable sites, and meet identified local housing need outlined in the Local Plan. The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan sets out a sequential test in the support for sites. Brownfield sites within villages are most favourable, then brownfield sites adjacent to villages, with the least favourable type of sites being greenfield adjacent to the village. The site assessment has found that of the seven sites considered three sites are immediately suitable and available for housing and, if found to be viable for the proposed development, would be a recommended shortlist from which the Parish Council could select sites to allocate for housing in the NP. They are free from constraints or have constraints that can be resolved. These are:

- **Site CNP4:** This greenfield site located towards the north of the village next to new build housing and would act as a natural extension to this. Access has been planned through this site. It has no environmental constraints.
- **Site CNP5:** This site is a mixture of greenfield and previously developed land in the centre of the village. Access could pose a minor constraint although there are no environmental constraints.

- **Site CNP7:** This site is a mixture of greenfield and previously developed land south of the village, mitigation would need to be provided for the large Beech tree on site. Other than this there are no constraints to the site.

Of these three sites, ***CNP5 and CNP7 perform best against the sequential test set out in Policy LP4 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan since they are within the existing built-up area of the village.***

A further three sites are potentially suitable and available (i.e. have not been ruled out entirely) but have constraints – some very significant – which mean they are less likely to be suitable for development. If these constraints could not be resolved or mitigated, they would not be appropriate for allocation. These are:

- **Site CNP1:** The site is a large greenfield located to the north of the village and has significant environmental and physical constraints. Development on the whole site would have a significant impact on locally-important views and is likely to exceed the levels of growth expected in the village. Therefore, if the site is to be allocated, only a small section adjacent to the existing footprint of the village would be appropriate for development.

- **Site CNP2:** The site is a greenfield located to the south of the village and has some environmental and physical constraints as well as some impact on locally-important views. Therefore, only development on part of the site adjacent to the existing footprint of the village is appropriate.

- **Site CNP3:** The site is a greenfield located to the south of the village and has some environmental and physical constraints. Therefore, only part of the site adjacent to the existing footprint of the village is appropriate.

The remaining site (CNP6) is not suitable due to environmental and physical constraints. *The site performs poorly against the sequential test set out in Local Plan policy LP4 and it is not appropriate for allocation in the plan.*

Next Steps/Assessment/Selection - Should Corringham Parish Council decide to allocate a site or sites, the next steps will be for the Parish Council to select the sites for allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan, based on:

- The findings of this site assessment;
- An assessment of viability;
- Community consultation;
- Discussions with West Lindsey District Council;
- Local criteria that can be applied to differentiate between the suitable sites, in particular the extent to which the sites support the vision and objectives for the Neighbourhood Plan;
- Any other evidence that becomes available, such as assessments of constraints, such as local transport or infrastructure capacity; and
- Other considerations such as the appropriate density of the proposed sites to reflect local character.

**Viability.** As part of the site selection process, the Neighbourhood Group should discuss site viability with WLDC and with landowners and site developers. The Local Plan evidence bases may contain evidence of the viability of certain types of sites or locations which can be used to support the Neighbourhood Plan site allocations.

## **2. Neighbourhood Plan Consultation to date**

An early consultation was undertaken in 2016 and 35 survey forms completed). 33 respondents said that the 'rural atmosphere' was what they most enjoyed, followed by 'easy access to the countryside' with 27 respondent selections, 'quiet village' with 25 selections, 'village hall' with 15, 'historic setting' with 12 and 'village activities / community groups' which had 9 selections.

Housing. Asked if they would be happy with housing, 15 respondents (43%) answered 'no more', 11 (31%) said 7 – 14 units, 6 (17%) said 1 – 6 units, and (9%) said 15+ units. In terms of location, the following points were made: Infill sites. Brownfield sites. Not just one site, use small pockets of housing. Adjacent to already developed sites.

Interested in bungalows (13), low cost/starter/affordable (18), family housing (14) and eco housing (9).

When asked where they would prefer to see future development 20 people selected 'Brownfield', followed, in descending order of the number of times selected, by 'infill developments' which had 16 selections, 'conversion of existing buildings' with 15 selections, 'a number of smaller developments' with 10 selections, 'Greenfield' with 2 and 'Larger developments' which received 0 respondent selections.

When asked if they thought new development should respect local character, landscape and heritage, 31 respondents (99%) said 'yes' and 1 respondent (1%) said 'no'. Comments included, maintain the gap between Corringham and Gainsborough, maintain greenfield areas and agricultural land.

People identified features important to them: The church. Green gap. - Church. Old buildings. Village hall. Playing fields. Pond. - Church. Gap between Gainsborough. Ensuring that Corringham remains a small farming village and doesn't become any bigger. It is fine just how it is. - Fields and farms. Church. School. Small village. Playing field. - Farmed fields and all of above. Playing field and pond area. The old mill in the field east of Corringham village. Post box and post office. Surgery. School. Nice people. - Green gaps encircling village. Church. Village hall. Open the pub. Small local shop. - The green gap around the village. - Open views on the edge of the village. The quietness. - St. Laurence's Church. Infilling although attractive will spoil the character of the village. We should avoid making the village an 'urban' extension. - Quiet lanes, access to walk with animals and children. Gap between Gainsborough and villages. Quiet evenings. - Victorian school. - The green gap. - Keeping the character of the village, you lose this the bigger a village gets. - Quiet lanes for walking. - Churches, gap between Gainsborough and the villages. - Quiet lanes for walking and cycling. - Pond, sports field, views. - Rural views. - Village to maintain 'a rural atmosphere' i.e. maintaining older buildings to keep character of village. - Churches. Small single roads that are traffic free. Footpaths. - Keep the green gap between Corringham and Gainsborough as large as possible. - Our field. - Any building of heritage or built pre 1900, (church, schoolhouse, refectories, mills).

When asked of their greatest concerns, should further development take place in Corringham Parish, 31 people selected 'effect on traffic', followed in descending order of the number of times selected by respondents, with 'loss of views / green spaces' which had 29 selections, 'change to village atmosphere' and 'effect on parking' each had 28 respondent selections, 'effect on road junctions' with 27, 'impact on the natural environment' was selected by 23 people, while 'impact on drainage and flooding' was selected by 22 people, finally, the 'potential loss of heritage features' had 16 respondent selections.

**March 2019 (Relaunch).** The drop-in session at the village Hall on Friday 29<sup>th</sup> March 2019 (2pm to 7pm) was attended by 43 people (including SG members and 3 children). The session was promoted through a newsletter and a short questionnaire on a draft vision and set of objectives was available and 22 were completed on today or handed in afterwards. It also resulted in an extensive and helpful body of local knowledge for the Character Study. Based on these expenses, which were almost wholly supportive of the Draft Vision and Objectives, such that **they can be approved for inclusion** in the Draft Plan.

<p><b>The Vision</b> - Corringham Parish will be a small, attractive rural place to live, work in or to visit. New housing will have met the needs of local people, especially the elderly and young families. Its design and appearance will have respected local character.</p> <p>The green gap separating Gainsborough and Corringham will have been preserved. Other open spaces and rights of way will have been improved to enable local residents to use them to the full.</p> <p>Social and educational facilities and businesses will thrive, supporting community cohesion.</p>
<p><b>Objective 1</b> – To accommodate around 14 (net*) new homes in Corringham village, by reusing brownfield sites, converting buildings and limited greenfield development on a variety of sites.</p>
<p><b>Objective 2</b> – To ensure that a mix of new housing meets local needs, in terms of size, cost &amp; tenure.</p>
<p><b>Objective 3</b> - To ensure that the design and materials used in new housing and other developments respect local character.</p>
<p><b>Objective 4</b> – To enable local businesses to thrive in the Parish whilst still respecting the environment</p>
<p><b>Objective 5</b> – To protect and enhance open spaces and the valued wider landscapes in the Parish.</p>
<p><b>Objective 6</b> – To protect and enhance local community, social and educational facilities</p>

\* This is derived from the Adopted Central Lincs. Local Plan which states a growth requirement of a 15% increase in dwellings for Corringham. The baseline dwellings figure was 222, which generated a growth requirement of 33 new dwellings (15%). Monitoring figures record 10 completions/commitments, leaving a net requirement of 23 dwellings. **However, the baseline has now been reduced to 163 dwellings, and the nett requirement to 14.**

### 3. The Character Study

**Features of the Till Vale LCA** - (“...agricultural landscape with large, flat, open fields and a strong rural character’ from the WL LCA). *A pleasing characteristic of the Till Vale LCA is the presence of several windmills, one of the best examples being situated some 0.8km east of Corringham village.*

**Trent Valley LCA** – “a more enclosed agricultural landscape...” hedges and woodlands. *Fig 25: One of the most prominently positioned and handsome of a number of rural farmhouses found within the Trent Valley LCA, Woodhouse Farm forms a landmark building along the north edge of the A631.*

Views from Corringham Village East to Lincoln Cliff and West to the wooded edges of Gainsborough.

**Village edges** - Aside from the village’s more exposed southern edge, (the A631) and those buildings that line the route, the remainder of Corringham’s outer edges generally benefit from a soft, green and verdant character. In views towards the village, built forms are generally subservient to the wider array of mature tree planting that tends to dominate and define the village edges and skyline. Through these strong tree canopies only tantalising glimpses can be gained of the settlement roofscapes, with the village church often forming the only prominent built feature. Occasional gaps and undeveloped plots along Middle Street appear to reflect old field patterns and cottage plots. See external view towards the village on P13, 14 & 15. NB, the importance of views of the Church from the N & W. The relevant recommendations are:

- Retain soft landscape edges of village.
- Maintain rural appearance of village gateways.
- Retain rural character of roads and lanes
- Retain views of St Laurence’s Church from all directions.

Corringham has a distinct “T” shaped layout and aside from the isolated Old Hall and Hall Farm (north of the village) it has a well-defined footprint with open land around. Seven-character areas are defined.

**Character Area 1:** North-west Corringham – a historic village townscape, and one of the most mature and attractive parts of Corringham, containing several listed buildings and other non-designated heritage assets. The rural character of the area and its edges is important, including the “tranquil rural character of Church Lane” and “visual connection to the church.” Church lane continues N as a public footpath. Key characteristics and features.

- Church (G1 Listed) and its setting, including views of the tower.
- Grass verges/rural character.
- Church Lane “...green and rustic village character.”

**Character Area 2:** Nicholas Way – Two self-contained, modern residential cul-de-sac developments with an attractive pedestrian link that cuts through a sheltered and planted setting. No through traffic and development has an inward-looking residential character. The frontage on East Lane, is a well-defined northern edge.

**Character Area 3:** - East Lane (Southern side) A single depth row of 1950s semi-detached local authority housing with open countryside to the south/east, but opposite a committed housing site to the north.

**Character Area 4: Middle Street** - Runs north/south from East Lane to the A631. Important buildings and open spaces (e.g. pond, school playing fields, village hall. Important occasional open breaks allowing views through to the open countryside/farmland beyond (see P42). Each offers longer views beyond. Several well-preserved vernacular buildings (red brick, with pantile or slate).

**Character Area 5: Poplar Lane** - One of Corringham’s most mature and distinctly rural parts of the village, Poplar Lane feels like a remnant of a bygone era, its quiet, leafy character contrasting starkly with the more built-up Middle Street and the heavily-trafficked environment of High Street. The lane has been spared the urbanising effects of modern highways works such as road widening, surface markings, traffic signage and raised kerbs, and has managed to retain a pleasingly simple and unfussy traditional rural appearance. See fig. 211 (former butchers). However, there is some recent infill development, which is generally appropriately designed. Refers to mature and attractive gardens, hedgerows and fruit trees and landmark buildings (No. 2 Poplar Lane)

**Character Area 6: High Street** - Along the busy High Street (A631), a busy E-W transport corridor. Corner Farm (Fig. 244) is a key gateway building stood prominently at the southern entrance to Middle Street. One of Corringham’s best preserved farmhouses, the dwelling has a locally distinct red brick and slate fabric. Sharing a setting with the farmhouse are a pair of traditional agricultural outbuildings, both of red brick with pantile roofs. The vernacular is complemented by a garden setting, which features hedgerows along its boundaries and a cluster of mature trees at its western corner, which are a key feature at the entrance to Middle Street. (Fig. 271): East of Corner Farm views appear to the village’s eastern landscape setting and a visual connection emerges with the buildings of East Lane at the northern end of the settlement.

Cumulative effect of high proportion of historic buildings helps to give the roadside environment a rich and distinctive character, with several stretches of mature townscape. Grass verges, hedgerows and trees are crucial elements of the character of High Street, providing a soft green edge to the road, unifying the streetscape.

**Character Area 7: Old Hall 7 Hall Farm** - a remote, isolated location, 150m north of Corringham village, it includes (1) Old Hall and (2) Hall Farm. The former is one of Corringham’s oldest properties), originally C14 in origin. Old Hall is a Grade II listed building of medieval origins set within a mature and heavily wooded estate setting. Hall Farm is an agricultural grouping and farmhouse fronted by Keeper’s Cottage, a two-storey detached dwelling. There is roadside tree and hedgerow planting, which is particularly towering and dense along the Old Hall frontage. (Fig. 276) It is only from the public right of way leading from Corringham to Aisby that a reasonably open view can be gained towards Old Hall, the western

parts of its grounds more porous and less wooded. From this view the general aesthetic of the building can be appreciated, with its white rendered facade and bright, steeply sloping pantile roof and collection of irregularly arranged chimney stacks.

**Character Area 8: Aisby:** A small hamlet, scattered farmsteads/dwellings, on a loop road. Separate to the settlement of Corringham.

#### **4. Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP)**

Policy LP4 (Growth in Villages) on a sequential test for the acceptability of development in villages, is a key consideration.

*In each category 5/6 settlement, a sequential test will be applied with priority given as follows:*

**1.** *Brownfield land or infill sites, in appropriate locations\*\*, within the developed footprint\*\* of the settlement*

**2.** *Brownfield sites at the edge of a settlement, in appropriate locations\*\**

**3.** *Greenfield sites at the edge of a settlement, in appropriate locations\*\**

*Proposals for sites lower in the list should include clear explanation of why sites are not available/suitable for categories higher. A proposal within/on the edge of a village in categories 5-6 of the settlement hierarchy should be accompanied by demonstrable evidence of clear local community support\*\* in combination with:*

**a.** *other development built since April 2012;*

**b.** *any extant permissions; and*

**c.** *any allocated sites, the proposal would increase the number of dwellings in a village by more than 10% or, where relevant, the identified growth level in the above table; or for non-dwellings, have a floorspace of 1,000 sqm or more or have an operational area (including, for example, parking and storage spaces) of 0.5ha or more. Local communities can, through NPs or other means, deliver additional growth over the levels in this Policy.*

**\*\*** *See definitions of ‘appropriate locations’, ‘demonstrable evidence of clear local community support’ and ‘developed footprint’ in Policy LP2. See extracts from Policy LP2 that follow.*

**\*\****throughout this policy, the term ‘appropriate locations’ means a location which does not conflict, when taken as a whole, with national policy or policies in this Local Plan (such as, but not exclusively, Policy LP26). In addition, to qualify as an ‘appropriate location’, the site, if developed, would:*

*- retain the core shape and form of the settlement;*

*- not significantly harm the settlement’s character and appearance; and*

*- not significantly harm the character/appearance of surrounding countryside or rural setting of the settlement.*

**\*\*\****throughout this policy and Policy LP4 the term ‘developed footprint’ of a settlement is defined as the continuous built form of the settlement and excludes:*

**a.** *individual buildings or groups of dispersed buildings which are clearly detached from the continuous built up area of the settlement;*

**b.** *gardens, paddocks and other undeveloped land within the curtilage of buildings on the edge of the settlement where land relates more to the surrounding countryside than to the built up area of the settlement;*

**c.** *agricultural buildings and associated land on the edge of the settlement; and d. outdoor sports and recreation facilities and other formal open spaces on the edge of the settlement.*

**CLLP (emerging)** A review of the CLLP commenced in June/July 2019 with an Issues and Options Consultation, a Call for Sites and other evidence gathering. It had been intended to publish a Draft Plan for public consultation in early 2020, but COVID-19 has caused a delay. However, publication is anticipated in the second half of the year and adoption could follow by mid/late 2021. It has been

established that the existing dwelling figure for Corringham (163) will continue to apply. The overall housing requirement will be examined but it is unlikely that the 15% ratio for new dwellings in small villages such as Corringham will change. However, the new plan will have an extended Plan Period, running from 2020 to 2040 (rather than 2012 to 2036). The NP should aim to cover the same period which could lead to a small increase in the dwelling requirement, e.g. from 14 (net) to 17/18. In selecting sites to be allocated in the NP, it may be advisable to plan for an anticipated increase. (The estimated 20% increase is based on the addition of 4 years (25%) of the Plan Period which remains at the time of writing, (16 years, from 2020 to 2036)

## **5. External Consultees comments on sites assessment report**

The following organisations have been given an opportunity to comment on the AECOM Sites Assessment report, within a 6 week period running from 12<sup>th</sup> June to 24<sup>th</sup> July 2020. A response (e.g. concerns over access or highway safety) may be critical in terms of whether a site is selected as “Preferred” or deemed “Unsuitable.”

- WLDC:
- CLLP JPU:
- LCC Planning:
- LCC Highways:
- LCC Archaeology:
- LCC Minerals and Waste:
- LCC Countryside & Access:
- LCC Education & Culture:
- LCC Public Health:
- Internal Drainage Board (Scunthorpe. & Gainsborough):
- Environment Agency:
- Natural England:
- Historic England:
- Anglian Water:
- Severn Trent Water:
- National Grid:
- Sport England:
- Lincs. Wildlife Trust:
- NHS Foundation Trust: