
From: Nev Brown
Sent: 27 May 2020 13:45
To: andrew ashcroft [REDACTED]
Subject: Responses to Examiner's Clarification Note - Bishop Norton & Atterby NP

Afternoon Andrew

Please find attached (also below) the PC's responses to your questions plus their justification for identifying those 6 local green spaces. With regard to your question to the District Council our response is:

Under LP2's definition of a hamlet the District Council does not recognise Atterby as a hamlet as it has less than 15 dwellings. This position was made clear in planning reports supporting decisions on recent planning applications 138146 and 140073. The

District Council is awaiting the outcome of a planning appeal decision on application 140073 which is likely to provide an inspector's opinion as to the settlement status of Atterby under LP2.

The planning applications can be viewed at: <https://planning.west-lindsey.gov.uk/planning/>

Regards
Nev

Nev Brown
Senior Neighbourhood Planning Policy Officer

[REDACTED]
Guildhall | Marshall's Yard | Gainsborough | Lincolnshire | DN21 2NA



[Sign up](#) to our digital newsletter



From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 26 May 2020 10:32

To: Nev Brown [REDACTED]

Subject: Response to Examiners report, Bishop Norton & Atterby NP

Good morning Nev

Hope you are well and enjoyed the Bank Holiday

With help from the Councillors and mostly Luke Browns assistance we have the responses to the Examiners report along with a table of LGSs to try to justify them, see attachments.

Hopefully they meet with the requirements to proceed with the next stage of the Plan.

Regards

Mick

Examiner's Clarification Note Answers

Questions for the Parish Council

Section 7

I can see the mathematical approach that has been taken. However, it would be helpful to have the Parish Council's observations on the comments made by the District Council on paragraph 7.28 of the Plan. This overlaps with my comments on the Proposals Map later in this note.

Agree that the list of historic or current planning permissions needs to be clearer and in line with the CLLP monitoring table for small villages. 7.28 revisions as follows:

P1 – now under construction

P2 – Under construction

P3 - completed

P4 – completed

P5 – completed

P6 – completed

P7 – under construction (completion of 4 properties approx. 80% finished)

Policy N1

I can see the relationship of the policy to the wider supporting text in Section 7 of the Plan. Nevertheless, as submitted the policy is a statement of fact rather than a policy.

In these circumstances I am minded to recommend the deletion of the policy and to incorporate its wording into an extended paragraph 7.29.

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

Agreed.

Policy N2

I can see the overall approach taken. I can also see the indicative minimum yields for the four proposed allocated housing sites.

However, on what basis does the policy include the very prescriptive figure of 18 new homes overall? How does it relate to the figure of 17 homes in paragraph 7.18 of the Plan?

In addition, there appears to be internal tension between the different elements of policies on new homes. On the one hand Policy N2 outlines 'up to 18 homes' whereas on the other hand the four policies allocating sites for residential use comment about the sites yielding a minimum number of homes.

Please can the Parish Council clarify this matter.

Policy N2 links directly to Figure 8 – the CLLP housing requirement which remains only 1 unit and an (community) agreed 16% additional growth requirement (17 dwellings) over the plan period. Collectively, this equates to 18 units (at the time of submission). The additional growth over and above that of the CLLP requirement is based on consultation feedback and the desire for the redevelopment of some of the identified sites in the plan.

The identified site thresholds are a minimum which is based on the CLLP LP4 and up to 4 dwellings per site for small villages. Site M1AS could accommodate more than for and there

was support for this from the landowner and community, so it was agreed that a minimum figure was established to comply with the CLLP. However, we are happy if a higher threshold on M1AS is proposed if it can demonstrate that there is support from the community.

Policy N4

Criterion a) appears to comment about 'building refurbishment' whereas the policy comments that the site is a greenfield site.

Please can the Parish Council clarify this matter.

Reference to greenfield land should be removed.

Policy N5

The District Council draws my attention to the recent refusal of permission for two dwellings on the site (L138146).

To what extent is the proposed development of the site consistent with its planning history?

The refusal of planning was due to the conflict with LP2 and it proposed 2 dwellings in a settlement classified as 'countryside'. The NP is now proposing to upgrade Atterby to be classified as a 'hamlet' due to it having more than 15 dwellings, this has been suggested by the Parish Council in the latest consultation review of the CLLP. If this is accepted, then single unit developments could be supported in principle.

Policy N7

I can see the commentary in the Plan that Atterby should be identified as a hamlet.

In the event that I am satisfied that this approach is evidence-based why does the second part of the policy seek to determine application in Atterby in the same way as in Bishop Norton when the policy approach for smaller settlements and hamlets in Policy LP2 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP) is different?

Possible revision to Policy N7

1. Proposals for new residential development in Bishop Norton and Atterby will only be supported where they can demonstrate that they have met all the following:

a) is proposing no more than 4 dwellings (unless otherwise demonstrated in part 2 of this policy) per site in Bishop Norton or no more than 1 dwelling per site in Atterby.

b) retains the core shape of the settlement.

c) does not significantly harm or alter the built character and appearance of the area.

d) does not significantly harm or alter the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside or the rural setting of the area.

e) does not create significant or exacerbate existing environmental, highway safety or sewage, water capacity problems.

f) does not cause any unacceptable negative impact to the private amenity of any adjacent properties; and

g) where appropriate, new dwellings should provide appropriate garden amenity space to meet household recreation needs, especially if the dwelling is for family accommodation. The space provided should be of a scale with the dwelling concerned, reflect the character of the

surrounding area and be appropriate in relation to preserving the privacy of any neighbouring dwelling(s).

2. Proposals for more than 4 dwellings on site in Bishop Norton will only be supported if it complies to other policies in this plan and has demonstrated that it has received community support (See Appendix 1 for the proposed criteria) for the proposal.

I can see the Parish Council's justification for Atterby to be considered as a hamlet in paragraph 12.9. The CLLP is very specific that a hamlet is a settlement with at least 15 homes. No other criteria are considered or included. On this basis I am minded to recommend the deletion of the other matters included in this paragraph.

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

Agreed.

Policy N8

I looked at the proposed Settlement Gap carefully as part of my visit.

To what extent is the definition of a Settlement Gap necessary beyond the application of countryside policies throughout the Plan period?

Is there any evidence of the need for a Settlement Gap policy?

This was an issue during the consultation. Feedback generally supported the idea of

If so, is the proposed Gap the smallest area that is necessary to achieve the intended policy approach?

Does the Parish Council anticipate that the provisions of Policy LP55 of the CLLP would apply in the Settlement Gap throughout the Plan period? If this is so should the policy and/or the supporting text comment as such?

The north-eastern part of the proposed Gap does not follow natural or man-made features. Was this a deliberate approach? If so, were other alternative north-eastern boundaries considered for the Gap?

Could a policy approach for the separation of the two settlements be incorporated in the Plan without the need to define a physical gap?

Policy N8 could be revised to a "descriptive" policy about the importance of avoiding physical coalescence between the two settlements. Based largely about the historic character of this area. This could allow for the removal of the geographical boundary of the settlement gap.

Policy NP9

This is an excellent policy. It will ensure high quality design outcomes

Nevertheless, I am minded to recommend that the various criteria apply as and when they are relevant to the proposed development – as submitted the policy assumes that all criteria will be relevant to all proposals.

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

Agreed.

Policy NP10

Has the Parish Council carried out any detailed analysis of the various local green spaces (LGSs) against the three criteria in the NPPF (paragraph 100)?

There appears to be a discrepancy between the LGSs as described in the policy and as shown on the Proposals Map. As I read the policy and observed the proposed LGSs, LGS6 should be to the immediate south of LGS2 (the churchyard). Please can the Parish Council advise.

Please see the attached justification table.

LGS6 description in Policy N10 and on page 59 needs revising to say:

"The green verge fronting Main Street upon which is the old horse trough (now planted), the parish council noticeboard, the Bishop Norton millennium sign, a bench seat and other street and utilities furniture".

I saw that LGSs 1-3 were more prominent and obvious than LGSs 4-6.

To what extent does the Parish Council consider that LGSs 4-6 are demonstrably special to the local community?

The identified spaces all have an important local role in providing green spaces to the community whether it is for recreation, character or historical reasons. All are valued by the community and used for different forms of recreation and pleasure.




The Proposals Map



Several of the policy numbers appear not to relate to the policies/policy numbers in the wider Plan. Is this because the Map uses the site numbers rather than the policy numbers in the Plan? Please can the Parish Council clarify this issue.

Agreed. Error. Site numbers need to be revised to reflect the site policies within the Plan.

What is the purpose of the arrow to the east of LGS1?

The arrow is to show direction of access into site NP5 (needs to be added to the map key)

Name of LGS	Why is it special	Recreational value	Historical Value	Photograph
LGS1 – Village Playing field with small playground	This is our only green space large enough for recreation within the Village. It also forms a green gateway into the village from Normanby.	Has goal posts for football and a separated kiddie's playground with a number of items of play equipment	Donated for use as a playing field early 1900s, used often for Cricket matches in its early years	
LGS2 – This area is consecrated ground, belonging to the church	The church is the heart of the community and this green space is the oldest in the village. It forms an integral part of the character and of the community and the setting of the church.	Informal relaxation. It is also a peaceful area.	Being under the 1851 Burial act, containing a small number of interments	
LGS3 – Green space fronting the Village Hall.	Amenity area giving good frontage to Village Hall used occasionally for outdoor events	Aesthetic view for Village Hall	Established early 1900's, formerly a YMCA timber building which was demolished to build the current Hall	

Name of LGS	Why is it special	Recreational value	Historical Value	Photograph
LGS4 and 5 – triangular green spaces forming part of the road junction, Greenhill Drive and Eastfields	Maintains green outlook for a number of surrounding properties. Royal Mail post box and a local authority dog waste receptacle	Informal walking by the community.	Present since Enclosure and has fulfilled a public amenity since just after WW2 as the site of the village public telephone box, removed in 2018.	
LGS6 – Main Street	On it is situated a stone animal water trough, a district authority road and footpath salt bin, the parish council noticeboard, the village millennium sign, a public bench. The area is predominantly grassed, with a bed for flowers and a tree planted to mark a Royal Jubilee,	The bench is on hard standing which also serves as a public bus stop for northbound routes.	Has served as a public amenity since late Victorian times.	

All LGSs are maintained by the Parish Council