

# Skillington Neighbourhood Plan

## Assessment of Responses to Pre-Submission Draft Plan (PSD)

Ref No.	Consultee	Para or Policy In PSD	Comment	Response by Steering Group	Modification to Plan as submitted to SKDC
1	Environment Agency	General comment	None	Noted	N/A
2	Natural England	General comment	None	Noted	N/A
3	Resident	General comment	'A detailed and professional plan'	Noted	N/A
4	Historic England	General comment	Important that strategy safeguards historic assets'	Noted	N/A
5	Resident	3.13	Mention phone box / defibrillator	Accepted	Add sentence to 3.16: 'The village phone box has been disconnected and, following a village fundraising appeal, is now used to house a defibrillator'
		2.16	EU obligations in light of referendum result	Draft covers current EU obligations	N/A
		3.4	Mention number of retired residents	Accepted	Add to 3.4 as third bullet: '21.8% were retired'
		General comment	Make meaning of abbreviations clearer	Accepted	Appendix: Glossary and Abbreviations to be added
		5.1	Comments on lack of village shop	Draft reflects present state of the village and residents' opinions. A shop would require a new initiative which is outside the scope of the Plan.	N/A
6	Resident	General comment	Support for proposals to conserve the village and surroundings	Noted	N/A

			Comments on community facilities: shop, pubs, play areas, and wish to see the Plan promote them more.	Commercial ventures (pubs, shop) are business ventures which require an owner and need to be profitable. A play area is desirable but residents' views on its location are divided.	N/A
7	Resident	General comment	No objections	Noted	N/A
8	Resident	General comment	Plan is 'well-prepared, well-considered, and clearly written. I would endorse it.'	Noted	N/A
9	Resident	Objective 4 / Policy 8	Objective should be strengthened to ensure a more pro-active approach to managing the Conservation Area. Policy 8 should be strengthened to include 'management of the Conservation Area' with a working group to review and recommend how the Conservation Area can be pro-actively enhanced.	Accepted though it should be noted that powers to compel adherence to design guidelines are limited, so education and advice are likely to be the main priorities.	Amend Policy 8 to: Add 'and Management' to title and before final paragraph insert: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'A working group will be established to review and recommend how the management of the conservation are can be pro-actively enhanced.'</li> </ul>
10	Highways England	General comment	No impact on A1	Noted	N/A
11	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	General comment	Lack of background ecological information used to prepare the Plan.	Accepted. Although a report was received from Lincolnshire Environmental Records Centre, and was considered in the formulation of the Plan, the text does not adequately reflect this.	Add as 3.53 'The Parish contains a number of areas important for their wildlife and landscape character. The report from Lincolnshire Environmental Records Centre (5 February 2016), identifies the following: four Local Wildlife Sites (Skillington Road Verges; Skillington to Gunby Road Verges; Stoke Rochford Road Verges; Crabtree Road Verges); one Site of Nature Conservation Interest (Lower Farm,

		Policy 3			Skillington); one Roadside Nature Reserve (Sproxton Road). Areas of Lowland calcareous grassland (3.04 hectares) were identified within and bordering the parish. (Full details of these locations are available from the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership, at <a href="http://www.glnp.org.uk">www.glnp.org.uk</a> ).
		Appendix 2	Wording in Policy 3 should be strengthened to 'avoid' rather than 'mitigate' adverse impact on the environment.	Partly accepted	Amend final sentence of Policy 3 to read: 'Any adverse impact on the environment should be avoided if possible, or otherwise mitigated.'
			Identification of ridge and furrow field locations	See 23 below	See 23 below
12	Resident	3.13	Location of nearest food shop is in Buckminster.	Noted but Colsterworth is fractionally closer.	N/A
		3.15	No mains gas supply	Noted, but 3.15 seems clear.	N/A
		Table 5.1	Comments about attitudes to development should be removed as they are not objective statements.	The table heading and content make it clear which items are opinion-based.	N/A

		6.4	Delete reference to 'Tranquil' as it is a subjective term. Include term 'sustainable' as it is in line with Objectives 1-3.	'Tranquillity', while admittedly a subjective matter, reflects the views of many residents as an important characteristic of Skillington. It is felt that the Vision and Objectives are adequately phrased.	N/A
		7.32	Development on the periphery of the village is not opposed by residents.	Only 30% of respondents to the survey supported any development on the periphery.	N/A
		7.67 – 7.70, Appendix 1	Why is the paddock not designated as Local Green Space?	As 7.66 explains, significant green areas can be protected in various ways, including LGS designation. The paddock is protected by the Conservation Area Reappraisal and it is felt that no extra benefit would be gained by LGS designation.	N/A
		General	Skillington Conservation Area boundary runs across paddock behind The Stackyard which is illogical.	Conservation Area boundaries were subject to recent consultation during Reappraisal of CA and are not addressed by Neighbourhood Plan.	N/A
			Paddock behind The Stackyard is proposed as suitable for development.	For reasons given in 7.32 the Plan does not include a	N/A

				designation of land for development.	
13	Resident	7.71	The Square: this piece of land was registered as a Village Green under the Commons Registration Act of 1965 on 3 <sup>rd</sup> February 2010.	Noted	Add to 7.71 (2): 'This piece of land was registered as a Village Green under the Commons Registration Act of 1965 on 3 <sup>rd</sup> February 2010'
		7.72	The paddock should be included as Local Green Space.	As 7.66 explains, significant green areas can be protected in various ways, including LGS designation. The paddock is protected by the Conservation Area Reappraisal and it is felt that no extra benefit would be gained by LGS designation.	N/A
		General	Whilst recognising that Skillington is a Non-Sustainable Community and Colsterworth is a Local Service Centre it is important that Skillington retains its own identity and is not considered a satellite of Colsterworth.	Noted	N/A
		General	'a well thought-out and detailed plan'	Noted	N/A
14	Resident	General	'This comprehensive plan is a fair assessment of the village as it stands and looking to the future. I make particular reference to the need to keep the centre unspoilt and preserve the open spaces and key views.'	Noted	N/A
15	Resident	General	'We fully support the whole draft plan. Any concerns we	Noted	N/A

			may have had have been addressed. We will keep the appearance of [our house] as it is and will never change to plastic windows!		
16	Resident	General	'The five key objectives I totally agree with.'	Noted	N/A
17	Resident	3.50	New development should adhere to (9) Use of limestone for new construction.	Noted	N/A
		4.8	Support small scale development (10 houses?). The key then is to influence the design and use of materials.	Noted	N/A
		6.4, 6.5	Agree with Vision Statement and Objectives	Noted	N/A
		7.29, 7.35	Opposed to infill which is stifling and spoils the nature of the village.	Noted	N/A
		Policy 6	Agreed	Noted	N/A
		Policy 9	Might this not stifle small scale development which might enhance the village?	Noted	N/A
18	Resident	Appendix 4	'Crossed Swords' should be 'Cross Swords'. 'Holly House' should be 'Holly Hill'. 'Ashfield' should be included as same style as 'Holly Hill'. Jackson's House and Jackson's Barn are separate houses.	Accepted in part. List of Positive Unlisted Buildings (PuBs) has been reconsidered and amended	Amend Appendix 4 as follows: The Square: Delete 'Other houses on SE corner', Delete 'West House', Delete '1847', Delete 'c.1850'. Insert 'Shepherd's Barn', Insert 'Stone House', Insert 'Stone Cottage and barn'.  Middle Street: Amend 'Jackson's House and Barn' to read 'Jackson's House'. Delete 'Holly House'. Insert 'Stone Cottage'

					<p>Church Street: Delete 'Houses on...Square', delete 'Shepherd's barn'. Insert '1-3 Church Street'</p> <p>Buckminster Lane: Delete 'Chapel House', delete 'West side...Blacksmith's'. Insert: 'The Post Box', insert: 'Christian's Barn', insert: 'Molland's Cottage'.</p> <p>Back Lane: Delete 'Meads House'. Insert: 'Jackson's barn'</p> <p>Add footnote to Appendix 2 : 'In the blue Positive Unlisted Buildings shown on the map above, Jackson's Barn is wrongly marked; it should be the second, not the first building on the north side of Back Lane.</p> <p>N/A</p>
		General	We fully support and agree with the Plan	Noted	
19	Resident	General	No objections	Noted	N/A
20	Resident	General	I support the Plan	Noted	N/A
21	Resident	General	The Plan appears to address the possibility of future development while protecting the conservation of the village.	Noted	N/A
22	Resident	General	I am happy that the draft plan supports the aesthetic qualities of the village and appreciate the time that has been taken to ensure that	Noted	N/A

			the village retains its historical roots and appearance.		
23	Individual Stakeholder	1.4	Area does not border Rutland which is 5km away	Noted	N/A
		6.4	Propose Vision should say 'sustainable' instead of 'tranquil'.	'Tranquillity', reflects the views of many residents as an important characteristic of Skillington. It is felt that the Vision and Objectives are adequately phrased.	N/A
		Policy 1 (d)	Questions how this policy meets NPPF definition on sustainability by guaranteeing that it will not <i>'compromise the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'</i>	This policy meets the first part of the NPPF sustainability clause <i>'meeting the needs of the present'</i> . It does not compromise future needs.	N/A
		Objective 4	Location and importance of ridge and furrow fields is challenged.	Comments on ridge and furrow fields were drawn from the Skillington Conservation Area Appraisal, which was subject to public consultation before adoption. The fact Skillington's fields were not listed in the top 40 does not make them unworthy of note or protection There seems to be a discrepancy between the location data cited by SKDC for the CA Appraisal and other data.	Add footnote to Appendix 2: 'Location of ridge and furrow fields south of Back Lane cannot be confirmed at present.'

		7.23, 7.32	7.32 ignores the final sentence of 7.23 that <i>'individual circumstances are likely to differ in each settlement'</i> .	The two paragraphs are not contradictory; either of each other or of the emerging Local Plan. The point is that the latter specifies no housing quota for any specific smaller settlements.	N/A
		General	<i>'Overshadowing / loss of outlook'</i> is a Material Planning Consideration. Equally, <i>'Loss of view'</i> isn't.  There are numerous references to 'View' within the SNP. Could the Steering Group kindly make clear the difference between an 'outlook' and a 'view'?	References to 'Views' are explained in 7.82 as important to the overall look and character of the village. The word 'outlook' is not used in the Plan.	N/A
24	Resident	Policy 6	Stonepit Lane needs a road safety plan.	This suggestion is not in conflict with Policy 6. Road safety issues are the responsibility of LCC Highways.	N/A
		Key	I would like the open views	View 4 provides	N/A

		Views	from Stonepit Lane in the plan.	this.	
		General	Areas like Chapel Row, Stonepit Lane, Buckminster Road, Bluetown must be considered in the Plan. These are key areas to the village and its active life.	All areas of the village were consulted in preparation of the Plan.	N/A
25	Resident	General	A comprehensive plan	Noted	N/A
26	SKDC	7.34	Which 'guidance' is referred to?	The second bullet point in para 7.2 states that 'Planning Practice Guidance hereafter referred to as Guidance'	Insert words 'Planning Practice Guidance' at start of para 7.34 to make clearer.
		7.13	New 5 year housing supply is in draft and will be available in the next few weeks.	Checked SKDC website but updated figure still not available.	Will include updated figure if available before date of submission.
		Policy 1	<p>Criterion (a) House extensions are generally acceptable in principle and the main considerations for such applications are design and impact on the streetscene and the impact on residential amenity. You would not generally consider a house extension to be new residential development.</p> <p>Criterion (1): You cannot require all of the forms of residential development identified as being acceptable to be infill and within the built up part of the village, e.g. this is not appropriate for agricultural workers dwellings (note Policy 9 permits these in the open countryside). Farm buildings, in some instances, can also be converted to</p>	<p>As most of the village is designated as a Conservation Area, any extension to an existing property is covered in the last para of Policy 7.</p> <p>There are two working farms in the village and it would be sensible to encourage any agricultural workers dwellings to serve them to be located within the village rather than the surrounding open countryside.</p>	<p>Delete a) in Policy 1 and renumber policy accordingly.</p> <p>Add to last para of Policy 7 '4) it does not have an adverse impact on the street scene or residential amenity.</p> <p>Add to 7.33: 'The Skillington Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan prepared by the District Council pointed out that the village has a strong rural and agricultural character with a number of working farms. The provision of a new isolated dwelling to</p>

			residential under prior notification.		meet the essential need for an agricultural worker close to their place of work is normally acceptable in the open countryside, but might be preferable within the actual village itself close to the existing working farms subject to it meeting all the relevant design criteria. This protects the surrounding landscape and retains the agricultural character of the village by supporting the viability of the working farms.'
		Policy 2	Policy SAP2 will not be in force forever. It may be prudent to refer to the adopted SKDC policy or list the criteria from the SAP2 in Policy 2.	This approach could apply to every adopted policy in the Development Plan. However SKDC clearly suggest that this particular policy cross reference be future proofed.	Add to Policy 2: c) meets the criteria listed in Policy SAP2 in the Site Allocation and Policies Development Plan Document <i>or listed in a replacement policy on rural exception sites adopted by South Kesteven District Council.</i>
		Policy 5	Please ensure that you have consulted all landowners. Please also ensure that the boundaries are accurate.	All affected landowners were informed of the proposed	N/C

		Policy 7	<p>Criterion 1 – the word ‘natural’ should be removed, as it potentially places unnecessary burden on development.</p> <p>Criterion 2 – this would likely just apply to house extensions.</p>	<p>designation.</p> <p>The wording of the last para in the policy was taken verbatim from the draft Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan undertaken by SKDC, so there appears to be some inconsistency in their advice.</p> <p>All of the listed criteria in this part of the policy solely apply to house extensions or alterations.</p>	<p>Delete ‘natural’ and replace with ‘building’ in criterion 1.</p> <p>N/C</p>
		Policy 8	<p>This policy cannot be applied to developments, as it is a statement of what the Parish Council intend to undertake.</p>	<p>This comment is correct as currently worded but it is a proposal to undertake further work that will influence future planning applications. However it does need future proofing to give status to the guidance once prepared.</p>	<p>Add to start of Policy 8: ‘A proposal for development in or adjoining the Conservation Area should have regard to: 1.) the Skillington Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan 2016 prepared by South Kesteven District Council; and 2.) Design Guidance for the Conservation Area prepared by the Parish Council.</p>
		Policy 9	<p>Criterion (A) is very open and may lead to a lot of development in unsustainable locations. You may need to define what is acceptable in more detail, perhaps through some wording around tourism or</p>	<p>The District Council feel the policy is not restrictive enough and needs more detail on what is, or is not, acceptable</p>	<p>The District Council feel the policy is not restrictive enough and needs more detail on what is, or is not, acceptable development. Proposals for development in the open countryside will only be supported :</p>

			<p>rural enterprise.</p> <p>Criterion (B) – It should be considered whether particular uses would be more suitable than others when re-using an existing building. Different uses will have different impacts. Similarly, some things cannot be controlled by Policy (e.g. as they are permitted development or come under prior notification).</p> <p>Criterion (C) – Does this mean for large buildings also or pitches with incidental buildings? You need to clarify what is likely to be acceptable in real terms.</p>	<p>development.</p>	<p>a) where it contributes to rural diversification and there is an essential requirement for a rural location;</p> <p>b) where it would involve the suitable reuse or extension of an existing building, and that any increase in size would be subordinate to the original building(s) in terms of floor space or massing;</p> <p>c) for outdoor sport or recreation where the rural character and openness of the landscape would be maintained;</p> <p>d) for a new isolated dwelling where there are special circumstances as specified in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework, such as the need for a rural worker to be close to their place of work;</p> <p>e) for affordable housing as ‘exception sites’ that are located adjacent to an existing built-up area; or</p> <p>f) for agriculture, forestry or equine purposes.</p> <p>Development will be supported where it preserves and enhances :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) landscape character and quality including individual features of value;</li> <li>2) sites of ecological value;</li> <li>3) listed buildings, Scheduled Monuments and other sites of</li> </ol>
--	--	--	---	---------------------	--

					archaeological interest including ridge and furrow; 4) the intrinsic character, beauty and tranquillity of the countryside; and 5) the character and appearance of the area in terms of its historic and vernacular built form.'
27	Resident	3.11	Specify which pub is closed.	3.11 to be clarified.	3.11 In third sentence after 'use' insert 'for the Blue Horse'.
		3.37, 3.41, 7.96	3.41 conflicts with 3.37 and 7.96	The distinction is between 'listed' buildings and 'locally listed' buildings. There are none of the latter but the Plan seeks to identify 'positive unlisted buildings' in lieu of locally listed ones.	N/A
		7.9, 7.32	Colsterworth and Woolsthorpe are 3 miles away, not 4.	7.9 and 7.32 to be amended.	7.9 in final sentence change '4' to '3'. 7.32 in 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet change 'four' to 'three'.
		7.20, 7.23	New housing in last 30 years has failed to maintain village services.	Sustainable services like a shop, doctor's surgery etc. would require much larger growth in housing numbers than the majority of residents want.	N/A
		General	Concern over condition and use of Church of St James.	Noted in plan	N/A
		General	No mention of paddock on Church St that is in village ownership and could be a	The paddock's importance as a green space is	N/A

		General	future usable asset.  Village will become stultified without provision of affordable housing for young families.	acknowledged in 7.85,7.89 and in three key views in Appendix 2.  The plan seeks to enable appropriate housing development as defined in Policy 1	N/A
		General	...otherwise a brilliant and well considered production. Well done!	Noted	N/A
28	Resident	Policy 7	Need for heritage funding and support for Church of St James.	Noted in plan	N/A
		Policy 1	Need to attract young people to the village through affordable housing	The plan seeks to enable appropriate housing development as defined in Policy 1. The additional consultation on this point is described in 4.16, 4.17.	N/A
29	Resident	General	'Agree with the Neighbourhood Plan'	Noted	N/A
30	The Easton Estate	Policy 5	Objection, by the land owner, to designation of the playing field as Local Green Space. The playing field is essentially agricultural land provided for village use for sporting purposes. It is protected by a 100 year lease to the village hall and requires no additional protection.	Accepted	Delete 7.71 (3) and Policy 5 (c) and amend map in Appendix 1