Dear Sirs,

We welcome the opportunity to comment on this important document, and have consulted widely on the contents therein, particularly with regard to the designated sites “LB01-LB18”.

In making our comments we think that you need to bear in mind the following relevant issues in connection with the village:

1. Notwithstanding our status as a “Local Service Centre”, infrastructure in the village is in fact limited. In particular, there is 1 general store only. Bus services are poor—the 55 Bingham-Newark service now fails to run through the village due to funding issues, and there are no buses whatsoever on Sunday.

2. Whilst there is a school, it has an annual PAN (Published Admissions Number) of only 40. There are currently 267 pupils on the roll—ie it is almost full and has no room for expansion.

3. There are issues of flooding and limited capacity in mains drains. Increased development would exacerbate this. A number of the proposed sites are on flood plain land. The Parish Council is seeking to develop a Riverside Walk and granting permission for sites abutting the riverbank would undermine this and undermine SKDC’s statement at page 91 of your own document “the River Witham….provides the opportunity to improve wildlife and recreational provision”.

4. If all of the sites were to be granted permission, this would more than double the population of the village and fundamentally change its character.

5. Even small infill sites have been developed in an unsympathetic way, losing hedgerows, failing to follow established building lines and losing large mature trees in the Main Road area in particular.

6. The village has recently grown extensively. Building done plus planning permissions granted since 2001 means that the village is already coping with over 200 additional houses. Even as a service point, Long Bennington has suffered a
disproportionate amount of development due to its popularity with builders and the high price of houses in the village.

In terms of particular sites our comments are as follows;

**LB16**-This is a “green lung” for the village and an attractive vista. It slopes away from the village, causing particular drainage problems and it is immediately proximate to the A1, leading to issues of noise and pollution disturbance.

**LB17**-This site would extend the envelope of the settlement and be adjacent to the main A1 road access, and is currently both unlit and without main road footways.

**LB18**-This site would have main road access. It has previously been subject to an application which was withdrawn, on officer advice as we understand it.

**LB02/01**-These sites would extend the envelope of the village substantially to the North. However one of them may be suitable to be designated as a playing field

**LB03**-This site contains the oldest property in the village, a collection of ancient cottages-it should be protected rather than being demolished.

**LB05**-This is currently an amenity area used for events by the Royal Oak pub and should be protected from development

**LB09**-This site is on flood plain and runs to the riverbank—thus preventing development of a riverside walk. It is serviced by Church Lane, a single-track road. It would extend the envelope of the village inappropriately.

**LB13**-please confirm what is proposed here as the number of houses is stated as N/A.

It would be appreciated if you would give our comments due weight and keep us informed as to your developing views in this matter.

Yours faithfully

Rhona Hersey
Long Bennington Parish Clerk
Dear Sirs,

We welcome the opportunity to comment on this important document, and have consulted widely on the contents therein. A public meeting has been held and was attended by over 150 residents. The vast majority of these residents rejected the sites for proposed further substantial development of Long Bennington in the sites suggested to the south of the current village envelope.

In making our comments we think that you need to bear in mind the following relevant issues in connection to the village:

1. Notwithstanding our status as a “Local Service Centre”, infrastructure in the village is in fact limited. In particular, there is one general store only and bus services are poor. The doctors surgery is also stretched to capacity.

2. The village primary school has an annual PAN (Published Admissions Number) of only 40. There are currently approximately 270 pupils on the roll and it is almost full, with no room for expansion.

3. There are issues of flooding and limited capacity in mains drains. Increased development would exacerbate this.

4. Further development would ultimately present traffic and road safety issues with increased population but present immediate issues around the construction of further sites.

5. If all of the sites were to be granted permission, this would more than double the population of the village and fundamentally change its character.

6. Even small infill sites have been developed in an unsympathetic way, losing hedgerows, failing to follow established building lines and losing large mature trees in the Main Road area in particular.

7. The village has recently grown extensively. Building done plus planning permissions granted since 2001 means that the village is already coping with over 200 additional houses. Even as a service point, Long Bennington has suffered a disproportionate amount of development due to its popularity with builders and the high price of houses in the village. In addition, there are currently existing permissions for over 80 properties that have not been exercised.

In terms of particular sites our comments are as follows;
ADD18/19 - These sites would extend the envelope of the village substantially to the South. They are immediately proximate to the A1, leading to issues of noise and pollution disturbance. There are substantial access issues with these sites.

ADD20 – Inappropriate due to the shape and an unproven need. Substantial potential overlooking problems to current adjacent bungalows. Potential flooding problems.

ADD24 - Given there is enough land zoned already, this additional site is unnecessary.

ADD25 – The size of this suggested site is completely disproportionate and inappropriate for the local area and would present serious traffic issues.

It would be appreciated if you would give our comments due weight and keep us informed as to your developing views in this matter.

Yours faithfully

Mrs Jane Evans
Clerk to the Parish Council