

Corby Glen Neighbourhood Plan: Responses to Examiner’s Clarification Note

Examiner’s comment	Response from Steering Group	Response from Parish Council
<p>Policy CG2 (Local Plan housing site): For development management purposes, does the policy bring any added value beyond local planning policies?</p>	<p>Formulation of our Neighbourhood Plan was begun over five years ago when the details of these new developments were still under planning consideration, and their size evoked considerable discussion within the village. We accept that circumstances have changed to the point where CG2 does not add any value. We will remove this policy.</p>	
<p>Policy CG8 (Market Place): Examiner is minded to recommend that the policy is modified so that it sets out a positive approach (what developers should do) rather than the negative approach as submitted. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?</p>	<p>We accept that it would be beneficial if the policy had a more positive approach and the following policy wording is suggested: Proposals that enhance the value and appeal of the Market Place as a central public space for residents and visitors will be encouraged provided that they: a) Do not detract from its traditional character, appearance, or ancient features such as the Market Cross and Pump; b) Do not adversely affect the setting of the buildings that surround the Market Place; c) Do not adversely affect the usage of the Market Place for community-wide events and celebrations.</p>	<p>The PC agrees with this response from the Steering Group</p>
<p>Policy CG10 (Archaeology): The policy takes a positive approach to this matter. Nevertheless, does it bring any added value beyond national and local planning policies?</p>	<p>We would prefer to keep this policy on the grounds that the Corby Glen Neighbourhood Plan area is rich in archaeological remains. Thus the Lincolnshire heritage explorer (see: https://heritage-explorer.lincolnshire.gov.uk/recordsearch/index?rt=mon&q=corby+glen) currently has 106 records spanning the neolithic, roman and medieval periods. Future building pressure could put at risk unexplored archaeological sites, such as the medieval fishponds (see https://heritage-explorer.lincolnshire.gov.uk/Monument/MLI34197) to the north of St John’s church. Inclusion of the policy emphasises the local importance attached to preserving the village’s rich archaeological heritage. If the policy is retained, we will add additional local information and justification in the explanation.</p>	
<p>Policy CG12 (Local Green Spaces): The policy approach taken towards the proposed Local Green Spaces (LGSs) has regard to the approach taken in the NPPF. The proposed LGSs are supported by the</p>	<p>We note that the Examiner is satisfied with the approach and supporting evidence regarding the proposed Local Green Spaces. SKDC have raised an issue regarding the designation of the amenity land at Musson’s Close. Our response is provided where SKDC’s representations are considered.</p>	

information in the submitted Evidence Document.		
Policy CG15 (Community facilities): What is the purpose of the second sentence of the policy? Is it necessary in the broader context of the remainder of the policy?	The second sentence will be removed. The second paragraph of the policy will be amended to read as follows: The improvement and extension of these buildings and the creation of new facilities will be supported, subject to compliance with other Neighbourhood Plan policies. Where planning consent is required, the loss of these facilities will not be supported unless: (a) alternative provision... (b) it is evident... etc	
Policy CG16 (Community halls): Is there a specific reason why the two community halls are not included within the schedule of facilities in Policy CG15? Examiner is minded to recommend that the policy is combined with Policy CG15. Does the Parish Council have a view on this?	Both community halls operate in rather more complex way than might be expected of a typical village hall (see section 8.4 of the evidence document) and may be more vulnerable to changing circumstances. Hence, we felt it helpful to have a separate policy to emphasise the protection of these facilities. However, we accept that the separation does not really add value and we will combine CG16 with CG15. In the explanation of this combined policy, we would like to highlight the community halls by retaining the final sentence of the existing CG16 explanation, i.e. "The Parish Council... ..their value to the community."	The PC agrees with this response to combine the halls into one policy although appreciate the different committees and the differing usage by the village of the two halls
Community Aspirations are distinctive to the parish. They are set out in a separate part of the policy in accordance with national policy.	No response required.	

Corby Glen Neighbourhood Plan: Responses to representations from South Kesteven District Council

SKDC's comment	Response from Steering Group	Response from Parish Council
Page1.10, first paragraph: update to reflect the new recently published Local Development Scheme timetable.	The first paragraph will be updated to mention examination of the Local Plan review taking place in Winter of 2024 /25 and adoption expected to be in 2026.	The PC agrees with this response, we are aware of the Local Plan timescales and current intentions
Policy CG1: SKDC support inclusion but elements of the policy are repetitive.	We agree with this suggestion.	

SKDC suggest removing “As appropriate to their scale, nature and location” given scale and location are covered by Criteria A / B)		
Policy CG1, explanation, third sentence: update to reflect the ‘Design Guidelines for Rutland and South Kesteven’, now adopted.	The explanation will be updated	
Policy CG2: SKDC question the need for this policy to be included within the Corby Glen Neighbourhood Plan given the allocated site is already subject to two full approved planning applications and development is already underway.	Policy CG2 will be removed.	The PC agrees with this response
Policy CG3, criterion A: move the phrase “(usually expected to be no more than 11 dwellings) as defined in the adopted Local Plan” is moved into the explanatory text section given that adopted Local Plan Policy SP3 relating to infill development does not specifically define a set amount of development within the policy itself.	We agree with this suggestion.	
Policy CG6, first paragraph: move the phrase “More detail, including maps and photographs are provided in the accompanying document entitled “Key Views”” to the explanation because it is not adding anything to the overall policy.	We agree with this suggestion.	
Policy CG7: recast “Development proposals should preserve or enhance the asset in question and contribute to the quality and character of its setting” to form the opening element of the policy to ensure that it has clarity and flows in a more procedural way.	We agree with this suggestion.	

<p>Policy CG8, criteria C: The phrase “central focus to the community” could be difficult to judge and implement from a decision-making standpoint.</p>	<p>We have proposed changes to the wording of this policy in response to the Examiner’s comments and this phrase has been eliminated.</p>	
<p>Policy CG9, third paragraph: this essentially rehearses the decision-making element of the development management process and officers are expected to always use a ‘balanced judgement’. Policy CG9, fourth paragraph: remove this paragraph as it is a duplication of paragraph 2.</p>	<p>We agree with this suggestion and the third paragraph will be removed. The fourth paragraph, which replicates paragraph 2, will also be removed. Additionally, if acceptable, we would like to make two small changes to the last sentence of the second paragraph: change “It should take..” to “They should take..” and change “.. and setting of assets.” to “.. and setting of assets and positive unlisted buildings”</p>	
<p>Policy CG10, explanation: the opening quote is now from paragraph 194 of the NPPF and not paragraph 189.</p>	<p>This will be corrected</p>	
<p>Policy CG11: recast the policy to have the second paragraph as the opening part so that it flows in a more procedural way.</p>	<p>We agree with this suggestion.</p>	
<p>Policy CG12, LGS1 Musson’s Close: SKDC are supportive of “part” of this LGS allocation and notes the extensive undertaking of work in the “The Compelling case for Local Green Space designation – Musson’s Close” as part of the evidence base document. Although, SKDC would like to note that the southern portion of the site has been subject to a number of recent planning applications over the years. As Local Green Spaces effectively take on the same status as greenbelt land there is a requirement under paragraph 140 of the NPPF that they must endure beyond the plan period.</p>	<p>The document in Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan sets out the case for the land at Musson’s Close being designated as Local Green Space, and this document has received the approval of both Musson’s Close residents and the Parish Council. In 2021, the land at Musson’s was designated as community asset (see http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=29367&p=0 SKDC). Residents of Musson’s Close have subsequently acquired shared ownership of the land, including the area previously subject to planning applications. The residents have acquired the land specifically with the intention of securing it as an amenity. Thus the circumstances of the land have changed since previous planning applications were made, making it very unlikely the land will be subject to any planning applications over the Plan period. Moreover, the intended designation of this land has received strong local support. For these reasons we do not wish to change the inclusion of land at Musson’s Close (LGS1) in CG12.</p>	<p>The PC agrees with this response, this land was, we believed, a designated Local Green Space in 2000. The PC would support the requirement for this area to be designated a Local Green Space There have been several planning permission applications over the last twenty years however ALL have been objected too and planning refused.</p>

<p>SKDC have concerns that this specific area (the southern portion) of the LGS may not be suitable to endure for the length of the Plan period given that development has actively been sought on the site in recent years.</p>		
<p>Policy CG15, second paragraph, second sentence: this is more of a statement than any relation to the policy. In order to meet the clarity required by the NPPF, SKDC suggest this sentence is removed and a space added between the first sentence and the third sentence in order to separate the different elements of the policy.</p>	<p>We agree with this suggestion.</p>	
<p>Policy CG16: As for Policy CG 15.</p>	<p>As Policy CG16 will be combined with CG15 (see responses to Examiner’s comments) this comment no longer applies.</p>	<p>The PC agrees with this response</p>
<p>Policy CG19: add a space between the first and second sentence of the second paragraph in order to separate the different elements of the policy.</p>	<p>We agree with this suggestion.</p>	
<p>General point: throughout the explanatory text there are a number of the NPPF paragraph references made which relate to an older version of the NPPF. This therefore means there are contextual inaccuracies and quotes that no longer relate to their intended paragraph. SKDC therefore suggest that all of these references are reviewed to ensure they correspond with the most up to date version of the NPPF.</p>	<p>The necessary updates and corrections will be undertaken.</p>	

Corby Glen Neighbourhood Plan: Responses to other representations

Source of representation	Comment(s) in the representation	Response from Steering Group	Response from Parish Council
NHS Lincolnshire Integrated Care Board	No comments to make at this time.	None required	
National Highways	No comments to make because the Neighbourhood Plan does not introduce any new development sites or transport-related policies that are likely to impact the safety and operation of the Strategic Road Network.	None required	
Historic England	Historic England confirm that the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of important designated heritage assets. They consider that, in line with national planning policy, it is important that the strategy for the Plan area safeguards those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets so that they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area. (The remainder of the comments provide advice should we be starting out on our neighbourhood plan).	Provides further support for retaining CG10	
Canal and River Trust	No comments to make because there are no relevant canals or waterways in the Neighbourhood Plan area.	None required	
Ron Dawson Memorial Trust	This representation points out inaccuracies in the Evidence Document as follows: (1) First paragraph: mention should be made that the field is now being used on a weekly basis by a local youth football club, the Ropsley Colts. (2) Second paragraph: the seated capacity should be 100. It has not hosted the Club(sic) scouts for over 5 years or the Horticultural Society for at least 3 years. (3) It is unhelpful to describe the Hall as a “long way” from the centre of the village. At worst it is less than half a mile from the market square and a lot less for most of the more recent estates. The numbers of villagers attending for the community functions at the Queen’s Jubilee and the recent Coronation were amongst the highest in the village. (4) The phrase “did not rate particularly highly” clearly has a negative connotation. The impression given is of a village feeling that the hall is not well thought of. Half a dozen comments from	We regret that some of the information concerning the Ron Dawson Hall was incorrect or came across as overly negative. Our responses to each point are as follows: (1) This information will be added. (2) The out-of-date and/or incorrect information will be amended. (3) The sentence “But is a long way... .. such as the sheep fair.” will be removed. (4) The paragraph beginning “It was evident..” will be removed and replaced with “The results of the residents’ survey indicated that the Ron Dawson Hall was moderately rated as a	The PC agrees with this response and would find an update of the hall’s current usage as a positive position

	<p>a community of over 1000 does not warrant this. (5) The use of the phrase “Funded by Pre-School” is pretty contentious. It would be as fair to say that Pre-School was funded by the Hall given the rent they are being charged is well below normal commercial rates. (6) None of the Trustees of the Charity have any family connections with Ron Dawson. The remaining committee members who were related to him retired several years ago.</p>	<p>community hall. However, it should be noted that there have been significant changes since this survey was undertaken. Some residents suggested that the hall would make a good venue for a community sports and gym facility, or a skatepark.” (5) The paragraph starting “The hall is the location...” will be replaced with “The hall is the location of the Corby Glen Preschool which is a major contributor to usage of the hall, and so provides it with a significant income stream.” (6) The final paragraph (“A final point..”) concerning the family connections will be removed. The summaries in sections 8.5 and 8.6 will be changed to reflect these amendments.</p>	
Environment agency	<p>Owing to environmental constraints (i.e. relatively low flood risk within the area), the Environment agency have no further detailed comments to make.</p>	<p>None required</p>	
David Fowler	<p>Points out that Page 25, Section 5.3 (Designated heritage assets) contains incorrect information. All references to B676 should read A151.</p>	<p>We will correct this error.</p>	
National Gas	<p>National Gas Transmission did not identify any assets that will be affected by the Neighbourhood Plan so no comments.</p>	<p>None required</p>	
National Grid	<p>National Grid Electricity Transmission did not identify any assets that will be affected by the Neighbourhood Plan so no comments.</p>	<p>None required</p>	
Natural England	<p>Have no specific comments on the Corby Glen Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>None required</p>	
Anglian water	<p>In an extensive representation, Anglian Water make the following points: 1) Anglian Water welcome local policy which supports higher levels of water efficiency in new development and requires the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) such as Policy CG4. 2) Anglian water state that Corby Glen Water Recycling Centre (WRC) has in recent years been unable to consistently meet all its permit conditions (especially Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) because of</p>	<p>This representation contains information which, over the longer term, has important implications for future housing and business development.</p> <p>We consider that it would be helpful to add the following sentence to the end of Policy CG1 (Sustainable Development):</p>	

	<p>treated wastewater). A £1.1m investment in the WRC is currently progressing and is due for completion this year. The current work to address BOD mean that no further investment will need to be considered between 2025 and 2030, and to the end of the current Drainage & Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP) in 2050.</p> <p>3) Anglian Water’s DWMP indicates that population growth in Corby Glen will be 633 people from 2021 to 2050. Anglian water notes that SKDCs Local Plan allocates some 250 dwellings to Corby Glen for the period to 2036. The updated draft Drainage & Wastewater Management Plan can be found at: https://www.anglianwater.co.uk/about-us/our-strategies-and-plans/drainage-wastewater-management-plan/.</p> <p>4) Anglian water emphasise that promoters of development sites to be served by Anglian Water should contact Anglian Water as a preapplication enquiry to develop a feasible solution for drainage and water supply.</p> <p>5) To protect water supplies, Anglian Water have recently agreed (is this with the EA?) a non-domestic water demand position. The position may mean that new demands for water from business and industry will be declined to address the water supply demand balance across the region.</p> <p>6) Given groundwater abstraction reductions (required by the EA?) there will be no water surplus in the east Lincolnshire (including SKDC) WRZ water resource zone by 2029. Without new supplies and water efficiency measures the WRZ (water resource zone) and communities within it will, in an average year, have a water deficit by 2044. That deficit is planned to be addressed through new supplies, smart metering improving domestic 2 and business water efficiency to reduce in property leakage, reductions in distribution leakage. In the longer term, the reduction in overall supply to business is also being driven by a new Defra target that requires water companies to reduce non-household demand by 13% by 2037/38 and by 39% by 2050.</p>	<p>i) Take account of future demands on drainage and water supply</p> <p>Brief extracts of the information provided by Anglian Water that are directly relevant to the Corby Glen Neighbourhood Plan Area and context of the Plan will be added to the evidence document (i.e. in the sections on Housing & Population and on Business & Communication).</p>	
--	---	---	--