

## Methodology for site selection – Reepham Neighbourhood Plan

### 1. Introduction

1.1 This document 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 Reepham, in the adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP) is based on a calculation using 15% of the existing housing stock, 405 dwellings. It is for a minimum of 61 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 14 commitments. The net requirement in the current CLLP is therefore, 47 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 late-2021), a new draft CLLP may be published which could be adopted shortly after the Reepham 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 Reepham 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 consultation with external bodies on the AECOM report.

### 2. Local Criteria

**2.1 Stage 1 site selection** reduced the 35 submitted sites down to a short-list of 9 sites. These remaining sites were then subjected to Stage 2 community consultation, feedback and site selection.

This consisted of eliminating all sites:-

- classified and agreed by AECOM and WLDC as being “windfall sites”.
- agreed by AECOM and WLDC as “not suitable for allocation”
- that although considered suitable by AECOM, resulted in a rejection comment from a statutory consultee that could not be mitigated under any circumstances.

This process resulted in 9 remaining sites being carried forward for further consideration by the community in stage 2 site selection.

#### Stage 2 Sites

Site 9.1	Approx 4 Acres of the field to provide both executive and affordable housing according to village requirements at the time with no specific time frame (Location: North of Moor Lane)
Site 9.2	9 Acres of the field to provide both executive and affordable housing according to village requirements at the time with no specific time frame. (Location: South of Moor Lane)
Site CL1423	SHELAA site submission (Location: North of Moor Lane). Indicated only - site of 0.259 Ha. A smaller section of site 9.1
Site 11	Up to 76 mixed new homes, up to 12 acres of land donated for new education, open space and play areas. Site area of 34.7 acres. (Location: West of Fiskerton Road)

*Additional graphical documentation accompanied this detail showing approx. 50% of site area developed with dwellings, 25% of site earmarked for community use and 25% site planted. The overall submission was shown as divided into 3 separately indicated sites.*

- Site 17 Rear field open for development in conjunction with neighbouring landowners as has been submitted by C & M Stuffins. Paddocks adjacent to and directly behind property backing onto field above are also open to development. Adjacent landowners have shown their support being H Roe and C&M Stuffins. No plans currently in place, previously I had considered commencing planning for low density, zero carbon BREEAM level 6 housing on the site. (Location: North of Site 11 and West of Fiskerton Road)
- Site 15.3 Area 0.87 Acre approx. Site promoted for single, sensitively designed wheelchair accessible eco-home. Untidy field- currently used for keeping and exercising horses. There is a new house next to the site, a large property on the former garden of 24 Church Lane. Current use would cease The existing building on the land would be removed. Would utilise existing access existing onto Church Lane. Does not require diversion or extinguishing of existing footpath. (Location: Paddock Rear of 14 Church Lane)
- Site CL3082 SHELAA submission (Location: North of Hawthorn Road next to Village Hall) Area 2.77 Ha.
- Site CL3083 SHELAA Submission (Location: Behind the Cricket Field) Area 1.77 Ha
- Site CL3084 SHELAA Submission (Farm yard site) Area 1.19 Ha

## 2.2 Stage 2 site selection criteria.

The table below sets the proposed criteria noting how/where they 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 May 2019 external consultation on the AECOM report. Community priority criteria have been included and are based on evidenced responses made via the Community Questionnaire (January 2018), and stage 1 and/or stage 2 Call for Sites consultation feedback gained. (2020/21)

Stage 1 Site selection Criteria	Derivation
Elimination of sites agreed by AECOM and WLDC planning as "windfall"	AECOM report, WLDC feedback
Eliminating sites agreed by AECOM and WLDC planning as unsuitable for allocation	AECOM report, WLDC planning feedback
Eliminating sites although considered suitable by AECOM, resulted in a rejection comment from a statutory consultee that could not be mitigated under any circumstances.	AECOM report, Statutory consultee comment.
Stage 2 Site selection Criteria/justification	Derivation
1: AECOM Classification	Detailed Sites Assessment Report classification 2019
2: WLDC- feedback	Response to AECOM report. May 2019- Mat 2020
3: Any additional site-specific constraints	Identified by NPPF, CLLP, Stage 1 and stage 2 Call for sites consultation community response.
4: Other statutory consultee constraint	feedback on AECOM report from consultees May 2019-May 2020
5: Level of public support identified from Call Sites consultation:-	Identified by Stage 1 and stage 2 Call for sites consultation community response. (see below)
6: Community Benefit – Sustaining/strengthening:- Rural character (87% support) Access to countryside (84%)	Identified by matching community questionnaire response priorities matched against Call For Sites submission.

<p>Family friendly/safe (76%) School (73%) Needs and use of Public Open Space.</p>	
<p>7: Level of indicated affordable/mixed housing provision Significant majority support for:- Small (83%)/medium(81%)/affordable(82%) housing Majority opposition to larger (4+ bedroom) dwellings</p>	<p>Identified by matching community questionnaire response priorities or CLLP requirements matched against Call For Sites submission.</p>
<p>8: Impact on community access to the countryside- Identified as a strength of the village by 84%.</p>	<p>priority identified in Community questionnaire (January 2018)</p>
<p>9: Level of impact on the designated Conservation area. 70% of respondents expressed concern at the loss of heritage features in the village through development.</p>	<p>CLLP (2017) Reepham Conservation appraisal (2001) Character assessment (May 2021)</p>
<p>10: Level of Impact on the Rural Character/setting of the village. Considered an important feature of the village by 87%</p>	<p>- identified from prioritised responses from community questionnaire(January 2018)</p>
<p>11: Impact on the local character of the area Study identifying 5 character areas</p>	<p>2021 Character Assessment</p>
<p>12: Impact on valued spaces 90% considered it important to protect named local spaces:- Manor Rise Play area, Reepham Cricket Field Village Green, Green space to the rear of Mellows Close, Allotments, Paddocks, School playing field Area around village hall, Footpaths, Roman field green area at Hawthorn Road / Kennel Lane junction conservation area, current green wedge</p>	<p>identified by Community Questionnaire. (January 2018)</p>
<p>13: Level of Impact on local Heritage assets (designated and non-designated)- 70% expressed concern at the loss of heritage features through development.</p>	<p>Identified as having value by Character assessment (May 2021), Conservation appraisal (2001) or other evidenced source.</p>
<p>14: Level of impact on the local environment. – 60% considered local wildlife/habitat to be a strength of the village.</p>	<p>Biodiversity, flora, fauna or their habitat:- prioritised from Community questionnaire / Identified by Stage 1 and stage 2 Call for sites consultation community response.</p>
<p>15: Impact on views into, out of and within the village.- 73% expressed concern at the loss of views through development.</p>	<p>Including retained view of St Peter and St Pauls Church throughout the village, views of local and distant Landmarks and Landmark buildings within and beyond the village and views out of the countryside. (Community questionnaire Priority response (January 2018)</p>
<p>16: The level of impact a site will have on Parking and traffic within the village. – 84% expressed this to be a concern about future development.</p>	<p>This priority relates to the prioritising of community questionnaire responses. It will be reflected by site location, scale and access. (Community questionnaire Priority response (January 2018)</p>
<p>17: Level of impact on localised drainage and flooding issues 79% expressed this to be a concern over future development.</p>	<p>Identified by statutory consultees and through local experiences communicated through feedback.</p>
<p>18: Impact on the distinctiveness of Reepham Village The importance of the distinctiveness of Reepham village from its neighbours and identity of a sense of</p>	<p>Evidenced by increased coalescence as identified by AECOM report (April 2019), WLDC feedback (May 2018) Stage 1 &amp; 2 Site assessment feedback.</p>

place is evidenced by 80% identifying the importance of the green wedge and a need to extend it further.	
19: Impact on the distinctiveness of Reepham Village entrances. The importance of the distinctiveness of Reepham village from its neighbours and identity of a sense of place is evidenced by 80% identifying the importance of the green wedge and a need to extend it further.	Through the blurring of a village entrance- by foot or road. Reference to Google Maps AECOM report, Statutory feedback and Community comment Stage 1 or 2 community consultation response (2020/21)

### 2.3 Stage 2 site selection process –

A) employed a points system 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 Detailed Sites Assessment report. The maximum number of points that could be scored is 114 (calculated by 19 x 6). A score of over 76 means that a site is a preferred location, a score between 45 and 76 means that a site (either in whole or in part) may be considered, but a score of less than 45 means, that a site is definitely not suitable.

B) Having undertaken the assessment on each of the site as submitted by the landowner using the above criteria. All sites were then re-assessed to identify any mitigation that could be made in order to identify e.g. if part of a site could be considered or alternative access could be provided in order to make a site a preferred one.

N.B 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 consultee objection may mean that it cannot be selected.

Conclusions from initial stage 2 site selection process.

#### Assessments of initial site submissions in descending order of preference score.

With a maximum score of 114, reference to a score based criteria based on approximately 1/3 and 2/3 maximum score, the assessments were ranked Red, Amber Green:-

Maximum Score	114
Preferred Site target score	76-114
Site mitigation range	39-75
Unsuitable site range	0-38

Submitted Site	Total score	No Dwellings/Area
17	81	1.27Ha
11	69	76/8.9Ha
CL1423	57	0.26Ha
9.1	48	1.6Ha
CL3082	39	2.77Ha
9.2	36	3.6Ha
CL3084	36	1.19Ha
CL3083	27	1.77Ha
15.3	21	0.35Ha

## 2.4. Site mitigation – reassessment.

### Rationale:

Submissions took varying forms. Some submissions contained up to 3 separate sites with indicated levels of anticipated housing with identified land for public open space. Some took the form of land areas with a suggestion of housing levels and types, while some were just outlined areas of land.

In order to assess all submissions with a common approach, it was important to evaluate them against the indicated preferences of the community and the constraints of the CLLP with its required housing need.

- CLLP requirement through LP2 and its implications for Reepham village: [Ref LP2 document Rev A.doc](#)
- Community expressed prioritised levels of support for development locations from community questionnaire:-

Conversion of agricultural buildings (79%) (1 exists)

On brownfield sites (75%) (None exist)

Conversion of existing properties into dwellings (73%) (None submitted)

Sites within Reepham Village footprint (69%) (None submitted)

On Greenfield sites outside the existing village (41%)

(All submitted sites are located outside the footprint of the village. Further analysis of the existing footprint was undertaken to identify “infill” opportunities on the edge of the village footprint [Ref LP2 document](#))

In gardens of existing properties (34%) (Rejected as windfall sites)

### Mitigation process.

Overlapping sites on a revised village footprint where infill opportunities identified potential revised sites. These revised and re-scaled sites were then re-assessed in order to identify a revised preference order of sites.

Mitigated Site	Total score	No Dwellings/Area
17	90	9/0.6Ha
9.1/CL1423	90	1/0.13Ha
11	84	45/4Ha (Part of site 11.3 only)
CL3084	60	1+1 conversion/0.15Ha
CL3082	39	
9.2	36	
CL3083	27	9/0.6Ha
15.3	21	

## 3. Conclusion and Next Steps

The selection methodology needs to be fair and robust, incorporating informal feedback comments from WLDC and Reepham Parish Council and the wider Reepham community.

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. Reepham 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 Reepham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group at the consultation stage. Where evidence from elsewhere conflicts with this report the QB will decide what policy position to take in the Neighbourhood Plan, and that judgement will be documented so that it can be defended at the Examination stage.

#### **NB. AECOM Assessment report – Executive commentary by Reepham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.**

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

Despite defining an area as "Brownfield" in AECOM's assessment of site CL3084, it has to be noted that the definition does not apply to agricultural buildings. There are no brownfield sites on the WLDC register of brownfield sites within Reepham Parish.

In three instances where AECOM suggested that a larger site is unlikely to be suitable, but a smaller area may be acceptable, that is taken into account.

In one case, although AECOM rejected a site on grounds of its size alone, WLDC made clear that a smaller part of that site should not have been rejected - evidenced by the subsequent granting of planning permission. Further evidenced by submission distinguishing 3 separate sites with some of the assessed land not submitted for development. This was taken into account.

In one case, although AECOM rejected a site on the basis of it having no suitable access. The opportunity was identified by WLDC to gain access through another submitted site and this was also taken into account.

### 2. Central Lincolnshire Local Plan

LP4 In each settlement in categories 5-6 of the settlement hierarchy, 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 development of a site lower in the list should include clear explanation of why sites are not available or suitable for categories higher up the list.

**N.B** The register of Brownfield Sites held by West Lindsey District Council contains none located in Reepham Parish.

The hierarchy of sites applied to Reepham Parish is therefore:

1. Infill sites in appropriate locations within the developed footprint of the settlement.
2. Greenfield sites at the edge of the settlement in appropriate locations.

**Exec. Summary - CLLP** - Reepham is defined as a Medium sized Village in the adopted Local Plan. Neighbourhood Plans will need to conform to the strategic policies of the Local Plan. A Neighbourhood Plan could not set lower growth than set by the Policy below, but it could set higher levels of growth or make decisions on precisely where the growth should go. Reepham is permitted to grow by 15%, equating to 61 dwellings (47 net). However, it will be necessary to reflect emerging CLLP and the agreed revision on Reepham base figure - in the WLDC Monitoring of Growth in Villages report; Feb. 2020 it is recorded as 405 dwellings.

From the shortlist of potentially suitable sites identified in this report, the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group will engage with Reepham Parish Council, 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 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 Submitted under the "Call for Sites."

### **Executive Summary – AECOM**

The assessment included 35 sites, made up of:

- Twenty two sites identified through a Neighbourhood Plan Call for Sites (CFS); and
- Thirteen additional sites identified through the SHELAA 2015. The suitability of these sites were not assessed in the SHELAA and were therefore considered as part of the overall assessment along with those sites identified in the Reepham Call for Sites.

Of these 35 sites, 16 were rejected during the desktop review of sites against national and local policy which purpose was to reduce the pool of site needing more detailed assessment.

Sites were assessed using AECOM's site assessment, desktop assessment and site visits. The desktop assessment involved a review of the conclusions of the existing evidence and using other sources including Google Maps, Google Streetview and Defra's MAGIC map2, in order to judge whether a site is suitable for the use proposed. The site visits allowed the team to consider aspects of the sites only apparent through visual inspection. They were also an opportunity to gain a better understanding of the context and nature of the neighbourhood plan area.



### 3. Consultation with the community.

#### 3.1 Neighbourhood questionnaire.

##### Key findings

1. The Neighbourhood Plan should aim to preserve and promote those aspects of the village that have been agreed by Reepham residents as being positive features of the village. (Rural character, Access to the countryside, Family friendly and safe, The school, Church/chapel, Open/green spaces/Sense of community, Wildlife & habitat, Historic Reepham, Having the Shop / PO / Pub)
2. Future plans for change should address concerns about the speed and volume of existing traffic, pedestrian safety and street parking in our village. The lack of Public open space for play is identified as an issue
3. Planning for change within our village must sustain and promote key amenities and ensure access to them. (Post office, Footpaths, Village shop, Bridleways, Fox & Hounds, Bus service and Church/ Chapel.
4. There is support from a significant majority of respondents to actively protect areas that are considered important in sustaining the character of the village. (Namely Village Green, Cricket Field, Play area, Allotments and public open space at the rear of Mellows Close)
5. There is an identified need for public open space for families to use for:- picnics/space to play/outdoor activities, for games / ball games / football and Community/village activities and for dog training.
6. 80% of all respondents identify the need to establish additional areas of green wedge in order to maintain the discrete identity of Reepham. This should be promoted by the Neighbourhood Plan
7. The residents of Reepham have significant concerns about future development. These include the nature and design of developments and the subsequent problems generated by additional traffic. The impact on green space and consequential loss of the natural environment is feared to alter the character of the village and impact on heritage features and views into and out of the village. These should be bourn in mind when evaluating proposed sites for the Neighbourhood Plan.
8. The residents of Reepham clearly identify benefits from future development promoted by the Neighbourhood plan. These include: Improved demand to support local business, improvement of local services, Provision of affordable housing, Increase in public open spaces, Additional public parking, Reinforcement of the village character, Attracting new businesses to Reepham and Alternative school parking.
9. The Neighbourhood Plan should aim to plan provision for the development of the number of homes targeted by the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.
10. The Neighbourhood Plan should promote the provision of affordable housing. Smaller and medium sized homes are identified as those that are in greatest need. Provision for the elderly through appropriate housing, sheltered housing and care provision is also to be promoted.

**Housing mix and type-** The community told us that there was a hierarchy of needs for new homes:

Small houses 1-2 beds 83%

Affordable houses 82%

Medium houses for purchase 3-4 bed 81%

Care home/retirement or sheltered housing 58%

11. The neighbourhood Plan can confidently assume support when proposing site developments of up to 9 properties. Sites between 9 and 25 might be supported if the proposal was appropriately and sensitively located, reflecting those preferences expressed by local residents.

##### Size

Individual dwellings eg infil 72%

Small developments up to 5 82%

Medium developments 6-9 73%

Support for larger developments 10-25 - 49% Support for developments of 25+ 30%

Only larger developments if in the right location

Larger development should bring better benefits to the village. There is a need of housing for younger people

Sites between 9 and 25 might be supported if the proposal was appropriately and sensitivity located, reflecting those preferences expressed by local residents but is less likely to be supported at referendum

12. There is clear support for improved provision of:- Play area, Litter & dog waste bins, Benches and seating, Footpaths & walkways, Speed reduction measures, Safe cycle routes, Road mirrors, Improved Mobile communication, Faster broadband

### 3.2 Call for sites consultation. Executive summary – Reepham Neighbourhood Plan Steering group

A series of 2 public meetings and a further 3 follow up consultation meetings were held in July/August 2019. These were to present details of all the sites submitted for the community to consider and comment on. All statutory feedback received at this point was displayed alongside the site submissions and landowners were invited to make themselves available in order to answer questions from members of the community attending the public meetings.

Community feedback on Call for sites

**Stage 1 Feedback** was received following 2 Public meetings, 3 follow-up consultations events, distribution of information flyer and feedback forms delivered to every dwelling in the Parish in September 2019. The community were encouraged to give feedback on each of the submitted sites. Feedback was received from 26 dwellings and this feedback was carried over to stage 2 consultation.

**Stage 2 feedback** questionnaires focused on the reduced number of sites following stage 1 site selection process. These were delivered to every residence in Reepham in December 2020. After processing to add additional comment to previously returned address responses from stage 1 feedback, a further 88 additional comments were added to previous ones. A total of 114 different addresses provided feedback on the stage 2 sites.

#### Stage 1 and stage 2 feedback returns by postcode

Location	Postcode	Returns from postcode	Dwellings in postcode	% Postcode response	Postcode Survey influence
Barfield Lane	LN22QX	0	3	0.0%	0.0%
The Chase	LN34BF	1	4	25.0%	1.1%
Carpenters Close	LN34DD	1	6	16.7%	1.1%
Laburnum Court	LN34DG	3	6	50.0%	3.4%
The Green	LN34DH	6	15	40.0%	6.9%
Althea Terrace	LN34DJ	0	5	0.0%	0.0%
Smooting Lane	LN34DL	2	3	66.7%	2.3%
Station Rd	LN34DN	7	32	21.9%	8.0%
High St	LN34DP	9	35	25.7%	10.3%
Church Lane	LN34DQ	9	25	36.0%	10.3%
Dawsons Lane	LN34DR	2	2	100.0%	2.3%
Mellows Close	LN34DT	4	27	14.8%	4.6%
Spring Hill	LN34DX	0	32	0.0%	0.0%
Kennel Lane	LN34DY	1	10	10.0%	1.1%
Kennel Lane	LN34DZ	1	4	25.0%	1.1%
Fiskerton Rd	LN34EB	4	34	11.8%	4.6%
Meadow Close	LN34ED	2	17	11.8%	2.3%
Moor Lane	LN34EE	2	9	22.2%	2.3%
Fiskerton Rd	LN34EF	9	25	36.0%	10.3%
Plough Lane	LN34EH	3	12	25.0%	3.4%
Chapel Close	LN34EJ	4	15	26.7%	4.6%
Kennel Walk	LN34EL	2	3	66.7%	2.3%
Beck Hill	LN34EN	5	9	55.6%	5.7%
Walnut Garth	LN34FF	0	2	0.0%	0.0%

Manor Rise	LN34GA	6	41	14.6%	6.9%
Hawthorn Rd	LN34JU	4	27	14.8%	4.6%
Totals	26	87	403	21.6%	100.0%

Summary of Positive (+), neutral (0) and negative (-) responses as shown in the table below.

Site		9.1	CL1423	9.2	11	17	15.3	CL3083	CL3084	CL3082	Green Wedge
Phase 1&2	No+	14	31	14	44	41	11	21	23	19	49
	No 0	21	25	25	15	23	18	20	13	27	0
	No -	42	23	40	23	17	49	40	44	33	4
	% support	18.2%	39.2%	17.7%	53.7%	50.6%	14.1%	25.9%	28.8%	24.1%	92%
	Overall	-28	8	-26	21	24	-38	-19	-21	-14	

### Context of responses.

We are aware that individual responses showing support or opposition to any proposed site are made from the perspective of where a respondent lives and where the site is located.

With this in mind the following table demonstrates an impact factor – to make the steering group aware of the context/perspective of the support or opposition indicated.

### Key.

An impact/locality score for each site and postcode is represented by the following.

Site Score	Site impact on postcode
0	No greater impact than any other area outside of Parish.
1	Some impact due to location. Could be visual or small % increase in traffic or amenity inconvenience.
2	Noticeable impact. Modest % increase in traffic and visual and amenity impact on the area of location.
3	Significant increase due to Visual, auditory, traffic during construction and on completion.

Site	9.1	CL1423	9.2	11	17	15.3	CL3083	CL3084	CL3082	Green Wedge
Average site impact from all postcodes	0.35	0.35	0.46	0.58	0.58	0.54	0.58	0.62	0.19	
Average supporter impact	0.29	0.32	0.29	0.55	0.63	0.27	0.43	0.43	0.32	
Average opposer impact	0.36	0.43	0.68	1.52	1.35	0.90	0.98	0.89	0.09	
Number of comments	59	56	61	71	63	64	65	68	64	53

#### **4. Character area study**

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 Reepham. The assessment of sites includes consideration of whether development would have an adverse impact on views and the surrounding landscape.

##### **Key features**

Reepham Parish is situated in the Central Lincolnshire Vale and is an agricultural landscape at the southern edge of the National Character Area (NCA) 44. There are expansive long distance and panoramic views with particularly pleasing views of Lincoln Cathedral and the Wolds. Reepham village is situated within the Parish centrally from an east/west direction and slightly towards the southern side. The Church is more centrally located within the Parish at the northern side of the village.

##### **Village Edges**

To the northern side of the village the edges are tree and shrub-lined softening the village with the Church tower rising above the trees. Only glimpses of village house roofs are visible through the trees. This is a pleasing view of the village with traditional routes also having green open space to soften the transition to open countryside and agricultural land. The south and eastern approaches are across historic moorland so there is no the same kind of tree cover naturally present, but some planting has helped to soften this and could be accentuated.

##### **Recommendations in the Plan are to:**

- Retain soft landscape edges of the village
- Maintain rural appearance of village gateways
- Maintain rural character of roads and lanes
- Retain views of St Peter and St Paul's Church from all directions

So these aspects have been focused on during the Site Selection process.

##### **Character Areas A- Hawthorn Road**

This area comprises a discrete development from a similar era of construction with no recent new development other than extensions. It is detached from the main village which has an attraction of its own. For the most part the linear development comprises low-rise buildings with a few Victorian villa style properties. The development mirrors one in Cherry Willingham Parish across the road with the Reepham side being just the ribbon of houses along the roadside. The deep back gardens are assets to the properties with open views to the countryside behind. The properties are also set back from the road with good sized front gardens with soft planting. This adds to rural feel of the development. The development has open fields between it and the main village.

##### **Character Area B-Fiskerton Road/Meadow Close/Moor Lane**

The properties in this area date from around the 1930's to the present day. It is therefore an entirely 20-21st Century development area. The earlier properties are characterised mainly by bungalows with a few modern larger houses towards the Parish boundary. Development has been such that there is no restriction of views across the open countryside and further to the Wolds from these houses on the eastern side of the road, with no two storey houses being built to overlook the bungalows at the time of writing. The views to open countryside are important for this character area as they comprise views over historic moorland.

##### **Character Area C- Infill developments off The High Street/Station Road area**

20th Century cul-de-sacs of primarily single rise bungalows with front gardens and most having soft planting, which is important to retain for the character. The properties date from around the 1960's to the present time. The newer housing comprises larger properties sensitively placed to not overlook the bungalows. Chapel Close would have a better relationship with the countryside beyond if the row of houses at the bottom end of the close had also had

single story dwellings amongst them, The Chase has no soft planting and Beck Hill has a group of houses that are beyond the scale of any other houses in the village apart from historic properties, and has contributed to loss of views of the Cathedral and the Church from within the village setting. Mellows Close has retained much of its 1960's character with original appearance still in tact. The low-rise, uniform appearance with soft planting on the frontages should be preserved. Manor Rise comprises 39 houses which are a mix of 3-4 bedroom properties with 4 affordable housing town houses. This was an add-on to the shape and form of the village and comprises the largest development in the Parish. The houses do not impinge excessively on the character of the village due to sensitive development style and green corridor. Green verges also run through the development.

#### **Character Area D- Kennel Lane/Spring Hill**

The properties here again date from the 1930's to the present day. The houses are solely on the east side of the road with open countryside to the west. Trees line the road adding to the rural feel of the approach to the village. Low rise buildings comprise the first few buildings and then the Spring Hill development dates from the 1960's and comprises 36 semi-detached former council houses. Three further affordable homes were built in the early 2000s. Views to Lincoln Cathedral are important to the character of the area along with the farmland providing part of the green-wedge and this should not be built on.

#### **Character Area E- Conservation area**

Many properties in this area pre-date the mid 1800's. There is a mix of one and two storey homes sensitively built to maintain privacy and apart from the High Street, most are set back from the lanes/roads. The area holds Conservation Area designation. Sinuous road and lane layout, green verges, hedges and trees are important to the character of this historic area. Notable view stops are cited in the Conservation Area Appraisal and these should be preserved. This is the most mature and attractive part of Reepham with listed buildings and landmark features in evidence. The visual connection to the Church is important and should be preserved in line with policy relating to setting of listed properties. Key characteristics and crucial features include:

- Green verges
- Sinuous road/lane layout
- Hedges
- Mature trees
- Quiet and rustic feel
- Church, setting and views of the tower
- Views to open countryside
- Open spaces where there is traditional/historic transition to open countryside

#### **Character Area F- Rural farms and businesses**

Rural farms form the character of the wider parish. Ward's farm in particular forms a significant feature at the entrance into the Parish from the A158 road. Tree cover and green verges make this farm particularly attractive. The remaining farms have their own appeal set back from the roads and lanes they are situated on, many with fine farm houses. They reinforce the rural, agricultural nature of the Parish and should remain as isolated residences.

### **5. Reepham NP LP2 defined (separate appendix)**

The current map of the village was used to identify the village footprint. Further analysis of this footprint was undertaken to identify infill opportunities to identify site locations that would make least impact on the footprint of the village. Site submissions were then superimposed onto this map to identify opportunities to mitigate the assessed sites in order to re-score them against the common criteria. This was used to identify preferred sites.

