

# Hough on the Hill Neighbourhood Plan Review

## [South Kesteven District Council - Hough on the Hill Neighbourhood Plan Review](#)

The Hough on the Hill SEA /HRA Screening Opinion Modified Version (2025) states that the proposed modifications are not likely to have significant environmental effects. Therefore, a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is not required (and nor is an HRA). It also confirms that references to the NPPF (2024) and the SKLP (2020) have been updated.

The Hough on the Hill Modification Proposal Statement states in its conclusion that proposed modifications are compliant as follows:-

- 3.2 The proposed modifications are consistent with the spirit, vision and objectives of the Made Plan and are necessary to ensure that the Plan remains in conformity with the revised NPPF (December 2024) and The South Kesteven Local Plan (adopted January 2020), both of which have come in to effect since the date the Hough on the Hill Neighbourhood Plan was made in July 2015.
- 3.3 Taken as a whole, the proposed modifications are considered to be “**material modifications which do not change the nature of the plan**”. It is, therefore, considered that, subject to consideration by an independent examiner, the modifications may be made without a referendum.

Some modifications that we have noted are described as follows:-

- 5. Neighbourhood Plan Policies Sustainable Development (and elsewhere): References to NPPF updated. .... To ensure consistency with latest version of the NPPF (December 2024).
- Policy HoH6: Terminology changed from “positive unlisted building/locally listed building or any other structure of local significance”, to “non-designated heritage asset”
- Policy HoH14: Title “Renewable and Low Carbon Energy for Businesses” added after policy number.
- Policy HoH15: Title “Maintaining and Improving Access to the Countryside” added after policy number

### **Consultation Statement (March 2025, updated Nov 2025) - Responses/actions that we have noted**

No responses on the proposed modifications were noted from LCC. Although the amendments were not deemed to be material, and formal consultation was not statutorily required, some consultation was nevertheless carried out. (App1, page 40, Consultation Statement).

- SKDC officer advised on a number of points to improve compliance with the adopted SKDC Local Plan as described in the Consultation Statement that has been submitted with this review of the NP.
- The Parish Council will explore, in partnership with the SKDC Conservation Officer, an appropriately evidenced process for compiling a Local List of buildings of architectural or historic interest, including within such consideration those ‘positive unlisted buildings’ identified within the Hough on the Hill Conservation Area (6 Non Planning Issues Page 102).
- The “Neighbourhood Planning Questionnaire Feb 2022” asked which areas should be designated as Green Spaces. Following a number of suggestions, there is a statement “A great deal of further work is required to identify eligible and appropriate locations for potential Green Space designation and consultants from AECOM will be working with us on this during the coming months. There will, of course, be further consultation, especially with landowners.”
- The Environment Agency (EA) responded on a number of issues including “support the inclusion of the ‘Green Spaces: Protecting Greenspace and Support Nature Conservation and Biodiversity’ section and NDP objective.”
- EA also suggested “that the water environment/blue infrastructure is also included as it is important to consider blue and green infrastructure together as water is vital to the health of greenspaces and biodiversity.”
- Comments were made about the Design Code. The Action noted was to develop the Design Code and guidance further, including further consultation. I don’t think this has been developed further yet.

## **Typos**

Page 8 History and Heritage 11. Line 1 “dating, **dating** from the Bronze Age” (the word “dating” should be stated once only)

Page 11 Housing. Last line of paragraph. There is a full stop where there shouldn’t be one “.... like to be housed. In Hough on the Hill.....”

Page 12: Transport and Movement – The last line and sentence “In particular, the permissive footpath” appears to be unfinished.

Page 14: Flood Risk, Water Quality and Geology 39 (line 7) LLFA should be set out in full (Lead Local Flood Authority) as this is the first time this acronym has been used, and there is no glossary.

Page 19: Para 58 Objectives . Bullet 4 “Encouraging” should be in the subsequent bullet point.

Page 19: Para 58 Objectives. Bullet 6 “Seeking” should be in the subsequent bullet point.

Page 19: Para 58 Objectives. Is the last bullet point really a bullet point?

Page 17 Design Guidance – Consultation in 2014 supported a “positive approach rather than just listing what’s not permitted”.

Page 36 NP: 107 “Policies to be read in conjunction with the Design Guidance, (Annex 1), the H on the H Landscape Character Assessment (Oct 2013) provided in App 1, and the ‘Key Views I the Parish’ shown in Figure 6 (page 31). (Character Assessment can be found on the H on the H PC website here: [2448-RE-Hough 01d vr](#)).

### **Non-designated heritage assets**

- Page 17 (Table) Valued unlisted structures appear to have been identified either within the NP (page 22), in the SKDC Conservation Area 2014 Draft Review and in the Appraisal and Management Plan 2014
- Page 40 115 “Heritage assets with the H on the H NP include (et al)
  - Locally listed buildings, ‘Positive Unlisted Buildings’ or other non-designated heritage assets ..... within the .....Appraisal and Management Plan, 2014 .....
- There is a list of “Positive Unlisted Buildings” for the village of Hough on the Hill listed on page 22 of the NP. They are an extract from the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan 2014. This document is not listed as an Appendix to the NP nor any links to it.

### **Local Green Spaces**

- Page 19 Para 59 Bullet 3 reports that “ Loveden Hill will be highlighted and protected through its designation as a Local Green Space.”

### **Views**

- Views are mentioned in para 61 on page 20 for H on the H.
- Important Views Index for Hough on the Hill is listed on page 25. The map of H on the H on page 24 includes directional arrows for these views.
- Chapter 4 Opportunities and Constraints starting on page 20 sets out a clear description of the character and features of interest of the village of Hough on the Hill. It lists
  - “Positive Unlisted Buildings”
  - Listed Buildings
  - 2 Important Open Spaces (Augustinian Priory Site and the Parish Playing Field)
  - A map of Hough on the Hill Conservation Area showing:-
    - Views – Important and Important Panoramic
    - Important Open Space (I don’t think this accords with the two sites listed)
    - Listed Buildings
    - Positive Unlisted buildings
    - SAMs
    - Area of Visual Dominance (the church – though clearly important it is not listed as an Important Open Space)
    - Conservation Area Boundary
    - Ridge and Furrow
  - Important Views Index

Although the subsequent descriptions of Gelston and Brandon set out interesting character and features of the villages, they do not include the useful Hough on the Hill map showing location of the views or the listed or undesignated buildings *et al* or a clear index for these features.

There is, however, a useful map on page 34 setting out the key views across the whole Parish.

## **Chapter 5 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICIES**

- The various policies note LGS and important spaces and green spaces but we don't think the document clearly indexes either Local Green Spaces or Important Open Spaces clearly. The emphasis is clearly on H on the H and not on the other two villages.
- Although there is mention of renewable energy throughout the document, the emphasis has been placed on small-scale domestic (and business HoH14) renewables (HOH12) and community-led (HOH13) energy initiatives.
- Policies for HoH5 (Listed Buildings) and HoH6 (NDHAs) contain identical wording which might suggest the same weight is given to NDHAs as to listed buildings. A small amendment to the HoH6 policy text would resolve this.
- Policy HoH12 (Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy) focuses mainly on new development and could acknowledge that energy efficiency improvements to historic/listed buildings may be supported where sensitively designed and consistent with their significance.

### **NSIPS**

- Given the rural historic landscape context of the parish, the plan could optionally acknowledge that larger infrastructure proposals should consider impacts on the wider historic landscape setting and key views.

### **"Positive Unlisted Buildings"**

- It would be helpful to clarify whether these buildings are intended to function as NDHAs for decision-making purposes, as its not a term I've come across before (although that may just be me). The plan does say it is working with LPA to progress proposals for a local list, which would likely resolve this.