



**South Kesteven District Council comments on the Submission Version of the Hough on the Hill
Neighbourhood Plan Review**

<u>Policy / Paragraph</u>	<u>Comment / Recommendation</u>												
Contents Page	SKDC would suggest re-alignment of the contents page to ensure consistency. The figures listed on the contents page does not include Figure 3. Figure numbering should be updated for clarity.												
Page 6/ Paragraph 6	SKDC advise that the text ' <i>NOTE: All changes are indicated in red text (with deletions crossed through).</i> ' can be removed as these changes are not visible in the submission version. It is noted that along with the submission of the Neighbourhood Plan, a separate document 'Modification Proposal Statement' has also been submitted as per previous SKDC comments. The statement concludes the proposed modifications are considered to be " <i>material modifications which do not change the nature of the plan</i> ".												
Page 8 Paragraph 11	First sentence SKDC suggest removing repeated word ' <i>dating</i> '.												
Page 10 Paragraph 25	SKDC suggest adding a space after the last sentence under the subheading Caythorpe Gelston Ridge before Upland Arable to keep the same formatting as the rest of the character areas.												
Page 11 Paragraph 28	As an update to this paragraph SKDC can provide additional information that there has been the delivery of no new affordable houses in Hough-on-the-Hill, Gelston or Brandon. Additionally, there are currently no applicants on the SKDC Housing Register with a local connection to Hough-on-the-Hill, Gelston or Brandon. However, there are 9 people on the Housing Register that would like to be housed in Hough-on-the-Hill but don't live or have a local connection with the area. The 9 people on the Housing register is broken down as follows. <table border="1" data-bbox="427 1547 1394 1624"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Bed no.</u></th> <th><u>1 bed</u></th> <th><u>2 bed</u></th> <th><u>3 bed</u></th> <th><u>4 bed</u></th> <th><u>Total</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Applicants</td> <td align="center">2</td> <td align="center">3</td> <td align="center">1</td> <td align="center">3</td> <td align="center">9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Bed no.</u>	<u>1 bed</u>	<u>2 bed</u>	<u>3 bed</u>	<u>4 bed</u>	<u>Total</u>	Applicants	2	3	1	3	9
<u>Bed no.</u>	<u>1 bed</u>	<u>2 bed</u>	<u>3 bed</u>	<u>4 bed</u>	<u>Total</u>								
Applicants	2	3	1	3	9								
Page 11 Paragraph 30	SKDC suggest that struck through '2011' should be removed as this has been updated to with reference to the 2021 Census.												
Page 30-31	Formatting of bullet points requires amendments.												
Policy HoH1: Appropriate Development	Policy HoH1 – addition of a policy title noted. Policy HOH1 "conformity with NPPF section – SKDC suggest that it should be clear which NPPF version is being referred to.												



Policy HoH2: Development Context	Policy HOH2 “Conformity with NPPF section” - SKDC suggest that it should be clear which NPPF version is being referred to.
Page 43 Paragraph 121	SKDC had provided comments previously regarding clarification.
Policy HoH3: Hough on the Hill Conservation Area	Policy HoH3 “conformity with NPPF” section – Changes noted. SKDC suggest that it should be clear which NPPF version is being referred to.
Policy HoH4: Protection of Heritage Assets	Policy HoH4 – addition of a policy title noted. Policy HoH4 “conformity with NPPF” section - SKDC suggest that it should be clear which NPPF version is being referred to.
Policy HoH5: Listed Buildings/ History and Heritage	The Hough on the Hill Neighbourhood Plan sets out well policies for the Conservation Area, Heritage Assets, Listed Buildings, and Non-Designated Heritage Assets. It is noted that no policies for archaeology or the Scheduled Monument have been set out at this stage. There have been several archaeological interventions, especially on Hall Close, and the Castle Hill Scheduled Monument has been noted in the supporting History and Heritage section. Given the context, the SM could be included in HoH5: Listed Building policy, with considerations to NPPF 213. An additional policy addressing archaeological concerns, in line with NPPF 207.
Policy HoH5 “conformity with NPPF” section	Policy HoH5 “conformity with NPPF” section - SKDC suggest that it should be clear which NPPF version is being referred to.
Policy HoH6: Non- Designated Heritage Assets	Policy HoH6 – Changes noted. Policy HoH6 “conformity with NPPF” section - SKDC suggest that it should be clear which NPPF version is being referred to. SKDC would recommend formatting spacings between <i>Conformity with Local Plan</i> Policy and <i>Conformity with NPPF</i> for consistency.
HoH7: Affordable Housing	Policy HoH7 “conformity with” section – Changes noted. SKDC suggest that it should be clear which NPPF version is being referred to.
Page 45/ Paragraph 125	In reference to South Kesteven Local Plan policy E7 Rural Economy. SKDC would suggest amending bullet point three to ‘Rural enterprises’.



Policy HoH8: Rural Diversification	Policy HoH8 – addition of a policy title noted. Policy HoH8 “conformity with NPPF” section - SKDC suggest that it should be clear which NPPF version is being referred to.
Policy HoH9: Local Green Spaces	Policy HoH9 – addition of a policy title noted. Policy HoH9 “conformity with NPPF” section - SKDC suggest that it should be clear which NPPF version is being referred to.
Policy HoH10: Protection of Valued Landscapes & Habitats	Policy HoH10 “conformity with NPPF” section - SKDC suggest that it should be clear which NPPF version is being referred to.
Policy HoH11: Protecting Valued Views and Settings	SKDC note that the reference to ‘ <i>Figure 6, Page 31</i> ’ should be updated to ‘ <i>Figure 6 Page 34</i> ’ to ensure reference corresponds to the correct page number. Policy HoH11 “conformity with NPPF” section - SKDC suggest that it should be clear which NPPF version is being referred to.
Policy HoH12: Domestic Scale Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy Generation	Policy HoH12 – addition of a policy title noted. Policy HoH12 “conformity with NPPF” section - SKDC suggest that it should be clear which NPPF version is being referred to.
Page 47	Paragraph 131 – Suggest removing struck through text.
Policy HoH13: Community-led Renewable Energy	Policy HoH13 – addition of a policy title noted. Policy HoH13 “conformity with NPPF” section - SKDC suggest that it should be clear which NPPF version is being referred to.
Policy HoH14: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy for Businesses	Policy HoH14 – addition of a policy title noted. Policy HoH14 “conformity with NPPF” section - SKDC suggest that it should be clear which NPPF version is being referred to.
Policy HoH15: Maintaining and Improving Access to the Countryside	Policy HoH15 – amendments noted. Policy HoH15 “conformity with NPPF” section - SKDC suggest that it should be clear which NPPF version is being referred to.
Annex 1: Neighbourhood Plan Design	SKDC has previously provided comment on the intention of the ‘NOTE’ in Annex 1 which refers to the AECOM design guidance. It appears that the Design Guidance and Design Codes has not been submitted and reference should be removed.



***Guidance
/Page 55***

--