

Neighbourhood Plan check list

Site SS5 Lower Kirklington Road

Policies		NP	Application 2018	Application 2019
Sustainable Development:				
SD1 -Delivering Sustainable Development				
Environment:				
E1 – Flood Risk Assessments and Mitigation			Dismisses flood risk but site was part flooded in 2013. Hopkiln and Maltkiln Cottages suffer from regular surface water flooding. Reference to Potwell dyke is irrelevant as it is on the other side of the town and flood water here comes from Halam Hill and	Same comment apply. Paras 4.10 & 4.13 don't ties up with local observations regarding flooding on the site.
E2 – Flood Resilient Design			Seems to be a potentially reasonable sw plan but will the combined sewer in LKR by able to cope?	Same comments apply.
E3 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity				
E4 – Public Rights of Way			Doesn't conform to NP policy E4 and SS5 vi as PROW runs along estate road.	Now only a very short length on the highway.
E5 – Green Link			n/a	n/a
E6 – Climate Change and Carbon Emissions			Solar/PV panels would be good to see	Solar/PV panels would be good to see
Design and the Historic Environment:				
DH1 – Sense of Place			OK	OK
DH2 – Public Realm			OK	OK
DH3 – Historic Environment			n/a	n/a
Transport and Access:				
TA1 – Cycle and Pedestrian Routes			See E4	See E4
TA2 – Public Transport Connectivity			just over 400m to bus stop	just over 400m to bus stop
TA3 – Highways Impact			Dismisses extra traffic and says most will walk to the town Centre. However it is way beyond the 800m/10 minute walk isocrone beyond which DfT research shows that most people would walk especially if carrying shopping.	Same comments apply. NB County Highways pushed for traffic lights at the junction rather than a mini roundabout!!
TA4 – Parking Standards			225 spaces -two per house generally but 1 per house for 1B2P houses	Police don't like the large parking court
TA5 – Parking Strategy			n/a	n/a
Community Facilities:				
CF1 – Identified Assets			n/a	n/a
CF2 – Green and Open Spaces and Burial Grounds			n/a	n/a
CF3 – Primary Shopping Frontage			n/a	n/a
CF4 – Tourism			n/a	n/a
Housing and Employment:				
HE1 – Housing Type and Density		30dph	38 dph Doesn't quite conform to DC or NP type %ages although the correct proportion of social housing is very welcome.	Reduced numbers welcome but now doesn't comply with NP %ages for smaller houses. Correct proportion of social housing is very welcome.
Dwelling numbers		65	105 – far more than allocated in this unsustainable location which will generate a lot of car journeys with congestion and parking issues in the town centre.	80
%age of types	1b		23%	13%
	2b	1+2b=60%	29% 1+2b = 52%	35% 1+2b = 47.5%
	3b	15.00%	27%	21%
	4b	4b+ 25%	12% 4b+ = 22%	15% 4b+ = 31.5%
	5b		5%	9%
	6+b		5%	8%
bungalows			nil but reasons seem to some, but not all, to be acceptable.	nil but reasons seem to some, but not all, to be acceptable.
HE2 – Affordable Housing Provision				
Affordable %		30%	OK	OK
Social rented		60% of affordable%	OK	OK
HE3 – Open Space and New Residential Developments			Inadequate open space and in the wrong place.. NSDC Green Space Improvement plans show a shortfall of Provision in North Ward amounting to 1.29ha for Children and young people and 1.28ha for parks and gardens. It goes on to say "Any significant new housing in the areas may require additional provision considering current deficiency levels."	Now much better provision and location.
HE4 – Economic Development		n/a		
Site Specific Policy compliance:				
	SS5 ix		Doesn't provide central open space/play area to give a sense of place and focal point for the development. The creation of a central green space in the region of plots 59-72 with houses facing it would give a sense of place, a play area, green space and would result in a less orthogonal plan form giving more interesting rooflines when viewed from outside the site.	Now much better provision and location.
	SS5 ii & Design Guide		doesn't address the transition into the town - lack of variety in roof heights and orientation – very orthogonal and high density in regimented rows, contrary to the Design Guide. A lot of very similar house types visually.	same comments apply. Sketch on Design statement has some variety in orientation which isn't carried through to the final plan. Roofline very regimented, houses to the east of the access road need a more varied roofline to help the transition from countryside to town.
	SS5 ii		doesn't retain hedges H5 & H6 which are on the NP proposals map as "important landscape vegetation" see SS5 ii	Now mostly retained.
Appendix 1 – Southwell Design Guide			8m wide maintenance buffer not provided (see design guide – Natural Environment)	8m wide maintenance buffer not provided everywhere. (see design guide – Natural Environment)
			Social housing not mixed in in contravention of NSDC Affordable Housing SPD paras 3.14-3.16	Same comment applies
			Blank gable ends at the entrance to the site in contravention of Neighbourhood Plan Design Guide	Blank gable ends at the entrance to the site in contravention of Neighbourhood Plan Design Guide. NB Police report refers to this as well, asking for windows in gable ends. They also don't like the rear accesses to several of the social houses.