

Grasby and Searby cum Owmbly Neighbourhood Development Plan

Responses (red) from the GSONP Steering Group to the Examiner's Clarification Note (blue) received 24 June 2026

Clarification 1

To what extent does the first part of Policy 2 bring any added value beyond the final part of Policy 1?

Policy 2.1

Development proposals in the areas identified as Significant Green Wedges (Map 4d) will be resisted. In this way their contribution to the wider character and sense of openness that they provide around the settlements of Grasby, Searby, Owmbly and Clixby, and the long views out to the open countryside, are maintained.

Policy 1.4

Outside the settlement boundaries proposals will be limited to development that is necessary to support the rural economy or is a rural exception site in accordance with national, district and other relevant policies in this Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy 2.1 is drafted to recognise the importance the local residents place on the open countryside surrounding the settlements in the Neighbourhood Plan area and, although Policy 1.4 accepts that limited development may be necessary in accordance with the CLLP and national policy, such development will be resisted where it adversely impacts the wider character, sense of openness or the long views out to the open countryside.

Clarification 2

The northern edge of the Significant Green Wedges is defined by the Brigg Road (A1084). However, in several cases, the southern boundary appears to cut across fields. How did the Parish Council approach the definition of the southern boundary?

The boundaries of the Significant Green Wedges follow existing landscape features where possible, mostly visual features such as hedgerows, woodlands, topography or built features. Many of the fields to the south of the escarpment are very large. The main purpose of this designation is to maintain the visual separation of the settlements. Following field boundaries would incorporate extensive tracts of land to the south would be disproportionate to the intent of this policy and result in a jagged boundary that appears inconsistent.

Clarification 3

I am minded to recommend that [Policy 3] parts 2, 3 and 6 are repositioned into the supporting text as they comment about other policies/documents (parts 2 and 3) or describe a free-standing process (part 6). Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

The Steering Group/Parish Council understands this comment. It was felt helpful to include in the policy references to these requirements to protect and enhance the natural environment in order to provide more complete and accessible information in one place. If this change is made, we would like to see these requirements identified as important considerations in the context of Policy 3.

Clarification 4

This policy [Policy 4]. takes a positive approach to flooding and has regard to Section 14 of the NPPF. Nevertheless, and in this context, the first part of the policy restates national policy. As such I am minded to recommend its deletion and its repositioning into an expanded supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?

We refer to our comments on Clarification 3.

Clarification 5

Has the policy's requirement [Policy 8a] for houses to be constructed to Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations been assessed for commercial viability?

The Steering Group have not assessed the impact on commercial viability of this policy requirement. It has been included because of the findings in the Housing Needs Assessment, local comments about the desire for more retirement accommodation and to better meet the needs of an aging population. It also supports Policy S20 (Resilient and Adaptable Design) in the CLLP which seeks to future proof new developments. Given there is developer interest within Grasby, higher average house prices and the topography of the allocated sites is relatively flat, compared to some sites within the village, it is considered that these requirements could be met with relatively modest changes to traditional designs and contribute to the goals set out in Policy S20.

Clarification 6

I note the commentary in paragraphs 164 to 167 of the Plan. Nevertheless, does the policy [Policy 8b] bring any added value beyond Policy S4 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan?

Thanks for raising this. Policy 8b is based on Policy S4 and also Policy S22, however it does, we believe, clearly set out those requirements plus those that are particularly important to residents such as reference to the Design Guide and the specific needs identified in the Housing Needs Assessment.

Clarification 7

Does the site [GSO.01 Policy 13C] area of 1.76 ha relate to the site identified for residential use or to the wider site (including the proposed open space)?

The area of 1.76ha relates to the site offered by the landowner during the Call for Sites exercise which comprises the allocated housing site GSO.01 plus the proposed open space. Site GSO.01 has an area of 0.91 ha. The proposed open space site had an area of 0.85 ha.

Clarification 8

Does the development of a maximum number of six dwellings represent the best use of land in accordance with Section 11 of the NPPF?

The proposal for a maximum of 6 dwellings on this site seeks to achieve a development of exceptional quality on this site which adds to the overall character of the village to secure a well-designed, attractive and healthy place. There are several aspirations set out for this site, along with new housing, that are felt to be important: improving biodiversity, maintains the PROW without narrowly enclosing it as has happened elsewhere in the village, providing some additional public car parking and protecting the adjacent trees especially those protected by TPOs.

The policy also seeks to maintain the average development density of the village (less than 9 dwellings per hectare) in order to maintain the prevailing village character. This site is within a rural village setting not within a town or city where much higher development densities would be appropriate. We believe the proposals set out meet the needs within the Plan area and the requirements of Section 11.

Additional public car parking seeks to address the chronic lack of such spaces to serve visitors to the village, particularly to the Viking Way., but also the school and village hall. Detailed analysis has not identified any sites where this could be provided except within new development sites. This site, with its direct link to the Viking Way, could provide 2-3 low impact permeable off-street spaces discretely incorporated into any landscaping/wildlife area. We include this explanation to provide more information on the car parking aspiration and would support the addition of new text to clarify this if the examiner approves.

Clarification 9

What type of open space provision does the Parish Council anticipate for the development of the site?

The Steering Group/Parish Council understand, from their discussions with the community, that there is a need for an area of open space for outdoor recreation such as walking, sitting, quiet enjoyment, formal play provision and informal events and games. The topography does not make the site appropriate for formal sports provision requiring level surfaces.

Clarification 10

Is the Parish Council satisfied that the reasons for the refusal of the previous applications on the site have been addressed in general terms, and that an appropriate vehicular access can be secured into the site?

The reasons for refusal given in previous planning applications are related to accessing the site from Clixby Lane which is particularly narrow adjacent to the site and has difficulties providing the necessary sight lines and space needed to safely create such access. Hence the allocated site indicates access from Bentley Lane. The Steering Group made additional enquires to the Highway Authority in order to determine if there were any known reasons for not being able to do this. They stated that they knew of no reason in principle but could not respond without having a detailed proposal to consider. See the Consultation Statement Annex K Ref 52. The route through the village to this site already accommodates very large vehicular movements to Bentley Lane Farm. It is not certain, as is normal for sites this early in the development process, that an appropriate vehicular access can be secured, some detailed design work needs to be done to confirm this.

Clarification 11

It would be helpful if the Parish Council responded to the representations made by Lincolnshire County Council.

No new representations were made by LCC in their Regulation 16 response. The representations made prior to Regulation 16 were fully considered and mainly accepted by the Steering Group. The representations, responses and changes made can be found in Annex K of the Consultation Statement. Where no change was made to the Plan these were representations that either supported the Plan, required no further action or were recommendations that did not impact the policies within the Plan.

Clarification 12

The District Council makes a series of representations on the policies and the supporting text. It would be helpful if the Parish Council commented on that representation.

All the representations made by WLDC in their Regulation 16 response are accepted by the Steering Group/Parish Council. The extension of the village boundary to include the allocated housing sites is an omission and was accepted by the Steering Committee. The wrong map layer was selected when creating the maps. The maps can quickly be corrected if this change is approved by the examiner.

GSONP Steering Group

8th July 2026