



Full Council
10th November 2014

Subject: Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Consultation - Council Response

Report by:

Chief Executive
Manjeet Gill

Contact Officer:

Manjeet Gill
Chief Executive
01427 676500
manjeet.gill@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Purpose / Summary:

This report provides details of

- (a) The key consultation responses arising from.
 - Member consultation workshops
 - The Extraordinary Council Meeting – 22nd October 2014.
 - Individual councillor responses to Local Plan consultation
- (b) Outlines process and timetable
- (c) Summarises the key issues arising
- (d) Proposes additional arrangements to ensure effective input by Parishes and Councillors representing West Lindsey to shape the Local Plan for its next draft stage.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that:

- a) Council approves the submission of the Council response as proposed in this report along with the appendices attached.**

- b) Council establishes a lead members' group representative of the political makeup of the Council, especially at key stages such as during land allocation.**
- c) That Councillors task the Chief Executive to work with the CLJSPC to produce a parish survey, which will particularly help to inform the Allocation and Settlement Strategy.**
- d) The Council requests feedback to individual points raised in the appendices and the report.**

IMPLICATIONS

Legal:

The Council's response is a legal evidence base for development of the Local Plan.

Financial :

Not applicable.

Staffing

Consideration needs to be given to more staff resources being devoted to this area over the next 12 months in order to ensure the evidence base for West Lindsey is robust and supports the CLJSPU in developing the Local Plan. This will largely be met from existing resources such as the Localism Team assisting with the Area Profiles and Parish Surveys.

Equality and Diversity including Human Rights :

The Local Plan needs to reflect the diversity of the District both urban and rural and the diverse nature of the communities including the needs of some of the more deprived areas in order to deliver quality of life for all communities.

Risk Assessment :

The main risks are about effective engagement over the next 12 months and supporting the West Lindsey Elected Member Representatives on the CLJSPC in producing a fit for purpose Local Plan that benefits West Lindsey. One of the recommendations proposes an additional member group to work with these elected members. The second risk is making sure sustainable development is as far as possible aligned to the different types of parishes and their needs. This will be mitigated through the Parish Survey process and carrying out with the Parish Council liaison that has been in place since December 2013.

Climate Related Risks and Opportunities :

The Environmental Policies take account of risks in these areas and reference being made to these risks particularly flooding with regard to sustainable growth and allocations.

Title and Location of any Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

See Appendices

Call in and Urgency:

Is the decision one which Rule 14.7 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules apply?

i.e. is the report exempt from being called in due to urgency (in consultation with C&I chairman)

Yes

No

X

Key Decision:

A matter which affects two or more wards, or has significant financial implications

Yes

No

X

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 This report provides details of:

- (a) The key consultation responses arising from:
 - Member consultation workshops;
 - The Extraordinary Council Meeting – 22nd October 2014;
 - Individual councillor responses to Local Plan consultation;
- (b) Outlines process and timetable;
- (c) Summarises the key issues arising;
- (d) Proposes additional arrangements to ensure effective input by Parishes and Councillors representing West Lindsey to shape the Local Plan for its next draft stage.

2 PROCESS AND TIMETABLE

2.1 As presented on 22nd October 2014, at an Extraordinary Council meeting, the current draft is a Preliminary Draft and has helped inform views on how sustainable development takes place.

2.2 The next stage is the most crucial stage as this will be the 2nd Draft Local Plan that will reflect the views from this consultation and undergo a three month consultation. This will be another opportunity to further fine tune and add to the views to be submitted for the current Preliminary Draft Local Plan Consultation. The 2nd Draft Local Plan is due July 2015 and the full timetable is given below.

2.3 At the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Partnership in March 2014 a new 'Local Development Scheme' (LDS) was adopted, which in simple terms signalled the legal commencement of the preparation of a new Local Plan for Central Lincolnshire. The LDS confirmed that the intention was to prepare the Local Plan in the following timeframe:

1 st draft Local Plan for consultation (the 'Preliminary Draft Local Plan')	October 2014
2 nd draft Local Plan for consultation (the 'Further Draft Local Plan')	July 2015
Final draft Local Plan for consultation (the 'Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan')	January 2016
Examination of Local Plan 2016	April-September
Adoption of Local Plan	November 2016

- 2.4 The next section of this report proposes the Council's consultation response, that it will include as appendices:
- (a) All member comments and views from councillor workshops
 - (b) All questions and answers from the Extraordinary Council meeting on 22nd October 2014.
 - (c) The three most important points that matter to each ward councillor with regard to representing their residents' views.

3 CONSULTATION RESPONSE – FOR SUBMISSION TO CENTRAL LINCOLNSHIRE JOINT STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE (CLJSPC)

- 3.1 West Lindsey District Council welcomes the first Preliminary Draft Local Plan and has engaged its parishes and local communities in the consultation process, as a reflection of the importance they place in getting sustainable development and growth that meets the needs of its diverse towns and villages especially in a rural district that must build on its unique strengths. Particularly its communities, heritage, environment and economy to thrive as a prosperous district.
- 3.2 The Council recognises that the Preliminary Draft Local Plan starts from an initial presumption informed by policies such as national planning policy guidance. This acts as a basis for local communities and the Council to respond to the various policies, especially settlement hierarchies, with views and questions.
- 3.3 We hope that our consultation response reflects the importance placed by all our councillors and parishes in what they think is an important Plan that shapes the long term future of the District. Views and feedback on the various points made will be sought before the next draft Local Plan. The Council will also set up new arrangements to ensure:
- (a) Councillors other than our CLJSPC representatives are more engaged for the final draft stage. Briefings and reports to CLJSPC are discussed and assurance is sought that views given in this response are effectively understood and explored.
 - (b) Parish Councils – Towns, Villages and hamlets all have an opportunity to shape what sustainable development means for their area. For example a more flexible approach to housing numbers, protection of certain green spaces, wedges. Consultation has revealed the positive manner in which parishes throughout the district have brought their detailed knowledge as an evidence base to inform the Local Plan. We urge that CLJSPC build on this.
- 3.4 We urge that in addition to the high level SHMAs, SHELAA economic assessments etc, required by national guidance that this is aligned with the detail at each parish level to reflect the unique nature of a diverse district. Without this alignment we risk not only the Inspector feeling the Local Plan is not adequately evidence based at all levels, but also the most important is the right plans to

inform the best sustainable growth for the settlements in which communities live or do business.

3.5 Key Consultation Points

The main points arising

3.5.1 Detail Consultation Responses and Feedback

The detailed responses given by the District Councillors reflects the importance place on ensuring we have a fit for purpose Local Plan for the long term, informed by views at ward levels. We have had workshops and individual feedback. These are appended to this consultation response. The Council asks the CLJSPC to give consideration to all the points in the appendices and give feedback on each point. This may be agreement or reasons for disagreeing and actions to be taken.

3.5.2 Sustainable Development and Settlement Hierarchies

One of the commonly raised points is consideration of the definition sustainable development and how it is applied to settlements. Sustainability must reflect:

- (a) **Population Demographics** and need – for example a small village with a growing ageing population and a local school with its roll numbers declining may be grounds for increasing housing to encourage more families and diversity in the community. In which case a settlement hierarchy may not be flexible to recognise this if only three houses are allowed as is the proposal in the Preliminary Draft Local Plan.
- (b) **Infrastructure and Green Space** – The present infrastructure, can it take more growth or less growth? Again an objective of the Local Plan is to make it “On Policy” versus market driven “Off Policy”. An understanding of local profiles of schools, health facilities etc are assumed to be part of the evidence base which shapes infrastructure and allocation in the next draft Local Plan. Economic viability.
- (c) **Balancing housing growth with economic growth** in areas and a reflection of key areas impacted by economic growth. An example is Caistor. It is felt that the north part of the district needs more focus on its growth needs, especially with the Immingham and other Humber Bank developments and jobs growth which will impact on housing demand around Caistor.
- (d) **Alignment with Neighbourhood Plans and Parish Surveys** - There needs to be a separate Policy that clarifies the relationship between the Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans, which gives due recognition to Neighbourhood Plans. More integration between the contents of current Neighbourhood Plans being prepared (albeit they are not approved) is required. Especially the evidence base they have collected. For those parishes not able to undertake neighbourhood planning we propose a Parish based survey that as a minimum

- i. Acts as an assessment to validate SHELLA (land proposed by land owners)
- ii. Identifies the nature and type of growth and where, including protection.
- iii. Validates the SHMA which is at a Central Lincolnshire/District level and making it more meaningful at the local level.
- iv. Makes the Local Plan more meaningful at the community level which is in the spirit of legislation since 2010 on Localism, neighbourhood planning or the National Planning Framework.

3.5.3 Statutory Consultees

The Council seeks assurance that all statutory consultees are encouraged to give full responses and examine provision or issues at a local level whether this is the NHS, CCGs, regarding Primary Care facilities such as GP access, Environment Agency and Highways Authority regarding flooding or highway infrastructure. This includes other utilities such as Anglian Water.

3.5.4 Duty to Co-operate and Other Areas

It is recognised that as more evidence is established for infrastructure, land allocation, economic growth and housing need that the next draft will have more detail on:

- Our duty to co-operate with neighbouring growth needs and vice versa use our duty to encourage neighbouring Council's Local Plans, such as shared viable Travellers provision in the north of the District. We ask for the CLSJPC to work with neighbouring Councils on this provision.
- The impact specifically of growth in the north especially the Humber.
- Infrastructure and economic development such as, Robin Hood Airport what this means for the railway line from Lincoln, Gainsborough to the Airport and the logistics hub by the Airport. This is one example of cross border infrastructure, that needs more mention in the next Draft Local Plan.

3.5.5 Employment and Retail Site Allocation

The Council agrees with the CLJSPC that jobs growth is a key part of sustainable growth. This needs to be as much about jobs growth in other areas as well as from areas such as Lincoln or the Humber Bank. By this we mean linked to settlements across the District and not just urban centres. Two suggestions are proposed:

- a) Consideration in the long term of land allocation next to existing employment land such as Business Parks, many of which are already facing near full capacity. Examples include Caistor, Market Rasen, Hemswell Cliff, Gainsborough.

- b) Rural Sites – this needs to reflect the nature of a rural sparse district and other type of rural economy, as economic growth must build on existing capabilities and strengths. The rural economy is based on small businesses and start-ups who require workshop within small communities and provide sustainability in terms of travel to work and small scale job creation (sustainable villages). A suggestion is that: Policy LP4 is reworded to include a specific section which protects and promotes all kinds of business enterprises in all rural communities and supports the expansion and growth of existing and new businesses within local communities at an appropriate scale.

3.5.6 Lincoln Fringe Villages

It is important to mention this as a separate heading to reflect the strength of views and feelings. Reference should be made to councillor comments in the appendices and gives more detail on the issues. Whilst similar issues as raised earlier apply, there is a particular view about sustainable growth.

- a) Protecting green space/wedges infrastructure
- b) Identity and preventing urban sprawl
- c) The CLJSPC is also strongly urged to assist with representatives to the Secretary of State and DCLG on the current status with managing planning applications whilst developing the Local Plan. The detailed response by this Council, reflects the importance in getting the most meaningful appropriate Local Plan delivered on time due to the pressures, the current policy position present. In addition partners such as LCC, on the CLSPC are asked to provide more detailed infrastructure support during consideration of planning applications at this important time.
- d) The Council questions the seven mile limit and asks consideration be given to a smaller radius and for feedback on how the seven miles are decided and what is the policy rationale?

3.5.7 Gainsborough

The Town has growth point status and there are strong aspirations to support three Sustainable Urban extensions (neighbourhoods). At the same time this has been difficult in terms of the Market, however the last six years have been difficult economically, resulting in housing development at a slower pace than desired. In addition use of brownfield sites for smaller development is being promoted by the Council, through the Economic Development Strategy. This information along with other consultation responses from particularly Gainsborough Town Council should be used alongside assessments such as SHMA and SHELAA to allocate housing numbers and future employment/retail sites.

3.5.8 Market Rasen

Market Rasen is an historic town and therefore its town centre is of a large scale than would normally be expected for a population of its size. Its location

in the Wolds and the large rural hinterland it serves as a Market Town means it has potential for further growth that is appropriate and in the right place. With an increased focus on the visitor and tourism economy, this town's economic potential also needs to be reflected in the local plan in terms of land allocation for economic and housing growth.

3.5.9 **New Settlements or New Villages**

It is proposed that to aid sustainable growth around Lincoln, some of the alternative options that should be appraised are the creation of a new settlement or the expansion of an existing smaller settlement. The appended consultation from councillors and community expand on this point.

3.5.10 **MOD and Ex MOD Sites**

These villages such as Brookenby and Hemswell are successful examples of enterprise growth of decommissioned sites. These settlements have a potential for growth and more flexibility in application of planning policy to these sites is requested.

- a) **Hemswell Cliff** At a major junction (Caenby Corner) is enterprise park has grown over the period of austerity demonstrating attractiveness to the market its strategic position. It has also developed a 'Cluster' effect in terms of an internationally recognised centre for antiques. Like any economic cluster affect, this presents opportunities for further business spinoffs in the area of heritage and links to the growth in visitor and tourism economy. Other business clusters include the renewables industry with major employers on the site. It is proposed Hemswell is considered for large scale development both for employment and housing growth. A masterplan is currently being developed in conjunction with the LEP and County Council for this site.
- b) **Scampton** – This site is a third unoccupied. Whilst plans are uncertain in terms of the MOD use of the unoccupied elements it is proposed that this site is allocated in the Local Plan for economic use including tourism and heritage. This site along with Hemswell Cliff and other sites such as the County Showground and Riseholme educational facilities form a strategic cluster along the A15 from Lincoln to the Humber Bank. Their accessibility to Lincoln on route to the Humber needs to be recognised for housing employment and educational growth.
- c) **Brookenby and Newtoft** – whilst not served by the proximity of A15, these sites have large areas of brownfield land suitable for economic or housing growth. Brookenby is close in terms of work travel proximity to Grimsby. Newtoft currently has designations in the current 2006 Local Plan for West Lindsey that hinder development and these restrictions should be considered for removal in the next Draft Local Plan.

3.6 **Conclusions**

The Council would like to thank the CLJSPC for this opportunity to consult at a preliminary stage so that it informs the next consultation draft and guides the CLJSPC's work in the next six months.

The level of engagement by the community, parishes and district councillors, reflects the importance of this long term Plan. Getting it right will ensure prosperity for the District in line with the Council's ambitions for settlements such as Gainsborough, Caistor and the diverse rural communities.

The Council through its officers and members will constructively engage with other partners on the CLJSPC during the next stage particularly in collating the parish council surveys referred to. The Council asks for early feedback on the consultation points raised, both to inform our confirmed engagement and instill confidence by the local community that consultation has been considered.

4 **Appendices**

- 4.1 Appendix 1 - Comments on the Local Plan from Councillors, 30th October 2014
- 4.2 Appendix 2 - Notes from the Public Meeting Session at the EPIC Centre, Lincolnshire Showground 22nd October 2014
- 4.3 Appendix 3 - Comments from WLDC Councillors from Local Plan Councillor Workshops at West Lindsey District Council.

Comments on the Local Plan from Councillors, October 2014

Type of Response	Councillor	Response
Settlement hierarchy	Cllr Summers	'Reconsider the hierarchy of settlements to focus where more growth is wanted and where less is wanted based on the consultation feedback.'
	Cllr Caine	[Development in all settlements should be considered in order to sustain them].
	Cllr Shore	[All villages should be allowed to grow as long as development is sustainable and of the right scale].
	Cllr Wiseman	'Middle Rasen to be reconsidered and looked at regarding the up grad[ing] from limited growth villages to small towns and growth villages. It says in the report these development would be limited to sites of 50 dwellings. This worries me as I know that developers are looking at 100 plus and more. I would ask that this be looked at again.'
	Cllr Leaning	'From LP1 – Have real sustainable development in Lincoln Fringe villages only where they can accommodate it.'
	Cllr Mewis	'The downgrade within the Settlement Hierarchy to 'Limited Growth Villages' has been given a big seal of approval by everyone, a request was also made to ask for it to go down further to 'Small Villages'. The basis on which this is made is that Scotter has expanded greatly in recent years with several large and small developments. Therefore there has already been an increase in population of Scotter by at least 25% since the last census without an increase in facilities. It has also increased the risk of flooding in the area.'
	Cllr Kinch	<p>'Use of a restrictive Settlement Hierarchy Outside the Lincoln Urban Area and Main Towns</p> <p>I am concerned that the preliminary draft plan does not adequately recognise the particular issues facing rural areas. This is particularly related to the settlement hierarchy proposed and the associated policies for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • housing, • economic development - protection and support for existing and new businesses located in rural areas, and • services and facilities - supporting and protecting existing and promoting new services and community facilities. <p>The policies are too restrictive and inflexible, especially on housing, and I am concerned they do not provide the right conditions for sustainable economic growth as required by the NPPF.</p> <p>HOUSING</p> <p>The role of housing in supporting the broader sustainability of villages and smaller settlements in rural</p>

		<p>areas is clearly set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, in the core planning principles, the section on supporting a prosperous rural economy and the section on housing. It indicates all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas. A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, on retaining and expanding local employment, local services and community facilities such as businesses, local shops, community venues, public houses, doctors, schools, places of worship. It also depends on acknowledging the interdependence of communities and villages where services, facilities and employment are provided in a network across a group of villages with each supporting the others and contributing to the sustainability of the group. Rural communities of all sizes supporting a range of community services, shops and work, will mean people will need to travel less, not more.</p> <p>The key is that rural housing should be delivered taking all three dimensions of sustainability into account for each village/group of villages. It should not be by putting by villages into a “category” in a settlement hierarchy (which is derived from a simple audit and does not look at networks or the interrelationships and dependencies of communities) and then fixing an arbitrary number of dwellings (e.g. 3 or 25 in LP2) for that “category”.</p> <p>The NPPF advocates a significant shift away from the hierarchical approach of the pre-NPPF old-style model of a hierarchy of settlements in the rural areas, and instead advocates that, to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services and the retention of employment and services and facilities in a village nearby.</p> <p>Villages in my ward and in West Lindsey, have seen housing provision stagnate over recent years. This has a significant impact on the vitality and viability of existing services and employment opportunities that go to the heart of sustainability in a rural location. Many villages in West Lindsey have lost shops, pubs and jobs etc.</p> <p>Policy LP2 includes a wide range of rural settlements, e.g.in the small settlements section it covers those with 1725 population to those with 55 and those with a good range of services and employment opportunities to those with none. I appreciate this is a “policy-off” position based on a straight “survey” based hierarchy,</p>
--	--	--

	<p>yet a policy is still proposed. It is not articulated how a “policy-on” approach would then render the whole exercise NPPF compliant. The derivation, wording of policy LP2 and its imposition of arbitrary numbers for a one size fits approach all in a hierarchical “group” is illogical, restrictive and inconsistent with the NPPF and thus will not deliver sustainable development in rural areas.</p> <p>Rather than the Plan settling out a hierarchical approach and limiting development to fixed numbers in a wide range of settlements the Plan should ask HOW CAN WE ENHANCE THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THIS COMMUNITY ?</p> <p>The Plan policy should be proactive and positive in assessing how development can enhance the vitality and viability of existing settlements. The policy principle should be that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities, recognising that groups of villages create sustainable places to live where the services and facilities of each can serve a wider hinterland, eg work opportunities in one, serving villages around it. This is an important consideration in rural districts like West Lindsey and should be reflected in the policy.</p> <p>Unfortunately the welcomed flexible approach of not having settlement boundaries is negated by the inflexible restrictive approach of policy LP2.</p> <p>The Inspector at the Joint Core Strategy Submission Draft Examination, in South Northamptonshire disagreed with a settlement hierarchy approach and the imposition of indicative figures for future levels of housing development within categories of the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Suggested Approach</p> <p>To deliver the proportion of housing to come forward in the rural areas over the Plan period there should be a policy based approach for housing on non-allocated sites with provision for a range of housing types to help meet the needs of the whole community and to enhance the sustainability of that community and those nearby.</p> <p>New housing development within the rural areas should</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhance or maintain the viability or vitality of the (rural) community within the settlement where the housing is proposed, and/or • where there are groups of settlements, development in
--	---

		one village may support services, and the retention of employment and facilities in a nearby village/s, and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the scale of the proposed development is well related to the scale, form, function and character of the existing settlement.'
	Cllr Rodgers	'Towns and parishes should be invited to produce an inventory of their services and amenities, (health, education, transport, employment, shops etc) with an indication of over/under utilization. This would be the evidence base that would guide the Planning Committee, and satisfy an inspectorate in the event of an appeal.'
	Cllr McNeill	'Policy LP2: The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy. This is insufficient. Whilst I, at this stage, do not contest the conclusions of the 2011/12 project into growth, there should be a greater number of hierarchy categories to provide differentiation between very different circumstances of the various communities. Nettleham for instance, as evidenced by the emerging Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan is unsuited to be categorised in 1. Lincoln Area and would be more appropriately placed either 3 or preferably 4 - although neither of these categorisation are precise for the circumstance. Greetwell may be suited to substantial growth, additional to that tabled for the sustainable urban extension, and might need its own category for the development of new communities. It may also be worth considering if it is entirely appropriate for future housing development to be almost entirely centred on the larger conurbations. Growth of the small villages and hamlets, in the right sustainable locations might provide a better, more diverse, solution.'
	Cllr Patterson	'Policy LP2, settlement hierarchy, part 1, Lincoln, the part about Lincoln being the principal focus in Central Lincolnshire has also got to be removed. ...all growth should be shared equally. The draft is Lincoln centric. Epic Centre is in West Lindsey, not Lincoln.'
Sustainable communities/developments/urban extensions	Cllr Bardsley	'There must be insistence on provision of executive housing [for Gainsborough], and possibly within the District, a retirement village.'
	Cllr Summers	'Whilst considering the three urban extensions for Gainsborough we must ensure an appropriate road structure is incorporated. A bypass running from Lea Road past extension one on Foxby Lane to extension three at Lodge Farm, Somerby connecting to the A631 and continuing via extension two and onto the Blyton Road.'
	Cllr Howitt-Cowan	[Regeneration in the Gainsborough Market Place.]
	Cllr Bowler	'LP 34, Building a Better Gainsborough; I support policy LP 34 but would welcome support for

		<p>employment in general and manufacturing in particular. We have relatively high levels of unemployment particularly youth unemployment.</p> <p>I would favour the SUEs being developed sequentially rather than simultaneously. This should support the growth being sustainable and will support the development of supporting infrastructure.'</p>
	Cllr Howitt-Cowan	'The thrust is for new build but where appropriate, we should be investing in brown field sites and converting suitable buildings into accommodation.'
	Cllr Summers	'Consider an urban extension and industrial expansion of Hemswell Cliff as an alternative to overburdening the Lincoln Fringe. Hemswell Cliff is almost equidistant from Lincoln, Gainsborough, Scunthorpe, Brigg and Market Rasen and obviously encompasses numerous villages within the rurality of West Lindsey.'
	Cllr Howitt-Cowan	<p>'I do support the extension of Hemswell Cliff . In my earlier submission I suggested 200 to 300 houses. Since discussions etc I think that Hemswell Cliff should be considered as a 'new village' and encourage greater expansion.</p> <p>Its road network is excellent for major cities eg Lincoln, Hull and market towns, a first class [primary]school, it has a business park for expansion in employment, it will sustain what we have already. The parish council is all on board.'</p>
	Cllr Darcel	'Build to improve and create sustainable communities.'
	Cllr Strange	'To save the Lincoln fringe villages, from inappropriate development, we should build into the next stage of the plan - an out of Lincoln, new community based on RAF Scampton. For a start, developing the land between the RAF Camp and the Show ground and including a joint venture hotel with a local builder. This must be the best way of getting a really up market, well designed, new large village/small town, with all mod cons for a vibrant community. This would also help to cut back on our Government funding shortfall. 2/3 thousand houses with health centre, shops, pubs, community centre and new school.'
	Cllr Cotton	<p>As the next thirty years is a long lead in time I would like to see consideration given to the development of extra new villages which would not be an immediate priority or achievable but would be deliverable in the life time of the plan.'</p> <p>'The Local Plan is planned to be a thirty year plan with rolling status and given that is the case we are focusing too much in many ways on the immediate housing need and not pacing the plan for the whole of that plan life period.</p>
	Cllr Day	'I think that there should be a proper effort to create new settlements.' The total projected housing numbers

		should be realistic and not based on the best case scenario which seems to be that every job on the Humber Bank and at Robin Hood [airport] materialises and buys a house in West Lindsey.'
	Cllr Milne	'What does [sustainability] mean when shops, pubs etc are closing in so called 'sustainable' villages where houses have already been built?'
	Cllr Lawrence	'A Growing Lincolnshire (broadly in agreement) 3.5.2. bullet point 5 Individual health checks of 23 additional centres are performing well....etc. NOT the case in Caistor. in policy LP5 Caistor is not mentioned as one of the towns.
	Cllr Keimach	[Improvements to Market Rasen's main retail streets.] 'Having met and discussed this with Mary Portas after she the town [was awarded] £100,000, it became obvious to both of us that an increase of population is necessary for prosperity.'
Growth around Lincoln	Cllr Leaning	'From LP1 - The creation of a new village incorporating North Greetwell, the small settlement around Hawthorn Road and the fields between. This was first considered back in 1986 as part of the local plan process. Advantages from such a settlement include the reduction in pressure for building more in existing Lincoln Fringe villages and it would provide a road access to replace the one cut off by the Eastern Bypass.'
	Cllr Welburn	'The draft seems to work with a top down approach based on the needs of Lincoln and then fits the neighbouring areas into these needs. I believe that this should be reversed to take account of the needs and wishes of the village communities especially given the work already done on Community-Led Plans and progress on the Neighbourhood Plans.'
	Cllr Welburn	'...the most important points are going to be those referring to the Lincoln fringe and the need to protect them from becoming suburbs of Lincoln.' ' ... limited growth without major infrastructure improvements and work opportunities.'
	Cllr Welburn	' ...include recognition of the development that has already taken place in the villages both over the period since WW2 and in ... the last 5 years.' 'It must recognise also the limit to the physical capacity of a particular village to accommodate more building i.e. the proportion of land already developed within the parish boundary of Cherry Willingham appears to be quite/relatively high.'
	Cllr Welburn	'The boundaries between the villages and between Cherry [Willingham] and Lincoln are already too small and would shrink further under these proposals which would ultimately change forever the character of the villages as evidenced by the relationship between the

		City and North Hykeham.'
	Cllr Rawlins	'I am concerned that further development in the Lincoln Fringe villages envisaged in the Preliminary Draft may not take into account sustainability <i>as a whole</i> , following from the suggested sites and applications currently in hand [with WL DM team] - which may be developed prior to the finalisation of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan - specifically regarding the provision of sustainable infrastructure, ie schools, health centres, highways and drainage and the community cohesion of these settlements.'
	Cllr Cotton	'Saxilby is some six miles from Lincoln and while technically in the Lincoln Fringe it is the furthest out of all the villages in that grouping. It seems to me that the 7 mile radius of Lincoln is an arbitrary figure and might almost be 7 miles to ensure Saxilby is "captured" within it. I would like to see Saxilby removed from that 7 mile catch all and indeed think the radius around Lincoln be reduced to no more than perhaps 4 miles at the most.'
	Cllr Cotton	'We have to consider what we can do in the Plan to "protect" those large villages that are near Lincoln, including Saxilby and Welton as well as Nettleham which saw massive blooming in the 1990's but without the infrastructure improvements. Those villages are now, in my view, at capacity and their original centres and infrastructures are now constrained by the built environment and cannot be improved to reflect large scale traffic movements and improvements which are inevitable where we keep adding more and more to these villages. We must also ensure the Local Plan protects those villages as much as possible from speculative development such as we are seeing now and safeguards that area into the future from such development and where possible builds in protection at the end of plan life before the next plan is either produced or when the new plan comes to the end of its life.'
	Cllr McNeill	'Policy LP3: Level and Distribution of Growth. Particularly a. Lincoln Area. Growth of Lincoln should more substantially take place in Lincoln. Building housing in the surrounding villages to serve Lincoln diminishes the sustainability and viability of West Lindsey and the fringe villages. I believe that Council has in the past supported the campaign for 'communities not dormitories' and this policy needs to reflect growth that advantageous to the district, not only for the benefit of Lincoln.'
	Cllr McNeill	'Policy LP32: Supporting the Natural Evolution of Lincoln. This policy is totally embryonic and our representations must make substantial recommendations to restrain Development growth within the limits of the bypass and

		proposed bypass. Particularly important is the green wedge between north Lincoln and the surrounding villages, the map of the green corridors is perilously thin as it passes Nettleham and Riseholme and the distance between Nettleham and Lincoln at the moment is only 1,200m and this is set to reduce with current building activity near the Nettleham roundabout.'
	Cllr Milne	'That we stop flooding the fringe villages with housing, all of which are being built on Green Field sites, taking much needed food producing land, it does not matter what grade the land is, all land is capable of producing food also.'
	Cllr Milne	'Lincoln has more than enough brown field sites, ... a place that is sustainable, [rather than cramming development into the Lincoln fringe villages.] The Plan is Lincoln centric.'
	Cllr Lawrence	'7.3.14 Option 3'
	Cllr Patterson	'Policy LP27, A growing Lincoln, part 7.3.11, the questions that lead people to agree to Lincoln swallowing up chunks of West Lindsey, This must be removed, it is not a consultation it is [a] leading question. Parts 7.3.11 to 7.3.15 have to go.'
	Cllr Bowler	'Section 7, for Lincoln I favour either option 1 expanding Lincoln or option 4 a new self-contained settlement. None of the nearby villages are capable of coping with the level of development which would be required.'
Growth in open countryside	Cllr Fleetwood	'The ability for people in open countryside to obtain permission for 1 or 2 houses to keep life-blood in rural areas.'
	Cllr Caine	'Small amounts of dwelling development should be encouraged even in the smallest of settlements.'
	Cllr Caine	'Positive regard to reuse of rural redundant farm buildings as homes and small businesses.'
	Cllr Rainsforth	'Protect greenfield sites and agricultural land, do not build on these until all brownfield sites have been exhausted. Lincolnshire is an agricultural county, let's do our best to make sure it stays that way.'
	Cllr Welburn	'The protection of farm land and food protection is a vital component of any plan.'
Growth in small villages/ development in rural areas.	Cllr Fleetwood	'... allowing 3 or 4 houses to be built in small hamlets.'
	Cllr Darcel	'Flexibility for both limited growth villages and small villages.' '...such growth will help provide facilities such as a village shop, better bus services and other civic amenities or a village primary school. The question would seem to be not so much the number but where would they go, and how will drainage and traffic problems be addressed.'
	Cllr Caine	'That one or two new dwellings in a small rural

		community is likely to lower the settlement/community mean average age.'
	Cllr Leaning	'LP39 – Special policies to support needed growth in the hamlets and small communities in our country side – Local housing for Local people with local needs. WLDC have led the way on this in previous WLDC Plans.'
	Cllr Rawlins	'I would support Policy LP39b “ that the development would not result in coalescence with any neighbouring settlement “ as this would support the WLDC’s stance with regard to applications between the villages of Dunholme and Welton. Also I would support Policy LP39j and LP39k regarding flooding, surface water drainage and highways.'
	Cllr Kinch	'Policy LP39 is far too prescriptive, (eg there may well be a settlement where extending the linear features of a settlement are perfectly acceptable in which case c and e would be contradictory!) It is surely far better to say the proposed development should be right for that settlement (the scale of the proposed development is well related to the scale, form, function and character of the existing settlement). This policy needs to be recast in order to be compatible with the above suggested approach and much simplified.'
	Cllr Milne	'Allow building in villages which are asking for more homes, as the villages are becoming mostly [in]habited by elderly people who have lived in them for many years, with the consequences that the villages are "dying" because there is nowhere for young people to move into.'
	Cllr Lawrence	'Delivering Locally (broadly in agreement) 7.1.5. Settlement boundaries. Who determines the "organic development" around our settlements especially if there is no Neighbourhood plan? Need to give some incentive/importance to "filling in", the use [of] brown field sites and in Lincolnshire’s case, RAF sites.'
	Cllr Darcel	'Build on infill and brown field sites first.'
Road infrastructure	Cllr Fleetwood	[Consideration of] ‘ the effects of the potential closure of Hawthorn Road connecting villages to Lincoln considering the increased traffic associated with housing expansion.'
	Cllr Darcel	'Give more importance to East/West travel, particularly to East coast towns and North to Scunthorpe.'
	Cllr Darcel	'Improve current road junctions around the A46 bypass and roads into Lincoln.'
	Cllr Mewis	'...improve the road system to and from Gainsborough, especially a good link to the motorway system.' 'It is imperative that the subject of roads is addressed within the Local Plan, if by the time the Plan is completed this has not been done then the opportunities for improvements will be lost for ever.'

	Cllr Mewis	'Most who travel the A15 agree that it needs dualling, ...the A15 is a corridor from Lincoln to North Lincolnshire, Immingham, the Humber and beyond.'
	Cllr Mewis	'The A159 is the most direct route from the M180/181 to and from Gainsborough and linking into the A1, M18, M1 and M62. ...this road runs through Scotter, cutting the village in half ... and is already very busy. '...North Lincolnshire Council's project to build 3,000 houses, including a new junction on the M181 which will push traffic onto Scotter Road that leads to the A159. ...This road will be on the edge of the new village. ... it will alleviate traffic problems in Scunthorpe but will exacerbate that through Scotter.'
	Cllr Darcel	'A158 ... junction improvements.'
	Cllr Keimach	'In the long range, true rejuvenation of [Market Rasen's] high street will not happen without some sort of by-pass to enable at least a partial pedestrianisation.'
Transport infrastructure	Cllr Bardsley	[For Gainsborough] 'travel arrangements for the future should include positive encouragement to use the railway links as in the past, bringing people into the town, rather than the outskirts as at present. Not insurmountable problem to open up Central Station again. Hopefully there will be a station at Robin Hood Airport soon.'
	Cllr Caine	'Public transport is unlikely to improve in rural areas. [The improvement and subsequent increase in electric car technology put into question the pollution levels of personal transport in the near future.] Groceries are now delivered to remote areas for a fraction of the fuel costs incurred in visiting nearby towns.'
	Cllr Patterson	'Part 4.6 Accessibility and Transport, I would like to see community transport given a bigger role.'
Green infrastructure	Cllr Bardsley	'For Gainsborough, at Policy LP22, aspiration essential to enhance the green infrastructure and provision of green public open space so that the town becomes an attractive destination, with riverside walks and at least another couple of parks. Allocations for housing development must include sustainable schemes for managing open space, by the residents. Please insist on more than 5% green space per development.'
	Cllr Darcel	'... maintain green wedges.'
	Cllr Welburn	'Green wedges, footpaths and cycle paths [are important in order to protect the Lincoln fringe villages becoming suburbs of Lincoln].'
	Cllr Welburn	'Green space issues are not just about protecting those that already exist but about developing others which enhance the quality of life in the villages.'
Quality of design to enhance quality of life	Cllr Darcel	' ... prioritise quality of life ...'
	Cllr Caine	'Every new build should be ready for new and future

		technology i.e. fibre [optic] ready, solar [technology], ground source [heat pump], rainwater harvesting.'
	Cllr Caine	'To encourage [executive] housing opportunities [in the upper north east area of West Lindsey].'
	Cllr Rainsforth	'Be more selective in the types of property we allow to be built. Developers obviously want to cram in as many dwellings as they can per hectare, thus bungalows are pretty much a no-no, but people are living longer and these are the type of property the elderly want, this would enable all generations to mix on a development.'
	Cllr Milne	'I want to see all housing built on Brown Field sites, there are plenty reading the Local Plan.'
	Cllr Keimach	'Although it is in the Plan, quality of housing has not been reviewed enough. Why are we continuing to erect cramped, sub-standard, [energy inefficient] housing all over the country?'
Economic growth/ Rural economy	Cllr Bardsley	'Economic development – another essential for Gainsborough if it is to grow as planned. To include Gainsborough as a tourist venue.'
	Cllr Caine	'Fast Broadband should be used to encourage new small businesses.'
	Cllr Caine	'Encourage small and medium businesses ... afforded by the opportunities on [South and North Bank of the Humber].'
	Cllr Shore	[Like France, the growth of settlements should include allocation for economic activity as well as housing].
	Cllr Bowler	'I support policy LP 34 but would welcome support for employment in general and manufacturing in particular.'
	Cllr Kinch	<p>'RURAL ECONOMY</p> <p>In the section of the NPPF titled Supporting a Prosperous Rural Economy, it states that planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development. To promote a strong rural economy, local and neighbourhood plans should: support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural area, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings; promote the development and diversification of agriculture and other land based rural businesses.</p> <p>Talking to rural business people in West Lindsey it is clear that they feel that achieving rural business growth in the District is a battle, stifled by restrictive, inflexible policies. Often it has been said to me as a Councillor, by local business people, that planning policy at the local level gives precedence to development in towns and restricts the growth of rural businesses – even where the proposal is small scale, low impact and secures local employment opportunities.</p>

		<p>To comply with the NPPF and promote diverse rural economic development policies must meet the needs of rural businesses and encourage and maintain local employment opportunities by supporting existing businesses and promoting new ones in all rural communities and the wider countryside, subject to acceptable local impacts. This will allow people to live and work in the same locality and avoid reverse commuting.</p> <p>The NPPF indicates that local plan policies should enable rural communities to build their environmental, social and economic sustainability by encouraging, retaining and sustaining local employment opportunities of an appropriate scale and type through the inclusion of specific supportive policies. Policy LP4 does not do this.</p> <p>Suggested Approach Policy LP4 is reworded to include a specific section which protects and promotes all kinds of businesses enterprises in all rural communities and supports the expansion and growth of existing businesses within the community.'</p>
	Cllr Keimach	<p>'During my time as Chairman of the JPU, I understood that we had to encourage a base of manufacturing and industry, with the retail and professional support necessary for jobs. ...we must [encourage] manufacturing [to] come first and housing to follow. 'Stimulation of trade and business need not be confined to just West Lindsey, but can be encouraged in nearby industrial areas within comfortable commuting distance. Here contact with the LEPs and neighbouring Councils is important.'</p>
	Cllr Keimach	<p>'Gallimore Lane, Market Rasen as an industrial and retail section, with a recycling centre as well, must be stimulated to expand on land that is already part "brownfield".'</p>
	Cllr Howitt-Cowan	<p>'Visitor Economy – this needs expansion [as a policy]. Get away from Lincoln centrism – I acknowledge Lincoln as a 'hook' but we must attract visitors into the wider Lincolnshire – there is more to Lincolnshire than Lincoln!'</p>
	Cllr Lawrence	<p>'3.6.1. The visitor economy does not mention the Lincolnshire Wolds or Caistor's significant position as a gateway with the real opportunity to grow tourism.'</p>
Brownfield development	Cllr Darcel	<p>'Use brownfield sites first.'</p>
Environment	Cllr Bardsley	<p>'... overall, we need to ensure that the Environment Agency, DEFRA and the water authorities give us robust comments on how best to look after our environment for the long-term.'</p>

Renewable Energy	Cllr Howitt-Cowan	<p>'What can be done for the old housing stock and commerce and industrial buildings? Modern housing is ok but the vast majority are left in the ' cold' literally. The grant system for insulation is not having a great take up as hoped for.</p> <p>All new housing estates should have district heating systems - ground source etc. All new builds should have higher standards of energy conservation and at least 2 solar panels linked to boiler to reduce energy bills.'</p>
Infrastructure in general	Cllr Bardsley	'... we need to be assured that other consultees also give robust consideration to long term issues, and short to medium problems that developments my cause – road infrastructure, health and educational facilities and so forth. Local knowledge and experience needs to be valued much more highly, and I do hope that at this stage, it can be built into this draft document via the comments that have come in from the public consultation.'
	Cllr Caine	'Fast broadband will permit ... working from home, thus reducing carbon footprints and household savings on vehicle costs.
	Cllr Darcel	'Drainage provision.'
Neighbourhood Plans	Cllr Wiseman	'Villages to be encouraged to do neighbourhood plans.'
	Cllr Welburn	'The document seems to ignore the significance of Neighbourhood Plans ... [there] should [be] a clear policy on the relationship between the [Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans] which gives due recognition to Neighbourhood Plans.'
	Cllr Day	'Neighbourhood Plans should be given the maximum possible clout.'
	Cllr Rodgers	'In accordance with the suggestion made by a member of the public: the District Council should produce a template to assist Towns and Parishes to produce Local [Neighbourhood] Plans. This would enable consistency, and be more cost effective than providing funding for consultants who have their own templates.
	Cllr Lawrence	'The Caistor Neighbourhood Plan should be included in some way, as it is nearing its final stage.'
Site Screening Methodology	Cllr Kinch	<p>SITE SCREENING METHODOLOGY Criterion 1 – Is the site sustainable?</p> <p>All three dimensions of sustainability should be included in a meaningful way to comply with the NPPF. The use of a selective “audit” does not do this; it is only a fragment of the sustainability picture. This is a narrow view of what makes a site location sustainable and for the reasons set out above, the hierarchy approach as set out in the preliminary draft plan is not NPPF compliant.</p>

		<p>I suggest questions about where the nearest employment opportunities, the nearest shop and community facility are added- all are crucial to the delivery of sustainable sites.</p> <p>Criterion 3 – Will the development help to deliver employment sites?</p> <p>This does not refer to the site supporting existing employment areas. This can be crucial in enhancing occupancy rates in employment areas which are somewhat run down and only partially filled.</p> <p>There is no Criterion which asks whether a site contributes to the retention and protection of local jobs, services, businesses or community facilities. This is necessary for any site selection methodology to comply with the NPPF.</p> <p>Criterion 6 – Is the site at risk of flooding? – (and housing delivery strategy and flood risk policy)</p> <p>There are a significant number of communities in West Lindsey and elsewhere in Central Lincolnshire which are located largely in Flood Zone 3. Some of these are defended with substantial, well-maintained defences, others are not.</p> <p>Care should be taken in developing policies in the local plan which effectively right off and blight such communities and consign them to decline resulting in the loss of services, facilities and employment. A number of other local authorities having a similar problem and have taken the approach that these communities should not be left to decline, particularly those that are defended and where safe development can come forward in the interests of wider sustainability (e.g. in Essex and Yorkshire).</p> <p>The Central Lincolnshire Local plan should adopt a similar approach and modify its relevant policies and site screening methodology to be explicit that it does not advocate a zero dwelling option in such communities.</p>
General	Cllr Welburn	‘The [Cherry Willingham] Parish Council in particular made a response to the earlier Core Strategy which seemed to be supported by good evidence which we feel is lacking in the current draft. Why has this not been used?’
	Cllr Rodgers	‘Historic development should be a part of every report to the Planning Committee, so that the cumulative effect can be properly assessed. This would enable an

		equitable distribution of new developments, and would be a sound element of the decision making process, which would be seen to be fair and equitable among our communities.'
--	--	---

Draft notes from debate

Welton	Relevance of time frame against planning applications?
Nettleham	2-3 years. Fringe villages under pressure, need support to avoid inappropriate development
Welton (PR)	What is Central Lincs? Greater Lincoln? WL abolished area forums. Public agendas. Not enough facilities in Welton
IGF	JPU Productions time. Evidence base? Hawthorn Road
MS	How quick get policy and protect villages? Got to go through statutory stages, going as quick as possible. Draft will have allocations and policies and will carry weight Got WLLP saved policies and can use to turn down unsustainable development. Want development where best impact No 5 yr supply, won't be easy
RS	Danger to not have plan in place. Withdraw from JPU developers happy! Government presumption in favour of sustainable development
NB	5 yr supply only got 3.6 NPPF pressure. Difficult without LP. Got to use evidence in the petition to protect. Would be wrong track to withdraw from JPU. Would take even longer to get WLLP
JS	Timeframe, consultation ends 11/11. Imperative for everyone to submit comments by closing date Giving power to public, need participation. 2 nd consult next year Process 2016, mustn't break. Would be left without Plan. Finance is a driving factor Trying to resist applications for inappropriate development Best defence is a Neighbourhood Plan, very important
RW	Evidence base started regional – validated local Mechanism for calculations
Saxilby (LH)	How many villages got NP?
Welton	Option 3 should say 'support' not 'allow'
GW	Area Forums were well attended but not listened to. Parish plans no good now. Settlements won't have NP in place in time
Saxilby	Do you consider development that has gone before? Saxilby has done its bit and there's no more room
MS	Difference between Parish Plan and NP PP not part of formal process, little weight NP part of localism act, sits alongside LP See how important NP are, none currently adopted, 7 in process. Caistor close. Encourage all community to get involved, got to come from residents. WL will support.
MC	Consider what has gone before?
MS	Yes cumulative impact Planning applications can provide things through contributions
JS	Central Lincs is just a name – WL, NK, CoL Lincoln is a beautiful city, growth Encroachment happening all over

	Here tonight to support communities
AC	Area forums, last one not well attended Planning committee hostage to statutory consultees, NHS, highways etc NPPF took away settlement boundaries Only way forward is to stick with JPU Between rock and hard place
RS	Expectations of NP very complex and very expensive ALL Cllrs support their residents One had been accused of not giving support, but is actually in a strategic position to do so, but can't say so Residents could make a big difference Applications get refused but then allowed at appeal
NB	Lincoln set to expand. No villages want to take on surplus, could spread development or create new settlements
Burton (CP)	Need longer consultation period PC not asked residents and can't get online Saved policies from WLLP still applicable
Sturton	Sustainable development – village doubled in size but all facilities gone. No infrastructure
Osgodby	Why are people unaware of LP and its impact? PC info event. Survey availability Why have all Lincolnshire residents not been mailed?
Saxilby	Road conditions Enough brownfield for all development Access sorted after completion
Riseholme	How can small parishes get a NP?
Saxilby	Trust in assessment of local authority? Highways capacity and condition, education provision and health
Saxilby	Not part of Lincoln Pay taxes to WL, why let us be in Lincolnshire Should withdraw from JPU to control own development
Dunholme	Writing NP, lack of support from WL No help or guidance Fringe villages trying to share information Statutory consultees' comments different to the establishments eg LEA/school
MS	Consultation ends 11/11 Will look to extend if possible (for some places) Not only opportunity, 2 nd draft next year Some extant policies still relevant, not housing land supply. NPPF supersedes Sustainable development, existing facilities Small parishes – govt suggest raising precepts for NP! Could work with other villages Saxilby not part of Lincoln – WL village Developers go where they want Trust consultees? Got to talk to authorities Level of consultation
RW	Not trusted – use different languages

	<p>CIL mechanism Run out of space in urban villages</p>
CJD	<p>Developers see 5 year supply as key to door Want plan in less than 2 years, if started in 2009 why haven't we got it here now? Should all be simpler – too complex</p>
JB	<p>Suggest 2016 look at other work programmes and bring forward by 6 months. If not – why? Need to <u>tell</u> the JPU Developers are not waiting they're here now Why not extend the saved policies Can't we hold developers off until that time?</p>
DC	<p>All Saxilby parishes have been given information and have opposed many developments that have then been allowed at appeal NPs don't give complete control Housing allocations are given by central govt. hands tied Could build new village – why not? Take housing allocation JPU or not, won't stop developers</p>
Welton	<p>Why no support for NPs? Could have framework drawn up Riseholme decimation Desecration of countryside with power stations, solar panels and wind turbines</p>
Welton (PR)	<p>Different view on area forums, no meetings since replaced with area managers</p>
NB	<p>WL should support parishes with NP New village – good idea. Location? Hemswell? Scampton?</p>
RS	<p>New village good Riseholme - cash grabbing LCC</p>
AC	<p>Statutory consultants – got to accept what is told to plan cttee. Would lose at appeal Plan is online and at libraries Would like it earlier Caistor had lot of support for NP</p>
JS	<p>Not that easy to produce plan in 2 yrs Can't just drop other jobs New village – good Officers going out at nights to talk to villages WL got good flooding record</p>
MS	<p>Pace of delivery Start by gathering evidence PINS got to judge as sound Public consult time consuming Responses have to be processed Weight carried during process If policies still supported by govt – can still be used Important to be sound rather than quick and able to protect small villages New village good</p>

	<p>Need to see impact on LP process/timescale</p> <p>NP support – meant to be bottom up approach, but support in place (officer off sick)</p> <p>Not just about saying no to development, about shaping</p>
MG Sum up	<p>All points being considered</p> <p>Bring dates forward? Assess risks will explore resources</p> <p>Training sessions on NPs. Support networks?</p> <p>Work within several frameworks</p> <p>Issues to be raised at national level</p> <p>Influence and lobbying</p> <p>More consultation wanted – but want quicker plan – Paradox!</p>

Comments from WLDC Councillors from Local Plan Councillor Workshops at West Lindsey District Council.

A number of workshops and discussions have been held with members to discuss the response of councillors to the policies contained in the Local Plan draft. Approximately 25 members have been involved in providing these comments.

Workshops have also been happening over the past few months and at each stage comments have been fed back which have been used to shape the Plan we have here.

All the latest comments have been distilled into the table below.

It should be remembered that as this Local Plan will be subject to robust challenge from an independent inspector in a public examination, that any policies that are part of the Local Plan will be subject to intense scrutiny and therefore detailed evidence will be required. This evidence will include local opinion and community involvement as well as facts and figures.

Central Lincolnshire Local Plan – Summary of Policies (Oct 2014 Preliminary Draft).

Note: All policies are current at draft stage for public consultation.

	Policy	Summary
	General Principles of Local Plan	
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the Local Plan is for the whole of the Central Lincolnshire area giving as much weight to rural areas as to the urban areas of Lincoln, Gainsborough and Sleaford. Therefore statements included in the Plan should be related to Central Lincolnshire not just Lincoln, Sleaford or Gainsborough. • Ensure that Central Lincolnshire Local Plan is not dominated by the needs of Lincoln and that it is balanced across all 3 districts. • Mention links to both Robin Hood Airport, Doncaster, Humberside Airport and South Humber Bank. • Influence transport policy to include dualling the A15 north of Lincoln to the Forest Pines roundabout, Scunthorpe, A158, the existing bypass around Lincoln and a second bridge/road crossing of the River Trent, Gainsborough.
A Growing Central Lincolnshire	LP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	A general policy as required to be included by central government to complement the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definitely want to ensure that all development is sustainable. • Questions as to the real sustainability of the Lincoln Fringe villages as it is perceived that in some villages services are oversubscribed now. Some of the villages in the Lincoln fringe are not sustainable as they have limited services. • WLDC priority to make ex-MOD bases more sustainable, Hemswell Cliff and RAF Scampton in particular as they are on a main road with easy access to Lincoln. • Some settlements may need extra infrastructure to ensure sustainability eg Bardney and Scotter need more employment land made available to encourage more local job opportunities. • New sustainable village near Lincoln at North Greetwell, near Hawthorn Road. (Approx 2,500 dwellings?) • When developing plans for sustainable communities ensure that they have significant amounts of green space (at least 5%) and greener aspects - tree-lined avenues, parks, riverside walks, leafy squares. Ensure that road networks are able to cope/wide

		<p>enough for extra traffic/parking/other users and that existing networks are not degraded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition long term management of planting as a responsibility on the residents of the new homes, not the builder who walks away. • Ensure growth on brownfield sites before greenfield sites. • Road infrastructure must include improvements to existing road network as well as new provision. • Schools and doctors throughout the area are at capacity – infrastructure needed before new homes.
	LP2: The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy	Policy determining which towns and villages fall into what category of the settlement hierarchy. Development and investment will be prioritised to those places higher up the hierarchy.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the emphasis from a Settlement Hierarchy to a Settlement Strategy. • Need to retain ability for some of the smaller settlements to grow 'organically' to ensure the survival of services and communities. • Need to look at Lincoln fringe villages carefully so the <i>Lincoln Sub-regional Study</i> proposed in September 2014 will be of great importance to determining which settlements grow and by how much. • New sustainable village near Lincoln at North Greetwell, near Hawthorn Road. (Approx 2,500 dwellings?) • As a result of the above and the strength of feeling from Councillors representing the wards particularly in the Lincoln fringe area please move the villages as listed below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry Willingham to Group 4 • Scothern to Group 4 • Sudbrooke to Group 4 • Saxilby to Group 4 • Hemswell Cliff to Group 3 • RAF Scampton to Group 3 • Sturton by Stow to Group 3 • Morton to Group 5 • If local communities want it then some settlements, not identified here, should be able to expand by more than the proposed 3 dwellings proposed. More flexibility about numbers.
	LP3: Level and Distribution of Growth	Policy which sets the housing growth targets (currently a range of between 25,000 -47,500). Policy directs the majority of growth to the City of Lincoln (50%), Sleaford (15%) and Gainsborough (15%).
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to take into account the influence of other housing market areas eg NE Lincolnshire and the South Humber bank industry development/ employment sites. This means that there is the potential for the NE of WL to absorb greater levels of growth eg Caistor which needs to increase the population to safeguard and grow services and

		<p>facilities. (Also has a Neighbourhood Plan nearly completed.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater percentage of growth required for Gainsborough due to growth aspirations which is a priority for WLDC. Depending on numbers this may be more than the 15% allocated at this time which Councillors want to take some pressure off the Lincoln fringe. • Greater levels of growth for Hemswell Cliff and RAF Scampton. • Level and distribution of growth around Lincoln needs to be looked at in greater detail – <i>Lincoln Sub-regional Study</i> (see comments above). • Scenario which Councillors favour at this point in time is the medium growth scenario. Need some growth to allow for natural increase in households, but also need some aspirational growth to encourage employment/jobs creation. • Encourage growth in villages that need an increase in houses for sustainability rather than push everything to the Lincoln fringe.
	LP4: Delivering Prosperity and Jobs	Policy to promote employment growth, with targets for new jobs and the release of employment land (no targets at this draft stage).
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<p>Broad agreement with this policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More emphasis on Gainsborough as a centre for employment growth as this is where the greatest employment needs are based in WL. • Employment/jobs growth needs to go hand in hand with housing growth. • Needs more mention of South Humber bank and employment opportunities there particularly links to Caistor and Market Rasen in the North East of the area. • Bardney and Scotter need more employment land made available to encourage more local job opportunities.
	LP5: Retail and Town Centres in Central Lincolnshire	Policy sets the retail hierarchy and retail impact assessment threshold.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aspirational growth for Gainsborough will help to safeguard and develop retail and leisure sectors in Gainsborough Town Centre. • Caistor and Market Rasen currently have larger retail centres than their populations suggest. Need to ensure that these are safeguarded and that retail diversity is maintained/increased. • Large scale urban extensions need to link into existing town centres but also provide the right level of sustainable retail opportunities.
	LP6: A Sustainable Visitor Economy	Policy to promote the growth of the tourism economy.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visitor economy is a priority for WLDC so a policy which promotes and encourages this is important. • Make sure there are strong links to rural policies. • Must ensure a sustainable visitor economy.

A Caring Central Lincolnshire: meeting needs and the provision of infrastructure	LP7: Health and Wellbeing	Policy requiring developers to take full account of health issues when preparing development proposals including the submission of a Health Impact Assessment, as appropriate.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of Major Developments needed here as there is a balance to be made between producing a Health Impact Assessment as part of a sustainable development and it stifling growth in some areas by adding to the cost and reducing the viability of a site too much. • Highlight the need for residents to have access to green space and the positive impact it has on mental wellbeing.
	LP8: Meeting Accommodation Need	Policy encouraging a range of accommodation types such as custom build, single storey dwellings and executive homes. Policy also sets out criteria for assessing Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople related development.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very important that there should be a strong evidence base to show need across the different groups. • Ensure that a range of provision for older people and single unit homes is taken into account. • That provision for all groups but especially Gypsy and Travellers is spread equally across the Central Lincolnshire area to ensure parity. • Cater for both ends of the housing market.
	LP9: Meeting Housing Needs	Policy setting affordable housing requirement and threshold (targets not yet available at this draft stage).
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to meet the need of the community. • More comments will be provided when targets are available.
	LP10: Infrastructure to Support Growth	Policy confirming the need for infrastructure to be provided alongside development, as well as an expectation for developers to contribute towards infrastructure provision.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<p>Broad agreement with this policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issue for most communities and settlements as a number perceive that infrastructure has not been provided for adequately in the past and they are questioning the mechanisms by which requirements are measured. • Infrastructure must meet existing need as well as for new developments.
	LP11: Transport	Policy covering strategic as well as site specific transport matters.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<p>Broad agreement with this policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issue for most communities and settlements as a number perceive that transport infrastructure has not been provided for adequately in the past and they are questioning the mechanisms by which requirements are measured. • Enhance the role of rail links.
	LP12: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk	Policy sets out the approach and criteria the Central Lincolnshire authorities will use in relation to flood risk

		and drainage matters.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	Broad agreement with the policy as it is set out here. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to factor in the new Sustainable Drainage Scheme policies currently being consulted on by Government and what impact they will have on new developments across Central Lincolnshire.
	LP13: Community Facilities	Policy setting out the criteria that will be used to assess the proposed loss of any community facilities or the creation of new stand-alone facilities.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	Broad agreement with this policy.
	LP14: Development on Land affected by Contamination	Policy setting out the approach to land with the potential to be affected by contamination.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	Broad agreement with this policy
A Quality Central Lincolnshire	LP15: Our Landscape	Policy setting out the criteria for assessing the landscape impact of proposed development.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	The AONB and other landscape designations need to be mentioned in the Introduction to this chapter at 5.1. Broad agreement with this policy and that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agricultural land grades (1, 2 and 3a) should be added to this policy so that it is very clear that this land will be protected in most cases. • The policy should link strongly to policy LP12 particularly in respect of agricultural uses. • Mention the AONB and other landscape designations in this policy.
	LP16: Climate Change and Low Carbon Living	Policy sets out an expectation for development to contribute to minimising resource consumption and contribute towards combatting climate change.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	Broad agreement with this policy and that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More emphasis should be put on designing in carbon reduction and water saving technologies from the outset of a development balanced against not stifling growth by asking for technologies that impact on the viability of a scheme.
	LP17: Stand-alone Renewable Energy Proposals	Policy setting out the criteria for assessing stand-alone renewable energy proposals.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	Broad agreement with this policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define agricultural land grades
	LP18: Green Infrastructure Network	Policy encourages developers to have regard to the Green Infrastructure Network.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	Broad agreement with this policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green corridors should mention green footpaths and ensure extensions between settlements. • Green infrastructure networks need promoting as well as protecting • More footpaths and cycle ways are needed particularly between existing and new developments. • Mention green wedges here.
	LP19: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Policy setting out the approach to assessing the impacts of development proposals on biodiversity and geodiversity.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	Broad agreement with this policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity by Design paragraph should be a stronger statement and made a 'duty'

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigation paragraph should be stronger.
	LP20: The Historic Environment	Policy with criteria to preserve or enhance historic assets.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rely on the strength of English Heritage role and mention here. Make statements stronger with regard to protection of historic environment.
	LP21: Design Principles	Policy requires high quality sustainable design and sets out criteria for assessing the design of proposals.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality buildings not bland. More renewable technologies incorporated from outset. Comments a-g on this policy are bland statements.
	LP22: Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities	Policy introducing the requirement for development proposals to provide open space. (Standards will be prepared to support this policy).
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage more access to green spaces particularly in rural areas as there is a presumption that access is easy, however in most smaller settlements access is very limited. Brownfield sites should be used first where possible. Should also consider necessary buildings such as changing facilities as well. On site or contribution to nearby site if there are already facilities in the area.
	LP23: Shop Fronts and Advertisements	Policy setting out criteria for assessing the impact of shop fronts and advertisements.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<p>Broad agreement with this policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CCTV cameras need to blend in to the surroundings. Delete point 'f' and provide proper policing in town centres or leave to local planning committees.
Your Central Lincolnshire	LP24: Threshold Test for locally supported growth in Villages	Policy sets out a capacity threshold (based on dwelling stock) of new development in villages before developers must demonstrate community support for their proposal.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	Broad agreement with this policy however it needs explaining more clearly – plain English.
	LP25: Local Green Spaces	Policy setting out the approach to Local Green Spaces.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<p>Sites need to be put forward.</p> <p>Any sites put forward will be subject to an allocation process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocation should be done by each district council in consultation with Parish and Town Councils.
Delivering	LP26: Sustainable Urban Extensions	Policy setting out a number of important general criteria as well as specific criteria in relation to design and energy, infrastructure and employment, and landscape which urban extensions should meet, where relevant.

WLDC Councillor Comments	<p>Broad agreement with this policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment uses and development is as important as housing growth. • Provision of facilities and services should add to and complement those already in the community but should not detract from the town centres. • Allow flexibility in case new sites come forward during the life of the Plan so that they can be investigated and developed if necessary.
LP27: A Growing Lincoln	Policy setting out the sustainable extensions and options for growth in and around Lincoln (exact locations to be added at the next stage).
WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Paragraph 7.3.2, make clearer that the facilities/amenities listed in the second half of the paragraph are located in WL and NK and serve the greater area. • The locations and numbers of houses to be promoted in these SUEs will be important in gauging the level of growth in the villages surrounding Lincoln. • It is important to promote growth on these largely brownfield sites that have greater links with existing infrastructure than increasing the development in Lincoln fringe villages.
LP28: Transport Priorities/Movement Strategy	Policy promoting schemes to improve transport in and around Lincoln.
WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That transport schemes that are needed to promote growth in the other SUEs around Gainsborough and Sleaford are not missed out in favour of Lincoln.
LP29: Houses in Multiple Occupation including Student Housing	Policy setting out criteria for assessing proposals for houses in multiple occupation including student housing.
WLDC Councillor Comments	No comments on this policy.
LP30: Protecting Lincoln's setting and character	Policy setting out criteria for assessing the impact of proposals on Lincoln's setting and character.
WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The setting and views of Lincoln from West Lindsey are an important part of the landscape and should be protected strongly. • The character of the city is important to the communities surrounding it and should also be protected.
LP31: Lincoln's Economy	Policy promoting a series of economic features in Lincoln.
WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is recognised that Lincoln is a key economic driver in Central Lincolnshire; however other key employment and economic sites in Central Lincolnshire must not be underestimated for their importance to the local economy.
LP32: Supporting the Natural Evolution of Lincoln	Policy setting out the allocations (housing sites, employment sites, Green Wedges, etc.) relating to Lincoln.

	WLDC Councillor Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The protection of Green Wedges is very important to the communities surrounding Lincoln. Identification of new ones that further strengthen the individual settlements will be important. It is hoped that this will be addressed in the Lincoln Sub-regional Study.
	LP33: A Growing Gainsborough	Policy setting out the sustainable extensions (exact locations to be added at the next stage)
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<p>Broad agreement with this policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage the growth of Gainsborough Encourage growth on brownfield sites before greenfield sites.
	LP34: Building a Better Gainsborough	Policy setting out a range of criteria to assist in regenerating Gainsborough.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<p>Broad agreement with this policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Broader mix of housing types needed from executive homes to single units and affordable housing. Do we still need to address just the SW Ward of Gainsborough as the other wards have also shown increased deprivation in latest figures?
	LP35: Supporting the Natural Evolution of Gainsborough	Policy setting out the allocations relating to Gainsborough.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	<p>Broad agreement with this policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add a marker about a second road bridge across the River Trent beyond the lifetime of this Plan. Employment land allocation.
	LP36: A Growing Sleaford	Policy setting out the sustainable extensions (exact locations to be added at the next stage).
	WLDC Councillor Comments	No comments on this policy.
	LP37: Building a Better Sleaford	Policy setting out a range of criteria to assist in regenerating Sleaford.
	WLDC Councillor Comments	No comments on this policy.
	LP38: Supporting the Natural Evolution of Sleaford	Policy setting out the allocations relating to Sleaford
	WLDC Councillor Comments	No comments on this policy.
	LP39: Development in Rural Areas	Policy specifically for development in rural areas covering matters such as conversion of buildings in the open countryside and mobile homes within the rural area.

	<p>WLDC Councillor Comments</p>	<p>Broad agreement with this policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is the need to remain fairly flexible to allow some growth in the villages that want it in order to protect their sustainability/services and keep them alive. If villages want to grow, move them up the hierarchy. • Ensuring that settlements aren't joined together as ribbon developments. • Allow conversion of large properties in the countryside into flats. • Allow the development of all encompassing 'retirement villages' which include all facilities and housing from non-supported to high support care homes on one site. (New Zealand model) • Strengthen Part D: No support for mobile or other 'temporary' homes in the open countryside, however keep the exception for need during construction.
--	--	--