

Guildhall Gainsborough
Lincolnshire DN21 2NA
Tel: 01427 676676 Fax: 01427 675170

AGENDA

This meeting will be webcast live and the video archive published on our website

Prosperous Communities Committee
Thursday, 29th July, 2021 at 6.30 pm
Council Chamber - The Guildhall

PLEASE NOTE DUE TO CAPACITY LIMITS WITHIN THE GUILDHALL THE PUBLIC VIEWING GALLERY IS CURRENTLY SUSPENDED

This Meeting will be available to watch live via: <https://west-lindsey-public-i.tv/core/portal/home>

Members:

- Councillor Owen Bierley (Chairman)
- Councillor Mrs Tracey Coulson (Vice-Chairman)
- Councillor John McNeill (Vice-Chairman)
- Councillor Stephen Bunney
- Councillor Christopher Darcel
- Councillor Michael Devine
- Councillor Steve England
- Councillor Mrs Jessie Milne
- Councillor Tom Regis
- Councillor Jim Snee
- Councillor Mrs Mandy Snee
- Councillor Trevor Young

1. **Apologies for Absence**
2. **Public Participation**
Up to 15 minutes are allowed for public participation. Participants are restricted to 3 minutes each.
3. **Minutes of Previous Meeting** (PAGES 3 - 8)
To confirm and sign as a correct record the Minutes of the Prosperous Communities Committee held on 13 July 2021

4. **Matters Arising Schedule** (PAGES 9 - 11)
Setting out current position of previously agreed actions as at 21 July 2021

5. **Members' Declarations of Interest**
Members may make any declarations at this point but may also make them at any time during the course of the meeting.

6. **Public Reports**
 - a) Draft Local Plan Consultation Response (PAGES 12 - 78)
 - b) Workplan (PAGES 79 - 82)

Ian Knowles
Head of Paid Services
The Guildhall
Gainsborough

Wednesday, 21 July 2021

Prosperous Communities Committee- 13 July 2021
Subject to Call-in. Call-in will expire at 5pm on

WEST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee held in the Council Chamber - The Guildhall on 13 July 2021 commencing at 6.30 pm.

Present: Councillor Owen Bierley (Chairman)
Councillor Mrs Tracey Coulson (Vice-Chairman) and
Councillor John McNeill (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor Stephen Bunney
Councillor Christopher Darcel
Councillor Michael Devine
Councillor Mrs Jessie Milne
Councillor Tom Regis
Councillor Jim Snee
Councillor Mrs Mandy Snee
Councillor Trevor Young

In Attendance:
Sally Grindrod-Smith Assistant Director of Planning and Regeneration
Ady Selby Assistant Director of Commercial and Operational Services
James O'Shaughnessy Head of Policy Strategy and Sustainable Environment /
Deputy Monitoring Officer
Katie Storr Democratic Services & Elections Team Manager (Interim)

Apologies: Councillor Steve England

Membership: No substitutes appointed

8 CHAIRMAN'S WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed all those present to the meeting, and highlighted to those in attendance the Covid-19 measures and expectations.

The Committee had been re-constituted at Council in June 2021 and as a result, its membership had reduced by two. Those Members, who had "retired" from the Committee, Councillor Welburn and Councillor Rainsforth, were thanked for their service and contributions to it.

9 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation for this meeting.

10 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

- (a) Minutes of the Meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee held on 8 June 2021.

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Meeting of the Prosperous Communities Committee held on 8 June 2021 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

- (b) Minutes of the Concurrent Meeting of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee and Prosperous Communities Committee held on 14 June 2021

In reference to the attendance list, it was noted that the “*” denoting Members of both Committees had not been applied across all relevant Members. This had been rectified on the minutes for signing and on that basis it was: -

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Concurrent Meeting of the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee and Prosperous Communities Committee held on 14 June 2021, with the administrative amendment made, be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

11 MATTERS ARISING SCHEDULE

The Chairman introduced the report advising Members that the report would be taken “as read” unless Members had any questions.

With no questions, and with no requirement for a vote, the Matters Arising were **DULY NOTED**.

12 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this point in the meeting.

13 REVIEW OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COUNCIL'S ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY WORKING GROUP

The Committee gave consideration to a report which presented and sought approval of revised terms of reference for the Council's Environment and Sustainability Working Group.

The Group's original terms of reference had been approved by the Committee in December 2019, when the Group had been formed to oversee the development of a new strategy for the Council related to sustainability, climate change and the environment.

The group had worked with Officers to develop a Strategy, with work culminating in the adoption of the Council's Sustainability, Climate Change and Environment Strategy and action plan by Full Council on 28th June 2021.

As such the original terms of reference of the Group had been fulfilled, and it was therefore considered its terms of reference should be refreshed, re-aligning the Group's work to now oversee the delivery of the actions contained within the Strategy.

Key changes were the Purpose of the Working Group (Section 2) and the widening of the pool from which membership could be sourced (3.2). The Group remained non decision making and would be required to report at least annually on its progress.

Since writing the report, the Lead Officer, with support of the Working Group's Chairman, indicated increasing the size of the Group from six up to eight may be of value. It was also noted that a vacancy had recently arisen on the Group. Should the Committee be minded to increase the membership, the vacancies / new positions would be discussed with relevant Committee Chairmen and the nominations submitted to a future meeting of this Committee for approval.

It was questioned whether increasing the size of the Group was the most appropriate action or whether the Group should have a nominated reserve arrangement like some other Groups. The rationale for the proposal was shared, this primarily being increased flexibility, and it was confirmed that the current vacancy was not due to a lack of interest.

Serving Members of the Group, expressed support for increasing the Membership, and as such the following amendment to the Draft Terms of Reference was proposed and seconded: -

“Ref 3.1 - The Working Group shall comprise **at least six and up to eight** Members including the Member Champion for Environment and Climate Change”

On being put to the vote the amendment was **CARRIED**.

With no further comments, and having been moved and seconded, on that basis it was:

RESOLVED that, with the inclusion of the amendment, namely, “Ref 3.1 - The Working Group shall comprise **at least six and up to eight** Members including the Member Champion for Environment and Climate Change”, the revised Terms of Reference for The Council's Environment and Sustainability Group, as detailed at Appendix 2 of the report be approved.

14 JUBILEE EVENT PLANNING MEMBER GROUP

Consideration was given to a report which sought agreement to establish a Member planning group, supported by Officers from across the Council, to oversee the preparations

Prosperous Communities Committee- 13 July 2021
Subject to Call-in. Call-in will expire at 5pm on

for the Queen's Platinum Jubilee in 2022.

The report further sought agreement to the proposed Planning Group's Terms of Reference and sought nominations for five positions available on the Group.

It was recognised that the Platinum Jubilee was of national, international and historical significance and, as such, preparing for celebrations should be considered as an authority-wide programme.

It was hoped the proposed approach would facilitate engagement, cohesion and co-ordination and would enable clear activities to be identified, resourced and delivered, ensuring a programme of events was established, agreed and delivered, in a timely manner to ensure delivery.

The high level role of the Planning Group was detailed in Section 2 of the report and the Terms of Reference had been drafted to ensure wide stakeholder engagement across the District and with the requirement for projects to be aligned to the Corporate Plan and deliver against wider Council objectives. It would not necessarily be for the District Council to "host" all such events but have a leading role in engaging communities and enabling District wide celebrations.

A proposed time line with key reporting milestones was set out in Section 4 of the report.

With no questions, the Chairman of the Committee advised of three nominations, Councillor Mrs D Rodgers, R Patterson and G McNeill, and sought indication as to whether the remaining positions could be filled outside of the meeting by the end of the week.

Noting the Terms of Reference required this Committee to appoint Members to the Group, Officers suggested in the absence of five nominations, and to avoid a return to Committee, a delegation could be granted to the Monitoring Officer in consultation with the Chairman to fill any remaining positions, if Members were minded to propose such an amendment.

It was clarified that with a delegation in place, nominations could be submitted within a timeframe suitable to the Chairman, however the Group could not commence work until its membership was in place. As such, the following amendment to recommendation (c) of the report was proposed and seconded: -

“ In addition to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of Council, 5 Members be appointed to serve on the Jubilee Event Planning Member Group, **including Councillors Mrs D Rodgers, R Patterson and G McNeill, with two further Members being appointed by the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of the Prosperous Communities,**

On being put to the vote the amendment was **CARRIED**.

With no further comments, and having been moved and seconded, on that basis it was:

RESOLVED that:

- (a) a Jubilee Event Planning Member Group be established;

- (b) the terms of reference as set out at Appendix A of the report be approved; and
- (c) In addition to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of Council, 5 Members be appointed to serve on the Jubilee Event Planning Member Group, including Councillors Mrs D Rodgers, R Patterson and G McNeill, with two further Members being appointed by the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of the Prosperous Communities,

15 WORKPLAN

Members gave consideration to the Committee Workplan as at 5 July.

With no comments or questions, and with no requirement for a vote, the Work Plan was **DULY NOTED**.

16 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED that under Section 100 (A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 A of the Act.

17 FUTURE OF WEST LINDSEY MARKETS

Consideration was given to a report which presented the findings of Phase 1 and sought Members' approval to proceed to Phases 2 and 3 of the future of West Lindsey Markets consultancy work.

In presenting the report Officers summarised the findings of the Phase 1 report which provided an overview of current performance, and challenges both in general for markets and those specific to Gainsborough. The report offered seven key interventions for further consideration as well as three potential delivery options.

Phases 2 and 3 for which approval was being sought focussed on Engagement and Future Planning. The timescales, associated costs and purpose of these phases were shared with Committee. The final report containing full analysis and recommendations for the future of the markets was anticipated to be presented to Members in late 2021.

Discussion ensued and Members indicated the workshop had been useful.

Concerns still existed that the report was too Gainsborough focused and Members spoke of their aspirations for a wider district offer. The need to appropriately resource the function was also raised and Members shared examples of previous decisions they considered had fundamentality impacted the Market's sustainability and had contributed to the current situation. The appropriateness of the comparators used in the report were questioned, as was the successfulness of some of those markets recently brought to the Committee's

attention.

Making use of the river as a greater feature and asset, broadening the use of the market square in general, the role of the Town Council, and the importance of a quality offer were also matters discussed.

Members were of the view the success of other planned projects, such as the cinema within the Market Square had the ability to either drive or impede progress dependent on their outcome.

In responding Officers confirmed there was a keen intent to include a wider district offer and to look at the use of the market square in the widest sense. It was acknowledged that there would need to be a future decision regarding funding and a potential change of focus, moving away from the cost centre approach previously adopted, in recent years.

RESOLVED that Phase 2 and 3 of the future of West Lindsey markets consultancy work be approved

The meeting concluded at 7.41 pm.

Chairman

Prosperous Communities Matters Arising Schedule

Purpose:

To consider progress on the matters arising from previous Prosperous Communities Committee meetings.

Recommendation: That members note progress on the matters arising and request corrective action if necessary.

Matters arising Schedule

Status	Title	Action Required	Comments	Due Date	Allocated To
Green	enforcement Training for Parish Councils	<p>Extract from mins 22/10/19</p> <p>in the past Officers from within the enforcement team had provided training to local residents in order that they could be certified to issue fixed penalties. The number of tickets issued by such persons however was very limited because although they had received training catching the culprit in the act still remained a challenge. This was something Officers were prepared to take away and see if further training could be offered as it had been previously and if there was desire and need in the community</p>	<p>this is something the council have offered previously and can continue to offer should Parish Wardens wish to issue FPNs for matters such as dog fouling or litter. Any individual has to be authorised and receive specific training. Information on this provision can be outlined within the Parish Charter.</p> <p>Currently on hold due to COVID -19 rules - virtual training not appropriate . target deadline extended as no change in rules</p>	01/08/21	Grant White
Green	information pack for parish councils re reporting issues	<p>Extract from mins of mtg 22/10/19</p> <p>Officers undertook to prepare a guidance and information pack for Parish Councils covering some of the top issues affecting a number of parishes, explaining how to report certain issues and the options available to them. This was welcomed.</p>	<p>At previous Committee Meetings the Parish Charter document has now been approved and a new Parish Council Support webpage has been created as part of this. This page lists details of schemes open to parish/town councils and links to reporting things to the District Council. The page is now live at: www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/parishsupport.</p> <p>Lead Members have sought confirmation that this page has been promoted with the parishes,.</p> <p>Limited promotion undertaken due to COVID 19 impact on the nature of this work and activities within the charter</p>	01/08/21	Grant White

Green	<p>parish charter publicity and promotion and yearly impact review</p>	<p>approval to commence the publicity and promotion of the charter as per section 4 of the parish charter report.</p> <p>Also need to put in yearly review report as per section of the report</p>	<p>Publicity and Promotion of the Charter has had to be adapted due to COVID 19 . the adopted Parish Charter is now live on our website. It is available on its own webpage: www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/parishcharter</p> <p>A page has also been created for Parish Forum events: www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/parishforum</p> <p>At the minute this page states we have no current planned events due to Covid-19 but that we are looking at a virtual event.</p> <p>GW Will liaise with Comms Teams and send out comms about this to Parish/Town Councils when we can also promote the virtual event so it's all linked up.</p> <p>Target date extended due to continuing covid restrictions</p> <p>Additional comment for information to be shared with Members in relation to Parish communications in order that Members can liaise with their Parishes and highlight such information</p>	01/08/21	Grant White
Green	<p>CCTV Case studies for Members Newsletter</p>	<p>extract from mins of mtg 14/7/2020</p> <p>Members felt it imperative that there was better reporting of outcomes directly resulting from CCTV intervention or information in order to improve public confidence. Officers undertook to publish some case studies in a future edition of the Members Bulletin</p>	<p>New comms and promotional material showing the use and impact of CCTV is planned to take place beginning January/February 2021. This timing coincides with comms on CCTV as part of the Safer Streets funded project to upgrade and expand CCTV in Gainsborough. In the meantime social media posts will be used to promote routine duties performed by CCTV where possible especially in the run up to Christmas and New Year.</p> <p>Update: Items for newsletter to be called every 4-6weeks, in line with pre-covid practices, CCTV included in call for items.</p>	30/07/21	Grant White

Green	ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY WORKING GROUP - vacancies	<p>extract from mins of mtg 13/7</p> <p>Should the Committee be minded to increase the membership, the vacancies / new positions would be discussed with relevant Committee Chairmen and the nominations submitted to a future meeting of this Committee for approval.</p>	Please advise once any vacancies have been offered in order that this matter can be reported up to the PC Cttee, as per the terms of reference	31/07/21	James O'Shaughnessy
Green	Jubilee Group - vacancies	<p>Extract from mins of meeting 13/7 : -</p> <p>In addition to the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of Council, 5 Members be appointed to serve on the Jubilee Event Planning Member Group, including Councillors Mrs D Rodgers, R Patterson and G McNeill, with two further Members being appointed by the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chairman of the Prosperous Communities,</p>	Please work with Chair to establish the remaining members once remaining members have been identified and notified , the Group will commence its work and make its first report back to cttee in September .	31/07/21	James O'Shaughnessy

Agenda Item 6a



**Prosperous Communities
Committee**

Thursday 29th July 2021

Subject: Draft Local Plan Consultation Response

Report by:	Assistant Director of Planning and Regeneration
Contact Officer:	Rachael Hughes Planning Policy Manager rachael.hughes@west-lindsey.gov.uk
Purpose / Summary:	To agree the formal response by West Lindsey District Council to the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Review Consultation

RECOMMENDATION(S):

Members consider the content of the consultation response as drafted and contribute further observation and commentary within the Prosperous Communities Committee meeting as appropriate.

Members agree and endorse the proposed consultation submission in relation to the Reg.18 Public Participation stage as identified within the indicative timetable contained with the Local Development scheme (September 2020).

Members delegate authority to the Assistant Director for Planning and Regeneration (in consultation with the Chairman of the Prosperous Communities Committee) to submit the final version of West Lindsey District Council's formal response to the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Reg. 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation incorporating any additional comments expressed and agreed throughout the debate.

IMPLICATIONS

Legal: Any legal matters arising from the Review of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan will be addressed by the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team and appointed legal representatives

(N.B.) Where there are legal implications the report **MUST** be seen by the MO

Financial : FIN/37/22/JA/A

There are no direct financial implications associated with this report. Any future financial implications arising from the local plan will be assessed through the annual budget setting process and built into the MTFP accordingly.

Staffing : N/A

(N.B.) Where there are staffing implications the report **MUST** have a HR Ref

Equality and Diversity including Human Rights :

The revised Local Plan will be supported by an equality analysis as part of the formal Local Plan process which will address any equality or human rights issues which may arise from the policies in the Local Plan

Data Protection Implications : N/A

Climate Related Risks and Opportunities: The Local Plan as drafted has a number of policies which are designed to support Central Lincolnshire and the individual Districts to promote zero net carbon development across the area. It is considered that these policies accord with the Council's recently adopted Sustainability, Climate Change and Environment Strategy. <https://www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/my-services/my-community/sustainability-climate-change-and-environment/sustainability-climate-change-and-environment-strategy/>

Section 17 Crime and Disorder Considerations : N/A

Health Implications: Whilst policy references have been updated within the draft Local Plan, the key elements of the Local Plan Policy which deal with Health and Wellbeing remain the same and are contained within new policy reference S53.

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

Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee Paper with resolution to begin the review

- <https://democracy.n-kesteven.gov.uk/mgAi.aspx?ID=66522>

Local Development Scheme (Sept 2020)

- <https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/central-lincolnshire/about-central-lincolnshire/>

Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Consultation Documents (30/06/21 – 24/08/21)

- [Local Plan consultation](#)

Prosperous Communities Committee – West Lindsey District Council formal response to Reg. 18 Consultation Issues and Options (2019)

- <https://democracy.west-lindsey.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=176&MIId=2349&Ver=4>

Risk Assessment :

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

X

No

Executive Summary

Since the Issues and Options consultation in June and July 2019, which West Lindsey District Council submitted formal comments for consideration, the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team and officers at the Central Lincolnshire Districts have been developing the evidence base for the new Local Plan.

West Lindsey District Council in the role of consultee has an opportunity to provide comments on the Consultation Draft Local Plan which consists of a number of questions endorsing or not draft policies and provides opportunities for comment and additional evidence as necessary.

As this is only a review, many of the policies remain largely unchanged since the Local Plan was adopted in 2017, however there have been some changes of note, specifically the change in layout and policy numbering to aid in navigation. Other areas of note are;

- Reduction on the housing requirement figure from 1540 to a range between 1060 and 1325
- Approach to housing growth in medium and small villages due to the ability to allocate sites for 10 or more dwellings
- Expansion of the retail hierarchy to include important local and rural centres
- Addition of a suite of policies focussed specifically on mitigating the impact of Climate Change and moving Central Lincolnshire towards carbon neutrality for all new development subject to planning permission

This is the second of three consultations on the Local Plan review which gives West Lindsey District Council an opportunity to comment, shape and inform the final draft to be submitted for examination.

Prosperous Communities Committee as West Lindsey District Council's Policy Committee are requested to consider the Consultation Draft Local Plan paper and provide where appropriate responses to the issues raised.

The Chair and Vice Chairs of Prosperous Communities Committee; Cllr. Bierley, Cllr. J McNeill and Cllr, Coulson were invited to a briefing on 02nd July 2021. During the briefing an overview of the Consultation Draft Local Plan was provided and key policy areas considered. Along with the briefing and with the support of Officers an initial consultation response has been drafted on behalf of West Lindsey District Council which can be found in appendix A for the Committee to consider, agree and endorse for submission.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 As Members of Prosperous Communities Committee are aware since 2009 the council's statutory local planning function has been delivered by a separate local planning authority (established by parliamentary order) known as the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee (CLJSPC), supported by a team of officers.
- 1.2 This CLJSPC is made up of members from the four contributing councils, including three members (plus one reserve) from West Lindsey. Members currently serving on this committee for West Lindsey are; Cllr. Bierley, Cllr. Fleetwood, Cllr. Cotton and reserve member Cllr. G McNeill.
- 1.3 The CLJSPC committee's role is to oversee the production and review of the local plan through to adoption and make decisions on new planning policy requirements. That means the approval and adoption and subsequent review of the local plan lies with the CLJSPC.
- 1.4 The current Local Plan adopted in April 2017 was developed in accordance with legislation and national policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and includes a detailed policy framework for Central Lincolnshire.
- 1.5 Following a resolution by CLJSPC on 14th January 2019 to review the Local Plan to align with current national policy, specifically aligning housing growth figures with Government methodology and more locally establish a policy position for RAF Scampton following the closure announcement in July 2018. The subsequent Issues and Options consultation took place during June and July 2019 and since then the Central Lincolnshire Local Plans Team in conjunction with lead officers at each of the partner authorities have been developing the evidence base for the new Local Plan.
- 1.6 Over the past two years, since the Issues and Options Consultation CLJSPC Committee members have continued to be briefed and provided a general steer on a number of policy considerations.
- 1.7 One of the main changes in relation to Policy since the Issues and Options consultation in June 2019 is the introduction of a suite of policies relating directly to Climate Change and the overarching aim to deliver carbon neutral development across Central Lincolnshire. The thrust of these policies very much align with West Lindsey's wider corporate objectives detailed within the Sustainability, Climate Change and Environment Strategy, specifically land use, buildings and transport.
- 1.8 This consultation is the first time the draft new plan has been published for public scrutiny following the Issues and Options consultation and the addition of specific policies in relation to tackling Climate Change. As such this consultation is an important opportunity for West Lindsey Members to review the proposals held within the plan, as well as test

public opinion and obtain feedback from the development industry and other stakeholders.

- 1.9 Whilst this is the first time that the draft plan has been published, this consultation is not the only time Members and the public will be able to comment. There is a further consultation planned for spring 2022, where the final draft will be published and available for comment before being submitted for Examination in Public in summer 2022.
- 1.10 A link to the current Local Plan review timetable can be found in the background papers section of this report. However it must be noted that the review is running behind the current published Local Development Scheme. This is in part due to the impact of Covid 19 and also the introduction of the Climate Change work which due to its technical nature has been developed with the support of specialist climate change consultants.

2 Content and Structure of the plan

- 2.1 The content and the structure of the Consultation Draft Local Plan is as follows:
1. Introduction, Context, Vision and Objectives
 2. Spatial Strategy
 3. Energy, Climate Change and Flooding
 4. Housing
 5. Employment
 6. Retail: City and Town Centres, and District, Local and Village Centres
 7. Tourism and Visitor Economy
 8. Transport and Infrastructure
 9. Design and Amenity
 10. Built Environment
 11. Natural Environment
 12. SUEs, Regeneration Areas and Opportunity Areas
 13. Site Allocations
 14. Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show-people
 15. Ministry of Defence Establishments
- 2.2 The change in structure provides a more thematic approach to the structure than that provided in the 2017 Local Plan. It is anticipated that this approach will make the document easier to navigate.
- 2.3 Many of the policies remain largely unchanged but a number have been revised following changes to the context since the Local Plan was adopted in 2017 or from experience of using the plan over the last four years. Appendix 1 provides a list of policies in the last plan and their new reference number for ease of reference.
- 2.4 The plan retains coverage and protection for the things that are valued in Central Lincolnshire whilst ensuring positive policies to help shape development to enhance the area in accordance with the Vision and

Objectives brought before the Committee in March 2021 and largely consistent with the Vision and Objectives of the 2017 Local Plan

- 2.5 In an effort to assist neighbourhood planners with understanding which policies are strategic (a key part of the basic conditions for developing a neighbourhood plan), policies are now prefixed with a 'S' for Strategic or 'NS' for Non-strategic. This is one of a number of steps being taken to try and assist communities in developing their own neighbourhood plans in clarifying expectations of the relationship between the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plans.

3 Headlines of the Consultation Draft Local Plan

- 3.1 The new draft Local Plan does also include a number of areas of substantial change from the plan adopted in 2017. The key areas of change are as follows:

Housing Requirements

- 3.2 The new Local Plan proposes a housing requirement range of between 1,060 and 1,325 dwellings per year. The lower figure of this range is the nationally derived Local Housing Need figure based on the standard formula taking account of population projections and affordability of housing. This figure is updated annually and will be subject to change prior to submitting the Local Plan. The upper end of the range is informed by evidence developed in the Housing Needs Assessment (2020) and Economic Needs Assessment Update (2020) as a figure that will support anticipated job growth in Central Lincolnshire.
- 3.3 This approach requires the identification of sites to deliver a total of 29,150 dwellings from 2018 to 2040. This requirement is below the requirement in the 2017 Local Plan which was 1,540 dwellings per year, or 36,960 dwellings from 2012-2036.

Settlement Hierarchy and site allocations

- 3.4 The settlement hierarchy remains largely unchanged from the adopted Local Plan with the same tiers and thresholds being used to define the tiers of the hierarchy.
- 3.5 The approach to housing growth in Medium and Small Villages has changed, where allocations of 10 or more dwellings have been considered in the Consultation Draft Local Plan. The decision on whether or not to allocate sites in these villages has been based on the overall sustainability credentials of each settlement as well as the suitability of sites being put forward.
- 3.6 Many of the sites being allocated in these villages in Policies S80 and S81 already have permission or are allocated in a made neighbourhood plan.
- 3.7 Policy S4 sets out the framework for how sites not allocated in the Local Plan should be considered, including support for neighbourhood plans to allocate sites and expectations for when additional development on small sites might be considered acceptable. This approach replaces the growth percentages from the 2017 Local Plan.

Retail Hierarchy

- 3.8 The retail hierarchy has been expanded to include important local centres and rural centres which perform an important local role in providing services to the population. This will help to protect these services from being lost in an increasingly challenging environment. The retail hierarchy is set out in Policy S34.

Climate Change

- 3.9 Possibly the biggest challenge facing the world at present is that of climate change. The declaration of a climate change emergency by the Government and also declarations and commitments to act by the Central Lincolnshire Authorities identifies this as an important matter that must be dealt with now.
- 3.10 Further to the steer provided by CLJSPC in March 2020, consultants were appointed to understand the challenges within Central Lincolnshire and to identify what the Local Plan can do to address this matter. At CLJSPC on 15 March 2021 some of the key findings of the evidence were provided to the Committee along with the proposed approach for the Local Plan. Following the approval obtained at this meeting, Policies S6-S19 in Chapter 3 of the Local Plan set out the proposed policies for addressing this.
- 3.11 These policies include two areas of particular note – the requirement to deliver net zero carbon homes in Policy S6, and a framework for considering the delivery of large scale renewable energy infrastructure in Policy S13.
- 3.12 For Policy S6 one of the key challenges for Central Lincolnshire is the challenging viability conditions in many parts of the area. Officers and consultants have investigated the ability to deliver net zero carbon homes from both a feasibility and viability perspective.
- 3.13 Whilst the evidence has identified that it is technically feasible to deliver this ambition, it has highlighted that, whilst in many areas it will be viable to achieve these standards, in some areas with lower sales values experienced, it will be challenging to deliver net zero carbon homes and other associated infrastructure whilst remaining viable when taking into account the industry-standard inputs for viability calculations.
- 3.14 The Whole Plan Viability Assessment sets out the details of the inputs and outputs of calculations, identifies value zones and what can reasonably be achieved in each zone in terms of contributions from development when using the inputs generally accepted in such an assessment.
- 3.15 It suggests that additional contributions or higher standards of building can be achieved in some cases, demonstrating that in significant steps towards achieving net zero carbon can be delivered in the Local Plan, ahead of Future Homes Standards (a new standard for energy efficient

homes that the Government is progressing for new homes being built in 2025, to be included in building regulations).

- 3.16 Officers are mindful of the Committee's ambition on climate change and the very clear steer provided, and so have proposed an ambitious, yet robust, position in the Consultation Draft Local Plan. CLJSPC's ambition in relation to Climate Change is acknowledged, however given this challenging and very new topic, specific questions have been asked on this policy, set out under paragraph 3.1.7 of the plan. It is hoped that responses to the consultation will assist in underpinning this position or highlighting further challenges that need consideration before the policy is finalised.
- 3.17 Policy S13 seeks to address the delivery of renewable energy generation infrastructure. The policy identifies the criteria that must be satisfied for any proposal for renewable energy infrastructure in areas identified as being suitable in principle for such infrastructure to be erected – this is considered to be particularly important for wind turbines (with Map 2 in the draft plan showing the areas not considered to be suitable for wind turbines of 40m plus due to constraints).
- 3.18 It is important to note that the sieving exercise that led to Map 2 will help to ensure that no wind turbines are located where they will result in safety or significant amenity issues or where they will have other widespread unacceptable impacts. But this does not mean that they can necessarily be developed elsewhere as detailed assessment of impacts will need to be undertaken and the criteria listed in the policy will need to be satisfied if they are to be approved under this policy.
- 3.19 This approach provides a good level of certainty for the conditions and locations where such wind turbines could be acceptable and adequate protection from any unwanted impacts, when considered against the benefits they provide from the generation of renewable energy.
- 3.20 As a very new policy area for Central Lincolnshire, views will be particularly welcomed from Members, the public and stakeholder on this policy.

4.0 Current Position

- 4.1 The second stage of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Review – Draft Local Plan consultation started on 30 June 2021 and runs until 24 August 2021. As with the last consultation, whilst the layout and policy references have changed, much of the plan has not been changed. Only those areas where policies have needed to be reviewed to address changes to national policy and local circumstances have been updated.
- 4.2 As such this consultation provides a further opportunity for Prosperous Communities Committee in capacity of consultee to comment on proposed changes detailed in the Draft Local Plan Consultation Document.

- 4.3 Cllr. Bierley and Cllr. Coulson as Chair and Vice Chair of Prosperous Communities Committee with the support of Officers have provided an initial consultation response on behalf of West Lindsey District Council. Key messages in relation to the consultation are:
- a. General support for the updates and additions featured within the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan
 - b. Positive response to the introduction of Theme 3: Climate Change, although some concern in relation to the implementation and enforcement of requirements without the support of Building Regulations
 - c. Support for greater clarity in the role of Neighbourhood Planning and the communities scope for influence
 - d. Acknowledgement of the important role biodiversity and green infrastructure play in terms of improving the quality of both developments and health and wellbeing and welcome those linkages.

*The full consultation response can be found in appendix 1 of this report.

- 4.4 It is important for members to note that whilst West Lindsey District Council will submit a single formal response all Councillors and Parish and Town Councils are able to submit their own consultation responses throughout the duration of this consultation period and indeed future consultations in relation to the Local Plan review.

5.0 Next Steps

- 5.1 A focus on the Local Plan and associated policies will continue to be featured in the Member Bulletin (released every Friday) until the close of the consultation on 24th August 2021.
- 5.2 Members will be able to add further comments to this formal consultation submission until Friday 6th August. The final formal submission will be made week commencing 09th August 2021, with agreement from the Chair of Prosperous Communities Committee.
- 5.3 Following the close of the first consultation period a full assessment of responses will be made and these responses will be used to help inform any further refinement to policy, which will again be consulted on in early 2022, with further opportunity for councillor, resident and stakeholder comment.
- 5.4 As detailed in paragraph 1.10 the current Local Plan review timetable can be found in the background papers section of this report. However it must be noted that the review is running behind the current published Local Development Scheme. Therefore further updates on the timetable and opportunities to comment will continue to be provided to Members throughout the review period.

Appendix 1

Central Lincolnshire
LOCAL PLAN



Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation June 2021

Form B: Consultation Response Form

From 30th June to 24th August 2021 we are consulting on the Draft version of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, plus the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). This is the second of three rounds of consultation on this new Plan, which can be viewed at:

www.central-lincs.org.uk

This form can be used for responding to the consultation, however we would prefer you to make comments online using the Online Consultation Portal found at the link above. Alternatively you can email this form to talkplanning@central-lincs.org.uk or post it to Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team, c/o North Kesteven District Council, Kesteven Street, Sleaford, NG34 7EF.

All comments must be received by **11.59pm** on **24th August 2021**. Late comments **will not** be accepted.

Part A: Your Details

Name: Rachael Hughes
Organisation: West Lindsey District Council
Address: Guildhall Marshalls Yard Gainsborough
Postcode: DN21 2NA
Email: rachael.hughes@west-lindsey.gov.uk
Tel: 01427 676548
Signature: (not required for electronic submission)

Important information about data protection:

Any comments you make as part of the consultations into the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan will be made public as it is a statutory requirement to publish comments. We will publish these online. If you have any concerns then please contact us. The Councils will however remove personal email addresses, postal addresses, telephone numbers and signatures. Your information will be retained by the Councils as part of our statutory plan making duty, until no later than six months after the Plan is adopted, at which point your information will be securely deleted / destroyed. We will consult you at subsequent stages of the Plan's preparation to seek further comments from you and to keep you informed. If you do not wish to be

contacted at subsequent stages of the Plan, please let us know using the contact details at the top of this page. **By submitting this form you are agreeing to these conditions.**

Part B: Your Comments

If you want to comment on several policies, paragraphs or other matters, please use a separate Part B for each representation. Please provide as much information as possible: for example, if you disagree with a policy please let us know why and tell us what alternative wording or approach you think we should use. If you need more space, please continue on a separate sheet.

Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1	
Theme 1 Introduction, Context, Vision and Objectives	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Theme 1 aligns with the 'People' and 'Place' themes identified in West Lindsey District Council's current Corporate Plan (2019-2023), namely the following areas of focus and corresponding objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Health and Wellbeing• Vulnerable Groups and Communities• Education and Skills• Economy• Housing Growth <p>In addition, theme 1 seeks to address many of the issues identified in West Lindsey's annual State of the District Report, such as social equality and community, employment, the local economy, health and wellbeing and the effects of climate change.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 2: Spatial Strategy</p>
<p>Policy S1 The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Welcome inclusion of Hawthorn Avenue ('Little Cherry') and Scampton (RAF) in medium villages.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Main Town and Market Towns – “growth will <i>primarily</i> be through...” needs to cross reference policy S3 and set out that unallocated sites will need to be compliant with policy S3.</p>	

Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1	Theme 2: Spatial Strategy
Policy S3 Housing in Urban Areas	
Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i>	Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Needs to be bolder and clear in saying that appropriate intensification, infill and brownfield regeneration will be supported.</p> <p>First Homes Exceptions Sites – the Plan needs to specifically set out what Local Design Criteria under NPPF71(b) applies.</p>	

Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1	Theme 2: Spatial Strategy
Policy S4 Housing Development in or Adjacent to Villages	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Support the opportunity to allocate in small and medium villages and the removal of growth percentages including the community support element of the policy.</p> <p>Value to the opportunity to better integrate Neighbourhood planning into the Development Plan to help shape communities from within.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Concern around the ongoing challenge of national policy not aligning or being ‘rural proofed’ for local priorities and needs. Challenge around the concept of sustainability and what this means in rural areas and supporting people to remain in communities they have grown up in.</p> <p>Support the inclusion of the guidance note for Neighbourhood Plans Groups, as consider high value in Neighbourhood Plans, specifically drawing attention to potential sites for the smaller allocations / windfalls. Acknowledge this is a positive and democratic way for communities to shape their future, equally note that current Neighbourhood Plans securing high levels of community support through the referendums.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 2: Spatial Strategy</p>
<p>Policy S5 Development in the Countryside</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Should Part G set out our position on the introduction of more intensive agricultural practices? Such as horticulture glass houses etc. specifically the criteria for landscape impacts and water sustainability?</p> <p>Enquiries for these applications are starting to come in and as such it is considered important to have a policy framework to assess against, particularly as the Central Lincolnshire Area is predominately agricultural.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 3: Energy, Climate Change and Flooding</p>
<p>Generic Theme Commentary</p>	
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Consider that the Local Plan requires one overarching policy, up front to state that all new developments will require an energy statement that addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Energy Hierarchy (paragraph 3.2.3) - Reducing Energy Consumption (see policies S6/S7) - Circular Economy (s9) - Embodied Carbon (S10) - Water Efficiency... (s11) - Electric Vehicle Charging (S17) <p>It should also clearly distinguish between major developments and non-majors. There is a concern that small/medium developers, self-builders will find this insurmountable and delay the delivery of small/medium sites which form a significant part of our land supply.</p> <p>The paragraph below (3.2.3) is a critical element of the policy – it needs to be firmly enshrined within policy(ies) and should be part of the Energy Statements submitted by developers. i.e. they should clearly state how the hierarchy has been addressed in their scheme on a point by point basis to make it easier to assess and ultimately enforce, if necessary.</p> <p>Energy Hierarchy <i>Overall, developers should follow the energy hierarchy as part of all design proposals, and in the following order:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Orientation of buildings</i> 2. <i>Form (i.e. shape and design) of buildings</i> 3. <i>Fabric of buildings</i> 4. <i>Heat supply</i> 5. <i>Renewable energy generated</i> <p><i>The more effort that is put into each step outlined above, the more reward can be achieved, and the least amount needs to be achieved by steps 4 and 5. Put another way, developers should not start their thinking at step 4 or 5; they will be the least effective and most expensive options towards reducing carbon emissions.</i></p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 3: Energy, Climate Change and Flooding</p>
<p>Policy 6: Reducing Energy Consumption – Residential Development</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Support technical and viability exclusions included to support development, particularly in lower value areas or in relation to important heritage assets.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Ensure policies within this theme are not too specific to ensure that new technologies that come in can remain reflected and supported within the Local Plan.</p> <p>Concerns around the practical implication of this policy and Policy S7, goes well beyond planning remit due to cross over with Building Control profession due to function, role and expertise. How could it be feasible to prevent sites being connected to the gas main? Is this a reasonable condition to impose?</p> <p>Development Management officers bound to assess application against the wording of the policy and the policy read alone would be difficult to implement. Equally, terminology used within the policy is unclear. What does on-site mean? Does this mean during construction?</p> <p>It potentially is an unreasonable to include obligations on the developer which homeowners then do not have to implement against any action plan that is produced, as detailed further down the policy.</p> <p>Understand that this is a small first step but essentially national government need to provide focus and direction to ensure this approach is effective, implementable and resourced appropriately. The requirements in terms of assessment and understanding should not be under-estimated. Nor should the impact on housing delivery.</p> <p>Template / pro-forma and guidance is an absolute must and should be available as part of the consultation on the Local Plan at Reg.19 due to the interdependency.</p> <p>This policy should require the setting out of Energy Hierarchy at paragraph 3.2.3 as part of the application.</p>	

Will small-medium developers and self-builders be able to comprehend and address this?

Need to consider resource implications for monitoring every major residential performance over 5 years (will we be consistently chasing up monitoring reports... or being swamped with them?) Will we need to secure these through s106s/legal agreements? Potential to add lengthy delays to applications and layer more cost into the process.

Are we going to use a Local List to require Energy Statements at validation? Or will applications without them simply be in breach of policy S6, delaying the application whilst they seek to undertake one, or we have to refuse PP.

How will developers deal with instances where there is a clash or contradiction between planning permission in place and Building Regulations in force at the time? If a requirement is conditioned/secured through s106 but can't be safely implemented under Building Regulations, would the developer have to apply to vary the condition/s106 agreement to ensure the development conforms to permission given? At whose cost?

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 3: Energy, Climate Change and Flooding</p>
<p>Policy 7: Reducing Energy Consumption – non-Residential Development</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Support there may be some offsetting and other ways that can mitigate the energy usage – policy should not stifle innovation to mitigate or provide solutions.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>

General Comments:

I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:

Ensure policies within this theme are not too specific to ensure that new technologies that come in can remain reflected and supported within the Local Plan.

Concerns around the practical implication of this policy and Policy S6, due to cross over with Building Control profession due to function, role and expertise. Equally non-residential build often more complex due to end use, concern understanding/assessments in this area could be specialised and cause delays in application determination process.

Development Management officers bound to assess application against the wording of the policy and the policy read alone would be difficult to implement. Equally, terminology used within the policy is unclear.

Understand that this is a small first step but essentially national government need to provide focus and direction to ensure this approach is effective.

Template / pro-forma and guidance is an absolute must and should be available as part of the consultation on the Local Plan at Reg.19 due to the interdependency.

This policy should require the setting out of Energy Hierarchy at paragraph 3.2.3 as part of the application.

Will small-medium developers and self-builders be able to comprehend and address this?

Need to consider resource implications for monitoring every major development performance over 5 years (will we be consistently chasing up monitoring reports... or being swamped with them?) Will we need to secure these through s106s?

How will the development of speculative employment units be dealt with under this policy, when the end-user and final fit out will be unknown? As discussed within the policy the variety of uses in a non-residential unit can be vast and ultimately the requirements of the building can be at odds with energy efficiency measures.

Are we going to use a Local List to require Energy Statements at validation? Or will applications without them simply be in breach of policy S7, delaying the application whilst they seek to undertake one, or we have to refuse PP.

How will developers deal with instances where there is a clash or contradiction between planning permission in place and Building Regulations in force at the time? If a requirement is conditioned/secured through s106 but can't be safely implemented under Building Regulations, would the developer have to apply to vary the condition/s106 agreement to ensure the development conforms to permission given? At whose cost?

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 3: Energy, Climate Change and Flooding</p>
<p>Policy: S8 Decentralised Energy Networks and Combined Heat and Power</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>How will the developer / local authority know if there is an “existing decentralised energy network” in the locality? Is there a requirement for an accessible database which captures this information?</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 3: Energy, Climate Change and Flooding</p>
<p>Policy: S9 Supporting a Circular Economy</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Far too vague and broad. What is a “Circular Economy”? What is being asked of the developer? How will this be assessed and considered as part of a planning application and the requirements secured?</p>	

Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1	Theme 3: Energy, Climate Change and Flooding
Policy: S11 Water Efficiency and Sustainable Water Management	
Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i>	Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Concerns that the restriction of water consumption, strays into the remit of Building Regulations and the implementation and monitoring of this would create a duplication of work and inefficiencies with the planning and Building Regulation process, particularly where Building Control inspections are carried out by Approved Inspectors who are under no obligation to undertake this additional check.</p> <p>Is it expected that the Development Management Team or Enforcement intensively monitor all sites once commenced? Is this reasonable and can it be resourced?</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 3: Energy, Climate Change and Flooding</p>
<p>Policy: S12 Reducing Energy Consumption in Existing Buildings</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Consider the requirements of this policy could be bolder and suggest all change of use / (larger) extensions now require a “Reducing Energy Consumption” statement as part of the application.</p> <p>Please can it be clarified whether the term ‘buildings’ include residential buildings? Would be worth specifying both residential and non-residential if that is what is meant.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 3: Energy, Climate Change and Flooding</p>
<p>Policy S13: Renewable Energy</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Accept it is necessary to test public opinion on the issues raised in this policy and acknowledging there has been a shift in public perception.</p> <p>Very important for residents to have a say over their local environments and communities, particularly in relation to this policy area.</p> <p>Support the policy element which ensures that community support is in place for any proposals.</p> <p>Support the opportunity for community involvement at the point of detailed application submission to assess and comment on a range of matters and impacts.</p> <p>Particularly keen to ensure policy supports local community energy generation and community benefits.</p> <p>Consider opportunities around smaller, localised schemes for community/local business benefit as these as far more appropriate for Central Lincolnshire than large scale renewable schemes.</p> <p>Support the specific criteria for assessing solar and small and medium turbines and the separation of large scale renewable schemes.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments:</p> <p><i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Ensure policies within this theme are not too specific to ensure that new technologies that come in can remain reflected and supported within the Local Plan.</p> <p>Wider infrastructure availability is a limiting factor in some cases in relation to large scale renewable scheme and this isn't always possible to deliver through traditional methods due to expense and environmental risks.</p> <p>Is only one small-medium turbine a bit restrictive? Compulsory pre-app consultation (art3 of DMPO2015) doesn't apply for up to 2 turbines where the hub height doesn't exceed 15m.... this may be acceptable in principle?</p>	

Small-medium turbines policy needs to address the “local community support” element of government policy to those where mandatory pre-app consultation is required (art 3 of DMPO) - <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/renewable-and-low-carbon-energy#Do-local-people-have-the-final-say>
Policy (or supporting text) should give a steer as to what level of consultation we’d expect.

“For the avoidance of doubt, any medium to large scale wind turbine proposals outside of the identified Broad Area Suitable for Larger Scale Wind Energy Turbines should [will] be refused.”

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 3: Energy, Climate Change and Flooding</p>
<p>Policy S16: Carbon Sinks</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Where are the plans identifying peatland? Will they form part of the CLLP mapping layer?</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 3: Energy, Climate Change and Flooding</p>
<p>Policy S17: Electric Vehicle Charging</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Policy supported in principle. To be effective, and captured in overall planning application assessment, this requirement needs to be amalgamated into overarching energy statement required from developers.</p> <p>Reference to whether these will be conditions and whether they will require ongoing management for any breaches. i.e ongoing provision of charging points?</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 3: Energy, Climate Change and Flooding</p>
<p>Policy S18: Fossil Fuel Exploration, Extraction, Production or Energy Generation</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Policy is very much welcomed to facilitate a step in the right direction, but considered not to be consistent with the NPPF (chapter 17) as currently drafted.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 3: Energy, Climate Change and Flooding</p>
<p>Policy S19: Resilient and Adaptable Design</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Considered that a lot of information being asked of the developer. All of these policy requirements need setting out in one specific “Energy / Climate Change” document to be produced by the developer, which can then be assessed against a clear check list of inclusions so that both the Developer and the development management team are clear on requirements.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 3: Energy, Climate Change and Flooding</p>
<p>Policy S20: Flood Risk and Water Resources</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Support this policy, however wonder if the policy could go further and require all surfacing to be permeable, rather than having to have areas identified as permeable and areas not. The removal of all hard surfacing would be a positive step.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>A general comment here is one in regards to whether these types of requirements will become conditions (i.e. is there going to be an ongoing expectation that these will feature on the development). See the extract below:</p> <p>Water management In addition to the wider flood and water related policy requirements (Policy S20), all residential development or other development comprising new buildings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • with outside hard surfacing, must ensure such surfacing is permeable (unless there are technical and unavoidable reasons for not doing so in certain areas) thereby reducing energy demand on the water recycling network; • with any flat-roofed area, should be a green roof (for biodiversity, flood risk and water network benefits), unless such roof space is being utilised for photovoltaic or thermal solar panels; and • which is residential and which includes a garden area, must include a rain harvesting Water-butt(s) of minimum 100l capacity. <p>If ensuring these requirements are required to remain in place (in perpetuity), the ability to secure and enforce these to be considered within the plan.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 4 Housing</p>
<p>Policy S21 Affordable Housing</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>The recognition of the diverse nature of the Central Lincolnshire and associated value zones is a positive step and it is hoped will facilitate a positive approach to development and reduce further the use of site specific viability appraisals.</p> <p>Affordable rented housing is detailed in the HNA as the only truly affordable housing tenure across Central Lincolnshire therefore the priority the policy gives to affordable rented as a tenure is supported.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p><i>“Affordable housing should integrate seamlessly into the site layout amongst the private housing.”</i> Can often prove difficult in practice as Registered Providers often require the units grouped together on maintenance grounds.</p> <p>Would suggest that the evidence required for tenure mix should be evidenced through a HNA and through local housing needs data which can provide a more specific picture of needs in the area.</p> <p>The value zones are not clear on the map – should a scheme come in on the boarder, not sure it is clear from the map which value zone it is in as the map is blurs at certain points when zooming in.</p> <p>Is there evidence to suggest that affordable housing is viable to deliver in specialist private schemes? It is considered but not evidenced that an Registered Providers would not take on that type of accommodation within a private setting so it may be unrealistic to expect it to be delivered on-site?</p> <p>Rural affordable housing, the policy doesn't suggest a requirement for community support? But appears it is a requirement of the NPPF? Should that requirement be referenced if not explicitly detailed within the policy?</p> <p>Not clear if it is appropriate to stipulate having affordable rented accommodation on first homes site if the developer wishes to put market housing on there. *Might need to check this requirement/wording.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 4 Housing</p>
<p>Policy S22 Meeting Accommodation Needs</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Does the sentence below require this as part of the application, or not? “viewed favourably” policies are not easy to interpret or indeed implement as the threshold is not defined, for example; if a planning application is fundamentally poor – is it suddenly acceptable if they provide a “viewed favourably” criteria?</p> <p><i>“Proposals which deliver housing at the higher access standards of Part M Building Regulations (Access to and use of buildings) to M4(2) of the Building Regulations or M4(3) standard will be viewed favourably.”</i></p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme: 4 Housing</p>
<p>Policy: NS23: Custom and Self-build Housing</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Support acknowledgement of opportunity for Self Build, particularly on a small scale within communities. Support self-build allocations being led by Neighbourhood Plans and the community.</p> <p>Support the need for plot passports and the defined requirement on large sites, to enable delivery of self-build.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Do self-builds still need to meet policy S6? This should be made clear either way.</p> <p>Is Part 3 a little hidden away? Would a major house-builder see this within our policies? Does it need cross-referencing from a broader residential development policy?</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 4: Housing</p>
<p>Policy S25 – Caravan pitches and park homes</p>	
<p>Support: I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</p>	<p>Object: I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</p>
<p>General Comments: I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</p> <p>Are we missing an opportunity to request contributions on these types of developments?</p> <p>If the land is allocated or suitable for permanent/traditional dwellings, then surely there needs to be a requirement for contributions, specifically affordable housing? It is highly unlikely that a Registered Provider would take on a non-traditional build property and as such should the policy require a commuted sum commensurate with the value of the build proposed in the application?</p> <p>The policy approach to this type of development need to be made more clear especially as this type of application is becoming more frequent.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 5: Employment</p>
<p>Policy S28: Strategic Employment Sites (SES)</p>	
<p>Support: I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</p>	<p>Object: I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</p>
<p>General Comments: I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</p> <p>Hemswell Cliff Business Park Extension, status update: Both Local Development Order and masterplan in place. The site is featured in Hemswell Cliff Neighbourhood Plan which is at draft regulation 14 consultation stage.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme: 5 Employment</p>
<p>Policy: S32 Non-designated Employment Proposals within Identified Settlements</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</p> <p>Opportunity to include reference and a clear position on whether live/work type employment uses will be supported especially given the growing trend of working from home.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme: 5 Employment</p>
<p>Policy: S33 Non-designated Employment Proposals in the Countryside</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</p> <p>The paragraph below implies that a new build can be acceptable, but not reinstating a derelict building, (g) should also require the robust business plan?</p> <p>Opportunity to include reference and a position on whether live/work type employment uses will be supported, especially given the growing trend of working from home.</p> <p>(Page: 71)</p> <p><i>f) If it would involve the construction of a new building in the countryside, the development is supported by a robust business plan that demonstrates;</i></p> <p><i>i. the demand for the development; and</i></p> <p><i>ii. that the facilities to be provided would constitute a viable business proposition on a long-term basis; and</i></p> <p><i>g) In the case of a conversion, the building is not in such a state of dereliction or disrepair that a significant reconstruction would be required.</i></p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 6: Retail City and Town Centres, and District, Local and Village Centres</p>
<p>Policy S34 Network and Hierarchy of Centres</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Support for retail hierarchy and recognition of Local Centres.</p> <p>Very important to protect wherever possible the smaller retail centres / larger village retail centres.</p> <p>Would be keen to see as much protection as possible for these vital facilities, particularly in light of changes to the GPDO coming in Aug 2021.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments:</p> <p><i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Where does Dunholme fit in terms of a village centre?</p> <p>A current problem with LP5... it doesn't properly recognise other tier 2 town centres – i.e. Market Rasen or Caistor, where a robust impact assessment is probably of greater need than anywhere else! It should be revised to say...</p> <p><i>In addition, a robust assessment of impact on nearby centres will be required for any edge-of centre or out-of-centre proposal for retail and leisure use that is located:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) within 1km of the Lincoln, Gainsborough or Sleaford primary shopping area and is greater than 2,500m²; or</i> <i>b) Within 500m of a Town Centre and is greater than 500m²</i> <i>b) within 500m of the boundary of a District Centre and is greater than 300m² gross;</i> <i>c) within 500m of the boundary of a Local Centre and is greater than 200m² gross; or</i> <i>d) in any other location not covered by a-c above and is greater than 500m².</i> <p>No definition of comparison shopping. Not clear where a definition would come from. In order to use this in a policy, it would need to be very clear and a precise referenced definition given, in order to determine applications against this policy. It appears that comparison retail does not include convenience retail i.e. food</p>	

shops. Therefore where does convenience retail sit in the policy?

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 6: Retail City and Town Centres, and District, Local and Village Centres</p>
<p>Policy S36 Gainsborough Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Not all town centre uses fall under Use Class E, we would support any 'town centre uses' within the town centre. Wording below could perhaps be tweaked/expanded to reflect that?</p> <p><i>b) would not result in the over concentration of non-retail uses</i> <i>"Over concentration" needs defining / illustrating – how many changes can take place until we are at "over-concentration"</i></p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 6: Retail City and Town Centres, and District, Local and Village Centres</p>
<p>Policy S38 Market Rasen and Caistor Town Centres</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Specific policy for Caistor and Market Rasen town centres is most welcome!</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 7: Tourism and Visitor Economy</p>
<p>Policy S41 Sustainable Urban Tourism</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Specific policy for sustainable urban tourism is most welcome and considered against S42 Sustainable Rural Tourism!</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 7: Tourism and Visitor Economy</p>
<p>Policy S42 Sustainable Rural Tourism</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Specific policy for sustainable rural tourism is most welcome and considered against S42 Sustainable Urban Tourism!</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Supporting text: Para: 7.2.2 (page 89) Please add: <i>the Wolds are a destination for walkers, cyclists and for outdoor pursuits</i></p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 8: Transport & Infrastructure</p>
<p>Policy S44 Strategic Infrastructure Requirements</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Co-location of health facilities is fully supported giving the opportunity for early intervention and new service models opening up opportunities for a system wide approach.</p> <p>Health: As stated engagement with the NHS is required to implement this policy effectively.</p> <p>Transport: Understand that the emphasis on areas of development being closer to amenities, reducing travel. However, also need to ensure that developments have the space required (driveways) for low and ultra-low emission vehicle refuelling infrastructure.</p> <p>Walking & Cycling: Agree that the infrastructure needs to be considered from the outset and integral to the design and development of all schemes.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Walking & Cycling: All partners need to work collaboratively on behaviour change otherwise the infrastructure will not be fit for purpose and therefor under-utilised.</p> <p>Community Facilities: Unfortunately most community facilities are underutilised. There is no easy answer to understanding usage of these facilities and to enable a case to be built to support existing community facilities which can keep pace with growth, whilst continuing to provide a quality offer.</p> <p>Open Spaces: Support the policy, however, there needs to be increased onus on the management and safeguarding of these spaces to ensure they are properly maintained and provisioned into the future.</p> <p>Education: Continued capacity levels within educational setting remain an issue in certain areas of the District/Central Lincolnshire area, which only exacerbates inequalities across areas.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 8 – Transport and Infrastructure</p>
<p>Policy S47 Walking and Cycling Infrastructure</p>	
<p>Support: I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</p> <p>The policy supports accelerated transition towards active travel impacting on improved air quality as well as health and wellbeing outcomes. Demonstrates the link between the environment and health and offers the opportunity to deliver on both simultaneously, which is welcome.</p>	<p>Object: I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</p>
<p>General Comments:</p> <p>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</p> <p>In the policy, it mentions protecting existing infrastructure for walking and cycling, this could go a little further in terms of proposals not being supported at all if existing walking and cycling infrastructure is not protected, specifically if a proposal do away with a cycle lane or footpath, it couldn't go ahead, unless it is replaced/relocated to allow continued usage.</p> <p>On site provision of open space should be of such that it can make a meaningful contribution to both the environment and health and wellbeing. Could emphasis be placed on opportunities to 'pool' contributions to provide enhanced provision off site and recognise the challenges of ongoing management of these areas/facilities?</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 8: Transport & Infrastructure</p>
<p>Policy S49 Community Facilities</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Should also cross reference with policy S39 – regarding loss of “local community use” shops in villages.</p>	

Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1	Theme 8: Transport & Infrastructure
Policy S50 Creation of New Open Space, Sports and Leisure Facilities	
Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i>	Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>This policy indicates a clear preference for on-site open space creation for new developments with 10 plus dwellings. There are many examples of poor quality open space creation within new site development purely to meet the planning policy requirements. They regular lack wider community benefit and do not have longer term sustainability factored. Preference should equally split between either new or existing open spaces within suitable proximity of a new development. Existing open spaces will see increased usage from new developments in its proximity.</p> <p>Please can Mercer Wood in Gainsborough be identified as an important green space as part of the review as it wasn't included last time.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 8: Transport & Infrastructure</p>
<p>Policy S51 Universities and Colleges</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>This policy may benefit from referencing other college sites within the Central Lincs area such as Lincoln College campus in Gainsborough.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 9: Design and Amenity</p>
<p>Policy S52 Design and Amenity</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Good quality mature trees are proven in various studies/papers to improve the desirability of a property and to increase property prices. Retaining and designing in appropriate space for existing trees, with arboriculture impact considerations regarding proximity, orientation, positioning in relation to windows, usable garden space etc. should help raise the quality of new developments.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>How would the criteria below be assessed? Is there a defined standard/good practice guide which could be referred to? If so, this should be detailed within the policy.</p> <p><i>“c) Ensure areas are accessible, safe and legible for all including people with physical accessibility difficulties and people with conditions such as dementia or sight impairment for example;”</i></p>	

Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1	Theme 9 Design and Amenity
Policy S53 Health and Wellbeing	
Support: I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:	Object: I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Support the principle of the policy however it could be considered that it falls short of what could be achieved through the planning system (see below).</p> <p>The expectation of the policy is that development proposals promote, support and enhance physical and mental health and wellbeing – thus contributing to reducing health inequalities. Health inequalities are ultimately about the differences in the status of people’s health however the opportunities that they have to lead healthy lives contributes to their health status. The planning system has an important role to play in influencing the determinants of health which should be maximised</p> <p>Developer contributions are provided in line with the SPD towards new or enhanced health facilities. In order to really tackle health inequalities is there an opportunity to develop a more system wide approach and proactively engage with health partners to encourage innovation and a shift away from asset based responses.</p> <p>This needs further development but as an example are there opportunities for developer contributions from health partners to contribute towards physical activity within a community rather than rooms in a GP surgery.</p> <p>Relationships with those responding to planning consultations should be further developed to encourage cross departmental consideration of what could be achieved through the planning system.</p> <p>Does the policy encourage innovation and creativity to enable health and wellbeing outcomes?</p> <p>We should also seek to understand the outcomes from Health Impact Assessments and influence where possible to ensure these are not just a box ticking exercise and that outputs are addressed and acted upon.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 11: Natural Environment</p>
<p>Policy S58: Green Infrastructure Network</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Agree with the policy, but the resource and capacity barriers facing Local Authorities makes the implementation of the policy very challenging.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments:</p> <p>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</p> <p>Policy S62, S63, S64 & S65: Agree entirely regarding the proposals and policies, however, similar to the above, there is a distinct lack of capacity within large rural authorities for green space management.</p> <p>Very few developers include appropriate consideration for existing natural features such as hedges, trees, watercourses. Even when developers have a tree report carried out, recommendations are rarely fully implemented and layout designs often allow too little space for trees to thrive and be retained, leading to nuisance to new residents and the prospect of being removed.</p> <p>It is important to consider the wider context of the development site in relation to how it fits in with and connects with its surrounding landscape or townscape. However, quite often only the confines of the site boundary are considered during the design process and often developers don't even want to retain good quality boundary hedges or proposed new hedges if it means they can have houses closer to a road and squeeze more properties in. This has happened on a number of developments where frontage hedgerows are allowed to be removed against the advice of professionals and the Lincs Wildlife Trust). Hedgerows are 'priority habitats' in the Lincs & UK BAPS & NERC Act, important as wildlife corridors (part of the green infrastructure network). This policy should work hand in hand with the Environment Bill 2020 (when it eventually receives Royal Assent).</p> <p>Q – what if the 'greenery' ends at a road, or is not physically connected to other 'greenery', would a developer be able to argue that their hedgerow or groups of trees is not an integral part of a green infrastructure network?</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 11: Natural Environment</p>
<p>Policy S59: Protecting Biodiversity and Geodiversity</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>It emphasises the importance of these sites and requires developers to give adequate care and consideration to such sites and the flora and fauna within them or that visit them, for the benefit of all.</p> <p>The hierarchy and staged approach to assessment detailed within this policy makes perfect sense and is very transparent.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Part One: Designated Sites, point 3:</p> <p>This para says <i>'planning permission will be refused for development resulting in loss, deterioration or fragmentation of irreplaceable habitats..... unless there are wholly exceptional reasons and a suitable compensation strategy will be delivered.'</i></p> <p>Is this misleading as the whole point of an irreplaceable habitat is that it cannot be replaced... it is irreplaceable! Unclear what a "wholly exceptional reason" could be, as that could differ from one person to another. Not clear on how a "compensation strategy" could be put in place and delivered, as it would be impossible to come anywhere close to replacing or compensating for the loss of such a habitat. Even if the same species of trees, plants, grasses etc.. can be found a new location to be planted nearby, it would take decades, probably centuries, to sufficiently establish, mature, and attract the same level of biodiversity as what was lost, if ever! If a habitat is so important and special that it is irreplaceable then under no circumstances should planning permission ever be granted that would destroy, deteriorate or fragment such a site?</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 11: Natural Environment</p>
<p>Policy S60: Biodiversity Opportunity and Delivering Measurable Net Gains</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Using national standards for consistency is positive and ensures effective implementation and transparency.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 11: Natural Environment</p>
<p>Policy S61: Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Areas of Great Landscape Value</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Agree with the policy position however in some cases the interpretation and implementation within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty can be challenging and create barriers to innovation and development where there shouldn't be.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments:</p> <p>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</p> <p>Agree with the policy position however in some cases the interpretation and implementation within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty can be challenging and create barriers to innovation and development where a pragmatic approach should be taken.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 11: Natural Environment</p>
<p>Policy S62: Green Wedges</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Fully support this policy, however have some concerns in relation to the appropriate management of these spaces, particularly resources and capacity of Local Authorities/Parishes to support where necessary.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments:</p> <p>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 11: Natural Environment</p>
<p>Policy S63: Local Green Spaces</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Fully support this policy, however have some concerns in relation to the appropriate management of these spaces, particularly resources and capacity of Local Authorities/Parishes to support where necessary.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments:</p> <p>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 11: Natural Environment</p>
<p>Policy S63: Local Green Spaces</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Fully support this policy, however have some concerns in relation to the appropriate management of these spaces, particularly resources and capacity of Local Authorities/Parishes to support where necessary.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments:</p> <p>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 11: Natural Environment</p>
<p>Policy S64: Important Open Space</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Fully support this policy, however have some concerns in relation to the appropriate management of these spaces, particularly resources and capacity of Local Authorities/Parishes to support where necessary.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments:</p> <p>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 11: Natural Environment</p>
<p>Policy S65: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Fully support this policy, however have some concerns in relation to the appropriate management of these spaces, particularly resources and capacity of Local Authorities/Parishes to support where necessary.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>Full consideration should be given to section 197 duty to consider the protection and planting of trees, and unless it's got important biodiversity/habitat, in the AONB/AGLV, a special site (SSSI, LWS etc...), green wedge, open spaces, or a TPO, they place little importance on the average tree or hedge around a field or in someone's garden. This policy should reinforce that appropriate tree survey data should be provided so any tree or hedge should still be given appropriate consideration, protected and be retained where appropriate without it having to have some special designation on it. We regularly get applicants/agent submitting plans and documents that show no trace of any trees being present, even though there are trees on or adjacent to the site.</p> <p>The policy says hedgerows are expected to be retained where appropriate, and development involving the loss of a hedgerow protected under The Hedgerows Regulations 1997 under certain circumstances. However under The Hedgerows Regulations all countryside hedgerows over 30 years old are protected, and the processes and criteria in the legislation determine which hedgerows are "important" for retention.</p> <p>The policy does not mention a need for a hedgerow survey to be submitted with an application that proposes hedgerow removal. Unless a hedgerow survey is supplied, it is unknown whether or not a specific hedgerow is classed as "important" under The Hedgerows Regulations. There is no duty of the Local Planning Authority to survey hedgerows within a development site to understand if the hedgerow meets the criteria to be "important", therefore the data should be supplied as part of the application process.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 15: Ministry of Defence Establishments</p>
<p>Policy S74 RAF Scampton</p>	
<p>Support: <i>I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p> <p>Support the approach, level of detail and vision set out within the policy.</p>	<p>Object: <i>I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</i></p>
<p>General Comments:</p> <p>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</p>	

Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1	Theme:
--	--------

Policy S79 Housing Sites in Large Villages

<p>Support: I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</p>	<p>Object: I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</p>
--	---

General Comments:
I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:

The indicative number of houses detailed for site WL/CW/001 is incorrect. As presented this provides a density of around 7dpha. Consider, based on published methodology that the indicative number should be more in the region of 116 dwellings, in line with the HELAA,

WL/CW/001	south of Station Road Land North of Rudgard Avenue, Cherry Willingham	5.17	40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development to be completed as Phase 1 • Development to provide pedestrian and cycle connectivity routes across CW/002 and 003.
WL/CW/002	Land East of Rudgard	5.93	133	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development to be completed

It would help site identification if settlement name included in all site addresses.

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	<p>Theme 13: Site Allocations</p>
<p>Policy S80: Housing Sites in Medium Villages</p>	
<p>Support: I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</p>	<p>Object: I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>It would help site identification if settlement name included in all site addresses.</p>	

<p>Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1</p>	
<p>Policy - Appendix 1: Housing Requirement for Neighbourhood Plans</p>	
<p>Support: I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</p>	<p>Object: I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:</p>
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>It would be helpful if this Appendix had a policy link.</p>	

Which document, site, policy, paragraph or other matter are you commenting on? e.g. Policy 1	Additional Appendix – planning application checklist / Local List
Policy	
Support: I support the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:	Object: I object to the above referenced document/ site / policy / paragraph because:
<p>General Comments: <i>I neither support nor object to the above referenced site / policy / paragraph but I make the following observations:</i></p> <p>The Local Plan now requires significantly more information to make a planning application than ever before – and these requirements are spread throughout the Local Plan and policies in various places. There needs to be a clear checklist for developers – suggest as an appendix?</p> <p>i.e.</p> <p>Major Residential Developments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Energy Statement (see policies S6, S8, S9, S11 etc.) ○ Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (policy S20) ○ Affordable Housing details (S21) ○ Housing Mix (S22) ○ Strategic Infrastructure statement (S44) ○ Car parking provision (S17, S48) ○ Etc.... <p>This should also become a Local List across the Central Lincolnshire Authorities to ensure consistency of approach.</p>	

Please tick if you are submitting more information relating to the above representation

Please submit your comments to: talkplanning@central-lincs.org.uk or Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team, c/o North Kesteven District Council, Kesteven Street, Sleaford NG34 7EF.
If you need assistance, call 01529 414155 or email talkplanning@central-lincs.org.uk.

Thank you for taking the time to respond

Prosperous Communities Committee Workplan (as of 21 July 2021)

Purpose:

The table below provides a summary of reports that are due on the Forward Plan for the remainder of the Civic Year.

Recommendation:

1. That members note the contents of this document.

Title	Lead Officer	Purpose of the report
29 JULY 2021		
Draft Local Plan Consultation Response	Rachael Hughes, Development Contributions Officer	To agree the formal response by West Lindsey District Council to the Central Lincolnshire Draft Local Plan Consultation
14 SEPTEMBER 2021		
Supporting Growth and Regeneration in Market Rasen - update	Wendy Osgodby, Senior Growth Strategy & Projects Officer, Amanda Bouttell, Senior Project and Growth Officer	Development of Historic Building Grant for Market Rasen
UK Resettlement Scheme	Andy Lee, Senior Homelessness Prevention Officer	An update around Lincolnshire's current refugee resettlement plans
to Consider Proposals from the Jubilee Group	Trudi Hayes, Democratic & Civic Officer	to allow jubilee group established in July 2021 to report back there proposed plan for sign off , in order to allow for delivery from sept onwards
Selective Licensing - Future Options and Proposals	Andy Gray, Housing and Enforcement Manager	To provide Councillors with information on the options available in relation to a future Selective Licensing Scheme and seek approval to consult upon these.
Membership of Keep Britain Tidy and implementation of DEFRA voluntary Code of Conduct	Ady Selby, Assistant Director of Commercial	Response for Committee following motion at full Council on the following points -

and Operational Services (b) by way of report to Prosperous Communities Committee, examine the merits of becoming a local authority member of the Keep Britain Tidy Network, and identify which of the campaign's including Love Parks and Charity Bins, could be introduced in the District; (d) by way of report to Prosperous Communities Committee, investigate whether promoting take-up of the DEFRA voluntary code amongst our fast food businesses and local business partnerships is appropriate and investigate the resource and capacity implications, of seeking their sponsorship for the introduction of a Charity Bin scheme and for a public education programme. Prosperous Communities Committee are charged with making a formal decision in respect of this aspect of the motion.

Page 80

Annual Update on Health related work	Diane Krochmal, Assistant Director Homes and Communities	to provide Members with an update on Health related work
Economic Recovery Plan	Sally Grindrod-Smith, Assistant Director of Planning and Regeneration	Consideration of the Greater Lincolnshire Economic Recovery Plan and the West Lindsey response
Transport and Connectivity Programme	Grant White, Enterprising Communities Manager	To approve a refreshed Transport
Selective Licensing - Gainsborough Scheme Review	Andy Gray, Housing and Enforcement Manager	To provide Councillors with information on the Gainsborough Selective Licensing Scheme in place between 2015 and 2020

2 NOVEMBER 2021

Corporate Enforcement Policy	Andy Gray, Housing and Enforcement Manager	To review and approve the Corporate Enforcement Policy
Local Enforcement Plan (Planning Enforcement) and Customer Charter	Andy Gray, Housing and Enforcement Manager	To seek approval for the updated Local Enforcement

Plan (Planning Enforcement) and Customer Charter

Progress and Delivery Quarter 2, 2021-22	Ellen King, Senior Performance Officer	This report presents performance against the Council's key performance indicators for quarter two (July - September), 2021-22.
Strategic Visitor Economy Strategy	Wendy Osgodby, Senior Growth Strategy & Projects Officer	<p>Support for the Visitor Economy is embedded within West Lindsey District Council's Corporate Plan, under the theme 'A prosperous and enterprising district' as follows:</p> <p>Vision: 'Creating local wealth through the visitor economy'</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Increasing number of visitors / length of stay -Increasing expenditure by visitors -Developing leisure, culture and recreational offer -Increasing the quality and number of businesses / jobs in the sector <p>Therefore, it is clear that support for developing our Visitor Economy sits at the centre of our strategy for the future of the district.</p>
Operational Services Separate Paper and Card Collections	Ady Selby, Assistant Director of Commercial and Operational Services	Proposal to provide residents with separate paper/card collections. This is part of a programme to improve the quality of dry recycle and has already been rolled out in Boston, with North Kesteven due to deliver in Autumn 2021
7 DECEMBER 2021		
Public Health Funerals Policy	Andy Gray, Housing and Enforcement Manager	To seek approval for the Policy relating to Public Health Funerals, for which the Council is responsible for under S46 of the Public Health (Control of Disease) Act 1984.
Hemswell Cliff Managed Estate Contract	Shayleen Towns, Senior Community Action Officer	WLDC contract to manage a private estate at Hemswell Cliff is a 5 year contract 1 July 2018 to 31 March 2023.

This report is ask members to consider a further 5 years
from 1 April 2023.
