



Issues and Options Consultation Response Form

Your views are being sought on the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Review Issues and Options Consultation which is open from **6 June to 18 July 2019**. The Issues and Options consultation document can be viewed at <https://central-lincs.inconsult.uk> along with other supporting information. The consultation document includes a number of questions on proposals and options for the plan review for which your opinion is being sought.

This form can be used to respond to the consultation as an alternative to the online questionnaire. Responses should be submitted to the Local Plan Team at talkplanning@central-lincs.org.uk or via post to: Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team, District Council Offices, Kesteven Street, Sleaford, NG34 7EF.

Comments must be received by 23:59 on 18 July 2019, late comments will not be accepted.

Part A: Your Details

Respondent details	Agent details (where applicable)
Name* : Prosperous Communities Committee on behalf of West Lindsey District Council	Name: Insert agent name here
Organisation: West Lindsey District Council	Organisation: Insert agent organisation here
Address* : Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, DN21 2NA	Address: Insert agent postal address here
Email: Rachael.hughes@west-lindsey.gov.uk	Email: Insert agent email address here
Tel: 01427 676548	Tel: Insert respondent telephone number here

* indicates required field

Important information about data protection

Your responses will be processed in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and your personal information will never be sold or shared for marketing purposes.

Any comment you make as part of the consultations relating to the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan cannot be treated as confidential and will be made public as it is a statutory requirement to publish comments. These will be published online. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the Local Plan Team. Published content will not include email addresses, postal addresses, and telephone numbers. As copies of representations must be made available for public inspection, they will be available for inspection in full.

Your information will be retained by the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team as part of the statutory plan making duty, until no later than 6 months after the Plan is adopted, at which point your information will be securely deleted, unless you confirm that you wish for it to be retained. If you wish to be contacted at subsequent stages of the Plan preparation to keep you informed and to allow you to submit further comments please tick this box.

By submitting your response you are agreeing to these conditions and to your information being processed in line with our privacy notice available at: www.central-lincs.org.uk/contact.

Part B: Your response

This response form only includes the questions being asked in the Issues and Options consultation and should be read with the main consultation document which includes the proposals to which each question relates.

Q1 – The Vision	
Do you agree that the Vision should remain the same for the new plan with only the plan period and housing growth level being updated?	
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Yes, in the light of the Local Plan only being adopted 2years ago it is appropriate that the vision and objectives should remain the same.	

Q2 – Objectives	
Do you agree that the Objectives should remain the same for the new plan?	
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: As above	

Q3 – Policies not intended to be changed	
Do you agree with the list of proposed policies that are not intended to be changed significantly in the new plan? If not please provide details.	
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: LP7 requires some additional narrative in relation to types of tourism uses, policy states tourism provision currently required to be adjacent to settlements, however clarity required in relation to holiday accommodation such as caravan sites? LP8 requires some minor adjustment in relation to wording to bring it up to date. Consideration given to clarifying uses accepted on identified green wedges in LP 22.	

Q4 – Plan Period	
Do you agree with the proposed plan period of 2018-2040? If not please provide details.	
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: A forward looking plan is appropriate in the context of National Planning Policy	

Q5a – Tiers of the Hierarchy

Do you think the 8 tiers of the Settlement Hierarchy should be retained in the new Local Plan? If not, please provide details of what changes you think should be made.

Yes

No

Comments: Identifying the tier in which a settlement fits in is a useful reference point. However consideration must be given to the rurality of parts of the Central Lincolnshire and as such understanding the functional geography and economic interdependence of clusters of villages is equally as important in order to allow communities to meet their needs and evolve sustainably which is a principle supported by para. 78 in NPPF.

Q5b – Defining the Tiers of the Hierarchy

Do you think that the number of houses in a settlement should be used to define what tier of the hierarchy it is within? If not, please provide details of what you think should be used.

Yes

No

Comments: Accept that this is an easily defined approach, however it doesn't necessarily represent how villages function together and provided complimentary facilities/services, as reference in the response to Q5a. Would be beneficial to consider a cluster model alongside existing hierarchy.

Q5c – Threshold for Tiers in the Hierarchy

Do you think the dwelling number thresholds (i.e. 750+ for Large Villages, 250-749 for Medium Villages, etc.) for what tier of the hierarchy a village is within should be retained?

Yes

No

Comments: Notwithstanding the Settlement Hierarchy Methodology would welcome further definition in relation to the development areas included which influences the tiers. Accept that a return to settlement boundaries is not for consideration however further detail on the rationale for inclusion/exclusion welcomed. Would also help with the understanding of the relationship between larger and smaller settlements which to all intense and purposes function together despite having a strong individual identity, for example: Osgodby, Kingerby & Kirkby Also the new approach to assessment has led to some contradictory results, for example Riby was a small village but is now considered not and has been split. This is not the reality in relation to the actual operation of the village. Concerned there may be others where this unintended consequence has occurred.

Q5d – Allocations in the Hierarchy

In what tiers do you think housing sites should be allocated in the new Local Plan? (please tick all that apply)

Lincoln Urban Area

Main Towns

Market Towns

Large Villages

Medium Villages

Small Villages

Hamlets

Countryside

Comments: Support the opportunity to allocate sites in small and medium villages. This approach recognises the rurality of the area, maintains a planned growth approach whilst helping sustain existing facilities such as village schools and ensure the community remains vibrant.

Q5e – Settlements in the Hierarchy

Are there any comments you would like to make about the proposed Settlement Hierarchy provided in Appendix A? Please provide details

Yes

No

Comments: Similar to comments in Q5c. Greater understanding as to how the village boundaries and numbers have been calculated in relation to address points. Taking the specific example of Middle Rasen, this has moved from a large to a medium village. Is this a reflection of a reassessment of the Parish boundary and the change in data source?

Q6a – Housing Need and Requirement - Inclusion of a Range

Do you agree with the use of a range for identifying the housing need and requirement for Central Lincolnshire?

Yes

No

Comments: Yes, this means the lower need figure may be used for monitoring housing delivery whilst providing a higher figure to accord with the vision of the Local Plan including growth aspirations of the plan.

Q6b – Housing Need and Requirement – Bottom end of the Range

Do you agree with using the Local Housing Need figure as the bottom end of the range? If no, please provide a clear explanation of what alternative you think should be used and justification for this alternative.

Yes

No

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Q6c – Housing Need and Requirement – Top end of the Range

Do you agree with using 1,300 dwellings as the top end of the range and as the number which the new Local Plan will help facilitate to be delivered? If no, please provide a clear explanation of what alternative you think should be used and justification for this alternative.

Yes

No

Comments: Yes, as it demonstrates that the plan whilst meeting need continues to have an aspiration for promoting sustainable growth too. Yes, as it demonstrates that the plan whilst meeting need continues to have an aspiration for prmomrting sustainable growth too.

Q7a – Lincoln Strategy Area

Do you agree that the Lincoln Strategy Area should remain as the focus for growth in Central Lincolnshire? If not, please provide details and any alternative proposals.

Yes

No

Comments: Generally should be a focus for development however concerns in relation to the large geographical area included in the boundary which appears to include less accessible areas and excludes some of those villages which are more accessible and sustainable due to their location on main routes from the city. If the LSA remains a focus for growth villages sited on economic corridors should be considered a higher priority for development than those in the rural areas of land between the key economic corridors.

Q7b – Gainsborough and Sleaford

Do you agree that Gainsborough and Sleaford should remain as a focus for growth? If not, please provide details and any alternative proposals.

Yes

No

Comments: The development of the main Towns of North Kesteven and West Lindsey should remain a priority, however where it is clearly demonstrated that development is slow or will not come forward in these areas then alternatives options should be explored to ensure that development within the whole Central Lincolnshire area is effectively managed through a plan led system. The Plan must seek to avoid where possible a deluge of speculative development in areas already under significant pressure.

Q7c – Breaking down the “Elsewhere” category

Do you agree that the “Elsewhere” category should be broken down further to address deliverability? If so, what break down do you think should be used to reflect sustainability and/or market considerations?

Yes

No

Comments: Given the rurality of the rest of the District and a lack of evidence to suggest other specific housing and economic markets exists the ‘elsewhere’ category appears to be an appropriate approach. However further research should be undertaken to support this assumption, as consideration must be given to other housing and economic sub-markets that have been created as a result of activity beyond the boundaries of Central Lincolnshire. Consider that further evidence may be collated as part of the Whole Plan Viability Assessment undertaken as part of the Local Plan Review, which may indicate other sub-markets, if this is the case these should be referenced within the plan and Policy drafted to reflect these accordingly, which could include a more proactive approach to the promotion of these sub-market for developments and being ‘open for business’ to further stimulate economic activity.

Q7d – Consideration of the Market and Deliverability

Do you agree that market capacity and deliverability should be considered before choosing what growth to distribute to which area?

Yes

No

Comments: Deliverability of sites is absolutely key in ensuring that growth levels can be achieved. Equally however market capacity will have an impact on this and a greater understanding of factors which effect this should be prioritised as part of site assessments of new and existing allocations.

Q8 – Sustainable Urban Extensions

Do you agree that the Sustainable Urban Extensions in the 2017 Local Plan should be carried forward into the new Local Plan with policies updated to account for the latest situation on each Sustainable Urban Extension? If not, please provide details of any alternative proposals.

Yes No

Comments: The principle and reliance on Sustainable Urban Extension within the Local Plan remains, therefore allocations should where appropriate be carried forward. However a more in depth understanding of each of the sustainable urban extensions is necessary and evidence of deliverability in both the short term (5yrs) and through the plan period should be sought from SUE promoters to ensure that the size of allocation and approach to phasing is still deliverable within the plan period to mitigate the risk of future under delivery and potential negative impact of speculative development on other settlements across Central Lincolnshire.

Q9a – Housing Allocation Threshold

Do you agree with the proposed revised lower threshold of 10 dwellings or more, in terms of minimum site size for allocations? If not please provide an alternative suggestion and justification for this.

Yes No

Comments: Agree with this approach as it reflects the rurality of the area and supports the principle of planned growth, however consideration should be given to the appropriateness of allocations of 10 or more in small villages and how this could work if a cluster model was followed as part of the review.

Q9b – Location of Housing Allocations

Do you think more settlements should receive site allocations and if so what do you think should be taken into account in deciding which settlements should receive allocations?

Yes No

Comments: Appropriately sized developments support the sustainability of small rural areas. Deliverability and viability of sites should be a key consideration when assessing allocations. Following on from comments made in relation to question 5a-e consideration should be given to the opportunity for assessing settlements that operate within a cluster who offer one another complementary services/facilities to support sustainable growth in a rural context and provide greater choice of areas for allocation.

Q10a – Retaining Housing Allocations from the 2017 Local Plan

Do you agree with the principle of carrying forward site allocations from the 2017 Local Plan where they are still considered suitable for development?

Yes No

Comments: Yes but an assessment of each existing allocation must be undertaken including consideration given to the appropriateness of the development in todays context and acknowledging changes of circumstances which may impact on the deliverability, existing infrastructure, character of the settlement and where appropriate also vaibility.

Q10b – Deallocating Housing Allocations from the 2017 Local Plan

Do you agree that where there is evidence that a housing allocation from the 2017 Local Plan is no longer suitable or available, or where there has been a lack of sufficient progress on the site that it should be deallocated in the new Local Plan?

Yes

No

Comments: Where there has been no evidenced progress made in connection with development on allocated sites from the 2017 Local Plan, serious consideration should be given to removing the sites allocated status. The requirement for the Local Authority to demonstrate not only a supply but also delivery makes it imperative that all allocations made as part of this review are not only deliverable on paper but that there is a willingness by the land owner and agent to see the site brought forward.

Q11a – Use of a Growth Level for Villages

Do you agree with the principle of using a percentage growth level for villages? If not please provide alternative suggestion.

Yes

No

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Q11b – 10% Baseline Growth Level

Do you think that, like it is in the 2017 Local Plan, using a 10% baseline for village growth is appropriate? Please provide details of what you think is appropriate if you do not agree.

Yes

No

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Q11c – Increasing Growth Level

Do you agree that this baseline percentage should be boosted where certain sustainability criteria are satisfied?

Yes

No

Comments: Although consideration must be given to the aspiration of the existing communities, specifically where there is a Neighbourhood Plan in place.

Q11d – Criteria for Increasing Growth Level

Should the criteria used in the 2017 Local Plan for increasing the growth level of a village above the baseline percentage continue to be used or should alternative criteria be used? Please provide details if you propose an alternative.

Yes

No

Comments: Yes, however consider the criteria should be updated to reflect more accurately the reality of the rural parts of the District and acknowledge that services and facilities with demonstrate sustainability in a National sense do not always successfully translate to rural areas. Therefore growth levels should be considered where appropriate across a cluster of villages/settlements and where appropriate those identified within Neighbourhood Plans.

Q11e – 15% Increased Growth Levels

Do you agree that 15% is the maximum that a growth level should be set at? If you disagree, please provide details of what percentage you think is appropriate and why.

Yes

No

Comments: Yes, although there is evidence to suggest that the opportunity to use 'community support' to exceed these levels is not working appropriately as the process and interpretation causes confusion. It is considered that the best way to deal with settlements that seek to secure additional growth over and above that which is detailed within in the plan is through the Neighbourhood Plan process.

Q12 – Preferred Approach for Growth in Villages

Do you think the preferred approach to reviewing the growth level for villages in the new Local Plan is appropriate? If not, please provide details of what alternative approach you would suggest.

Yes

No

Comments: Yes it acknowledges where growth targets have been met and makes an allowance for planned growth with the benefit of planning permission but also ensures that the Local Plan retains a positive approach to growth within the Central Lincolnshire area.

Q13a – Affordable Housing Requirements

Do you agree that any new need for affordable housing arising from evidence being produced should be addressed in the new Local Plan? If no, please provide justification.

Yes

No

Comments: The Central Lincolnshire Housing Needs Assessment is expected to provide further clarity on the new definitions of affordable housing as detailed in the NPPF 2019 (as amended). The Affordable Housing policy LP11 will therefore need to be amended to address any need the assessment identifies to ensure that the policy is capable meeting need.

Q13b – Affordable Housing Delivery

Do you think there is more that the new Local Plan should do to deliver additional affordable housing? If yes, please provide details.

Yes

No

Comments: Support the provision of innovative approach to delivery of affordable housing. Current interpretation of the policy appears to be if a site is being delivered as fully affordable, according to LP11 that would be an over delivery of affordable housing based on a requirement of 20-25% depending on area. Could LP11 be amended to reflect the opportunity to provide more than 20-25% affordable housing to meet other identified need as it is acknowledge in the West Lindsey Housing Strategy 2018-2022 that the planning system alone will not deliver all the affordable housing required in our area. With LP11 stating only 20-25% on all sites can be delivered as affordable housing. This could be interpreted that a site offering more than that is not meeting this policy. Support the provision of innovative approach to delivery of affordable housing. Current interpretation of the policy appears to be if a site is being delivered as fully affordable, according to LP11 that would be an over delivery of affordable housing based on a requirement of 20-25% depending on area. Could LP11 be amended to reflect the opportunity to provide 20-25% affordable housing as a minimum? It is acknowledge in the West Lindsey Housing Strategy 2018-2022 that the planning system alone will not deliver all the affordable housing required in our area, but LP11 is stating only 20-25% on all sites can be delivered as affordable housing. This could be interpreted that a site offering more than that is not meeting this policy.

Q14 – Entry-Level Exception Sites
How do you think the new Local Plan should address the need for entry-level housing? Please provide reasons for your answer.

Comments: The Central Lincolnshire Housing Needs Assessment is expected to identify a need for entry level housing. It is likely that this need is not going to be met entirely through the planning system which appears to be supported by the introduction of the new entry-level exception site policy in the NPPF. The new NPPF does not give many options for refusing such applications as the policy is so specific, as such the plan does need to acknowledge the new policy but it will not be able to put barriers in place to prevent this type of site being granted permission. The Local Plan should take the opportunity in the review to address Central Lincolnshire’s understanding of entry –level exception sites and how they intend to be approached by Central Lincolnshire, for example Entry level exception sites should support the needs identified within the Local Plan where sufficient development sites have not been identified or delivered and what a planning application for an entry level exception should include.

Q15a – Retaining Employment Site Allocations and Designations
Do you agree that the existing employment allocations (Strategic Employment Sites, land for employment within the Sustainable Urban Extensions, and Established Employment Sites) should be brought forward into the new Local Plan unless evidence suggests that they are no longer suitable or deliverable? If not, please provide details.

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----------------------------

Comments: Strategic Employment Sites should be retained, however further work should be undertaken with specific promoters to establish their future vision for the site. In relation to allocations on the Sustainable Urban Extensions, this will be dependent on whether the scale of the SUEs are altered as part of the wider allocation. Again reference to evidence of deliverability and motivation to promote future deliverability is imperative in this context.

Q15b – Increasing Flexibility on Established Employment Areas

Do you agree that greater flexibility for other uses should be provided for Established Employment Areas where this would not undermine their role and function? If not, please explain why.

Yes

No

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Q15c – Definition for Local Employment Sites

Do you agree that the new Local Plan should include greater definition of what is a Local Employment Site under the employment policy and do you agree with the proposed definition? If not, please provide details.

Yes

No

Comments: Do not agree with the exclusion of land and buildings recently used in agriculture, as feel the promotion of diversification and the rural economy should be supported/promoted. However, is there scope to introduce a cap so that the more incidental development will not develop to a scale which competes with the existing strategic employment or established employment areas?

Q15d – Detail for Employment Sites in the Countryside

Do you agree that the new Local Plan should include definition of what development is or is not acceptable on employment sites in the open countryside? If not, please explain why.

Yes

No

Comments: Accept the principle of a definition but would want to ensure that it is not too restrictive, ensuring a balance between a working landscape and visitor economy.

Q16a – City and Town Centres

Do you agree that the new Local Plan should try to address the challenging retail environment through positively responding to issues and opportunities identified through work on the city and town centres?

Yes

No

Comments: The Local Plan is one of the best places to address the challenging environment faced by town centres. It is understood that it is the intention of the Local Plan team to review the evidence base which underpins the current Town Centre boundaries and as such fully supportive of this. For example a focus on the historic Market Place of Gainsborough itself would allow more flexibility towards the river end of Lord Street to create anchors which can direct footfall from Marshalls Yard to the historic town centre.

Q16b – Specific Changes Required for the City and Town Centres

Are you aware of any specific planning policy changes that would help to strengthen the city or town centres? If yes please provide details

Yes

No

Comments: The new NPPF has an emphasis on the diversity of uses for town centres to ensure its long term vitality and viability, including opportunities for residential uses. It may be worth considering introducing residential uses even within the Primary Shopping Area at ground floor using a 'take away (A5)' style restriction which some London Boroughs adopt. Where it restricts the level of residential permitted to a certain percentage of total frontage and restricts congregation of such uses so that they are spread out across the town centre rather than creating a large amount of dead frontage. This would help further promote existing Heritage led regeneration projects such as living over the shop etc.

Q16c – Retaining Current Designated District and Local Centres

Do you agree that the District Centres and Local Centres identified in the 2017 Local Plan should be carried forward unless evidence suggests that this is not suitable? If no, please provide details.

Yes No

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Q16d – Designation of Additional Centres

Do you agree that the plan should designate District Centres, Local Centres and Rural Centres outside of the Lincoln Urban Area?

Yes No

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Q16e – Identifying New Centres

Is there a specific centre which you think should be designated as a District Centre, Local Centre or Rural Centre? If yes, please provide details.

Yes No

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Q17 – Tourism and the Visitor Economy

Do you agree that the new Local Plan should provide greater distinction and clarity for how tourism development will be considered in the open countryside?

Yes No

Comments: Yes, promotion of visitor economy should be supported/promoted. Interpretation of the current 'overriding' test is unclear, specifically in relation to visitor accommodation. Element of flexibility, should be retained as tourism and visitor economy considered could be very varied in nature.

Q18a – Local Green Spaces

Do you agree that the Local Green Spaces in the 2017 Local Plan should be carried forward in the new Local Plan? If no, please provide details.

Yes No

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Q18b – Additional Local Green Spaces
 Do you have any suggested additional Local Green Spaces which you think meet national policy criteria, and therefore should be designated?

Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------	-----------------------------

Comments: Recommend that this should be explored in detail with Parish and Town Councils.

Q19a – Areas Protected for Use or Type
 Do you agree that churchyards, cemeteries, school playing fields, sports centres, recreation grounds and allotments should be protected for their role and/or type? If no, please provide details.

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----------------------------

Comments: Although shouldn't be restrictive where development of the site is in the interests or for protecting and supporting the existing use. How does this fit with national policy and LEA?

Q19b – Important Open Spaces Methodology
 Do you agree with the proposed criteria for including or excluding sites from designation as Important Open Spaces?

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----------------------------

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Q19c – Specific Important Open Spaces
 Is there an open space that you think would meet the proposed criteria and should be designated as an Important Open Space in the new Local Plan? If yes, please provide details.

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----------------------------

Comments: Yes consider Mercer's Wood in Gainsborough. Further consultation with Parish and Town Councils for other nominations should be explored.

Q20a – Energy Performance Standards in Residential Development
 Do you think that the new Local Plan should require higher energy performance standards than are required by the building regulations for residential development, up to Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes?

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----------------------------

Comments: Supports the direction of National Policy and promotes better quality efficient homes across the area

Q20b – Energy Performance Standards in Non-Residential Development

Do you think that the new Local Plan should require higher energy performance standards in non-residential development and if so what standards should be required?

Yes

No

Comments: For the same reasons a detailed in question 20a

Q20c – Viability Implications of Higher Energy Performance Standards

If you think the Plan should do either of the above, do you have any evidence to demonstrate that requiring higher energy performance standards would or would not be viable? If so please provide this evidence. Alternatively, do you have any suggestions whereby other developer contributions might appropriately be reduced, in order to ensure development remains viable?

Yes

No

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Q21 – Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation

Are you aware of any specific needs for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople accommodation in Central Lincolnshire? If yes, please provide details.

Yes

No

Comments: Based on discussions had with travellers and Local Authorities experience of travellers, the main identified need for travellers is transit sites. Transit sites are required close to major routes providing facilities to enable Gypsy and Travellers to have an available place to stop while travelling. It is expected this will be a recommendation that comes out of the GTAA. The GTAA is due by the end of 2019.

Q22a – Operational Ministry of Defence Sites

Do you think the operational Ministry of Defence sites should be listed in the new Local Plan?

Yes

No

Comments: [Click here to enter text.](#)

Q22b – Recently Operational Ministry of Defence Establishments

Do you think “recently operational” should be defined in the new Local Plan and if so what length of time do you think is reasonable to define this?

Yes

No

Comments: Yes for clarity this should be defined, however rather than create a new definition does the MOD have a definition of recently operational? Is there an opportunity to develop a Local Plan Policy which deals specifically with ex MOD sites which have been decommissioned over a number of years ago and as a consequence experience a range of issues as a result.

Q23a – RAF Scampton Policy

Do you agree that the future of RAF Scampton should be managed through a new planning policy in the new Local Plan?

Yes

No

Comments: Yes the Local Plan and an appropriate policy position is one of a number of important elements required to safeguard the sustainability and economic viability of the base for the future once the MOD leave the site.

Q23b – RAF Scampton Policy Scope

Do you have any preliminary views of what that Policy might seek to achieve for the site?

Yes

No

Comments: In the context of current uncertainty over the status of the RAF base in relation to constraints, a flexible mixed use policy which safeguards the future of the community through the promotion of a sustainable and economically viable place, which includes opportunities for tourism/visitor economy whilst acknowledging the bases important aviation heritage is crucial.

Q24 – Need for Houseboat and Caravan Accommodation

Are you aware of any need for moorings for houseboats or sites for caravans in Central Lincolnshire? Any evidence to support your comments would be welcome, or suggestions as to how such need could be identified in Central Lincolnshire.

Yes

No

Comments: West Lindsey Planning Department have been subject to a number of applications for 'lodges,' both large and small scale

Q25 – Parking Standards

Do you agree that minimum parking standards are needed in Central Lincolnshire? Please provide any further comments you may have, such as in relation to what the standards should be or where they should apply to.

Yes

No

Comments: Support parking standards, specifically in relation to the needs of rural and suburban communities, ensuring that there is sufficient parking for the size of the housing delivered in acknowledgement of the lack of regular public transport options in these areas. However consideration must be given in relation to the viability of parking standards imposed on certain tenures of Affordable Housing. Suggest that this is considered as part of the whole plan viability assessment and tested accordingly to ensure the policy is responsive to the needs of householders and communities whilst not inadvertently introducing a barrier to the delivery of Affordable Housing units.

Q26 – Any Other Comments

Is there anything else you would like to raise – has anything been missed, or are there any general comments you would like to make?

Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Comments: Consideration needs to be given for the possibility of a mixed use policy which could be used to promote sites, specifically brownfield on the edge of Town Centres to give greater flexibility and increase the likelihood of development coming forward. Appendix C West Lindsey has commissioned a Gainsborough Green Infrastructure Study to assess all the current green spaces in the Gainsborough area and to suggest and prioritise a list of green infrastructure projects for the area. As part of the commission, a simplified green space audit was produced based on the green flag assessment methodology. It was produced so that neighbourhood planning groups and planning officers can utilise it to assess the quality of green spaces available to them. It is suggested that the Local Plan review considers this audit methodology and considers its suitability to supplement Appendix C as the Locally Agreed Quality criteria.</p>	