

# **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**2014-2031**



Regulation-15(2)

## **Consultation Statement**

April 2015

## Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>03</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Aims of the Consultation</b>	<b>03</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>04</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Consultation Process</b>	<b>04</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Main Issues and Concerns</b>	<b>09</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Strategic Environmental Report</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Appendix A:</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>A.1 Residents Representations</b>	
	<i>Analysis of Representations</i>	<b>12</b>
	<i>Responses to Representations</i>	<b>15</b>
	<b>A.2 Statutory Consultees and Professional Bodies Representations</b>	
	<i>Analysis of Representations</i>	<b>44</b>
	<i>Responses to Representations</i>	<b>49</b>

## **Section 1 Introduction:**

This Consultation Statement has been prepared with the aim of fulfilling the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012, which are set out in the legislative basis below.

An extensive level of consultation (community and statutory) has been undertaken by the steering group, focus groups, and parish council as required by the legislation and is set out below.

Legal basis:

Section 15(2) of Part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations sets out that, a consultation statement should be a document containing the following:

- (a) details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan; (see section 4)
- (b) explanation of how they were consulted; (see section 4)
- (c) summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; (see section 5) and
- (d) description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan (see section 5 and Appendix A)

## **Section 2 The Aims of the Consultation**

The aims of the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan consultation process were:

- To involve as much of the community as possible throughout all consultation stages of Plan development so that the Plan was informed by the views of local people and other stakeholders from the start of the Neighbourhood Planning process;
- To ensure that consultation events took place at critical points in the process where decisions needed to be taken;
- To engage with as wide a range of people as possible, using a variety of approaches and communication and consultation techniques; and
- To ensure that results of consultation were fed back to local people and available to read (in both hard copy and via the website) as soon as possible after the consultation events.

## **Section 3 Background**

### **3.1 Steering Committee**

In April 2012 a committee of the Parish Council was formed, comprising Parish Councillors and other interested residents to undertake the production of a Neighbourhood Plan.

The Neighbourhood Plan Designation for the Parish of Nettleham was made by West Lindsey District Council on 8 January 2013.

### **3.2 Professional support and advice**

The Committee received direct planning support from a planning professional, Mike Dando provided through Planning Aid, and also Rob Lawton of West-Lindsey District Council.

In addition at the Regulation 14 Consultation stage Ann Skippers (past President of RTP1) was engaged to “health check” the plan and provide feedback and advice on the Reg14 representations made.

## **Section 4 The Consultation process**

### **4.1 Initial Consultations**

#### **Public Consultation**

The period from February 2013 to August 2013 was devoted to a significant level of focus groups and workshops and interaction/engagement of key groups and individuals. It commenced with a full community survey delivered to every household in the parish to identify key issues of; what was good, what was bad and what needed to change, plus other comments. This survey resulted in 174 responses (10% of all households) and provided the platform for further engagement and consultation to refine issues and possible solutions.

These engagement activities were publicised using a mix of posters, flyers, newsletters, online social media and the Parish Council website, the latter being regularly updated during the process.

As a result of the feed back from the various public engagement activities over the first half of 2013 focus groups were formed to research and produce proposals relating to the issues raised. These proposals were then formalized into outline policies for easy public digestion.

In May 2014 a Preliminary Draft Plan comprising a 4 page document was published based on the key findings of the consultations. The Preliminary Draft Plan proposed outline policies and their justification. Over the following 3 months further consultations on the content of the document took place and feedback questionnaires showed that over 88% of the 140 respondents were in favour of all the policies proposed.

A copy of the preliminary Draft Plan was also sent to various statutory consultees including West-Lindsey District Council, Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency. This document then formed the basis for the more substantial statutory Regulation 14 Draft Plan.

### **Local Authority Consultation**

Throughout the process, the Committee has maintained regular liaison with officers of the relevant local planning authorities, and especially West-Lindsey District Council. The objective was to ensure the policies in the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan achieved the right balance between being in general conformity with the adopted Local Plan and the emerging Local Plan for Central Lincolnshire.

### **Land Owners and Developers**

The Parish Council representatives have also sought to actively and consistently engage landowners/potential developers in and around the village, over the period of the plan's development. Meetings were held on a confidential basis to fully understand the developer's aspirations and plans for development in Nettleham. In addition once the plan started to take shape further meetings were held with each of the interested parties to discuss the emerging shape of development being proposed in the plan.

Meetings were held with the following landowners/developers/agents between January 2013-December 2014

1. John Dixon Homes/Globe Consultants
2. Truelove Construction
3. Larkfleet Homes/J Marshall/Robert Doughty Consultancy
4. Persimmon Homes
5. D Tate/Saxby Design
6. LACE

All the developers were then invited to comment of the content of the Plan at Reg 14 Consultation stage.

## **4.2 The Reg 14 Draft Plan**

The Draft Plan was approved by a special meeting of the Nettleham Parish Council on 2nd October 2014, subject to minor clarifications and amendment. The Reg. 14 consultation version of the Draft Plan was submitted for the 6-week formal consultation in December 2014, both in in printed form and on the Parish and

District websites. All residents received a leaflet drop notifying them of the document availability and the close date for comments. A feedback form was also provided. In addition local drop-in sessions were organized to explain the plan. Feedback showed some 90% of respondents in general support of the plan.

### **4.3 Consultees on Reg14 Consultation**

The following list of consultees were notified before the 12th December that the plan had reached the Statutory, Regulation 14 stage of the process and advised where a copy of all of the relevant documents could be found. Hard copies of the mandatory documents were sent to the relevant Local Authorities.

#### **Hard Copy Sent**

Lincolnshire County Council  
WLDC (disc)

#### **Email Notification**

Network Rail  
Coal Authority  
Natural England  
English Heritage  
Anglian Water  
NHS England  
Lincolnshire Police Authority  
Environment Agency (Midlands)  
Highways Agency  
British Telecom  
British Gas plc  
Northern Powergrid  
HCA  
Marine Management Organisation  
Mono Consultants Ltd  
Severn Trent Water Authority  
Western Power Distribution  
iGas  
Veolia  
Stagecoach  
PC Coaches  
Planning Aid  
LACE Housing  
Larkfleet Homes  
John Dixon Homes  
Truelove Development  
Persimmon Homes  
McCarthy & Stone  
Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust  
Lincolnshire Co-op  
Welton Parish Council

Riseholme Parish Council  
North Greetwell Parish Council  
Sudbrooke Parish Council  
Scothern Parish Council  
Cherry Willingham Parish Council  
Lincoln City Council  
Nettleham Infant School  
Nettleham Junior School  
Nettleham Woodland Trust  
Nettleham Methodist Church  
Threshold Church  
All Saints Church

#### **Letter through post**

Virgin Media  
RAF Scampton  
Nettleham Medical Practice

#### **Consulted via leaflet / drop-in sessions**

Nettleham residents  
Local landowners  
Nettleham businesses  
Village Sports & Social Groups

### **4.4 The Submission Plan**

The plan is based on comprehensive background data and evidence to support the proposed policies. Specific sections include:

- About Nettleham (History, demographics, community views and the planning context)
- Visions and Objectives
- Planning Policies covering amongst other things: Housing, Transport, Local Green Spaces, Flood, Assets of Community Value and Buildings of Special Character.
- Plan delivery and implementation.

### **4.5 The Evidence Base**

The Evidence Base, which supports the Draft Plan was published in report form. The report was compiled and made available both on in a book form and also on the Parish Council Website under Neighbourhood Plan at the time of the commencement

of the Reg14 Consultation (12 December 2014). In addition the Strategic Environmental Assessment Report, and its Non Technical Summary were also made available in printed form and also posted on the Parish Councils Website for reference at the same time.

#### 4.6 Publicity and Community Engagement

The following lists the principle community engagement activities undertaken during the preparation of the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan and where details can be found in the Evidence Base document.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Detail</b>	<b>Who consulted</b>	<b>Evidence base Page number</b>
25 Feb 2013	Initial Leaflet drop	All residents and businesses	P18-23
8-9 March 2013	Drop-in Session to discuss issues raised	All residents and businesses	P18-23
26 March 2013-6 Feb 2014	Visit Notes and emails	Service providers	43-58
1 June 2013	Consultation feedback in Nettleham News	All residents	P18-23
13 July 2013	Display at Village carnival on results of consultations	All residents	P18-23
26 March 2013-3 Nov 2014	Meetings and emails regarding Flooding issues	Environment agency, Lincs CC, WLDC,	P59- p76
31 March 2014	Housing for older people	LACE Presentation to the committee	
25 June 2014	Preliminary Draft Plan presentation	Public meeting	P31-p33
4 July 2014	Preliminary Draft Plan discussion	Public Drop-in session	P31-p33
5 July 2014	Preliminary Draft Plan discussion	Public Drop-in session	P31-p33
12 July 2014	Preliminary Draft Plan discussion	Public Carnival display	P31-p33
1 Sept 2014	Feedback on Preliminary Draft plan consultation in Nettleham News	All residents	P31
2 September 2014	Ecological Survey completed	Nettleham Woodland Trust	P76
30 October 2014	Parish Council adopts Draft Neighbourhood plan	Parish Council and Residents	
12 Dec 2014-31 Jan 2015	Reg14 Consultation on Draft Plan	All residents	
1 March 2015	Feedback on the Reg14 Draft Plan results in the Nettleham News	All Residents	



## Section 5 Main Issues and Concerns

5.1 During the process of preparing the Neighbourhood Plan a number of key issues and concerns of the local community and other stakeholders had to be specifically addressed. The Steering Group has been keen to negotiate and resolve as many issues of disagreement as possible prior to completing the submission documentation.

5.2 A summary, and full listing of all responses/representations made in response to the Reg 14 Consultation can be found in Appendix A

5.3 Those issues that required particular attention are summarized below:

Policy	Reg 14 Consultation Comment	Response
E1 Green Wedge	This green Wedge is identified in the WLDC Local Plan 2006 but justification should be provided to make the area larger -WLDC	Plan modified to clearly define and justify expansion of the green wedge
E2 Local Green Spaces	The large number of LGS should be justified and a criteria based policy could improve it. - WLDC Backwell NP, was quoted and in particular extensive tracts of land being contrary to NPPF/PPG guidance. - Gladman	The Plan has been amended to show detailed site justification. The area proposed is not an extensive tract it is a number of individual plots with different community uses. The largest continuous plot being approx. 6Ha.
E5/6 Nettleham Beck	Merge into one policy and add some clarity to the wording -WLDC	Policy E5 and E6 Merged and intent clarified.
D-2 Pedestrian and Cycling Distances	The intention of the policy is to ensure that applications for development include consideration of how improvements to cycle and pedestrian access can be delivered. - WLDC	Policy reworded to accord with suggestion from WLDC
D3 Parking	Visitor parking is not considered and it s not clear if garages are included. - WLDC	Policy modified to include visitor parking and garages
D4/D6 Drainage	These policies should be merged and clarity improved - WLDC	Policies merged and clarity improved
D 7 Ribbon Development	This policy deals with 2 issues so they should be separated. - WLDC  Policy is contrary to basic conditions and restricts growth - Gladman	Policy split and now is D7- Residential Development in open countryside and D 8 - Residential Development on Approach roads into Nettleham. The Policy wording has been clarified and does not seek to restrict growth.
D 8 Design of new Development	Suggested amendments to policy to aid clarity and justify housing density - WLDC	Policy revised and housing density justified. Appendix J of the plan -Housing Evidence Paper, demonstrate sdeliverability and evidence of local housing density.
H1 Managed Housing Growth	Policy is not deliverable as currently worded as it imposes a maximum number of new houses and phasing of development -WLDC  Consideration has not been given to community advantages of one large site	Wording amended to make it deliverable and compliant with NPPF. Appendix J Housing Evidence Paper, demonstrates deliverability and evidence of local housing density.  Early consultations indicated clearly that there was a strong preference in the community for several smaller developments rather than one large one.

	over several smaller one. – JDH/Beal Homes  Site assessments are invalid as they ignore the 2014 SHLAA Site Assessments done against background of out of date SHLAA methodology and contrary to PPG - Gladman	The 2013 SHLAA and 2014 SHELAA for Nettleham were very similar, however the 2014 SHELAA sites are assessed in the Appendix J of the plan. PPG states that existing site assessments can be a starting point and this has been expanded in the revised Appendix J of the Plan
H-2 Housing Mix	Requires clarification on how this will work, needs demonstrated and defined - WLDC	Wording amended to align with the emerging CLLP.
H-3 Housing for Older People	Policy needs more flexibility to account for viability, and an indication of how developers can demonstrate they have met the policy. - WLDC	Policy reworded to address concerns expressed via design and access statement and other suggestions made. It has also been made clear that all sites would be expected to address the issue considering the anticipated local growth in demographic area.
H6 Local Connection	This is not appropriate here as there is priority set out in the local register, policy should be deleted - WLDC	Policy deleted
S 1 Services and facilities	The wording for this policy was not identified as such in the supporting text paragraph so would carry no weight. - WLDC	Policy S 1 This paragraph from supporting text was made a policy

In addition some community concern was expressed regarding new footpaths and bridleways. The Plan was reviewed in an attempt to address these concerns, and provide for more bridleways.

## **Section 6 Strategic Environmental report**

Statutory consultees raised no adverse comments and on the whole were positive in their response to the Plan.

## **Section 7 Conclusions**

It is clear from the above, that the NNP has been the subject of an ongoing and proportionate level of community engagement that not only meets the requirements of the regulations but which was also tailored to secure input from hard to reach groups.

It is also clear that the policies of the NNP reflect the issues raised as part of this consultation and indeed that the draft policies were overwhelmingly supported by respondents. Where comments / objections were made to the Draft Plan, appropriate changes have been made to these to address legitimate concerns and clear justification has been made where the Steering Committee felt that other suggested changes should not be made.

# **Appendix A**

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

2014 - 2031



Regulation-15

### **Consultation Representations**

#### **Appendix A.1 Residents' Representations**

April 2015

The following composite comprises an overview of the representations received from Residents to the Regulation 14 Consultation. There were forty two such responses. In order of appearance, the documents that follow are :

- ❖ Analysis of all representations in tabular form.
- ❖ Summary of each representation showing a précis of each point raised and the considered response, to each point, of the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee.

A copy of each respondent's actual representation can be provided on request but with personal details redacted to comply with Data Protection obligations.

### **Analysis of Representations.**

## Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan

### Regulation 15 Responses from Residents

#### Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

### Summary of Written Responses

from Regulation 14 Consultation : 12 Dec 2014 to 31 Jan 2015

Note		Number	%
<b>i</b>	Number of written responses received from Residents **	41	
<b>ii</b>	Total Number supporting Draft Plan	40	97.6
<b>iii</b>	Total Number supporting Draft Plan without reservation	22	53.7
<b>iv</b>	Number supporting Draft Plan with minor reservations	15	36.6
<b>v</b>	Number supporting Draft Plan with significant reservations	3	7.3
<b>vi</b>	Number not supporting Draft Plan	1	2.4

#### Notes Explained

<b>i</b>	** 42 responses received but RES042 is a duplicate of RES013, so discounted.
<b>ii</b>	Sum of rows iii+iv+v
<b>iii</b>	Support Draft Plan without any reservations.
<b>iv</b>	Support Draft Plan but with single, minor, concern, e.g. route of a footpath.
<b>v</b>	Generally support Draft Plan but with more than one concern of a minor or more significant nature. E.g. the effects on traffic of additional housing.
<b>vi</b>	Generally not supportive of the Draft Plan.

#### Consultation

The statutory 6 week Regulation 14 Consultation ran from 12 December 2014 to 31 January 2015, inclusive; the extra time allowing for residents who may have been away over the Christmas and New Year periods. Notification of this consultation were hand-delivered to each dwelling in the village. This notification also included details of two open days, organised by NNPSC, to allow residents to ask questions of the NNPSC, discuss any concerns and make their comments known. The Open Days were held on 9 & 17 January 2015 and, over the two days, we logged a total of 58 visitors. The written responses received as a result of the above consultaion period are those logged in this section.

Concerns & Requests Voiced by Residents.	Score
Request for more Bridleways	6
Location of Footpaths.	5
Parking & Traffic Related	5
Loss of CIL + wider benefits, (incl Care Home ?), of 3x small sites vs 1x large site	4
Concern re Flooding caused by new developments	3
Against moving Scout Hut from village centre.	2
Against more Commercial development/retention of such sites.	2
Concerned phased development will increase strain on highways.	2
Site C : better access possible via Sudbrooke Lane rather than The Hawthorns.	2
Concern low-density developments reduce financial yield benefit to village.	1
Against development behind "Brown Cow" PH.	1
Do not support Beal Homes proposal for extended Site C	1
Concerns Site A will have detrimental visual impact on area.	1
Concerns Site A will have detrimental impact on village businesses.	1
Hope developments can be staggered, as outlined.	1
How to ensure developers' promises, (Allotments etc), are delivered over time.	1
How to ensure developers create new footpaths.	1
Why no mention of the provision of a Library in the NP?	1
SUDS should be extended to house extensions and new infill builds.	1
Need to include desirability of new Baker & Greengrocer in village.	1
Need to ensure current commercial sites are retained as such.	1
Policy required to address issue of ACVs.	1
Site C adjoins area which already has more than its share of development.	1

## Responses to Representations.

### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

#### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

#### **Response Reference : RES001 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : Object to proposed footpath between 49/51 Ridgeway. Privacy and nuisance issues.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOTED

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Footpath routes are indicative only, and subject to consultation with land owners.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

#### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

#### **Response Reference : RES002 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : General support of Draft NNP, but concerned about parking in village.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

#### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

#### **Response Reference : RES003 Ref Policy Number or Area: Resident Comments :**

**Fully supportive of Draft NNP**

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES004 Ref Policy Number or Area: Resident Comments : Fully supportive of Draft NNP**

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES005 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : Concerned about apparent proposal to move the Scout Hut being moved and the site being used for a car park.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : The potential Scout Hut move was suggested, some time ago, for discussion. There is no intention to include this as a Policy within the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----



**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES006 Ref Policy Number or Area: Resident Comments :**  
Happy with the plan. NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

---

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES007 Ref Policy Number or Area: 1.4 The Context (a)**  
Sustainable Development Resident Comments : Sustainability is not clearly defined.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Sustainability to be defined in the document.

Plan Modified : YES

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: 4.2 & 5.2.1 Traffic Congestion & Traffic

Resident Comments : Areas A and B not suitable for housing development due to increase in the “already undesirable traffic flow on Deepdale Lane”. Also Deepdale Lane unsuitable for safe passing of Buses.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted. See attached response from Stagecoach re Buses.

---

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: Commercial Development

Resident Comments : Further commercial development should not be encouraged as it will give rise to further increase in traffic flows and environmental impact.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Commercial areas create very little additional traffic.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: 5.2.2 Drainage and Flooding

Resident Comments : Concern that surface water drainage from Deepdale Lane could have an effect on flooding problems in the village centre. Also, the nature of the highway bridges over the Beck, in village centre, could exacerbate the flooding problem/

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : SUDS will address surface water flow into the Beck.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: General

Resident Comments : Low levels of new housing density on proposed sites will not give financial yield necessary to support affordable housing. Also other areas of development land, bought for this purpose, which do not appear at present but will result in planning applications.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Developers have already come forward with viable proposals for identified sites, at the proposed density.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES008 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : Object to proposed footpath between 49/51 Ridgeway. Privacy and nuisance issues.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOTED

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Footpath routes are indicative only, and subject to consultation with land owners.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES009**

Ref Policy Number or Area: E2/3/4/5. D1/2/3/4/5/6/7/8. H1/2/3/4/5/6/7/8/9. B1

Resident Comments : Agree with Plan narrative as a whole and Policies as shown above. See comments below.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: E1

Resident Comments : Understand that land owned by brewery behind Brown Cow PH, on A46, is to be sold with a view to development.

NNPSC Status ref above : Noted

NNPSC Supporting Comments : No formal communications received at this time.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Resident Comments : Development along Nettleham Beck should be actively resisted. Increasing numbers of Kingfishers and Water Voles are in evidence.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Comments support Plan.

Ref Policy Number or Area: E6

Plan Modified : YES

----- <> -----

### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

#### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

#### **Response Reference : RES010 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : Request for more, and improved access to, Bridleways for horse riding around the village.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Footpaths/Bridleways are for discussion with land owners/developers, on a case-by-case basis.

Plan Modified : YES

----- <> -----

### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

#### **Response Reference : RES011**

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-1 Managed Housing Growth

Resident Comments : Concerned that Policy refers to 50 new homes per site but 68 may be built at Site B. Will sites A or C be reduced to keep within the 180 new homes maximum?

NNPSC Status ref above : Noted

NNPSC Supporting Comments :

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-9 Site C (Ridgeway)

Resident Comments : Would welcome a reduction of building on Site C. Do not support Beal Homes proposal to build circa 200 homes on an extended Site C.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Plan call for 50 dwellings on Site C. Proposal mentioned does not form part of Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: Site C - Woodland Trust Issues

Resident Comments : Concerned about the Beal Homes proposal, (above), but favourable response to their proposed buffering compared to NNP proposal for buffering at this site.

NNPSC Status ref above : An Observation

NNPSC Supporting Comments : This is a detailed site comment which would form part of a full planning application.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: Footpath Resident Comments : Against placement of footpath between 49/51 Ridgeway.

NNPSC Status ref above : Noted

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Footpath markings are indicative only. Final locations are a matter for discussion with land owner/developer.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)**

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

#### **Response Reference : RES012**

*Resident has declared an interest in land adjoining the village with property bordering Site A.*

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-7 Land behind Deepdale Lane

Resident Comments : Development of this site will increase the flooding risk in village centre as site drainage will find it's way into the Beck.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : This is not a flood risk area and SUDS are specified.

Plan Modified : YES NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-7 Land behind Deepdale Lane

Resident Comments : Development of this site will have a detrimental visual impact on the village.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Proposed development would be behind existing homes and extensive use of bungalows & tree screening would minimise any visual impact from Deepdale Lane.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-7 Land behind Deepdale Lane

Resident Comments : Development of this site, close to the A46, will make residents more likely to shop in Lincoln rather than Nettleham, depriving Nettleham businesses, and the village as a whole, of benefits.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Development would be a net contributor to the village's retail activity and its location makes it easy to reach the village centre on foot.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-1

Resident Comments : Smaller sites will not deliver the wider benefits that one large site would. These could include new woodland walks and sporting facilities.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : The village residents have shown an overwhelming

preference for smaller developments, with little demand for additional sporting facilities to those recently provided, (MUGA, Basketball Court and soon to be completed mini-Skate Park).

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-1

Resident Comments : Phased release, (development), of homes is not practical as market forces will determine demand. If 3 sites were under construction at the same time it would put further strain on the highway infrastructure.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Wording of relevant section of this Policy will be amended to take this into account.

Plan Modified : YES

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-1

Resident Comments : Should 3 sites commence development as the market demands, Nettleham would not get the CIL payments due to them as they would be finished before CIL was approved. One large site would deliver CIL due to phased release.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : CIL would apply at Planning Approval stage, so one large development would be treated as several smaller ones.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-1

Resident Comments : Because of economy of scale, one large site could deliver care homes for the elderly.

All these reasons point to missed opportunities. NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Smaller sites are what residents have most called for.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

*This response is from Mr John Dixon, a village resident and Principal of John Dixon Homes. John Dixon Homes have also submitted a response in the Statutory Consultees and Professional Responders category and these two responses should be considered together.*

### **Response Reference : RES013**

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-1

Resident Comments : States that three smaller sites would not provide the benefits, (better footpaths, increased CIL), that might be derived from one larger development on an extended Site C.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : The village residents have shown an overwhelming preference for smaller developments. CIL would apply at Planning Approval stage, so one large development would be treated as several smaller ones.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-1

Resident Comments : Phased release of sites would not be practical as market forces would determine speed of development. 3 sites would also place strain on the village's highway infrastructure.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Wording of relevant section of this Policy will be amended to take this into account.

Plan Modified : YES

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-9 Land Behind The Hawthorns

Resident Comments : Access to this site is through an estate road. There is a better access from Sudbrooke Lane via a Brownfield site which would less disruption for residents of The Hawthorns and Larch Avenue.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE



NNPSC Supporting Comments : Access road would be acceptable. The NNP does not specify access but The Hawthorns was originally built as access to future development of what is now Site C.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: B-1

Resident Comments : Concern that land at Deepdale Lane (NE1) and Lodge Lane (NE2) must be retained for employment purposes. Marketing history

indicates little opportunity for these sites to be used for such purpose. Policy is unrealistic and at odds with NPPF Para 22 which advocates consideration of alternative use in such circumstances.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Commercial developments have been depressed due to economic down turn of the past 7 – 8 years. Signs are now emerging of economic upturn.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

#### **Response Reference : RES014 Ref Policy Number or Area: H-9 Land Behind The Hawthorns**

Resident Comments : Concern over that The Hawthorns will be used to access the proposed new Site C. Traffic and access problems.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted, but proposed scale of development will not create excessive traffic flows.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: Scout Hut

Resident Comments : Questions the sense/desirability of demolishing the Scout Hut, and re-siting it, to provide a new car park.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : The potential Scout Hut move was suggested, some time ago, for discussion. There is no intention to include this as a policy within the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

#### **Response Reference : RES015 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : General support of Draft NNP as a comprehensive and competent document reflecting the views and aspirations of residents.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

#### **Response Reference : RES016**

##### **Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : General support of Draft NNP as being as good a future for Nettleham as could be expected, but concerned that national government may overturn the NP to the detriment of the village.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Resident Comments : Like the idea of houses enjoying views over open field. We partially enjoy such views at present but would lose it when new development starts.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

#### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

#### **Response Reference : RES017 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : Fully support of Draft NNP and commend those involved for an excellent job.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

#### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

#### **Response Reference : RES018 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : Support Draft NNP and agree with 3 sites for development. Hope new buildings will be in sympathy with surroundings and that developments can be “staggered” in implementation.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

### **Response Reference : RES019 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : Support Draft NNP and agree that it seems sensible and has taken on board local comment and feedback. Level of growth, circa 11%, is appropriate provided infrastructure is there to cope.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

---

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

### **Response Reference : RES020 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : Support Draft NNP and agree that it is comprehensive and should be implemented in full.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

### **Response Reference : RES021 Ref Policy Number or Area: H-1**

Resident Comments : How can you ensure that the builders does all that is promised – Allotments etc – whilst developments proceeds over a number of years? How will it be enforced?

NNPSC Status ref above : Noted NNPSC Supporting Comments : Subject to standard Planning enforcement

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-7

Resident Comments : How are you able to require a developer to create new footpaths over land not within a site?

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : This is a suggestion for how we would like the footpath network develop, as a guide to land owners.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)**

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

#### **Response Reference : RES022 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : Seems to be a very reasoned plan that addresses the concerns of villagers very positively. Like the Woodlands Trust proposals and hope a lot of them will be implemented in time.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: B-1

Resident Comments : Very encouraging.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES023 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : A carefully thought-out plan which addresses the need for new build in a way which minimises impact on the village.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES024 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : Generally a well thought-out plan and preferable to an externally generated plan being landed on us from central government.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number or Area: Roads & Traffic**

Resident Comments : Condition of roads is a major concern. Surface of Scothern Road will not cope with increased site or residential traffic.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted. This is a matter for LCC Highways Dept. Not within Parish Council control or scope of Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES025 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : Plan is thorough, well researched and covers all areas of concern.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES026 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : Why no mention of provision for a Library? This is critical. This could benefit from any subvention to the rates.

Why not co-locate Infant and Junior Schools and extend Linelands by sale of Infant School premises?

Support Beal Homes proposal and agree with the need for provision of sheltered accommodation.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Library was not raised as a concern in our consultations and has been addressed directly by the Parish Council. Schools are not under the control of the Parish or District Councils and both are Academies.

Plan Modified : NO

Ref Policy Number or Area:

----- <> -----

Support Beal Homes proposal and agree with the need for provision of sheltered accommodation.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : The Beal Homes proposal does not form part of the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES027 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : The NP appears to be a well-considered solution to additional housing and the future of the village.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES028 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : Request for more, and improved access to, Bridleways for horse riding around the village.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Footpaths/Bridleways are for discussion with land owners/developers, on a case-by-case basis.

Plan Modified : YES

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council



**Response Reference : RES029 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : Request for more, and improved access to, Bridleways for horse riding around the village.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Footpaths/Bridleways are for discussion with land owners/developers, on a case-by-case basis.

Plan Modified : YES

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES030 Ref Policy Number or Area: Appendix E3**

Resident Comments : Request for more, and improved access to, Bridleways for horse riding around the village.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Footpaths/Bridleways are for discussion with land owners/developers, on a case-by-case basis.

Plan Modified : YES

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

Response Reference : RES031 Ref Policy Number or Area: H-7, H-8, H-9 Resident Comments : 50 dwellings per site is alright. Need to get Linelands re-opened. NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

#### **Response Reference : RES032**

*Respondent is Vice-Chair of NNPSC*

Ref Policy Number or Area:

Resident Comments : Fully support Draft NNP, particularly provision of affordable housing.

Need to get Linelands re-opened. NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC  
Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

#### **Response Reference : RES033 Ref Policy Number or Area: Overall**

Resident Comments : Draft Plan is a great credit to all who produced it and almost all of it looks fine to me.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: Housing P1

Resident Comments : Proposals for new housing are excellent. Suggests extending parking and SUDS etc comments to house extensions or single-house infills.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Must be subject to Building Regulations. Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: Community Services P1

Resident Comments : Comments re now-closed Bakery in village mentioned on p45. Suggest including desirability of new bakery and greengrocer in village.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Past experience has shown these businesses were not viable.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: Community Services P1

Resident Comments : Original Policy C-1 has vanished. Is 2<sup>nd</sup> para of 5.6 intended as policy?

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : No.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: Traffic P2

Resident Comments : Comments re school traffic and car-sharing. NNPSC Status ref above : Noted NNPSC Supporting Comments : Issues raised with Schools previously.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: Traffic P2

Resident Comments : Suggests need for junction improvements at Washdyke Lane/A46, Deepdale Lane/A46 and Lodge Lane/A158 plus temporary measures to lessen accident potential.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : LCC Highways Dept will be consulted on all Planning Applications.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: Business P2

Resident Comments : 5.4 looks good but suggest new Policy B-2 to guard against change of use from business to residential.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Site already retained under Policy B1

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: Environment P2

Resident Comments : Cannot find any Appendices on website. Should Appendix E actually be Appendix H? Suggests policies aim to improve environment rather than just minimizing further deterioration.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted. Enhancement is proposed.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: Flooding P4

Resident Comments : Plan policies to avoid new developments worsening flood situation is excellent. However this will show no improvement in existing problem. Suggests measures necessary to achieve such improvement. Suggests addition of a Policy D-6 to cover this.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Hydraulic Modelling will demonstrate where improvement(s) can be made.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: Community Facilities P6

Resident Comments : 5.6 should include Village Green and 3 village centre pubs. Suggests adding a policy on ACVs, as per example given on p7.

NNPSC Status ref above : Noted.

NNPSC Supporting Comments : See Policy E2 ref Village Green. ACVs not appropriate for this document, but change of use clause could possibly be included. To be

reviewed.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES034**

Ref Policy Number or Area:

Resident Comments : In complete agreement with Draft Plan and think number of houses is realistic in the circumstances.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES035**

Ref Policy Number or Area:

Resident Comments : Proposed developments of 50 houses each seems a sensible approach.

Protecting the “Green Wedge” is critical to the identity of the village. NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES036**

Ref Policy Number or Area:

Resident Comments : In agreement with the proposal re sites for new houses which seems reasonable for the infrastructure to cope with.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NOT AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments :

Plan Modified : YES NO

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES037**

Ref Policy Number or Area:

Resident Comments : Thank you for the work you are doing on behalf of the village.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

Response Reference : RES038 Ref Policy Number or Area:

Resident Comments : Request for more, and improved access to, Bridleways for horse riding around the village.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Footpaths/Bridleways are for discussion with land owners/developers, on a case-by-case basis.

Plan Modified : YES

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

#### **Response Reference : RES039 Ref Policy Number or Area: 5.3.6 and Appendices B & C**

Resident Comments : Congratulations to PC on producing this document. Very difficult to identify proposals for footpaths and no mention of relevant reference numbers. Needs colour to identify proposed vs existing footpaths. These comments only relate to clarity and are not a criticism of the objectives.

NNPSC Status ref above : Noted. NNPSC Supporting Comments : Thank you for the comments.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: Appendix E3

Resident Comments : Request for more, and improved access to, Bridleways for horse riding around the village. Contains suggestions as to where and how.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Footpaths/Bridleways are for discussion with land owners/developers, on a case-by-case basis.

Plan Modified : YES

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES040 Ref Policy Number or Area:**

Resident Comments : Neighbourhood Plan is fair and realistic, provided the infrastructure can cope with the new developments.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-9

Resident Comments : Parking is getting worse and some form of control is required. Examples are provided

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Parking control is with the remit of LCC and a scheme is with them for consideration at this time.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 14 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Response Reference : RES041 Ref Policy Number or Area: H-9**

Resident Comments : Sudbrooke Lane area has had more than its fair share of developments over recent years. Site C will add to this.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-9

Resident Comments : Concern about proposed pathway connecting Sites B & C, especially as regards loss of personal privacy due to footpath running along



resident's property boundary. Suggest existing Larch Avenue/Hawthorns estate footpath be used, instead, to connect Sites B & C.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOTED

NNPSC Supporting Comments : Footpath routes are indicative only, and subject to consultation with land owners.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Residents**

Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)

On Behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council

*This response is from Mr John Dixon, a village resident and Principal of John Dixon Homes. John Dixon Homes have also submitted a response in the Statutory Consultees and Professional Responders category and these responses should be considered together.*

***n.b. This is a duplicate submission of RES013. Refer to RES013 for comments.***

***RES042 is retained for completeness but will not be counted in the scoring.***

#### **Response Reference : RES042**

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-1

Resident Comments : States that three smaller sites would not provide the benefits, (better footpaths, increased CIL), that might be derived from one larger development on an extended Site C.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : Consultation showed it was the residents over-riding wish that there should be several smaller scale development rather than 1 big one. The cost of more footpaths is not great and CIL money is still not guaranteed.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-1

Resident Comments : Phased release of sites would not be practical as market forces would determine speed of development. 3 sites would also place strain on the village's highway infrastructure.

NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : The Plan will be modified to require developers to ensure they have a construction vehicle travel scheme in place to minimize disruption in the village.

Plan Modified : YES

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: H-9 Land Behind The Hawthorns

Resident Comments : Access to this site is through an estate road. There is a better access from Sudbrooke Lane via a Brownfield site which would less disruption for residents of The Hawthorns and Larch Avenue.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : The access road proposed is of adequate width and designed appropriately for extension of the development.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

Ref Policy Number or Area: B-1

Resident Comments : Concern that land at Deepdale Lane (NE1) and Lodge Lane (NE2) must be retained for employment purposes. Marketing history indicates little opportunity for these sites to be used for such purpose. Policy is unrealistic and at odds with NPPF Para 22 which advocates consideration of alternative use in such circumstances.

NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE NNPSC Supporting Comments : The local economy is just recovering from the deepest recession in living memory and local businesses will soon be starting to expand and look for new premises.

Plan Modified : NO

----- <> -----

# **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

2014 - 2031



Regulation-15

**Consultation Representations**

**Appendix A.2 Statutory Consultees &  
Professional Bodies**

**Representations**

April 2015

The following composite comprises an overview of the representations received from the Statutory Consultees & Professional Bodies to the Regulation 14 Consultation. There were twelve such responses. In order of appearance, the documents that follow are :

- ❖ Analysis of all representations in tabular form.
- ❖ Summary of each representation showing a précis of each point raised and the considered response, to each point, of the Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee.

A copy of each respondent's actual representation may be found in the document entitled Evidence Base, Regulation 15, Consultation Responses.

**[Analysis of Representations.](#)**

<b>Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan</b>			
<b>Summary Of Regulation 15 Responses From Statutory Consultees and other Professional Respondents</b>			
<b>Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)</b>			
On behalf of : Nettleham Parish Council			
<b>Consultee :</b>	<b>Anglian Water Authority</b>		
<b>Policy No. Commented Upon</b>	<b>Comments Agreed By NNPSC YES / NO</b>	<b>Draft Plan Modified YES / NO</b>	<b>Refer To Detail In Response Reference</b>
<b>D3</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>SC&amp;P 001</b>
<b>D4</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	
<b>D5</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	
<b>H1</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	
<b>H7</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	
<b>H8</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	
<b>B1</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	
<b>Appendix B Proposals Map</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	

<b>Consultee :</b>		<b>Marine Management Organisation</b>	
<b>Policy No. Commented Upon</b>	<b>Comments Agreed By NNPSC YES / NO</b>	<b>Draft Plan Modified YES / NO</b>	<b>Refer To Detail In Response Reference</b>
None	YES	NO	<a href="#">SC&amp;P 002</a>

<b>Consultee :</b>		<b>Natural England</b>	
<b>Policy No. Commented Upon</b>	<b>Comments Agreed By NNPSC YES / NO</b>	<b>Draft Plan Modified YES / NO</b>	<b>Refer To Detail In Response Reference</b>
E2	YES	NO	<a href="#">SC&amp;P 003</a>
E5	YES	NO	
E6	YES	NO	
D8, Appendix E	YES	NO	
H7	YES	NO	
H8	YES	NO	
H9	YES	NO	
SEA	YES	NO	

<b>Consultee :</b>		<b>Stagecoach Group plc</b>	
<b>Policy No. Commented Upon</b>	<b>Comments Agreed By NNPSC YES / NO</b>	<b>Draft Plan Modified YES / NO</b>	<b>Refer To Detail In Response Reference</b>
NONE	YES	NO	<a href="#">SC&amp;P 004</a>

<b>Consultee :</b>		<b>Welton Parish Council</b>	
<b>Policy No. Commented Upon</b>	<b>Comments Agreed By NNPSC YES / NO</b>	<b>Draft Plan Modified YES / NO</b>	<b>Refer To Detail In Response Reference</b>
H1	YES	NO	<a href="#">SC&amp;P 005</a>
Development 5.2 Traffic	YES	NO	
H3	YES	NO	
Education	YES	NO	

<b>Consultee :</b>		<b>John Dixon Homes</b>	
<b>Policy No. Commented Upon</b>	<b>Comments Agreed By NNPSC YES / NO</b>	<b>Draft Plan Modified YES / NO</b>	<b>Refer To Detail In Response Reference</b>
H1	NO	NO	SC&P 006
H9	NO	NO	
B1	NO	NO	
<b>Consultee :</b>		<b>JH Walter on behalf of un-named clients</b>	
<b>Policy No. Commented Upon</b>	<b>Comments Agreed By NNPSC YES / NO</b>	<b>Draft Plan Modified YES / NO</b>	<b>Refer To Detail In Response Reference</b>
None Quoted Refers To Housing Allocation	NO	NO	SC&P 007
<b>Consultee :</b>		<b>JH Walter on behalf of Mr &amp; Mrs Stuffins</b>	
<b>Policy No. Commented Upon</b>	<b>Comments Agreed By NNPSC YES / NO</b>	<b>Draft Plan Modified YES / NO</b>	<b>Refer To Detail In Response Reference</b>
Plan General	YES	NO	SC&P 008
Seeks Allocation of new site - see text	NO	NO	

Consultee :		West Lindsey District Council	
Policy No. Commented Upon	Comments Agreed By NNPS YES / NO	Draft Plan Modified YES / NO	Refer To Detail In Response Reference
E1	YES	YES	SC&P 009
E2	YES	YES	
E3	YES	YES	
E4	YES	YES	
E5 & E6	YES	YES	
SECTION 5	YES	YES	
D1	YES	YES	
D2	YES	YES	
D3	YES	YES	
SECTION 5.2.2	YES	YES	
D4	YES	YES	
D5	YES	YES	
D6	YES	YES	
SECTION 5.2.3	YES	YES	
D7	YES	YES	
D8	YES	YES	
SECTION 5.3	YES	YES	
H1	YES	YES	
SECTION 5.3.2	YES	YES	
H2	YES	YES	
SECTION 5.3.3 (H3)	YES	YES	
H4	YES	YES	
H5 & H6	YES	YES	
SECTION 5.3.6	YES	YES	
H7	YES	YES	
H8	NO	YES	
H9	YES	YES	
SECTION 5.4	YES	YES	
B1	YES	YES	
SECTIONS 5.5 & 5.6	YES	YES	
SECTION 6	YES	YES	
APPENDIX	YES	YES	

<b>Consultee :</b>		<b>Gladman Developments Ltd</b>		
<b>Policy No. Commented Upon</b>	<b>Comments Agreed By NNPSC YES / NO</b>	<b>Draft Plan Modified YES / NO</b>	<b>Refer To Detail In Response Reference</b>	
<b>Overall</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>SC&amp;P 010</b>	
<b>Central Lincs Local Plan</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>		
<b>H1</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>		
<b>Legal Basis</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>		
<b>Central Lincs Local Plan</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>		
<b>Vision &amp; Objectives</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>		
<b>Core Strategy</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>		
<b>E1</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>		
<b>E2</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>		
<b>E3</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>		
<b>E4</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>		
<b>D7</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>		
<b>Evidence Base</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>		
<b>Site Assessments</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>		
<b>Future Involvement</b>	<b>Noted</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>		
<b>Consultee :</b>		<b>Globe Consultants representing John Dixon Homes</b>		
<b>Policy No. Commented Upon</b>	<b>Comments Agreed By NNPSC YES / NO</b>	<b>Draft Plan Modified YES / NO</b>	<b>Refer To Detail In Response Reference</b>	
<b>E1</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>SC&amp;P 011</b>	
<b>E5, E6</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>		
<b>H1</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>		
<b>H9</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO</b>		
<b>H9, H4</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES</b>		



<b>Consultee :</b>		<b>Globe Consultants representing Beal Developments</b>	
<b>Policy No. Commented Upon</b>	<b>Comments Agreed By NNPSC YES / NO</b>	<b>Draft Plan Modified YES / NO</b>	<b>Refer To Detail In Response Reference</b>
E1	YES	YES	<b>SC&amp;P 012</b>
E5, E6	NO	NO	
H1	NO	YES	
H9	NO	NO	
H9, H4	YES	YES	

**Responses to Representations.**

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

**Regulation 15 Responses From Statutory Consultees and Professional Bodies**

**Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)**

On Behalf Of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Consultee Name : Anglian Water Authority**

**Ref Policy Number : D 3 , D5, H1, H7, Appendix B new footpaths**

**Consultee Comments :** Support/ no objection, but identify need for further discussion with the landowners inc AWA for footpaths to be delivered.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :**

Footpaths were included as indicative and for future discussions as part of a more detailed Planning Application and this should be made clear in the submitted plan

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : D 4**

**Consultee Comments : Generally supportive but with a suggested change of wording :**

A Drainage strategy must accompany all planning applications **including those which** would impact the Beck

- a) the approach to SUDS
- b) the approach to foul drainage

**para 2**

The sufficiency of existing infrastructure to accommodate any surface water and foul water emanating from the proposed new development, any proposed development and how these will be delivered. **Surface water will not be permitted to discharge to the public foul sewerage network**

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Modifications will be made as suggested

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H8**

**Consultee Comments :** It should be noted that foul water networks might need to be enhanced, and this should be explored as part of the drainage strategy.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Policy wording to be amended

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H 9**

**Consultee Comments :** As the site is located within 400m of the Nettleham sewage works there is potential for nuisance to future residents, odours, lighting, noise and traffic. AWA has an encroachment policy which states that they will undertake a risk assessment for any development proposals located within 400m of a water recycling centre at the Planning Application stage. This site has been assessed as medium risk and the applicant will have to undertake a further detailed assessment to demonstrate that the site can be developed without adverse impact on future residents.

It should be noted that foul water networks might need to be enhanced, and this should be explored as part of the drainage strategy.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Should be included in the policy preamble

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : B 1**

**Consultee Comments :** It is important for any developer of the business site be aware of the proximity of the foul pumping station in the design and layout of the scheme and leaving a distance of 15 m from the boundary of the occupied buildings to reduce risk of nuisance and loss of amenity associated with the operations of the pumping station.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** The policy preamble will include this comment

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Statutory Consultees And Professional Bodies**

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)**

On Behalf Of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Consultee Name : Marine Management Organisation (MMO)**

**Ref Policy Number : None**

**Consultee Comments :** Clarifies the areas covered by MMO; East Inshore does not extend inland beyond the coast, therefore, no comments are made on Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :**

**Noted.**

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Statutory Consultees And Professional Bodies**

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)**

On Behalf Of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Consultee Name : Natural England**

**Ref Policy Number : E2 Local Green Spaces,  
E5 Nettleham Beck Green Corridor,  
E6 Development at Nettleham Beck**

**Consultee Comments :** Will protect and enhance the Green Infrastructure and contribute to the health and well-being of the village

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :**

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : D8 design of New Development,  
Appendix E Ecological Strategy**

**Consultee Comments :** Will protect and enhance natural assets and biodiversity, and provide a valuable assessment of the environmental assets of the parish.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :**

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H7, H8 and H9 Site specific policies**

**Consultee Comments :** Welcome provisions to protect footpaths, hedgerows and trees and to incorporate green spaces into designs

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :**

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)**

**Consultee Comments :** SEA follows accepted methodology and meets the requirement of relevant legislation. Welcome the consideration of alternatives to timing and location, the assessment of draft policies and the opportunities to mitigate any significant environmental effects of the proposals.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :**

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Statutory Consultees And Professional Bodies**

#### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)**

On Behalf Of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Consultee Name : Stagecoach Group PLC**

**Ref Policy Number :** None

**Consultee Comments :** Complimentary re the Plan

**NNPSC Status ref above :** AGREE

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** N/A

**Plan Modified :** NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Statutory Consultees And Professional Bodies**

#### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)**

On Behalf Of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Consultee Name : Welton Parish Council**

**Ref Policy Number :** H1 Managed Housing Growth

**Consultee Comments :** New development in Nettleham unlikely to impact Welton significantly.

**NNPSC Status ref above :** AGREE

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Noted

**Plan Modified :** NO

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number :** Development: Point 5.2 Traffic

**Consultee Comments :** LCC should address A46 traffic issues

**NNPSC Status ref above :** AGREE

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :**

**Plan Modified :** NO

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number :** H3 Housing for Older People (and Sustainable Transport)

**Consultee Comments :** Confirms the joint Welton/Nettleham strategy for the provision of a range of accommodation for the elderly which will be sustained by existing bus links between the two villages.

**NNPSC Status ref above :** AGREE

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Development Point 5.3.3 Housing for elderly

**Plan Modified :** NO

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number :** A point was raised re Education.

**Consultee Comments :** Development at Welton and Dunholme could result in William Farr Comprehensive School reducing its catchment area with a possible knock on effect on Nettleham residents.

**NNPSC Status ref above :** N/A

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Point noted.

**Plan Modified :** NO

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Statutory Consultees And Professional Bodies**

#### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)**

On Behalf Of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Consultee Name : John Dixon Homes Ltd**

**Ref Policy Number : H1 Managed Housing Growth**

**Consultee Comments :** Objects to limitation of 50 homes per single site, market forces will dictate speed of development which could see all 3 allocated sites developed prior to any CIL agreement, a phased large development of site C would deliver more benefits for the village.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** 5.3.1. Proposed development would meet 12.6% growth parameters indicated by the former JPSU in the absence of any emerging Local Plan allocation. The allocated sites and limitation on numbers complies with views expressed by the village in feedback/consultations. H1 stipulates the allowable phasing.

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H9 Land Behind The Hawthorns**

**Consultee Comments : Objection:** Development on the disused poultry/brownfield land (site E3 Appendix C Site Assessment in Evidence Base) has closer access from Sudbrooke Lane so would be less environmentally disruptive than development on Site C which is accessed via a longer estate road and takes up arable land.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Following the Site assessment exercise and taking into consideration the views of the residents which were used to formulate policies,



Sites A, B, C and D were allocated as the most appropriate to provide the required number of new homes to meet Policy H1 Managed Housing Growth. The site C could be accessed via a road through site E3 appendix C however housing development on E3 is less desirable than E1 and E2 due to its proximity within 400m of the sewage works and the attendant nuisance/encroachment policy concerns highlighted by Anglian Water.

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : B1 Land identified in WLDC Local Plan 2006 at Deepdale Lane (NE1) must be retained exclusively for employment purposes.**

**Consultee Comments :** The lack of response to marketing indicates the market for employment related development in the village has been met. Policy B1 is, therefore, unreasonable and against the provisions of para 22 of the NPPF which advises against the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose – NPPF advocates consideration of alternative uses by having regard to market signals.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** NPPF further states that applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits. Policy D7 Ribbon Development precludes any residential development along the access routes in and out of Nettleham that would extend the existing built footprint of the settlement along these routes.

Following the Site assessment exercise, Sites A, B, C and D were allocated as the most appropriate to provide the required number of new homes to meet Policy H1 Managed Housing Growth.

Planning Permission was in fact granted 23 February 2015 to PDA Developments Ltd by WLDC for a new commercial office building on Plot 3A Deepdale Enterprise Park, Nettleham, thus indicating that demand for employment related development on the site remains extant.

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Statutory Consultees And Professional Bodies**

#### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)**

On Behalf Of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Consultee Name : JH Walter for unnamed client.**

**Ref Policy Number :** None quoted but refers to Housing allocations.

**Consultee Comments :** Seeks Land to the east of Scothern Road be considered for site allocation (Site C1 Appendix C Site assessment Evidence Base).

Highlights - a flat site, clear access from Scothern Rd, low flood risk, adjacent to existing end of village development and opportunities to enhance use of existing public right of way. The site should, therefore, be deliverable.

**NNPSC Status ref above : DISAGREE re choice of the site in question**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Policy D7 Ribbon development precludes any residential development along the access routes in and out of Nettleham that would extend the existing built footprint of the settlement along these routes.

Following the Site Assessment exercise, Sites A, B, C and D were allocated as the most appropriate to provide the required number of new homes to meet Policy H1 Managed Housing Growth.

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Statutory Consultees And Professional Bodies**

#### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)**

**Consultee Name : JH Walter for Mrs M Stuffins and Mr C Stuffins**

**Ref Policy Number : None**

**Consultee Comments : General - supportive of the draft Plan Vision and Aims.**

**NNPSC Status ref above : Noted**

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : None**

**Consultee Comments :** Seeks Land to the west of Scothern Road be considered for site allocation (southern part of Site B4 Appendix C Site assessment Evidence Base).

Highlights:

The location of the site supports the following Policies: E1 Protect the Green Wedge, E3 Heritage Sites, E4 Buildings of local Character, D2 Pedestrian and Cycling Distances, D1 Access.

Development of the site would comply with D3 Parking Provision (New Housing), D4 Drainage Strategy, D5 Sustainable Urban Drainage (which will ensure site runoff would not exceed Greenfield rate), D7 Ribbon Development as the site lies opposite existing development on the east side of Scothern Road, H2 Housing Mix, H3 Housing for Older People, H4 & 5 Affordable Housing Element & Criteria, H6 Local Connection and

**NNPSC Status ref above : DISAGREE re choice of the site in question**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Following the Site Assessment exercise, Sites A, B, C and D were allocated as the most appropriate to provide the required number of new homes to meet Policy H1 Managed Housing Growth.

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Statutory Consultees**

#### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)**

**Consultee Name : West Lindsey District Council**

**Ref Policy Number : E1**

**Consultee Comments :** General support for this but questions the extent suggesting that it should range from A46 to Greetwell Lane (current Green wedge). Methodology of choosing the area should be provided as should photos.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Policy now re-written and supporting map included**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : E2**

**Consultee Comments :** General support, but we need to define “value” and “resisted” should be reconsidered and terms under which proposals would be opposed should be stated. Move last sentence to D8.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Justification for Green Spaces now updated.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : E3**

**Consultee Comments :** Text needs some review as it is repetitive and what classifications are included.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Policy amended in line with comments and classifications included.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : E4**

**Consultee Comments :** Supporting text repetitive of earlier section and suggested alternative policy wording is provided.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Changes made as suggested.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : E5 and E6**

**Consultee Comments :** It is suggested that these 2 policies be merged into one of the beck. Cross referencing and repeats should be deleted. Wording modification proposed. It should be explicit about improvements being sought if they are specific and they should be listed , see proposed rewording.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Amended as per above. Policy E6 now merged with Policy D5.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Section 5**

**Consultee Comments :** More clarity required as the section is confusing.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Amended to reflect comments.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : D 1**

**Consultee Comments :** Is this policy needed and if so then reference should be made to the roads that are classified as trunk routes, last sentence need review,

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Policy retained and amended as per comments.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : D 2**

**Consultee Comments :** policy rewording suggested. Potential routes should be identified.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Amended in line with comments.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : D 3**

**Consultee Comments :** Visitor parking is not considered, do the parking standards include garages, ref to SUDS is not necessary as it is in D5. We need justification for parking requirements required.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Amended as per comments. SUDS removed to Policy D5. Justification for parking requirements is provided in Appendix F.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Section 5.2.2**

**Consultee Comments :** Tense change

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Amended as suggested.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : D 4**

**Consultee Comments :** How will it be decided whether a development impacts the Beck 'use map" and define size of development to trigger this. Flexibility should be incorporated in the wording to account for occasions when appropriate bodies do not have the capacity to comment. We should state that the application would be refused if acceptable solution is not proposed.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Amended to reflect above comments.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : D5**

**Consultee Comments :** Cross ref to D3 not necessary and should be deleted

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Amended as per comment.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : D6**

**Consultee Comments :** Should this be included in D4? Detailed comments on the bullet points including the developments it applies to. It should specify significant increases in surface water discharge. This should clarify the physical area to which it applies.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Retained as separate policy. Amendments made as per comments.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Section 5.2.3**

**Consultee Comments :** Some comments in this section do not relate to design and needs some suggested rewording. The ribbon development box should come after the building design policy box.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Amended in line with comments.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : D7**

**Consultee Comments :** Should be separated into development in the countryside and ribbon development. The key characteristic of ribbon devt is its linear form this should be specified in policy. Change existing built footprint to adjacent to existing built footprint is used and define footprint (suggestion given). The second part of the policy needs clarification that it refers to development that is not immediately connected to the built area of Nettleham.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Policy D7 now split into Policy D7 and Policy D8.**



**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : D8**

**Consultee Comments :** Development referred to in the section should be clarified (all or large scale) as well as extensions and infill. Character assessment needs clarifying and VDS reference. (c is repetition of E3 and E4, criteria should be provided to assist in decision making on how the developments might “respect and protect”. The requirement on density and ecological strategy could not apply to extensions. We should refer to energy efficiency rather than energy conservation. The density of 20 homes per Ha might not allow lower cost homes to be built so should be modified to exceptions will be acceptable where proposals will deliver a mix of housing and achieve other goals of the plan.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Policy modifications made and justifications provided.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Section 5.3**

**Consultee Comments :** Clarification of what the issue is for the care home and define what mixed means in relation to the type column.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Amended to reflect guidance given in comments.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H1**

**Consultee Comments :** It needs to be made clear that this policy relates only to the allocated sites - re 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph needs clarification.

Phasing is unclear and not deliverable – alternative wording is proposed.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Amended to reflect guidance given in above comments.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Section 5.3.2**

**Consultee Comments :** Stats need review as they are not comparable

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Reviewed and amended.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H2**

**Consultee Comments :** How will the demonstrated needs be made available to applicants to consider in proposals and who will define them. What research has been done.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Will be defined by Central Lincolnshire Plan which will provide supporting evidence.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Section 5.3.3 (H 3)**

**Consultee Comments :** Remove reference to LACE and McCarthy and Stone (favouritism). There is an absence of link between intro and H3 how can this be delivered in the policy. H 3 should clarify how developers can demonstrate that they meet the requirements of the policy (design and access statements and annotated

plans. Design for life is ambiguous and should be more specific (example given). Viability needs to be considered offer either affordable or older peoples housing or affordable but not necessarily both.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Amended to reflect comments.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H 4**

**Consultee Comments :** It needs to be made clear whether we are looking for affordable (rented , social) or low cost market housing. As the proposed requires the same as the Local Plan Policy then it is not necessary to repeat it don't ref S106 and conditions as mechanisms in the policy suggested wording, "it should remain affordable in perpetuity".

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Amended in line with comments.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H 5 and H 6**

**Consultee Comments :** b) does not fit in with the way it is currently presented and he wording should be reviewed. c) is not necessary if H6 is retained. It is recommended that policy H6 is deleted as housing policy and need priority are set out in the WLDC housing policy register rather than planning policies.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : H5c deleted. Policy H6 deleted. Amendments made to reflect comments.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Section 5.3.6**

**Consultee Comments :** The densities are very low and could lead to development of larger properties contrary to H2. Could be a cause for challenge at examination. Maps should be annotated with footpaths and boundaries. Physical boundaries

should be used wherever possible to provide a defensible boundary to avoid ambiguity.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Justification now provided.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H7**

**Consultee Comments :** Green lane not shown on map.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Amended as per comment.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H8**

**Consultee Comments :** Refers to green corridor along the beck but this is not part of the designated area so should be deleted or the area extended. Review wording and punctuation of point 7.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : All land under same ownership, so considered to be deliverable. Other comments actioned as suggested.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H 9**

**Consultee Comments :** Clarify if it is off Hawthorns or Larches. How will the site be accessed by vehilces. The land owner needs to agree to the footbridge if in third party ownership.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Confirmed as The Hawthorns, which provides a 5.5 metre wide access. Land down to The Beck not in 3<sup>rd</sup> Party ownership.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Section 5.4**

**Consultee Comments :** Table states locate new shops and business away from existing centre but would this make it less sustainable.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Amended to specify Business only.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : B1**

**Consultee Comments :** Requires policy title.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Policy title now inserted.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Sections 5.5 and 5.6**

**Consultee Comments :** Do not contain policies so should be could be removed.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Now merged into Policy S1**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Section 6**

**Consultee Comments :** It is suggested that it is better to use the list of priorities in a different/separate document.

**NNPSC Status ref above :** AGREE

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Now moved to Appendix.

**Plan Modified :** YES

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number :** Appendix section

**Consultee Comments :** Various minor comments to be considered.

**NNPSC Status ref above :** AGREE

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Comments considered and amendments made as appropriate.

**Plan Modified :** YES

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Statutory Consultees and Professional Bodies**

#### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)**

On Behalf Of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Consultee Name : Gladman Developments Ltd**

**Ref Policy Number :** Overall

**Consultee Comments :** Refers to Neighbourhood Plan being a “Submission” version, (Reg 16), whilst it is in fact a Reg 14 version.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Plan will be modified before becoming a Reg 16 version, in line with comments received by all consultees and residents.

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Central Lincolnshire Local Plan**

**Consultee Comments :** The Plan should seek to support and complement the policies contained in the emerging Central Lincs Local Plan. As it stands it undermines the CLLP as it seeks to constrain development in the ‘Lincoln Area’. It is artificial to look at Nettleham in isolation. The Plan cannot progress at this time and does not meet the basic conditions.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** No requirement for the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) to do this as the basic condition is for the NP to generally conform to the strategic policies of the development plan. NPs can come forward before Local Plans, so no issue.

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H1**

**Consultee Comments :** NP is anti-growth and seeks to resist all future development. Policy H1 imposes a cap on housing numbers.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Policy H1 amended.

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Legal Basis of NP**

**Consultee Comments :** Suggests NP is legally flawed and may be subject to Judicial Review as it does not meet the Basic Conditions.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** At this stage the Basic Conditions Statement had not been written. It will be written in preparation for Reg 16 stage.

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Central Lincolnshire Local Plan**

**Consultee Comments :** Recommends work is postponed given stage of CLLP and uncertainty about housing requirement and alignment with policies.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Postponement not needed as NPs can come forward before Local Plans.

**Plan Modified : NOT APPLICABLE**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Vision & Objectives**

**Consultee Comments :** In principle it is a positive statement, but the policies in the Plan are anti-growth and inward looking, fail to meet identified housing need and contribute to the delivery of sustainable development contrary to the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance. Vision does not say it will meet objectively assessed housing needs (OAN). No support for economic development to deliver required homes to support the viability proposals it presents (i.e. not enough development to support aims and objectives and wish list of

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** No requirement to explicitly state OAN will be met.

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----



**Ref Policy Number : Core Strategy**

**Consultee Comments :** Core Strategy gave average core figure of 12.6%. This approach is used in the Plan and is flawed as it does not assess OAN. Aecom report referenced identifying Nettleham as a primary supporter. CS was withdrawn

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Justification does not rely solely on Core Strategy figures. These figures were only used as an indicative guide, alongside other evidence.

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : E1**

**Consultee Comments :** Object. Green wedges are not the same as Green Belt and the policy is not NPPF compliant. LP policy is time expired. Not supported by any evidence. Does not accord with the basic conditions. Seeks rewording of policies.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Policy E1 re-drafted in line with overall comments received.

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : E2**

**Consultee Comments :** Object. LGS need to be consistent with paras 76 and 77 of the NPPF. Lack of evidence, appraisal not carried out by an independent professional. Quotes Backwell NP and extensive tracts of land argument. Refers to PPG para 007. Particular objection to sites 2,3,4 and 5 on grounds of extensive tracts of land.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Appraisals not required to be carried out by an independent professional. The area proposed is not an extensive tract but a number of individual plots with different community uses.

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : E3**

**Consultee Comments :** Delete policy. Issues better left to national and local policy.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Noted. This is a matter of opinion and important to our local community.

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : E4**

**Consultee Comments :** Delete policy. Issues better left to national and local policy.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Noted. This is a matter of opinion and important to our local community.

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : D7**

**Consultee Comments :** Not supported by evidence, seeks to actively restrict housing growth, inconsistent with the NPPF, contrary to basic conditions.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Policy does not actively seek to restrict housing growth, but has been re-written to be consistent with NPPF.

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Evidence Base**

**Consultee Comments :** Failure to take PPG into account. No robust evidence base to

explain the Plan's intention to restrict the ability of any future growth (para 040 of PPG). Plan is flawed, not based on the NPPF and PPG. Therefore policies flawed particularly open space, LGS.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Basic Conditions Statement not written at this stage. When written it will take account of PPG.**

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Site Assessments**

**Consultee Comments :** Appraisal of housing sites done against background of out of date SHLAA methodology and contrary to PPG para 042. Ignores SHLAA of October 2014. Does not meet basic conditions.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** This was written prior to SHLAA of October 2014. However, Appendix J – Housing Evidence Paper has been reviewed to reflect the SHLAA of October 2014.

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : Future Involvement**

**Consultee Comments :** Would like to remain involved throughout NP preparation process.

**NNPSC Supporting Comments : Noted.**

**Plan Modified : Not Applicable**

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Statutory Consultees**

#### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)**

On Behalf Of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Consultee Name : Globe Consultants representing John Dixon Homes**

**Ref Policy Number : E1**

**Consultee Comments : Supports general principles but could be tightened to reflect NPPF**

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Will review the wording.

**Plan Modified : YES, subject to review.**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : E5 E6**

**Consultee Comments :** Supported but could be improved by larger community benefits from a larger residential development on the site. This would enable the area around the Beck to be enhanced and improve connectivity. An area of no mans land would exist between proposed development and the Beck this not maximizing its potential.

**NNPSC Status ref above : DISAGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :**

Extensive consultation showed that the community did not want large developments but overwhelmingly supported smaller scale developments. As the land next to the Beck is owned by the site C land owners then there is the potential to introduce sympathetic planting there providing amenity value to the community which should form part of the site development discussions at the detailed panning stage.

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H 1**

**Consultee Comments :** Concerns over methodology of site assessment due to the disaggregation of potential allocations rather than a larger master planned and comprehensive form of development which would deliver more benefits. The assessment was too simplistic relying on a formulaic quantitative assessment rather than including a more balanced qualitative assessment.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** The formulaic approach was taken to initially assess and screen potential sites, then the other policies derived from the consultations on issues such as; “1 large development or a number of smaller developments? “ were overlaid on the screening results to give a qualitative solution.

**Plan Modified : YES** A clearer explanation of the process will be provided in the plan.

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H9**

**Consultee Comments :** Concern over whether a limited development as described could be delivered with the 25% affordable housing and other site development requirements such as a foot bridge and footpath on site.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** These aspirations would be subject to detailed discussions on viability with the developer as a more detailed plan is brought forward.

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H9 and H4**

**Consultee Comments :** Concerns raised over deliverability of bridge and footpath along with 25% affordable homes on this site with the other planning obligations likely to be imposed on the developer. Different land ownership interests may also preclude the realistic delivery of the NNP development requirements in the absence of any directly associated enabling development.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Some flexibility will be introduced into the Plan to enable deliverability trade-offs to be explored at the Planning stage.

**Plan Modified : YES**

----- <> -----

## **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **Regulation 15 Responses From Statutory Consultees**

#### **Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Committee (NNPSC)**

On Behalf Of : Nettleham Parish Council

**Consultee Name : Globe Consultants representing Beal Dev.**

**Ref Policy Number : E1**

**Consultee Comments : Supports general principles but could be tightened to reflect NPPF**

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Will review the wording.

**Plan Modified : YES, subject to review.**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : E5 E6**

**Consultee Comments :** Supported but could be improved by larger community benefits from a larger residential development on the site. This would enable the area around the Beck to be enhanced and improve connectivity. An area of no mans land would exist between proposed development and the Beck this not maximizing its potential.

**NNPSC Status ref above : DISAGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :**

Extensive consultation showed that the community did not want large developments but overwhelmingly supported smaller scale developments. As the land next to the Beck is owned by the site C land owners then there is the potential to introduce sympathetic planting there providing amenity value to the community which should form part of the site development discussions at the detailed planning stage.

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H 1**

**Consultee Comments :** Concerns over methodology of site assessment due to the disaggregation of potential allocations rather than a larger master planned and comprehensive form of development which would deliver more benefits. The assessment was too simplistic relying on a formulaic quantitative assessment rather than including a more balanced qualitative assessment.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** The formulaic approach was taken to initially assess and screen potential sites, then the other policies derived from the consultations on issues such as; “1 large development or a number of smaller developments? “ were overlaid on the screening results to give a qualitative solution.

**Plan Modified : YES** A clearer explanation of the process will be provided in the plan.

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H9**

**Consultee Comments :** Concern over whether a limited development as described could be delivered with the 25% affordable housing and other site development requirements such as a foot bridge and footpath on site.

**NNPSC Status ref above : NOT AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** These aspirations would be subject to detailed discussions on viability with the developer as a more detailed plan is brought forward.

**Plan Modified : NO**

----- <> -----

**Ref Policy Number : H9 and H4**

**Consultee Comments :** Concerns raised over deliverability of bridge and footpath along with 25% affordable homes on this site with the other planning obligations likely to be imposed on the developer. Different land ownership interests may also preclude the realistic delivery of the NNP development requirements in the absence of any directly associated enabling development.

**NNPSC Status ref above : AGREE**

**NNPSC Supporting Comments :** Some flexibility will be introduced into the Plan to enable deliverability trade-offs to be explored at the Planning stage.

**Plan Modified : YES**

