



# Spridlington



## Consultation Statement

2018 - 2036

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Why have we produced this Statement? .....	3
Our Consultation Statement .....	3
The Neighbourhood Development Plan designation .....	3
Establishing a Neighbourhood Development Plan steering group.....	4
Professional support and advice.....	4
The Consultation Process.....	5
Table 1: Regulation 14 Responses and the groups response to each comment.....	9
Table 2: List of Organisations Contacted and who replied .....	47

## **Introduction**

The Neighbourhood Plan steering group has been committed in undertaking consistent, transparent, effective and inclusive periods of community consultation throughout the development of the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) and associated evidence base.

### **Why have we produced this Statement?**

The Neighbourhood Plan Regulations require that, when a Neighbourhood Development Plan is submitted for examination, a statement should also be submitted setting out details of those consulted, how they were consulted, the main issues and concerns raised and how these have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Plan.

Legal Basis:

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

- Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan;
- Explanation of how they were consulted;
- Summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
- Description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed NDP.

The NDP for Spridlington will cover the period 2018 until 2036. The NDP proposal does not deal with county matters (mineral extraction and waste development), nationally significant infrastructure or any other matters set out in Section 61K of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

## **Our Consultation Statement**

This statement outlines the stages in which have led to the production of the Spridlington NDP in terms of consultation with residents, businesses in the parish, stakeholders and statutory consultees.

In addition, this statement will provide a summary and, in some cases, detailed descriptions of the numerous consultation events and other ways in which residents and stakeholders were able to influence the content of the Plan. The appendices detail certain procedures and events that were undertaken by the Neighbourhood development Plan Steering Group, including; producing questionnaires and running consultation events.

### **The Neighbourhood Development Plan designation**


As part of the process, an NDP area needs to be designated to allow a scope of work to be produced. The NDP area covers the entire Parish of Spridlington which allowed the Parish Council to act as the qualifying body to lead and manage the NDP process.

The consultation period ended on the 15<sup>th</sup> December 2016. The application was approved by West Lindsey District Council on the 20<sup>th</sup> December 2016. The approved NDP designated area

is shown in figure 1 and information on the designation can be found in the Designation Statement on West Lindsey District Council's webpage:

<https://www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building/neighbourhood-planning/all-neighbourhood-plans-in-west-lindsey/spridlington-neighbourhood-plan/>

**Figure 1: Spridlington Neighbourhood Plan Area**



As previously stated, WLDC consulted people who live, work or carry out business in the area about the Neighbourhood Plan designation request along with the proposed area. The full application and relevant information on how to make representations was made available on the Council's website [www.west-lindsey.gov.uk](http://www.west-lindsey.gov.uk).

### **Establishing a Neighbourhood Development Plan steering group**

People from our community have contributed to producing the plan. Everyone who offered their opinion, idea, argument or hands on has helped produce the final Plan. At the time of writing the NDP, the Steering Group consisted of people who have volunteered to work together to complete the process. They usually met once a month, or more if needed, to report on progress and to review comments and ideas, as well as look at new ways to engage with the community. The group reported back to the wider Parish Council when appropriate.

### **Professional support and advice**

The Neighbourhood Plan group received direct support from officers at West Lindsey District Council and independent planning consultants. This support was aimed at both guiding and directing the Neighbourhood Plan Steering group.

## The Consultation Process

The steering group engaged with the whole community in establishing our issues, opportunities, future vision and our objectives for the next 15-20 years.

The benefits of involving a wide range of people within the process, included:

- More focus on priorities identified by our community;
- Influencing the provision and sustainability of local services and facilities;
- Enhanced sense of community empowerment;
- An improved local understanding of the planning process; and
- Increased support for our Neighbourhood Plan through the sense of community ownership.

The Neighbourhood Plan process has clear stages in which the steering group has directly consulted the community on aspects of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, including events, surveys and presentations. Residents were updated on the process through local newsletters, the website: <http://parishes.lincolnshire.gov.uk/Spridlington/index.asp> and the District Council Website. Regular updates were also given to the Parish Council on the progress of the Plan throughout the process.

**Figure 2: List of consultation events and method below shows key dates of the consultation undertaken**

Date	Event	Recipient/ responses
17 <sup>th</sup> November 2016 – 15 <sup>th</sup> December 2016	Designation of Neighbourhood Plan Area consultation	West Lindsey District Council notified the public and relevant agencies of the intent of Spridlington Parish Council
21 <sup>st</sup> February 2017	Initial public meeting.	21 attended as well as representatives from WLDC and NP Champion.
April 2017	Circular – update giving details of Steering Group members and email address to contact the group.	To each household and landowner.
May 2017	Questionnaire distributed to all adult residents. All landowners were contacted.	77.4% response rate from the questionnaire. Received nominations for site submission.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Event</b>	<b>Recipient/ responses</b>
July 2017	Questionnaire distributed to children aged 11-17 years.	13 individuals identified, and 6 responses received 46.2%.
August 2017	Circular with update re response rate and notification of meeting.	To each household and landowner.
23 <sup>rd</sup> August 2017	Drop-in session. Provided more details of questionnaire response and details of sites submitted.	31 attended. Positive comments received about plan development process.
October 2017	Circular – details of questionnaire response and details of sites submitted.	To each household. As a result, further sites submitted.
1 February 2018	Circular – final ‘call for land’ request. Date of the 16 <sup>th</sup> February given.	To each household and landowner. Two further sites submitted.
April 2018	Circular – notification re public consultation evenings.	To each household and landowner.
12 <sup>th</sup> April 2018	Site Allocations Public Consultation	30 people attended, 27 questionnaires returned
13 <sup>th</sup> April 2018	Site Allocations Public Consultation	27 people attended, 24 questionnaires returned
July 2018	Regulation 14 public consultation leaflet drop	To each household and landowner.
2nd August 2018	Regulation 14 public consultation drop-in event	Residents were able to attend and ask questions regarding the draft Neighbourhood Plan.
7th August 2018	Regulation 14 public consultation drop-in event	Residents were able to attend and ask questions regarding the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

The consultation process commenced with a public meeting on 21 February 2017. Twenty-one individuals attended and it was agreed that a neighbourhood plan for the parish should be developed and volunteers were identified to take this work forward.

In May 2017 a questionnaire was distributed to all adult residents within the parish, not simply one per household, and all landowners were notified in writing. There was a 77.4% response rate from residents and in addition nominations for potential sites were received from landowners. A further questionnaire for children aged 11 – 17 years was also distributed in July 2017, with a response rate of 46.2 %

Following analysis of the data collected and comments made, a public drop-in session was organised for 23 August 2017. Results from the questionnaire were displayed, along with maps identifying those areas of interest proposed by landowners and areas where residents' responses indicated development would not be welcome. A comment sheet was provided to each person attending in order to capture opinions and ideas from those viewing the information. 31 people attended and positive comments received about the plan development process. A business questionnaire was made available at the meeting aimed at anyone running a business from home, but there was no response.

The provision of updates to all interested parties was an ongoing activity, including circulars (hand delivered and electronic) and updates on the parish website. Feedback and questions were occasionally received via the email address, all of which were shared with the Steering Group and all respondents received replies to queries or the feedback fed into plan development.

On 1 February 2018, the final 'call for land' request was made. This was sent to households, landowners and interested parties and as a result additional sites were submitted.

Following the implementation of methodology to assess each proposed site and early contact with some key statutory bodies, two further public consultation events were held on 12 and 13 April 2018 to provide all the information available on the proposed sites and ascertain whether the draft vision and objectives developed, as a result of community feedback, were appropriate.

A number of methods were used to disseminate and display the information and questionnaires were provided seeking feedback on each proposed site and the draft vision and objectives. Over the two sessions, 57 people attended and 51 questionnaires completed. The Vision and Objectives of the Plan were adopted.

Regulation 14 consultation was advertised by circular to all residents and (email) to landowners at the end of June 2018. A separate email was sent to those specific landowners who had submitted land for inclusion in the plan, and the outcome, as well as those individuals who had sites which were being proposed for Local Green Space designation. This was to notify them of the site assessment result and that the draft plan would be available on the Spridlington Parish Website from 9th July 2018 for its statutory six-week public consultation. The consultation period began on the 9<sup>th</sup> July 2018 and ended on the 19<sup>th</sup> August 2018.

An announcement of the consultation period was also published in the local parish magazine, the Draft Plan and all appendices uploaded to Spridlington Parish website for viewing from 9 July 2018 and there was an additional circular distributed to all residents offering the opportunity for hard copies of the documents to be available for reading on the evenings of 2 and 7 August 2018 (at the Village Hall), at which members of the Steering Group would be available for any questions. 10 residents attended, and some provided comments on the draft Plan.

In addition, all relevant statutory consultees were also notified by email of the consultation period. Some minor amendments have been made to the Neighbourhood Plan based on the comments received from residents and the statutory consultees and these are summarised in Table 1.

*1 of 2 draft plan Consultation events on the 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2018.*



**Table 1: Regulation 14 Responses and the groups response to each comment**

Consultee	Response	Group Response
<p>1. West Lindsey District Council</p>	<p>Need to ensure that the titles given to supporting documents -e.g. in the contents list- are repeated exactly throughout the document and are also in the documents themselves. There are many occasions when this is not done such as for example just saying Spridlington Character Assessment rather than its correct title Appendix 2: Spridlington Character Assessment. These are all sound documents forming part of the plan and need to be referenced precisely. We would not wish to see any confusion arise as to which is the right document. There are also instances in the plan where reference is made to other documents. A note/link needs to be provided as to where these can be sourced/ viewed. Need to ensure that all figures and maps are referenced in the supporting text/policy otherwise why are they there?</p>	<p>Completed.</p>
	<p>All references to the old NPPF need to be updated RG/DE</p>	<p>Completed.</p>
	<p>There are several instances where Local Plan text/policy is repeated in the NP. It is imperative that this is identical to that given in the final adopted version of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Completed.</p>

Consultee	Response	Group Response
1. West Lindsey District Council	Many maps have poor clarity e.g. Figures 14,16, 17 and 19. They need to be enlarged even if it means they are shown in landscape format.	Noted but did not agree.
	Change '(2012)' to '(2011)'. RG/DE	Completed.
	.. the District's planning policies?	Changed to CLLP.
	.. 11 <sup>th</sup> century were?	Changed to 'was'.
	.....See Appendix 2 Spridlington Character Assessment...	Completed.
	..1886 OS Map see Figure 3?	Completed.
	....1948 OS Map Figure 4?	Completed.
	Need to explain what a "ha ha" is?	Noted. However, it was felt that an explanation for this was not needed and it would be unnecessary to add this into the Plan.
	It would be helpful if you could give more details about each of the sites which together contribute to the 5 dwellings figure and also would be good if each could be annotated on Figure 7a	Completed.
	Growth table as of 27/07/2018 it is still 4 dwellings remaining but might change at any point. A comment explaining that this is a live table is required. RG/DE	Completed.

Consultee	Response	Group Response
	<p>Welcome the approach you have taken here by allocating sites to help meet your growth target and recognise the hard work you have done to identify these sites by way of your Appendix 4 Spridlington Site Assessments document.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>1. West Lindsey District Council</p>	<p>Your approach gives priority primarily to previously developed sites and then infill sites as supported by results from a consultation survey you undertook. This aligns with guidance given in the Local Plan for sequentially selecting sites(Policy LP4). However on the basis of the definition of previously developed land provided in the NPPF unfortunately at least two of the sites you wish to allocate cannot be regarded to be previously developed as the definition excludes land formerly in agricultural use. Maybe it would be best instead to argue for the allocation of these sites on the grounds of huge community support for them compared to other sites and the objective outcomes of the comprehensive site assessment you have undertaken.</p>	<p>Noted and policy re-worded.</p>
	<p>Given what is said above not sure if this policy works any longer. You could perhaps instead say in this policy that priority is given to those sites that have significant community support and backed by your site assessment results. Or would be better if you</p>	<p>As above – noted and policy re-worded.</p>

Consultee	Response	Group Response
<p>1. West Lindsey District Council</p>	<p>used this opportunity to set out your stall by outlining your overall policy approach to meeting and managing your housing growth target during the plan’s lifetime.?</p> <p>e.g.</p> <p>For policy intro use para 4.2. Then say that NP will meet the growth in this order/way during plan period:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. by confirming sites already committed (planning permission/under construction)</li> <li>2. identifying allocated sites supported by consultation survey and site assessment results (your 4 sites). Proposals to increase capacity on these sites would require community support.</li> <li>3. and finally how you would deal with non-allocated/unidentified/windfall proposals during the plan period that could impact on your plan’s delivery of the growth target and which are likely to arise. Proposals such as:-</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- new unallocated housing sites in appropriate locations</li> <li>- loss of dwellings due to demolition</li> </ul>	

Consultee	Response	Group Response
	<p>- conversions of buildings leading to net gain of dwellings which would also count towards growth target.</p> <p>You could possibly deal with all scenarios arising in 3. by stating in your policy that such instances beyond those planned for in NP would require community support or something similar.</p>	
	<p>Policy 1 needs to be reconsidered by the NPG. Currently the policy does not add anything of substance as the wording is taken from the CLLP (NP's should avoid lifting the wording straight from the CLLP into the NP policies). Much of the text should be moved into the supporting text. Instead, a policy which outlines any future development proposals such as infill outside of the NP allocations would appear more appropriate. RG/DE</p>	<p>As above – noted and policy re-worded.</p>
	<p>Would prefer to see site assessment references (NP03 etc) used rather than site 1, 2 etc This avoids introducing a new set of references to plan and also more importantly acknowledges the link between the plan and its supporting document.</p>	<p>Completed.</p>
	<p>This concept is supported by WLDC. The supporting text of this section would benefit by explaining the relationship between the</p>	<p>Policy 1 re-worded. Changes made to extant permissions in document.</p>

Consultee	Response	Group Response
1. West Lindsey District Council	allocations and the growth target. For example a comment which explains that the allocations will take up all the remaining growth would suffice. Also, the policy does not provide a comment on the approach to the extant permissions. In isolation, the document only plans for 4 dwellings whereas the growth target is 9. It is appreciated that the extant permissions are largely under construction, perhaps adding clarity on this situation would be beneficial. RG/DE	
	*Agricultural buildings so not brownfield (Site 1) – not second category sequential test LP4 – Category 3 – Greenfield site on edge of settlement in appropriate locations. RG/DE	Changed.
	Final criterion. This is an agreed community objective 1. But it is felt you could offer local guidance here or make more reference to the Local Plan’s parking standards as it is a community objective.	Noted. This should be managed by WLDC as depends upon unit(s) and size of submitted plan.
	Also fully welcome your decision to allocate sites in your plan. Really helpful and approach fully supported. But realistically though couldn’t some sites take more than one dwelling before having to seek community support? It would be okay for your allocations together to exceed your growth target which is regarded to be a minimum target rather than a maximum	Noted.

Consultee	Response	Group Response
1. West Lindsey District Council	one. You don't have to meet the target exactly.	
	The Local Plan provides some guidance as to what constitutes community support but at end of the day leaves it to the local planning authority to decide. Your neighbourhood plan provides you with the opportunity to define what you regard to be community support in your parish which would be really helpful eg parish council decision/ full parish poll/ part village poll etc	Guidance developed and within Plan.
	The definition at the bottom of the page needs re-wording. Currently it explains that the applicant must demonstrate community support to show that additional dwellings do not conflict with other policies... I don't think this is the intention. Should it read: <i>*** unless it can be demonstrated, through clear community support as described in CLLP policy LP4 that additional dwellings are supported on the site and that additional dwellings would not conflict with other relevant policies within this plan</i> ". RG/DE	Policy 1 re-worded.
	This applies to all allocations policies – consideration should be applied to the way the criterion follow on from the introductory part of the policy. RG/DE	Noted.

Consultee	Response	Group Response
1. West Lindsey District Council	**Is it agricultural or ceased to be agricultural – if Site 3 is not agricultural it is in category 1 of LP4 infill site within developed footprint in appropriate location. RG/DE	Noted and changed.
	Agricultural or residential (probably residential?) see point ** above. RG/DE	Noted and changed.
	In terms of open space the plan makes reference to local green spaces, important verges and in the text mentions important open spaces. There seems to be a lot of crossover here particularly where it talks about important open spaces in the character area text. The plan would benefit from making clearer distinctions between the types of open space and avoid loose references to it in the text. It is essential to keep terms separate to avoid misinterpretation.	Clarification made.
	Are these public open spaces? They need to be publicly accessible and usually publicly owned too e.g. by parish council, WLDC	This is not strictly true. Private land can be protected, but without the consent of the landowner, it can be subject to challenge.
	What is the Green Infrastructure Project proposal and where can it be viewed?	Removed.
	new NPPF para 99 to 101 RG/DE	Changed.
	A revised NPPF has recently been released. All references to NPPF must come from this	Noted and changed where necessary.

Consultee	Response	Group Response
1. West Lindsey District Council	and not previous version e.g. chapters/paras etc.	
	...undermine the reasons for their designation. Where can these reasons be found?	Reasons for their designation are in the Local Green Space Report so a reference to this can be made in part 2 of Policy 6.
	Welcome the designation of Local Green Spaces in your plan and that it is backed up by evidence in Appendix 3. But why aren't the northern grounds of Spridlington Hall assessed or that open space on the northeast corner of the junction of Owmbly Road and Faldingworth Road the latter which is identified by the character assessment? The local green space assessment says that all sites met the criteria on page 15. But appears many sites actually scored red against certain criteria particularly access. Also it would be useful if an explanation could be given as to how the 9 assessment criteria align with the NPPF 's 6. Maybe this could be made in the notes column to the table.	No new LGS designations will be added. Will clarify re new NPPF guidance.
	For some earlier NPs it was suggested that they include a lot of detail from their character assessments. But in the case of this plan this is not considered necessary. It is clear that the character assessment forms part of the plan and should be read in conjunction with it. So it is recommended that chapter 7 be cutback considerably and that for each area only those key features	Chapter 7 has been significantly reduced.

Consultee	Response	Group Response
1. West Lindsey District Council	and attributes be listed for each area as informed by the detailed character assessment. This would enable both development management officers and developers to easily gauge what the design considerations ,as directed by policy 7, should be taken into account for a proposal in a particular character area.	
	A lot of this could go in to appendices as it is the biggest introduction to any policy (Policy 7 and Policy 8). Could the policies be amended to have short introductions/justification like the other policies? RG/DE	Noted.
	<p>This needs to be re-jigged to reflect heading orders as given in supporting text and as initially established by the character assessment</p> <p>eg start with intro .... following principles:</p> <p>then sub headings something on these lines...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Layout and topography</li> <li>-Heritage (point out that this is dealt with under separate policy 8)</li> <li>-Building types ,architectural styles and materials</li> </ul>	Noted by Group but did not agree.

Consultee	Response	Group Response
1. West Lindsey District Council	<p>-Natural features</p> <p>-Boundary treatments and streetscape</p> <p>-Open spaces</p> <p>-Views and vistas</p> <p>Criteria a) to i) in current policy should then be reassigned to one these headings eg b) should be moved under sub heading to views and vistas. This should help user of plan considerably. It will help user cross reference back from policy to guidance lists in supporting text and ultimately to the full detail provided in the character assessment.</p>	
	Part 2 This policy is all about character areas. Rather than use the term open countryside could you instead say Wider Landscape character area?	Changed wording.
	The character assessment flags up the magnificent contribution that trees make to the unique character of Spridlington. But this unfortunately does not appear to be taken forward into the plan itself by way of planning policy. Policy 7 makes no mention of trees.	Most of the significant trees within the village are within the Conservation Area – so are protected. Do not think a policy would add any more weight to their protection.
	A key purpose of the neighbourhood plan will be to guide Spridlington Parish Council when it comes to making comments on planning applications in its area. It is	Noted. However, it was discussed during a Neighbourhood Plan meeting that the existing policies within the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan on these particular

Consultee	Response	Group Response
1. West Lindsey District Council	<p>therefore important that the plan provides policy guidance in general or a specific way to cover all the usual types of application that are likely to be submitted in the parish over the plan period. As well as making allocations and designations the plan can be used to provide guidance on householder proposals (such as alterations, conversions, and extensions) listed building consents, changes of use, works/demolitions in conservation areas, remote barn conversions, holiday let accommodation, commercial operations. As the plan stands it would appear that Policies 7, 8, and 9 provide guidance for such proposals. The group may like to consider whether their NP policies backed by the Local Plan policies are sufficient or whether they would like to include more policy advice to cover the variety of applications they are likely to consider during the NP plan period.</p>	<p>issues raised by WLDC are already covered by their existing planning policy. In addition, for applicants who want to extend their properties or undertake alterations, the village is covered by a Conservation Area designation and therefore existing legislation and guidance is already provided.</p>
	<p>It is noted that the plan provides little specific guidance beyond what is in the local plan for commercial/employment/conversions proposals. Perhaps these may not arise in the Village itself during the plan period but they could possibly occur in the NP area at isolated farms or in character area 3 former RAF Faldingworth.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Consultee	Response	Group Response
1. West Lindsay District Council	Sub title should just read Change of Use as not all categories of buildings in this section are heritage assets as defined earlier. Not sure what the policy is seeking when it says .. the optimum viable use...	Changed.
	... around.. .....in.... ? which one?	Changed to 'in'.
	Are all these views/vistas taken from publicly accessible places? They need to have been.	Yes.
	<p>What about the views from a public spot in Owmbly Road across the paddock (LGS6) out to open countryside in the east and similarly over Spridlington Hall Grounds to open countryside to the west? This is an important east-west green corridor providing open green from inside Spridlington.</p> <p>What about the lovely views of Spridlington from roads into the village especially coming from Owmbly and A15.</p>	Noted but no further views added.
	What is the blue shaded area?	A heritage site called the Ox Pond (and paddock).
	The community aspirations chapter identifies a number of facilities that the residents would like to see in the village e.g. play area, recreational space, footpath extensions/ improvements. Couldn't the plan do more to help realise these ambitions or at least address them more fully in this chapter?	Noted. It was decided to leave this section as it is not a fundamental part of the Plan and the Parish Council can act on these aspirations outside of the Neighbourhood Plan process.

Consultee	Response	Group Response
1. West Lindsey District Council	Need to re-title policy as part 3 covers new community facilities.	Changed.
	Appendix 1 - Is this needed as a separate document? Wouldn't it be better for this information to be moved to Appendix 2 to consolidate what is already there on local/ positive buildings see para 3.1.5? This would avoid any duplication problems that could arise with information.	Noted but no change.
	<p>Appendix 2: Photos provided in document are really helpful. But due to lack of cross referencing both to a map and in the text it is very difficult to gauge the relevance of the photos. Each photo figure should be referred to in text where relevant and also would be good to show photo location and direction taken on a map.</p> <p>The boundary of The Village character area mirrors that of the conservation area apart from Spridlington Hall grounds. This is justified but just wondered if consideration had been given to having other character areas within The Village. The Faldingworth Road area seems to be different to those areas found along Owmbly Road and Cliff Road.</p> <p>3.1.6 It is felt that more justification is required as to why those buildings of local</p>	Noted but document signed off.

Consultee	Response	Group Response
	<p>interest and importance have been identified particularly those added to the original list and which together now form the positive buildings list. Some detail is provided in Appendix 1 but would benefit from photos of buildings like provided for views and vistas in Figure 15.</p>	
	<p>Appendix 3: The example letter says the plan will be reviewed in 5 years time. There is not a legal requirement for NPs to automatically have to do this. Rather this is a decision for the parish council to take in agreement with West Lindsey District Council. A review can only be made to a NP where it is evident that a vital part of plan is shown to be no longer working or something major needs to be added. It is felt that a review of the plan is unlikely to be needed in 5 years' time.</p>	<p>The new NPPF states that all made development plans should be reviewed within 5 years of their adoption.</p>
<p>2. Central Lincolnshire Planning Team</p>	<p>Just to confirm that the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team will not be submitting comments on your draft plan.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>3. Natural England</p>	<p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>4. Environment Agency</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting us on the Spridlington Draft Neighbourhood Plan. We note that parts of the parish are within flood zones 2 and 3. We recognise that the site selection process has applied the</p>	<p>Noted. Copy sent to WLDC and reference to this made in Policies 2,3,4 and 5.</p>



Consultee	Response	Group Response
<p>4. Environment Agency</p>	<p>demonstrate that the risks are acceptable and can be mitigated.</p> <p>We use the zones in conjunction with our Groundwater Protection Policy to set up pollution prevention measures in areas which are at a higher risk.</p> <p>The Environment Agency may object in principle to, or refuse to permit, some activities or developments if they have potential to adversely affect groundwater.</p> <p>We recommend early consultation with Anglian Water to determine whether there is (or will be prior to occupation) sufficient infrastructure capacity existing for the connection, conveyance, treatment and disposal of quantity and quality of water associated with any proposed development within environmental limits of the receiving watercourse.</p> <p>Management of foul water can pose a risk dependent on the method proposed. Generally, the Environment Agency will only agree to developments involving release of sewage effluent, trade effluent or other contaminated discharges to ground if it is satisfied that it is not reasonable to make a connection to the public foul sewer. We do not encourage the use of cesspools or cesspits, other than in exceptional</p>	

Consultee	Response	Group Response
<p>4. Environment Agency</p>	<p>circumstances as there must be no discharge to the environment and poorly managed cesspools and cesspits present a considerable risk of causing pollution, which can be difficult to monitor and correct.</p> <p>Our records show that there is a public sewer within Spridlington (map 2) and as stated all development should be connected to this network to mitigate potential groundwater pollution. We recommend that Anglian Water is consulted regarding the feasibility of connecting sites 1 and 2 (which are up to 170m from the nearest sewer on our map) and the capacity at the nearby Water Recycling Centre.</p> <p>Please note that if connection is not possible, or there is not sufficient capacity in the infrastructure then we must be consulted again with alternative methods of disposal.</p> <p>There is potential that construction activities on the site could pose a pollution risk to groundwater. This should be managed through pollution prevention techniques and agreed through a Construction Environment Management Plan if further investigation deems it necessary and could be dealt with through the planning process.</p>	

Consultee	Response	Group Response
5. Historic England	We do not have any detailed comments to make on the plan at this time.	Noted.
6. Highways	I have now reviewed this document and can respond that Highways England do not have any significant comments to submit for the consultation process	Noted.
7. Marine Management Organisation	<p><b><u>Response to your consultation</u></b></p> <p>The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) is a non-departmental public body responsible for the management of England’s marine area on behalf of the UK government. The MMO’s delivery functions are; marine planning, marine licensing, wildlife licensing and enforcement, marine protected area management, marine emergencies, fisheries management and issuing European grants.</p> <p><b><u>Marine Licensing</u></b></p> <p>Activities taking place below the mean high water mark may require a <a href="#">marine licence</a> in accordance with the <a href="#">Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA) 2009</a>. Such activities include the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object below the mean high water springs mark or in any tidal river to the extent of the tidal influence. You can also apply to the MMO for</p>	Noted.

Consultee	Response	Group Response
7. Marine Management Organisation	<p>consent under the Electricity Act 1989 (as amended) for offshore generating stations between 1 and 100 megawatts in England and parts of Wales. The MMO is also the authority responsible for processing and determining harbour orders in England, and for some ports in Wales, and for granting consent under various local Acts and orders regarding harbours. A wildlife licence is also required for activities that that would affect a UK or European protected marine species.</p> <p><b><u>Marine Planning</u></b></p> <p>As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring tides mark, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. Marine plans will inform and guide decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas. On 2 April 2014 the <a href="#">East Inshore and Offshore marine plans</a> were published, becoming a material consideration for public authorities with decision making functions.</p>	

Consultee	Response	Group Response
7. Marine Management Organisation	<p>The East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans cover the coast and seas from Flamborough Head to Felixstowe. For further information on how to apply the East Inshore and Offshore Plans please visit our <a href="#">Marine Information System</a>. The MMO is currently in the process of developing marine plans for the South Inshore and Offshore Plan Areas and has a requirement to develop plans for the remaining 7 marine plan areas by 2021.</p> <p>Planning documents for areas with a coastal influence may wish to make reference to the MMO's licensing requirements and any relevant marine plans to ensure that necessary regulations are adhered to. For marine and coastal areas where a marine plan is not currently in place, we advise local authorities to refer to the <a href="#">Marine Policy Statement</a> for guidance on any planning activity that includes a section of coastline or tidal river. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with the <a href="#">Marine and Coastal Access Act</a> and the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise.</p> <p>Local authorities may also wish to refer to our <a href="#">online guidance</a> and the <a href="#">Planning</a></p>	

Consultee	Response	Group Response
7. Marine Management Organisation	<p><a href="#">Advisory Service soundness self-assessment checklist.</a></p> <p><b><u>Minerals and waste plans and local aggregate assessments</u></b></p> <p>If you are consulting on a mineral/waste plan or local aggregate assessment, the MMO recommend reference to marine aggregates is included and reference to be made to the documents below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Marine Policy Statement (MPS), section 3.5 which highlights the importance of marine aggregates and its supply to England's (and the UK) construction industry.</li> <li>• The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sets out policies for national (England) construction minerals supply.</li> <li>• The Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS) which includes specific references to the role of marine aggregates in the wider portfolio of supply.</li> <li>• The National and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020 predict likely aggregate demand over this period including marine supply.</li> </ul>	

Consultee	Response	Group Response
	<p>The NPPF informed MASS guidance requires local mineral planning authorities to prepare Local Aggregate Assessments, these assessments have to consider the opportunities and constraints of all mineral supplies into their planning regions – including marine. This means that even land-locked counties, may have to consider the role that marine sourced supplies (delivered by rail or river) play – particularly where land based resources are becoming increasingly constrained.</p>	
<p>8. Western Power</p>	<p>Spridlington village itself appears to be fed from Northern Power Grid’s network. Western Power has network to the south of Spridlington which is covered by Emma Caller who has been cc’d into this email.</p>	<p>Noted. Email sent to Northern Power with information about consultation, however, no response received.</p>
<p>9. National Grid</p>	<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid’s electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution’s Intermediate and High Pressure apparatus.</p> <p>National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Consultee	Response	Group Response
10. Anglian Water	<p>It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of criteria based policies which are intended to be used in the determination of planning applications within the parish. The adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan includes a district wide policy relating to water supply and water recycling infrastructure (Policy LP14). It is expected that development in Spridlington including the proposed allocation sites will comply with Policy LP14 together with the policies of the Spridlington Neighbourhood Plan. Therefore it is not considered necessary to include a similar policy in the Neighbourhood Plan, and we have no comments to make relating to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Noted.
11. Inland Waterways Association	<p>Whilst we respond to West Lindsey DC Planning consultations it is only on areas where there are waterway navigations.</p> <p>In Spridlington`s case it is outside the Inland Waterways Associations remit. We wish you well with the Development of your Neighbourhood Plan which involves a lot of time and effort but is important to ensure the Plan meets the wishes of the village.</p>	Noted.
12. Forestry Commission	Thank you for consulting the Forestry Commission, unfortunately we do not have	Noted.

Consultee	Response	Group Response
	<p>the resources to respond to Neighbourhood plans. If you have ancient woodland within your boundary to consider the Forestry Commission has prepared joint standing advice with Natural England on ancient woodland and veteran trees which we refer you to in the first instance. This advice is a material consideration for planning decisions across England. It explains the definition of ancient woodland, its importance, ways to identify it and the policies that relevant to it. It also provides advice on how to protect ancient woodland when dealing with planning applications that may affect ancient woodland. It also considers ancient wood-pasture and veteran trees</p>	
<p>13. Witham District Internal Drainage Board</p>	<p><b>Witham District Internal Drainage Board Response</b>  <u>Spridlington Draft Neighbourhood Plan</u>  Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Neighbourhood Plan it is partly within Witham Third District Internal Drainage Board area.  The Board supports West Lindsey District Council Planning Policies and this plan in general.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Consultee	Response	Group Response
13. Witham District Internal Drainage Board	<p>Below are general Board comments for Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is suggested that the Neighbourhood Plan should support the idea of sustainable drainage and that any proposed development should be in accordance with Local, National and Regional Flood Risk assessments and Management plans.</li> <li>• No new development should be allowed to be built within flood plain. The 'Flood Maps' on the Environment Agency website provides information on areas at risk. Also risk from surface water flooding should also be considered, information can also be found on the Environment Agency website.</li> <li>• Under the terms of the Land Drainage Act. 1991 and the Board's Byelaws, the prior written consent of the Board is required for any proposed works or structures within any watercourse within the District. This is independent of the Planning Process.</li> </ul> <p>Through the planning process the Board will continue to comment on the individual planning applications, as and when they are submitted. Many of the proposed areas for</p>	

Consultee	Response	Group Response
13. Witham District Internal Drainage Board	development have been subject to multi-agency discussions including this Board with regard to flood risk and surface water discharge.	
14. Shire Group Internal Drainage Board	Dear Sirs, Most of the existing settlement of Spridlington and the proposed development sites indicated within the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan (with the exception of site NP07) lie outside of the Drainage Board District, comments regarding Land Drainage and compliance with the requirements of the Land Drainage Act in such circumstances would be under the responsibility of the relevant Lead Local Flood Authority, unless such matters are administered by the Drainage Board under an extended Boundary Agreement.	Noted.
15. LCC Archaeology (Places Team)	Thank you for consulting this office on the draft neighbourhood plan you have produced. I enjoyed reading it and am pleased to see so much attention given to preserving the historic environment, and the recognition of its role in creating local character and sense of place. Please find attached my formal response and comments on particular points.	Noted.
	This office is pleased to see the strength of community feeling in Spridlington for	Noted.

Consultee	Response	Group Response
15. LCC Archaeology (Places Team)	protecting the village's historic environment, and desire to enhance it and preserve the village's character. It is also good to see that the community places 'respect for the historic environment' within its Community Vision for future development that lies at the heart of its neighbourhood plan.	
	We are also supportive of the policies proposed to protect and enhance the village's historic environment and preserve its sense of place in new development. We also endorse the full list of non-designated heritage assets chosen as 'positive buildings' within the Spridlington Conservation Area. It would however have been desirable for the community to have nominated buildings outside the designated area, as these do not already have protections in place to help preserve them, and raising awareness of particular examples could help contributed to protecting some of the more isolated historic buildings in the parish, and those that originally formed part of former RAF Faldingworth.	Noted but no further action.
	Full comments on the particular elements of the plan are provided below, and on the whole are mainly suggestions to strengthen the plan with additional information, or to point out things that may have been	Noted.

Consultee	Response	Group Response
<p>15. LCC Archaeology (Places Team)</p>	<p>overlooked or heritage assets that are under appreciated. As this office was previously consulted during the production of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, we have not provided further comment on the site allocations or their potential impacts on the village's historic environment.</p>	
	<p><b>2. Introduction to Spridlington</b> We are delighted to see such a detailed and well researched account of the village's past in the plan, firmly grounding it in terms of the historic development that has given the village its character and sense of place today. However, it would be great to include a brief mention of the longer history of settlement in the parish prior to the medieval creation of the present village.</p> <p>The earliest known evidence for human activity in the parish takes the form of two Neolithic flint scrapers found on Spridlington Cliff, perhaps left by one of the first people to settle here, clearing the forest and creating fields to farm the land.</p> <p>By the Bronze Age it is likely that most of the parish's cultivatable land had been cleared of woodland with farmsteads spread across the landscape. This scattered community came together in death with a large cemetery of</p>	<p>The contents of the draft Plan included extracts from the Character Assessment. It was subsequently decided at Steering Group Meeting that information concerning the four character areas would be removed from the Plan, but remain as part of the Character Assessment. Mr Ian Marshman (LCC) and Jen Austin (author Character Assessment) had a discussion about his comments.</p> <p>He subsequently provided some suggested wording and Jen Austin decided to include this information in a revised, final version of the Character Assessment.</p>

Consultee	Response	Group Response
<p>15. LCC Archaeology (Places Team)</p>	<p>round barrows stretching along the 30m contour on the slopes to the cliff, long since ploughed out but still visible today as cropmarks.</p> <p>2.4 A number of Roman objects have been found in the fields close to the village, including coins and a lead weight, and the area probably continued to be settled with small scattered farmsteads during this period. One possible example is known from cropmarks visible on aerial photos in fields south of Cliff Road near Rose Cottage. This was connected to Ermine Street by a trackway which ran through the former barrow cemetery and appears to have continued down the slope in the direction of the present village, where other farms may have been located taking advantage of the spring line.</p> <p>2.5 It is worth stating here that this devastation left Spridlington so depopulated that even today it affects the village's character, as it has still not recovered its former extent. In addition to the scheduled moated site, other earthworks of former medieval settlement exist to the south, east and north of the village.</p>	

Consultee	Response	Group Response
15. LCC Archaeology (Places Team)	2.14 The road was moved presumably so as not to spoil the view from the new Rectory (as Spridlington Hall then was) when it was built in 1841-42. Part of this route remains visible today as an earthwork hollow way within the grounds of the Hall.	
	<p><b>3. Community Vision &amp; Objectives</b> Objective 4: It would be beneficial to include non-designated heritage assets (aka positive buildings) within the first sentence, as this accords with the NPPF (para 189) which underlines that all heritage assets designated or not can have significance derived from their setting, and proposals indirectly harming non-designated assets should also be considered in planning decisions (para 197). This could be reworded as follows:</p> <p>"Objective 4: Historic Environment – To manage new development so it respects and enhances our Listed buildings, the Conservation Area, <b>non-designated 'positive buildings'</b>, and their wider setting. The Plan will <del>also</del> identify such “positive buildings” within the Conservation Area to help retain the area's historic character and identity."</p>	Noted and objective 4 wording amended.
	<p><b>8. Character Area 1: The Village.</b> This office is disappointed to find no mention of the village's moated scheduled monument in this section, particularly in the list of</p>	The contents of the draft Plan included extracts from the Character Assessment. It was subsequently decided at Steering Group Meeting that information concerning the

Consultee	Response	Group Response
<p>15. LCC Archaeology (Places Team)</p>	<p>heritage assets within this character area. It is noted in the characterisation study, so its absence in the plan itself is puzzling. The moated earthworks have been designated because of their national importance, only 2% of archaeological sites are deemed important enough to warrant such a designation. It therefore needs to be given appropriate weight within the plan. If at present little is made of the site, its significance is so high that opportunities to enhance its setting and better reveal its significance should be considered. It should also appear within the important open spaces list, although since it is already designated as a scheduled monument it does not need to be included in the local green space allocation.</p> <p>8.5. As noted in the local history section, the village in fact grew up as a polyfocal settlement with two separate manors and two churches, only merging in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, and even then its two manorial holdings continued to be recognisable into the 19<sup>th</sup> century. This has been studied by the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England in their assessment of the village as part of the survey of medieval remains in North-West Lincolnshire. The village's polyfocal origin</p>	<p>four character areas would be removed from the Plan, but remain as part of the Character Assessment. Mr Ian Marshman (LCC) and Jen Austin (author Character Assessment) had a discussion about his comments.</p> <p>He subsequently provided some suggested wording and Jen Austin decided to include this information in a revised, final version of the Character Assessment.</p>

Consultee	Response	Group Response
15. LCC Archaeology (Places Team)	<p>and later combination is therefore significant and somewhat unusual and contributes to what makes Spridlington today distinctive and characterful. It is therefore factually incorrect and undervaluing the village's historical significance to say it "grew up around the central feature of the church of St Hilary."</p> <p>8.8 Isn't Spriglington Hall located in the Spridlington Hall character area?</p> <p>8.10 Gentrification is an anachronism here. The term has only been used since the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century to describe the movement of wealthy people into areas of deprivation, often where formerly grand historic houses had become multiple occupancy dwellings etc. 'Improvements' would be a better word appropriate to the period under discussion, and certainly what the Rev. Hutton would have said he was doing to better the decayed medieval settlement to make it more polite.</p>	
	<p><b>9. Character Area 2: Spridlington Hall</b>  9.6-7 This section on heritage should refer to the upstanding earthwork remains of the shrunken medieval village preserved within the parkland/character area, such as the hollow way preserving the original course of Owby Road before the Hall was built in the 1840s. These contribute to the park's</p>	As Above.

Consultee	Response	Group Response
15. LCC Archaeology (Places Team)	<p>significance and to the character of the village and conservation area.</p> <p>9.14 It is important to emphasise that the gardens of the hall, including features such as the ha-ha whilst not meeting the requirements for Registration by Historic England, still represent a non-designated heritage asset in their own right. NPPF's definition of 'heritage asset' makes clear that they include designed landscapes such as parks and gardens not just buildings, structures and archaeological sites.</p>	
	<p><b>10. Character Area 3: Former RAF Faldingworth</b></p> <p>This section greatly under appreciates the historic significance of this 20<sup>th</sup> century military site.</p> <p>The phrase "nor does it comprise any heritage assets of special interest locally or nationally" must be removed. Each of the historic buildings and features discussed in this section is a heritage asset, as is the base itself and its below ground archaeological remains. Each of these has local significance and some may even be of national significance. Historic England has produced guidance on assessing 20<sup>th</sup> century military sites and on military structures which could be consulted to improve this section. It is</p>	As above.

Consultee	Response	Group Response
	<p>important to note for instance that some nuclear bomb stores have already been and currently are being considered for designation as Listed buildings.</p> <p>Had this office been consulted earlier we would have been able to help assess the significance of these buildings and provide information on the history of airfield.</p> <p>10.22 Whilst we appreciate it was not possible to enter the character area itself, it should be evident that the lines of former runways, parts of which survive in use for other purposes, are important views and should be protected in any future development within this character area.</p> <p>10.23 Views of church towers were often significant for RAF crews trying to locate themselves. Given that the church lines up with the one of the runways on the base, it is likely that these views would have had significance for such purposes.</p>	
	<p><b>11 Character Area 4: Wider Landscape</b>  This section could have contained some consideration of the archaeology of the parish (such as that mentioned above), each monument of which represents a non-designated heritage asset. This is particularly disappointing when it comes to the many</p>	Noted

Consultee	Response	Group Response
	upstanding earthworks around the village, particularly to the east, which make a significant contribution to the setting of the conservation area and its character and possesses additional evidential and historic value for the information they provide about the village's long history and development.	
16. LCC Public Health	I enjoyed reading the documentation particularly the local history of the area. I have no specific comments but congratulate the steering group on the production of your plan and the acknowledgement to the wider determinants of health and wellbeing	Noted.
17. Met Office	We do not intend to respond to the consultation.	Noted.
18. Community Lincs	No comments to make	Noted.
19. Resident 1	<p>Some brief comments on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan on the Spridlington Website.</p> <p>Well done to all those who have worked hard to do the Plan. It took a long time to read but it was very interesting.</p> <p>When we came to the results of the questionnaire, I remember that there were two graphs, one showing LIKES and another</p>	Noted and included in a supporting document.

Consultee	Response	Group Response
	<p>showing FEARS. I think they both had green spaces right at the top, perhaps you could check.</p> <p>If my memory is right, and nowadays it is not always, then something about these results could be put into the introduction to the Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>This would show that most of the villagers want to keep them, not just the ones who went to the last meetings or just the team who wrote the plan.</p> <p>Well done once more.</p>	
<p>20. Resident 2</p> <p>20. Resident 2</p>	<p>Dear Committee</p> <p>Following on from my chat with a member of the committee at the 'Neighbourhood Plan drop in session' I write to express my concern about the unmandated allocation of protected green spaces in the proposed neighbourhood plan. The omission of the original protected green space as shown in the Spridlington conservation area document to the south and east of Church View Farmhouse is curious. It is important given the opportunity to protect open green spaces in the neighbourhood plan that this area close to the church is protected.</p>	<p>Discussed at Steering Group meeting. Decision was made not to include as proposed LGS designation as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Already within curtilage of Grade II listed building;</li> <li>2. This specific area identified within the Spridlington Conservation area Report (1999)</li> <li>3. Due to the high surrounding hedge it cannot be viewed from a public area</li> </ol> <p>Replied to resident and thanked for contribution and above reasons provided for non-designation as LGS.</p>

Consultee	Response	Group Response
	I look forward to your comments.	
21. Resident 3	Site assessment document – may require more clarification to relate answers with previous (original) questions.	Noted.
22. Resident(s) 4	We have read the neighbourhood plan and we are very happy to support the recommendations put forward.	Noted.
23. Resident(s) 5	Very thorough and comprehensive information – “a huge amount of hard work”. We thoroughly support the details within the Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted.
24. Resident(s) 6	X and I are very happy with the contents of the Neighbourhood Plan. A lot of hard work has been done by the committee and everything in it is as we wished.	Noted.
25. Resident 7	Excellent presentation and explanations of the Plan. A thorough & professional piece of work. The logical layout and interpretation of policies related the neighbourhood plan are clear and fully explained. Hard work and commitment to preserve our beautiful village of which we are all proud and the knowledge that its care for future is in good hands.	Noted.

**Table 2: List of Organisations Contacted and who replied**

Organisations Contacted during Regulation 14 Consultation Period for the Spridlington Draft Neighbourhood Plan					
Organisation	Comment*	Replied	Organisation	Comment*	Replied
WLDC	Y		Forestry Commission	Y	
Central Lincolnshire Planning Team	Y		Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership		N
Lincolnshire County Council		N	Heritage Lincolnshire		N
Faldingworth Parish Council		N	English Heritage		N
Hackthorn & Cold Hanworth PC		N	Internal Drainage Board (Witham)	Y	
Owmby Parish Council		N	Shire Group of Internal Drainage	Y	
The Coal Authority		N	Lincolnshire Community Land Trust		N
Dept of Housing, Planning and Local Government		N	Lincs Historic Buildings Joint Committee		N
Homes England		N	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust		N
Natural England	Y		Society for Protection Ancient Buildings		N
Environment Agency	Y		Sports England		N
Historic England	Y		The Georgian Group		N

Organisations Contacted during Regulation 14 Consultation Period for the Spridlington Draft Neighbourhood Plan					
Highways	Y		The Victorian Society		N
Marine Management Organisation	Y		The Woodland Trust		N
Three		N	West Lincs Community Safety Partnership		N
Vodafone		N	Lincolnshire Agricultural Society		N
Everything Everywhere Limited		N	Lincolnshire Gardens Trust		N
Lincs Partnership NHS Foundation Trust		N	Ramblers Association		N
NHS		N	LCC Public Health	Y	
Western Power	Y		LCC Minerals and Waste		N
National Grid	Y		LCC Economy and Place		N
Anglian Water	Y		LCC Archaeology	Y	
Ancient Monument Society		N	LCC Educational and Cultural Services		N
Inland Waterways Association	Y		LCC Countryside Access		N
Community Lincs	Y		LCCPROW Team		N
CPRE		N	LCC Libraries and Heritage		N
Diocese of Lincoln		N	Amenities Society		N
Church Commissioners for England		N	Lincolnshire Bat Group		N
MOD Safeguarding		N	Lincolnshire Bird Group		N

Organisations Contacted during Regulation 14 Consultation Period for the Spridlington Draft Neighbourhood Plan					
Lincolnshire Rural Housing Association		N	Lindsay Age UK		N
Stagecoach East Midlands		N	Diability Lincs		N
SUSTRANS		N	Call Connect		N
Royal Mail Group		N	Ancholme IDB		N
Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue		N	Government Pipelines & Storage System		N
Lincolnshire Police		N	JPU		N
Met Office	Y		RSPB		N
Twentieth Century Society		N	Society for Lincs History & Archaeology		N