

Sudbrooke NP Examiner Procedural Letter and Questions
Sudbrooke's responses

Hi Steve

Please find attached Sudbrooke PC's responses to the examiner's questions including a revised figure 12 map.

Regards

Nev

ANNEX

From my initial reading of the Sudbrooke Neighbourhood Plan and the supporting evidence, I have the following preliminary questions for SPC and for WLDC:

1. The Plan does not include an indication of the period over which the Plan is to take effect. Could SPC confirm that the Plan period is that shown in the Basic Conditions Statement (paragraph 1.8) as 2018 until 2036?

Yes – We confirm plan period is 2018-2036, which should have been stated in the introduction to Plan (section 1)

2. If the Plan is '*made*' it becomes part of the Development Plan for the area and has the same legal status as the adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP). The Plan makes no reference to the local planning policy framework, including the CLLP, or the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) document. The Basic Conditions Statement, whilst referring to the NPPF, also omits reference to the local policy framework (although it does include a table *Development Management Policies and conformity with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan*). In order to provide clarity, would the SPC and WLDC agree to a new section being incorporated into the text of the Plan following the Introduction section, setting a policy context for the Plan including the NPPF and the CLLP? If this is the case, please can SPC and WLDC provide the appropriate text for insertion.

**We believe that there is sufficient reference to both CLLP and NPPF.
i.e. CLLP in section 7.3 and Fig 7 of the Plan, and Table 3 of Basic Conditions
NPPF in section 2 and 3 and tables 1 and 2 of Basic Conditions.**

We certainly agree that a section could be included in the text of the plan relating to the policy context. Please see draft section as requested;

“Through the Localism Act neighbourhood planning allows for formal mechanisms for greater influence for Parish Councils to set policies for the use of land in their area. Such policies could include; the allocation of sites, the protection of things of importance to residents and design matters. Neighbourhood Plans must meet the legislation and conform with the strategic policies contained within the both the

CLLP and the NPPF. Sudbrooke Parish Council have taken both documents into consideration when preparing the plan”

3. Section 7 makes reference to the CLLP proposal for a 10% increase in new housing in Sudbrooke amounting to around 71 new dwellings, but advises that 181 new homes have already been permitted in the Plan area, with around 155 at Sudbrooke Park. Can WLDC provide reference numbers for the permissions covering the more significant of these developments, and – where possible - links to websites providing the documentation?
We have been informed today (28 Aug) by the Senior Neighbourhood Planning Policy Officer at WLDC, Mr N Brown, that he has responded to this question on our behalf.
4. In the case of Policy 3, Local Green Space, and in order to have due regard to the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance (Reference ID: 37-019-20140306), could SPC confirm that the relevant individual landowners have been contacted at an earlier stage in the Plan-making process?

Sites were identified at the consultation stage so owners had opportunity to see these, where possible owners were contacted. Some sites are of course Parish Council sites.

The following spaces are designated as Local Green Spaces in the Plan;

- a) Site 1: Football pitch - PC
 - b) Site 2: Playground, tennis courts, village hall sports field - PC
 - c) Site 3: Millennium stone at the corner of Holme Drive -**
- PC**
- d) Site 4: Beech tree corner - Wilkinson Farms
 - e) Site 5: Northfield park (including open corner opposite) - PC
 - f) Site 6: Corner of junction Scothern Lane and Wragby Road - LCC Highways
 - g) Site 7: Churchyard - Parish Church. The Rev Penny Green
 - h) Site8: Green between Holme Drive and Courtfield Close - Disputed
 - i) Site 9: Fox Covert with bench and footpath - PC
 - j) Site10: wide planted verge along the entrance to Manor Drive from Scothern Lane. At the time we thought this was LCC Highways but due to a recent land transfer this is now in private ownership and no longer worthy of local Green Space, and thus could be deleted

The majority of sites are in public ownership. Only 2 sites are private. All sites were identified at consultation stage. Site 10 was public ownership at time of Plan development but has recently been transferred to private ownership and the boundary has been moved so that this is no longer valued as a Local green Space.

5. Policy 5 refers to identified ‘*protected trees*’, shown on figures 11 and 12. Figure 11 shows large areas coloured as Protected Trees (TPOs). Can WLDC confirm that these green coloured areas are, in all cases, Area TPOs?

WLDC have responded on our behalf

6. Figure 12 refers to Nettleham Beck and Balancing Ponds, shown as notional linear features. For the purposes of Policy 6, can SPC confirm that the balancing ponds are located within these linear features?

Due to an error, balancing ponds were not identified on fig 12. These 2 ponds are near centre of figure and have been identified on revised Fig 12 as attached

7. Figure 14 shows the identified settlement breaks. Area 1 has a western boundary which follows an identifiable feature – Sudbrooke Road, and the Parish Boundary for a short distance, but then turns eastwards and then northwards away from any identifiable feature on the ground. Can SPC provide a reason for this? Figure 14 also shows a boundary for Area 2 which follows the Parish Boundary and some identifiable features for the eastern and southern boundary, but large parts of the northern and western boundaries appear to be arbitrarily defined. Can SPC provide a justification for this?

For Area1, the southern boundary is Nettleham Beck. The east boundary is the edge of woodland and the adjacent public footpath, PF159 running north to south

For Area 2, the north and west boundaries are roughly defined by the Lake/Lakefield and poultry houses

8. For the purposes of Policy 10, non-designated – or locally listed – heritage assets are identified in Appendix 2 and have been assessed using the criteria in the NPPF. Can SPC confirm that individual owners also been consulted about the proposed inclusion of their properties as suggested in Historic England’s Advice Note 7, paragraph 23?

Members of the NP steering group wrote and visited as many owners as possible. Only one owner did not respond. Sites in Appendix 2 were identified on draft plan at consultation stage

9. Does SPC have any further comments it wishes the Examination to take into account relating to the Regulation 16 responses?

Not at this stage. Thank you.

Figure 12: Significant trees (those not subject to a TPO) and Nettleham Beck and Balancing Ponds in Sudbrooke

