

# **Corringham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2021-2036**

**A report to West Lindsey District Council on the  
Corringham Neighbourhood Development Plan**

**Andrew Ashcroft  
Independent Examiner  
BA (Hons) MA, DMS, MRTPI**

**Director – Andrew Ashcroft Planning Limited**

## **Executive Summary**

- 1 I was appointed by West Lindsey District Council in August 2021 to carry out the independent examination of the Corringham Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- 2 The examination was undertaken by written representations. I visited the neighbourhood area on 11 August 2021.
- 3 The Plan proposes a series of policies and seeks to bring forward positive and sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. It allocates three sites for housing purposes and proposes the designation of local green spaces.
- 4 The Plan has been underpinned by community support and engagement. The community has been engaged in its preparation in a proportionate way.
- 5 Subject to a series of recommended modifications set out in this report I have concluded that the Corringham Neighbourhood Development Plan meets all the necessary legal requirements and should proceed to referendum.
- 6 I recommend that the referendum should be held within the neighbourhood area.

**Andrew Ashcroft**  
**Independent Examiner**  
**1 October 2021**

## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 This report sets out the findings of the independent examination of the Corringham Neighbourhood Development Plan 2021-2036 ('the Plan').
- 1.2 The Plan has been submitted to West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) by Corringham Parish Council (CPC) in its capacity as the qualifying body responsible for preparing the neighbourhood plan.
- 1.3 Neighbourhood plans were introduced into the planning process by the Localism Act 2011. They aim to allow local communities to take responsibility for guiding development in their area. This approach was subsequently embedded in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2012, 2018, 2019 and 2021. The NPPF continues to be the principal element of national planning policy.
- 1.4 The role of an independent examiner is clearly defined in the legislation. I have been appointed to examine whether or not the submitted Plan meets the basic conditions and Convention Rights and other statutory requirements. It is not within my remit to examine or to propose an alternative plan, or a potentially more sustainable plan except where this arises as a result of my recommended modifications to ensure that the plan meets the basic conditions and the other relevant requirements.
- 1.5 A neighbourhood plan can be narrow or broad in scope. Any plan can include whatever range of policies it sees as appropriate to its designated neighbourhood area. The submitted Plan has been designed to be distinctive in general terms, and to be complementary to the development plan in particular. It addresses a range of housing, environmental and community issues and proposes the allocation of three housing sites.
- 1.6 Within the context set out above, this report assesses whether the Plan is legally compliant and meets the basic conditions that apply to neighbourhood plans. It also considers the content of the Plan and, where necessary, recommends changes to its policies and supporting text.
- 1.7 This report also provides a recommendation as to whether the Plan should proceed to referendum. If this is the case and that referendum results in a positive outcome, the Plan would then be used to determine planning applications within the neighbourhood area and will sit as part of the wider development plan.

## **2 The Role of the Independent Examiner**

- 2.1 The examiner's role is to ensure that any submitted neighbourhood plan meets the relevant legislative and procedural requirements.
- 2.2 I was appointed by WLDC, with the consent of CPC, to conduct the examination of the Plan and to prepare this report. I am independent of both WLDC and CPC. I do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan.
- 2.3 I possess the appropriate qualifications and experience to undertake this role. I am a Director of Andrew Ashcroft Planning Limited. In previous roles, I have over 35 years' experience in various local authorities at either Head of Planning or Service Director level. I am a chartered town planner and have significant experience of undertaking other neighbourhood plan examinations and health checks. I am a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute and the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service.

### *Examination Outcomes*

- 2.4 In my role as the independent examiner of the Plan I am required to recommend one of the following outcomes of the examination:
- (a) that the Plan as submitted should proceed to a referendum; or
  - (b) that the Plan should proceed to referendum as modified (based on my recommendations); or
  - (c) that the Plan does not proceed to referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 2.5 The outcome of the examination is set out in Sections 7 and 8 of this report.

### *Other examination matters*

- 2.6 In examining the Plan I am required to check whether:
- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood plan area; and
  - the Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the Plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one neighbourhood area); and
  - the Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under Section 61G of the Localism Act and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.
- 2.7 I have addressed the matters identified in paragraph 2.6 of this report. I am satisfied that the submitted Plan complies with the three requirements subject to the recommended modification in this report on the matter of the Plan period.

### 3 Procedural Matters

3.1 In undertaking this examination I have considered the following documents:

- the submitted Plan.
- the Basic Conditions Statement.
- the Consultation Statement.
- the SEA/HRA screening report.
- the Site Options and Assessment report (AECOM).
- the various related documents on the site selection methodology and feedback from related consultation.
- the Character Assessment (Carroll Planning and Design).
- the representations made to the Plan.
- the Parish Council's responses to the Clarification Note.
- the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012 to 2036.
- the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Review Consultation Draft June 2021.
- the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.
- Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014 and subsequent updates).
- relevant Ministerial Statements.

3.2 I visited the neighbourhood area on 11 August 2021. I looked at its overall character and appearance and at those areas affected by policies in the Plan in particular. The visit is covered in more detail in paragraphs 5.9 to 5.16 of this report.

3.3 It is a general rule that neighbourhood development plan examinations should be held by written representations only. Having considered all the information before me, including the representations made to the submitted plan, I was satisfied that the Plan could be examined without the need for a public hearing. I reached this decision once I had received the responses to the clarification note.

## 4 Consultation

### *Consultation Process*

- 4.1 Policies in made neighbourhood plans become the basis for local planning and development management decisions. As such the regulations require neighbourhood plans to be supported and underpinned by public consultation.
- 4.2 In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 CPC prepared a Consultation Statement. It provides specific details on the consultation process that took place on the pre-submission version of the Plan from November 2020 to January 2021.
- 4.3 The Statement also sets out details of the consultation events that were carried out in relation to the initial stages of the Plan. Details are provided about the engagement with the statutory bodies and the public consultation events in the area. Specific events highlighted include:
- the community questionnaire (September to November 2016);
  - the Village Hall event (March 2019);
  - the site selection and assessment process (June and July 2020);
  - the consultation on the housing site selection process (including drop-in sessions) (September 2020); and
  - the meetings/phone calls with landowners/agents (September 2020).
- 4.4 Table 1 of the Statement sets out details of the responses received on the pre-submission version of the Plan. It also sets out how the Plan responded to those representations. The exercise has been undertaken in a very thorough and proportionate fashion.
- 4.5 The Statement also includes a series of appendices. In most cases they reproduce earlier publicity material and summarise the results/feedback of those activities. The appendices provide a degree of interest and distinctive flavour to the Statement.
- 4.6 From all the evidence provided to me as part of the examination, I conclude that the Plan has sought to develop an inclusive approach to seeking the opinions of all concerned throughout the process. WLDC has carried out its own assessment of this matter as part of the submission process and has concluded the consultation process has complied with the requirements of the Regulations.

### *Representations Received*

- 4.7 Consultation on the submitted plan was undertaken by the District Council. It ended on 21 May 2021. This exercise generated comments from a range of statutory and local organisations. They are listed below:

- Historic England

- Department of International Trade
- Mobile Broadband Network
- Environment Agency
- Nottinghamshire County Council
- Defence Industry Organisation
- Thonock and Somerby Estates
- North Kesteven District Council
- Health and Safety Executive
- National Grid
- Natural England
- Severn Trent Water
- Anglian Water Services
- Highways England
- Scunthorpe and Gainsborough Internal Drainage Board
- NHS Lincolnshire Clinical Commissioning Group
- Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board
- West Lindsey District Council
- Forestry Commission

4.8 One representation was also received from a local resident.

4.9 In most cases the various bodies raise no comments or objections on the submitted Plan. This reflects the collaborative way in which the Plan has been produced in general, and the positive way in which it has incorporated earlier comments from these and other bodies in particular. This is a major achievement. It reflects the way in which the Plan has been prepared and how CPC has managed the wider process.

4.10 I have taken account of all these representations as part of the examination of the Plan. Where it is appropriate and relevant to do so I refer specifically to the representation concerned in this report.

## 5 The Neighbourhood Area and the Development Plan Context

### *The Neighbourhood Area*

- 5.1 The neighbourhood area is the parish of Corringham. It was most-recently designated as a neighbourhood area in March 2020. In 2011 it had a population of 523 persons living in 217 households. 163 of these households are in Corringham village.
- 5.2 The neighbourhood area sits in open countryside to the immediate east of Gainsborough. It is irregular in shape. Corringham is the principal settlement in the neighbourhood area and is located on and to the immediate north of the A631. Aisby is a smaller settlement to the north of Corringham with a very distinctive and attractive settlement pattern. There is also a group of properties at Yawthorpe to the east of Corringham. The remainder of the neighbourhood area is in agricultural use.
- 5.3 Corringham itself is heavily-influenced by its location in its wider natural landscape. It has a strong nucleated pattern arranged around Middle Street which runs on a north-south access and connects High Street (A631) to the south with Mill Mere Road/East Lane to the north. St Laurence Church dominates the northern part of the village. As a whole Corringham has an attractive relationship with the surrounding countryside.

### *Development Plan Context*

- 5.4 The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP) was adopted in April 2017. It sets out the basis for future development in the central Lincolnshire area up to 2036. The CLLP provides a very clear spatial context for development in the Plan area. Policy LP2 provides a focus for development by way of a settlement hierarchy as follows: the Lincoln urban area, the main towns, the market towns, larger villages, medium villages, smaller villages, hamlets and the countryside. Within this hierarchical approach Corringham is identified as a 'Small Village'.
- 5.5 Policy LP2 also provides a framework for the development of neighbourhood plan policies in the various settlement categories. In the context of small villages, it identifies that unless otherwise promoted via a neighbourhood plan or through the demonstration of clear local community support, the settlements will accommodate small scale development of a limited nature in appropriate locations. Proposals will be considered on their merits but would be limited to around 4 dwellings, or 0.1 hectares per site for employment uses. Policy LP4 provides further details for the type of development proposed in the small villages and sets a growth requirement for Corringham.
- 5.6 The CLLP includes a wide range of other policies. The Basic Conditions Statement helpfully captures these against the various policies in the submitted Plan. In summary, the following other CLLP policies have been particularly important in underpinning neighbourhood plan policies:

LP15 Community Facilities

LP23 Local Green Spaces and other Important Open Space

LP25 The Historic Environment  
 LP26 Design and Amenity  
 LP55 Development in the Countryside

5.7 A review of the CLLP has now started. Consultation took place on a draft plan between June and August 2021 whilst the examination was taking place. Given the stage which the CLLP review has reached it has a limited influence on this examination. Nevertheless, I have referred to the Plan review process later in this report insofar as it has a bearing on the monitoring and review of any ‘made’ neighbourhood plan.

5.8 It is clear that the submitted Plan has been prepared within the context provided by the adopted Local Plan. In doing so it has relied on up-to-date information and research that has underpinned the Local Plan. This is good practice and reflects key elements in Planning Practice Guidance on this matter.

*Unaccompanied Visit to the neighbourhood area*

5.9 I visited the neighbourhood area on 11 August 2021.

5.10 I drove into Corringham from Gainsborough to the west along the A631. I immediately saw the way in which the neighbourhood area was set on higher ground from Gainsborough and the River Trent. I also saw first-hand the excellent road system connecting the neighbourhood area with Gainsborough.

5.11 I looked initially at two of the three proposed housing allocations in Middle Street. I saw that the one on Poplar Lane was more intimate in character whereas the one at Corner Farm was more open and extensive.

5.12 I walked along Middle Street to the village pond. It was as attractive as indicated in the photograph in the Plan. I enjoyed the morning sunshine on the Rex Butler seat in the green area around the pond itself. I also took the opportunity to look at the recreation ground to the immediate east of the pond. I then saw the school and its obvious role in the community. I had earlier seen its play area from the south.

5.13 I then took the opportunity to look at St Laurence Church. I saw its impressive tenth century tower and the equally impressive roll moulding in the tower arch. I appreciated the more modest vernacular buildings in its immediate vicinity.

5.14 I then walked along East Lane. I saw the newly-constructed houses at its eastern end and the way in which they provided the backcloth to the third proposed residential allocation in the Plan.

5.15 I then drove to Aisby. I saw that it had a very different character to that of Corringham based on its horseshoe road system. I saw a variety of traditional and more modern buildings. The relationship of the village to agriculture in the wider neighbourhood area was self-evident.

- 5.16 I left the neighbourhood area by driving along the A631 to the east and up to the A15. This further reinforced the way in which the parish was well-connected to the strategic road network.

## 6 The Neighbourhood Plan and the Basic Conditions

6.1 This section of the report deals with the submitted neighbourhood plan as a whole and the extent to which it meets the basic conditions. The submitted Basic Conditions Statement has helped considerably in the preparation of this section of the report. It is a well-presented and informative document. It is also proportionate to the Plan itself.

6.2 As part of this process I must consider whether the submitted Plan meets the Basic Conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. To comply with the basic conditions, the Plan must:

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in the area;
- be compatible with European Union (EU) obligations and the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR); and
- not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

6.3 I assess the Plan against the basic conditions under the following headings:

### *National Planning Policies and Guidance*

6.4 For the purposes of this examination the key elements of national policy relating to planning matters are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued in July 2021. The Plan was prepared on the basis of the 2019 version of the NPPF. Where its policies are affected by the changes to the NPPF I make any necessary comments in Section 7 of this report.

6.5 The NPPF sets out a range of core land-use planning issues to underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. The following are of particular relevance to the Corringham Neighbourhood Plan:

- a plan-led system – in this case the relationship between the neighbourhood plan and the adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan;
- delivering a sufficient supply of homes;
- building a strong, competitive economy;
- recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving local communities;
- taking account of the different roles and characters of different areas;
- addressing climate change and flood risk issues;
- highlighting the importance of high-quality design and good standards of amenity for all future occupants of land and buildings; and
- conserving heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

- 6.6 Neighbourhood plans sit within this wider context both generally, and within the more specific presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 13 of the NPPF indicates that neighbourhoods should both develop plans that support the strategic needs set out in local plans and plan positively to support local development that is outside the strategic elements of the development plan.
- 6.7 In addition to the NPPF I have also taken account of other elements of national planning policy including Planning Practice Guidance and ministerial statements.
- 6.8 Having considered all the evidence and representations available as part of the examination I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to national planning policies and guidance in general terms. It sets out a positive vision for the future of the neighbourhood area. In particular it includes policies to bring forward appropriate residential growth in the parish. It also proposes the designation of local green spaces. The Basic Conditions Statement maps the policies in the Plan against the appropriate sections of the NPPF.
- 6.9 At a more practical level the NPPF indicates that plans should provide a clear framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made and that they should give a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to a development proposal (paragraph 16d). This was reinforced with the publication of Planning Practice Guidance in March 2014. Paragraph ID:41-041-20140306 indicates that policies in neighbourhood plans should be drafted with sufficient clarity so that a decision-maker can apply them consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. Policies should also be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.
- 6.10 As submitted the Plan does not fully accord with this range of practical issues. The majority of my recommended modifications in Section 7 relate to matters of clarity and precision. They are designed to ensure that the Plan fully accords with national policy.

*Contributing to sustainable development*

- 6.11 There are clear overlaps between national policy and the contribution that the submitted Plan makes to achieving sustainable development. Sustainable development has three principal dimensions – economic, social and environmental. It is clear that the submitted Plan has set out to achieve sustainable development in the neighbourhood area. In the economic dimension, the Plan includes policies for housing and employment development (Policies CNP2 and 15 respectively). In the social role, it includes policies on open spaces (Policy CNP10), local green spaces (Policy CNP11), and community facilities (Policy CNP14). In the environmental dimension the Plan positively seeks to protect its natural, built and historic environment. It has specific policies on local character and design (Policy CNP5), on key views (Policy CNP6) and on heritage matters (Policies CNP 7/8/9). CPC has undertaken its own assessment of this matter in the submitted Basic Conditions Statement.

*General conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan*

- 6.12 I have already commented in detail on the development plan context in West Lindsey District in paragraphs 5.4 to 5.8 of this report. I am satisfied that subject to the incorporation of the modifications recommended in this report that the submitted Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan.
- 6.13 I also consider that the submitted Plan delivers a local dimension to this strategic context. The Basic Conditions Statement helpfully relates the Plan's policies to policies in the development plan. I am satisfied that the submitted Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan.

*European Legislation and Habitat Regulations*

- 6.14 The Neighbourhood Plan General Regulations 2015 require a qualifying body either to submit an environmental report prepared in accordance with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 or a statement of reasons why an environmental report is not required.
- 6.15 In order to comply with this requirement, a screening exercise was undertaken on the need or otherwise for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be prepared for the Plan. The report (December 2020) is thorough and well-constructed. As a result of this process, it concluded that the Plan is not likely to have any significant effects on the environment and accordingly would not require SEA. The screening report reached this conclusion on the following basis:
- no sensitive natural or heritage assets will be significantly affected by policies contained in the Plan;
  - the policies are in general conformity with those within the CLLP; and
  - the Plan does not allocate specific large development sites or promote a large amount of development.
- 6.16 The screening report includes a separate Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Plan. It comments that there are no protected sites within 15kms of the neighbourhood area. Nevertheless, it assesses the potential impact of the Plan's policies on both the Hatfield Moor SAC and the Humber Estuary Ramsar and SAC. It concludes that the Plan is not considered to have the potential to cause a likely significant adverse effect on a European protected site. It also concludes that there will be no likely significant in-combination effects.
- 6.17 The screening reports include the responses received as part of the required consultation process with statutory bodies. In doing so, they provide assurance to all concerned that the submitted Plan takes appropriate account of important ecological and biodiversity matters.
- 6.18 Having reviewed the information provided to me as part of the examination, I am satisfied that a proportionate process has been undertaken in accordance with the various regulations. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, I am entirely satisfied that the submitted Plan is compatible with this aspect of European obligations.

- 6.19 In a similar fashion I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and that it complies with the Human Rights Act. There is no evidence that has been submitted to me to suggest otherwise. In addition, there has been full and adequate opportunity for all interested parties to take part in the preparation of the Plan and to make their comments known. On the basis of all the evidence available to me, I conclude that the submitted Plan does not breach, nor is in any way incompatible with the ECHR.

*Summary*

- 6.20 On the basis of my assessment of the Plan in this section of my report I am satisfied that it meets the basic conditions subject to the incorporation of the recommended modifications contained in this report.

## 7 The Neighbourhood Plan policies

- 7.1 This section of the report comments on the policies in the Plan. In particular, it makes a series of recommended modifications to ensure that the various policies have the necessary precision to meet the basic conditions.
- 7.2 My recommendations focus on the policies themselves given that the basic conditions relate primarily to this aspect of neighbourhood plans. In some cases, I have also recommended changes to the associated supporting text.
- 7.3 I am satisfied that the content and the form of the Plan is fit for purpose. It is distinctive and proportionate to the Plan area. The wider community and the Parish Council have spent time and energy in identifying the issues and objectives that they wish to be included in their Plan. This sits at the heart of the localism agenda.
- 7.4 The Plan has been designed to reflect Planning Practice Guidance Section (41-004-20190509) which indicates that neighbourhood plans must address the development and use of land. It also includes three Community Aspirations.
- 7.5 I have addressed the policies in the order that they appear in the submitted plan. The Community Aspirations are addressed after the policies.
- 7.6 For clarity this section of the report comments on all policies whether or not I have recommended modifications in order to ensure that the Plan meets the basic conditions.
- 7.7 Where modifications are recommended to policies they are highlighted in bold print. Any associated or free-standing changes to the text of the Plan are set out in italic print.

### *The initial sections of the Plan (Sections 1-6)*

- 7.8 These introductory elements of the Plan set the scene for the policies. They are commendable in the way that they are proportionate to the Plan area and its subsequent policies. The Plan is very well-presented. The distinction between the policies and the supporting text is very clear. It is helpfully supported by tables and maps.
- 7.9 Section 1 provides an introduction to the Plan. It includes information about the background to the preparation of the Plan. It is a particularly effective and concise introduction to a neighbourhood plan. It identifies the neighbourhood area (Figure 1) and when it was designated. I recommend that this part of the Plan defines the Plan period and that the relevant information is also shown in the front cover of the Plan. This approach will ensure that the Plan complies with Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

*At the end of paragraph 1.2 add: 'The Plan period is 2021 to 2036'*

*On the front cover of the Plan after the Plan title add '2021 to 2036'*

- 7.10 Section 2 comments about the neighbourhood area. It provides details about its population, its community facilities and its business profile. It sets the scene for the Plan and its policies in a very comprehensive fashion.
- 7.11 Section 3 comments about the policy context within which the Plan was prepared. It helpfully includes commentary on the NPPF, the CLLP (and its review) and the contents of the Gainsborough neighbourhood plan (to the immediate west of the parish).
- 7.12 Section 4 comments about the way in which the Plan has been produced and how the community has been engaged in the process. It overlaps with the Consultation Statement. It is particularly effective in setting out the outcome of the various engagement processes.
- 7.13 Section 5 comments about the evidence which has underpinned the Plan's production. In particular, it highlights the importance of the Character Assessment, Census data and the planning policy context. It also comments about the site selection process. This wider approach is very effective and reflects best practice. It demonstrates that the Plan's production has been evidence-based.
- 7.14 Section 6 sets out a Vision and Objectives for the Plan. The summary on page 38 of the Plan on the relationship between the policies and the objectives demonstrates this matter very clearly. The approach taken provides assurance to all concerned that the Plan has addressed key local issues.
- 7.15 The remainder of this section of the report addresses each policy in turn in the context set out in paragraphs 7.5 to 7.7 above.

#### CNP 1: Sustainable development principles

- 7.16 The policy sets out a series of sustainable development principles with which new development should comply. It has been designed to provide a positive framework for decision making, as required by the NPPF.
- 7.17 The general approach of the policy meets the basic conditions. The principles are locally-distinctive.
- 7.18 I recommend a detailed modification to the wording of the fifth criterion so that it has the clarity required by the NPPF for a development plan policy. I also recommend that the eighth criterion is repositioned so that it reads as a separate part of the policy. It is different in its approach and context to the preceding criteria and, in any event, will not necessarily apply to all development proposals.
- 7.19 The final part of the policy comments about the importance of sustainable development (as defined elsewhere in the policy) not contributing to the risk of flooding in the parish. Whilst this is an important matter it reads as supporting text rather than policy. In this context I recommend that it is deleted from the policy and repositioned into the supporting text.

#### **In the fifth criterion replace 'adversely' with 'unacceptably'**

**Reposition the eighth criterion so that it reads as a free-standing section of the policy. In doing so replace ‘Encouragement’ with ‘Support’**

**Delete the second part of the policy.**

*Replace the third paragraph of supporting text with: ‘Whilst the Parish Council supports appropriate development in Corringham, it is important that it does not increase the risk of flooding and/or exacerbate existing drainage problems. This approach takes account of the requirements of national policy, advice from the Environment Agency and the provisions of Policy LP14 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017)’*

CNP 2: Sites for new housing in Corringham village

7.20 This policy allocates three sites for residential development in Corringham as follows:

- land north of East Lane (Site A);
- land at Corner Farm (Site B); and
- land off Poplar Lane (Site C).

It identifies specific criteria for the development of each site and then general criteria for the three sites.

7.21 The collective yield of the three sites has been designed to be of a scale to meet the new dwelling requirement for the parish set out in the CLLP (Policy LP4).

7.22 Since the Plan was submitted a Consultation Draft of the CLLP Review was published (in June 2021). Policy S81 of the Draft Plan includes a proposal for housing development to the north of High Street, Corringham (WL/COR/002A). The emerging Plan is not part of the development plan and is at an early stage of development. As such I attach little weight to its contents. It is however a matter which I recommend is addressed in any review of a made neighbourhood plan.

7.23 I have taken a similar approach in terms of the representation to the Plan made by the Thonock and Somersby Estate. Whilst the Estate supports the allocation of the three sites in the Plan it suggests that it allocates two additional sites – land to the north of High Street and land to the south of High Street. The former site forms part the parcel of land proposed for housing development in the Consultation Draft of the CLLP Review (WL/COR/002A). In both cases, the two additional sites proposed in the representation were rated lower than the three allocated sites in the site assessments which accompanied the submitted neighbourhood plan.

7.24 I looked at the three sites allocated in the submitted neighbourhood plan carefully when I visited the neighbourhood area. I saw that the first site would be a continuation of the site of the recently-completed houses to the immediate north of East Lane. The other two sites are free-standing. In each case the three sites are well-related to existing development in Corringham.

7.25 As submitted the policy has a complicated format. I recommend modifications so that the opening part of the policy sets the scene for the development of the three sites. In particular the recommended modifications address the following matters:

- the removal of unnecessary supporting text in the policy;
- making more definitive statements about highways access (rather than commenting that agreement needs to be made with the County Council);
- ensuring that the requirement for compliance with the Character Assessment is both with its excellent design summary (Section 5) and the relevant character area rather than simply the detailed assessments for the various Character Areas; and
- establishing a clear relationship between the relevant parts of the policy and the Plan's approach towards non-designated heritage assets (in Policy CNP 8).

7.26 There is a slight discrepancy between the extent of the Corner Farm site on the aerial photograph (on page 41) and on the Proposals Map (page 58). In its response to the clarification note CPC advised that the correct site was that as shown in the photograph. I recommend that the Proposals Map is modified accordingly. In doing so I am satisfied that no party has been disadvantaged by this matter.

7.27 In a similar fashion the lettering for the three sites in the policy does not align with that in the Proposal Map which is specific to this policy. I recommend accordingly.

7.28 Otherwise, the policy meets the basic conditions. It will contribute significantly to the delivery of the economic dimension of sustainable development in the parish. In addition, the various criteria will ensure that high-quality development is secured on the three sites and which will overlap with other policies in the Plan.

**Replace the policy with:**

**'The sites listed below and shown on the Proposal Map (see below) are allocated for housing development.**

**Development proposals on the three sites will be supported where they meet the criteria associated with the various sites as follows:**

**A - Land north of East Lane (approximately 7 dwellings):**

- **the design/development form should be informed by the Character Assessment in general, the contents of its Section 5 and the specific recommendations for Character Area 2 and reflect/complement adjoining dwellings, with detached properties at low density and with single level or dormer style units adjoining existing dwellings;**
- **the provision of open spaces along the eastern boundary, retaining the existing hedge and ditch and incorporating habitat creation and connectivity to maintain the rural character of the lane;**
- **the provision of hedge and tree planting along the northern boundary to create an appropriate relationship with the open countryside beyond and increase habitat connectivity; and**
- **the incorporation of measures to manage the disposal of surface water and the existing risk of surface water flooding.**

**B - Land at Corner Farm (approximately 5 dwellings):**

- the provision of a satisfactory vehicular access from either Middle Street or the A631;
- the retention of the existing farmhouse and outbuildings taking account of their identification as a non-designated heritage asset;
- the retention of the existing hawthorn hedge on Middle Street and two Copper Beech trees and their sensitive incorporation into the development;
- the delivery of single level or dormer style dwellings to complement the existing bungalows to the north; and
- the design/development form should be informed by the Character Assessment in general, the contents of its Section 5 and the specific recommendations for Character Area 6.

**C - Land off Poplar Lane (approximately 2 to 3 dwellings):**

- the provision of a satisfactory access from Poplar Lane which retains the rural character of the lane through the retention of the existing brick boundary wall;
- the retention of the existing house and the outbuilding/former butchers taking account of their identification as a non-designated heritage asset;
- the sensitive development of two new dwellings in the grounds of the existing house;
- the retention of the existing hawthorn hedge on Middle Street and the adjacent orchard trees and their sensitive incorporation into the development; and
- the design/development form should be informed by the Character Assessment in general, the contents of its Section 5 and the specific recommendations for Character Areas 4 and 5.

**In addition, each site, should meet the following requirements:**

- the provision of electric vehicle charging points for individual dwellings; and
- the size and layout of dwellings should make provision for home working where practicable.’

*On the Proposals Map modify the extent of the Corner Farm site (B) so that it coincides with the aerial photograph of the site as shown on page 41 of the Plan.*

*On the policy specific Proposals Map on page 41 identify the sites so that they coincide with the site as shown in the policy itself.*

CNP 3: Consideration of new houses in the hamlet of Aisby and in open countryside

7.29 This policy sets out an approach for new residential development in Aisby and the wider open countryside. It has two related parts. The first refers to the policy approach in the CLLP. The second sets out specific criteria which relate to the findings of the Character Assessment.

- 7.30 In general terms, the policy approach has been well-considered. In particular, it intends to marry the approach in Policy LP2 of the CLLP with the findings of the Character Assessment (Character Area 8). Nevertheless, it then seeks to apply the same principles for the Aisby Character Area to the countryside for which a specific character area has not been defined. In its response to my question on this matter in the clarification note CPC commented:

*‘the detailed requirement emerged from the Character Study, which looked at Aisby in detail. However, we would wish the design principles to apply to any proposed new dwellings in Yawthorpe and the open countryside. Perhaps this could be best achieved by an additional clause’*

- 7.31 I have considered this suggestion very carefully. On balance, I am not satisfied that it would either be appropriate or evidence-based to apply an approach which has been developed for Aisby in the Character Assessment to another location and/or the wider countryside. In any event, as the policy comments different elements of Policy LP2 of the CLLP apply to hamlets (Clause 7) and to the countryside (Clause 8). In these circumstances, I recommend that the policy is reconfigured so that it applies the restrictive approach to the countryside as set out in national and local planning policies. In reaching this conclusion I have also taken account of the representations from the Thonock and Somerby Estate.
- 7.32 I also recommend detailed modifications to the wording of the policy itself. As submitted, it requires the reader to refer directly to the relevant policy in the CLLP. I also recommend that some of the explanation in the policy itself is repositioned into the supporting text.
- 7.33 Finally I recommend detailed modifications to the criteria in the policy to ensure that they have the clarity required by the NPPF.

**Replace the opening part of the policy with:**

**‘Development proposals for new residential development in Aisby will be supported where they are for single-dwelling infill developments and meet the following criteria:’**

**In i) replace ‘Materials’ with ‘the materials used’ and ‘noting the need for’ with ‘and with a particular emphasis on the use of’**

**In ii) replace ‘must’ with ‘should’**

**In iii) replace ‘unlisted buildings of positive character’ with ‘non-designated heritage assets’, ‘must’ with ‘should’ and ‘adversely’ with ‘unacceptably’**

**In iv) replace ‘erode’ with ‘unacceptably detract from’**

**After the fourth criterion add a free-standing part of the policy to read: ‘Development in the countryside will be carefully controlled in accordance with national and local planning policies.’**

*Replace the third paragraph of the Justification with: ‘Any development proposals in Yawthorpe and the wider countryside will be assessed against the requirements of policies in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan including Policies LP2(8) and LP55. Where development proposals accord with relevant Local Plan policies, their design and details will be very carefully-controlled. Some of the principles for development in Aisby may be appropriate for any such development.’*

#### CNP 4: Residential extensions and conversions

- 7.34 This policy has two parts. The first sets out a series of criteria for residential extensions. The second encourages the incorporation of sustainable design and nature conservation features into the wider design of extensions.
- 7.35 The policy has been well-developed. In its representation WLDC suggests a fifth criterion is included in the first part of the policy to address heritage assets. Such an approach will ensure that there is a proper relationship with other policies in the Plan and will provide the clarity required by the NPPF. I recommend the inclusion of this matter into the policy as a freestanding element of the policy rather than as another criterion.

**Insert a free-standing element of the policy after the list of criteria to read: ‘Residential conversions or extensions affecting listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets should also comply with Policies CNP7 and CNP8 respectively’**

#### CNP 5: Local character and the design of new development

- 7.36 This policy establishes a relationship between new development and the Character Assessment work. The first part of the policy defines a series of locally-distinctive criteria. The second part comments specifically about the rural lanes in their role as an important part of the character of the parish.
- 7.37 As the supporting text comments, understanding local character and community aspirations is fundamental to achieving high-quality sustainable design. The intention of this policy is that all new development must make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. In this context, I am satisfied that the policy has regard to the most up to date version of the NPPF. The Plan sets out the Council's approach towards a clear design vision and expectations for development sites. This will ensure that applicants have as much certainty as possible about what is likely to be acceptable. In particular the Character Assessment work has fed directly into the criteria for the three allocated sites proposed in the Plan (Policy CNP2).
- 7.38 The policy takes a positive approach to this important matter. The second part of the policy on rural lanes is particularly distinctive to the parish. Nevertheless, the format of the policy is complicated. In particular, the first part is unclear about the extent to which the various criteria will be applied to development proposals. I recommend modifications to the policy to remedy this matter. The recommended modifications also result in the criteria in the first part of the policy being presented in a consistent fashion. This will help to bring the clarity required by the NPPF.

7.39 I also recommend that the second part of the policy is modified so that it has the clarity required by the NPPF and is presented in a positive fashion. Thereafter I recommend that the policy identified the outcomes of development proposals which would have an unacceptable impact on the identified rural lanes.

7.40 Finally, I recommend that all of the rural lanes identified in the second part of the policy are shown on the Proposals Map.

**Replace the first part of the policy with:**

**‘Development proposals should recognise and complement the local character of the areas identified and described in the Corringham Character Assessment. As appropriate to their scale and nature proposals should:**

- **respect existing plot boundaries, ratios, orientation, historic or traditional forms and the established grain of development within the character area;**
- **respect the predominant materials used in the area which include red brick with red-clay pantiles and natural slate and the occasional use of the local Waterstone;**
- **ensure that the height of new buildings is in keeping with neighbouring properties and not be over-bearing or dominant in the existing street-scene;**
- **reflect the predominant boundary treatments in the immediate area consisting of brick or stone walls or hedges, often behind grass verges;**
- **deliver off-road parking provision, servicing and access arrangements in accordance with the most recently-published standards by Lincolnshire County Council;**
- **retain the open character of prominent private gardens within any development; and**
- **protect and retain watercourses as open features, alongside other sustainable drainage measures’**

**Replace the second part of the policy with:**

**‘Development proposals alongside or serviced from rural lanes (Pilham Lane, Mill Mere Road, the lanes to and around Aisby and Yawthorpe and Springthorpe Road) as shown on the Proposals Map should respect, and where practicable enhance, the rural appearance of the byways and their green verges/hedgerows.**

**Development proposals which would have an unacceptable impact on the rural character and appearance of the identified rural byways will not be supported’**

*Show Springthorpe Road and lanes around Aisby as rural lanes on Parish Wide Proposals Map.*

**CNP 6: Key views**

7.41 This policy identifies a series of key views which are important to the character and appearance of Corringham. It comments that they should be respected and not compromised by the location, design or scale of new development. The second part of the policy comments that development proposals should be sensitive to, and designed

to maintain the rustic and rural appearance of village approaches to ensure that views of key landmarks on entry to the village, such as the windmills to the west and east and St Laurence Church, are not compromised.

- 7.42 I looked at several of the key views during my visit. I am satisfied that they have been appropriately-selected and help to define the character of the parish. I am also satisfied that the policy takes a non-prescriptive approach towards the relationship between new development and the identified views.
- 7.43 I recommend that the policy is reconfigured so that it identifies the views at the outset and then sets out the policy implications. I also recommend that the policy includes an additional element to address proposals which would conflict with the policy approach by having an unacceptable effect on an identified key view or an approach to Corringham.
- 7.44 The recommended modifications also remove unnecessary element of supporting text from the policy. The submitted supporting text provides an appropriate context to the policy. In addition, it is presented in a general format. As such consequential modifications are not required.
- 7.45 WLDC raises several comments about the details of some of the views. I recommend specific modifications to remedy most of the issues raised. Whilst an appendix of the views would be desirable, it is not necessary to ensure that the Plan meets the basic conditions.

**Replace the policy with:**

**‘The Plan identifies the following key views (list the views at this point)**

**The location, design and scale of new development should take account of any relevant key view and not compromise its integrity or significance.**

**In addition, development proposals should be sensitive to, and designed to maintain the rustic and rural appearance of village approaches to ensure that views of key landmarks on entry to the village in general, and in particular the windmills to the west and east and St Laurence Church, are not compromised.**

**Proposed developments which would have an unacceptable effect on a key view or an approach to Corringham will not be supported.’**

*Ensure that the Parish Wide Proposals Map shows each of the Key Views and that they are consistent with those shown on the Corringham and Aisby Inset Maps.*

*Amend the details for key view 9 so that it looks west rather than east.*

**CNP 7: Designated heritage assets**

- 7.46 This policy comments that development proposals should protect, conserve and seek opportunities to enhance designated heritage assets (and their settings), and in a clear context in terms of the significance of the building, materials, scale, setting and layout. It lists the listed buildings in the parish to which the policy will apply.

- 7.47 In general terms, the policy meets the basic conditions. Nevertheless, I recommend a detailed modification to its wording so that its intention as a development plan policy is clear.
- 7.48 The location of the listed buildings will be well-known to WLDC and CPC. However, to bring the clarity required to a development plan policy by the NPPF I recommend that the listed buildings are shown either on a separate map or on the wider Policies Map.

**Replace ‘set in a clear context in terms of the significance of the building, materials, scale, setting and layout’ with ‘in general and in terms of the significance of the building, materials, scale, setting and layout in particular’**

*Show the listed buildings either on a separate map or on the wider Policies Map.*

CNP 8: Protecting and enhancing unlisted buildings of positive character

- 7.49 This policy continues the approach taken in Policy CNP7. In this case it applies to unlisted buildings. It comments that proposals for change of use or other development affecting the unlisted buildings of positive character will be required to demonstrate how they would contribute to its conservation, whilst preserving or enhancing its architectural or historic interest.
- 7.50 The general approach taken in this policy has regard to national policy. However, as WLDC point out in its representation such assets are referred to in NPPF and CLLP as ‘non-designated heritage assets’. It suggests that this established term should be used in the policy. In addition, elsewhere in the policy, an alternative ‘locally important asset’ terminology is used. I recommend a modification to remedy this matter, to bring consistency and to ensure that the policy has the clarity required by the NPPF for a development plan policy.
- 7.51 As with Policy CNP 7, WLDC recommend that the non-designated heritage assets are shown on the Policies Map. However, given their number and the way in which the policy signposts the reader to their details I am satisfied that a similar approach/recommendation is not necessary.

**Replace ‘unlisted buildings of positive character’ in the policy itself and the policy title with ‘non-designated heritage assets’**

**Replace ‘locally important asset’ in the policy with ‘non-designated heritage assets’**

CNP 9: Protecting and enhancing archaeological sites

- 7.52 This policy comments about development proposals which may affect Scheduled Monuments, other archaeological sites and areas of archaeological potential and their settings.
- 7.53 The policy has been carefully developed. It has regard to national policy and meets the basic conditions.

## CNP 10 Existing open spaces and recreation facilities

- 7.54 The policy identifies open spaces and recreation facilities which will be protected from inappropriate development which would prejudice their recreational use, landscape value and the views that are provided out into open countryside. It is underpinned by CPC's assessment that there is only limited provision of open spaces in Corringham. The Plan also comments that the existing facilities are well-used and valued community assets which support social and recreational activity and help to define the landscape and character of the area. In addition, they have views of the countryside which contribute to the quality of life for residents.
- 7.55 The policy identifies four open spaces and recreation facilities which will be protected from inappropriate development. Two of the four open spaces are also proposed to be designated as local green spaces in Policy CNP11. In these circumstances the open/green spaces would be affected by two related but different policies. This would not bring the clarity required by the NPPF. Given that the designation of local green space is the most effective way of safeguarding open spaces, I recommend that the overlap between the two policies is resolved by deleting the two proposed local green spaces from this policy.
- 7.56 I recommend that the wording of the policy is modified so that it has regard to national policy. The use of 'inappropriate development' is traditionally restricted to Green Belts and which do not apply to the neighbourhood area. I also recommend other detailed modifications to the wording of the policy to bring the clarity required by the NPPF. Otherwise, it meets the basic conditions.
- 7.57 WLDC helpfully identify that there are inconsistencies between the numbering of the open spaces in the policy and on the Proposals Map. I recommend that this matter is remedied by way of a modification.

**Replace the policy with: 'The open spaces and recreation facilities listed below and shown on the Proposal Maps will be protected from development which would unacceptably detract from their recreational use, landscape value and the views that are provided from them into open countryside'**

**Delete (3) Pond/picnic site; and (4) The recreation ground from the schedule of open spaces**

*Ensure consistency between the numbering of the open spaces in the policy and on the Proposals Map.*

## CNP 11: Proposed Local Green Spaces

- 7.58 The policy proposes two Local Green Spaces (LGSs) – the village pond and picnic site off Middle Street and the recreation ground to the rear the pond/picnic site, off Middle Street. It seeks to apply the principles in the NPPF on this matter to two parcels of land. The proposed LGSs are described in the Plan and assessed against the three criteria in paragraph 102 the NPPF. I looked at the proposed LGSs during my visit to the parish.

- 7.59 Based on my own observations and the information in the Plan, I am satisfied that the proposed LGSs meet the basic conditions. They are precisely the types of green spaces which the authors of the NPPF would have had in mind in preparing national policy.
- 7.60 In addition, I am satisfied that their proposed designation would accord with the more general elements of paragraph 101 of the NPPF. Firstly, I am satisfied that their designation is consistent with the local planning of sustainable development. They do not otherwise prevent sustainable development coming forward in the neighbourhood area and no such development has been promoted or suggested. Secondly, I am satisfied that the LGSs are capable of enduring beyond the end of the Plan period. Indeed, they are an established element of the local environment and, in most cases, have existed in their current format for many years. In addition, no evidence was brought forward during the examination that would suggest that the proposed local green spaces would not endure beyond the end of the Plan period.
- 7.61 The policy sets out the implications for LGS designation. It seeks to follow the approach as set out in paragraph 103 of the NPPF. However, it goes beyond that approach in indicating that the ‘development of these spaces will only be permitted in very special circumstances where harm to the local green space, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.’
- 7.62 I can understand the circumstances which have caused CPC to design the policy in this way. Nevertheless, I recommend a modification so that the policy takes the matter-of-fact approach in the NPPF. The recommended modification also takes account of the recent case in the Court of Appeal on the designation of local green spaces and the policy relationship with areas designated as Green Belts (2020 EWCA Civ 1259).
- 7.63 In the event that development proposals affecting designated LGSs come forward within the Plan period, they can be assessed on a case-by-case basis by WLDC. In particular WLDC will be able to make an informed judgement on the extent to which the proposal concerned demonstrates the ‘very special circumstances’ required by the policy. I recommend that the supporting text clarifies this matter.

**Replace the second part of the policy with:**

**‘Development proposals within the designated local green spaces will only be supported in very special circumstances’**

*Replace the final paragraph of supporting text (after the photographs) with: ‘Policy CNP11 follows the matter-of-fact approach in the NPPF. In the event that development proposals come forward on the local green spaces within the Plan period, they can be assessed on a case-by-case basis by the District Council. In particular it will be able to make an informed judgement on the extent to which the proposal concerned demonstrates the ‘very special circumstances’ required by the policy’*

## CNP 12: Countryside management

- 7.64 This policy sets out an approach towards the countryside. It comments that development related to agriculture, forestry, equine, recreation, tourism, utility infrastructure and other rural land uses, will be supported provided that it does not cause demonstrable harm to a series of locally-distinctive criteria.
- 7.65 The policy has regard to national policy in general terms. I recommend a detailed modification to the wording used in the initial part of the policy by replacing 'demonstrable harm' with 'unacceptable harm'. This will bring the clarity for a development plan policy as required by the NPPF.
- 7.66 The policy title suggests that CPC (or others) will be undertaking proactive countryside management whereas the policy content is one which relates to the operation of the development management system. I recommend that the title of the policy is modified to reflect its approach.

**In the opening part of the policy replace 'demonstrable harm with 'unacceptable harm'**

*Replace the title of the policy with: 'Development in the countryside'*

## CNP 13: Nature conservation and biodiversity

- 7.67 This policy comments that proposals with an impact on biodiversity will be required to demonstrate how any potential effect on local wildlife sites, habitats and species networks has been considered.
- 7.68 As submitted the policy has a complicated format. In particular the second, third and fourth criteria read in a separate fashion from the opening part of the policy and the first criterion. I recommend detailed modifications to the policy which address the following matters:
- the incorporation of the definition of biodiversity features from the first paragraph of supporting text into the policy;
  - a simplification of the relationship between the opening part of the policy and the first criterion;
  - the use of language appropriate for a development plan policy; and
  - an acknowledgement that proposals for the planting of new trees and hedgerows may not need planning permission.

Whilst the policy is recommended to be replaced, its approach is unchanged.

**Replace the policy with:**

**'Development proposals which impact on woodland, trees, hedgerows, ponds and watercourses, unimproved and semi-improved grassland should identify how these features have been safeguarded and sensitively incorporated within their overall designs. Where appropriate any loss of biodiversity should be**

minimised and mitigated by the creation of new habitats or the enhancement of existing places.

**Development proposals which would result in loss or unacceptable harm to woodland, trees, hedgerows, ponds and watercourses, unimproved and semi-improved grassland will not be supported.**

**Projects to enhance wildlife habitats and species based on the Lincolnshire Biodiversity Action Plan and the Natural Environment Strategy will be supported.**

**Insofar as planning permission is required, proposals for tree planting and hedgerow creation aimed at providing a network of wildlife corridors across the Parish will be supported.'**

CNP 14: Community buildings and facilities

- 7.69 This policy identifies four important community facilities in the parish. Thereafter it applies a policy approach which would only support development proposals for their conversion to other uses which meet specific circumstances which include viability issues and the provision of alternative facilities. A second part of the policy offers support to proposals to enhance, improve or extend the identified community facilities.
- 7.70 The policy takes an appropriate and balanced approach to this matter. It acknowledges the importance of community facilities to the well-being of the parish. In general terms the policy meets the basic conditions. However, to bring the clarity required by the NPPF, I recommend that the section of the policy which lists the community facilities is repositioned so that it appears at the beginning of the policy. I also recommend that the wording of the policy uses wording appropriate to a neighbourhood plan policy.
- 7.71 The element of the policy which offers support to alterations, improvements and extensions to the identified facilities is entirely appropriate. Nevertheless, I recommend that it is modified to acknowledge that alterations and improvements may not always need planning permission.

**Reposition the section of the policy listing the community facilities to the beginning of the policy. In doing so, replace 'This policy covers the facilities listed below:' with: 'The Plan identifies the following community facilities'**

**In the first part of the policy (as submitted) replace 'will be resisted' with 'will not be supported'**

**At the beginning of the third part of the policy (as submitted) add: 'Insofar as planning permission is required'**

**In the third part of the policy (as submitted) replace 'these facilities' with 'the identified community facilities'**

CNP 15: Local employment and businesses

- 7.72 This policy addresses economic issues in the parish. It has three main parts. The first offers support to a range of employment-related uses subject to a series of criteria. The second offers support for proposals for homeworking. The third safeguards two identified employment sites from development proposals on adjoining sites which may affect their longevity and/or viability.
- 7.73 In general terms, I am satisfied that the first and second parts of the policy meet the basic conditions. In particular, they will contribute significantly to the delivery of the economic dimension of sustainable development in the parish. However, to bring the clarity required for a development plan policy I recommend detailed modifications to the wording used in both policies.
- 7.74 The intention of the third part of the policy is self-evident. However, it is not written in a way which has the clarity required by the NPPF. I recommend modifications to remedy this matter. In particular they identify the two employment sites and formulate a policy protection towards their safeguarding. As submitted the policy simply requires that WLDC gives consideration to these matters in its determination of planning applications.

**In Ai) replace ‘significant adverse’ with ‘unacceptable’**

**In Aiv) replace ‘reduce’ with ‘unacceptably detract from’**

**In B replace ‘unacceptably adverse’ with ‘unacceptable’**

**Replace C with:**

**‘The Plan identifies Peacock and Binnington and High Street Garage on High Street (see Proposals Map on page 52) as important employment sites.**

**Development proposals on sites adjoining either of the important employment sites should be designed and arranged within the application site to ensure that the viability or operational effectiveness of the important employment site concerned is not unacceptably harmed by the new use and/or its activities’**

CNP 16: Transport and Active Travel in and around Corringham

- 7.75 This policy comments about transport in the parish. It has three separate parts as follows:
- traffic generation issues and the capacity of the local highways network;
  - the protection of rights of way and the network of rural lanes; and
  - the creation of circular roadside footpaths.
- 7.76 I am satisfied that the first part of the policy and the opening element of the second part meet the basic conditions. In both cases I recommend modifications to ensure that they use the language necessary for a development plan policy as required by the NPPF. In particular I recommend that the first part of the policy comments about the implications for development proposals which would create an unacceptable impact

on the local highways network. As submitted the policy is worded in a way which assumes that a successful outcome will be achieved for any proposed development proposal.

- 7.77 The latter part of the second element of the policy and the third part of the policy set out a series of potential highways and movement-related proposals and the collaborative work which CPC wishes to pursue with WLDC and Lincolnshire County Council. In their different ways, they would be positive initiatives which would offer significant opportunities for local people. However, they are community aspirations rather than planning policies. As such I recommended that they are deleted from the policy and repositioned into the Aspirations in Section 15 of the Plan (see paragraph 7.77 of this report).

**Replace the policy with:**

**‘Proposed developments that would generate additional traffic movement which would contribute towards evidenced traffic hazards should be supported by relevant measures to maintain highway safety and avoid vehicular/pedestrian conflict. Where necessary, proposals should be supported by a transport statement or assessment which sets out details of the transport issues relating to the development, including appropriate mitigation measures.**

**Development proposals which cannot be satisfactorily or safely accommodated within the local highway network, or where the impacts cannot be appropriately mitigated, will not be supported.**

**Development proposals should protect existing Public Rights of Way and the network of rural lanes and where appropriate incorporate them into their design and layouts.’**

*Add the following Community Aspiration to the schedule in Section 15 of the Plan:*

***CNPCA4 Footpaths and connectivity:***

*The Parish Council will seek support from the District and County Councils to:*

- *create circular roadside footpaths linking Middle Street, the A631/High Street (existing footway), Pilham Lane/Blyton Road and Mill Mere Road and linking Corringham and Aisby; and*
- *extend and improve routes to enhance pedestrian and cycle connectivity to and from Gainsborough and into surrounding countryside.*

Community Aspirations

- 7.78 The Plan includes three Community Aspirations. They have naturally arisen during the production of the Plan. They are not land use matters. As such they are included in a separate part of the Plan.

7.79 The Aspirations are as follows:

- CNPCA1: Investment in community facilities
- CNPCA2: Local history and heritage
- CNPCA3: Countryside Management/Nature Conservation.

7.80 I am satisfied that the Aspirations are appropriate to the parish and reflect its distinctive character. In their different ways they will be complementary to relevant land use policies in the main body of the Plan.

7.81 In paragraph 7.76 of this report I have recommended that an additional Aspiration is added to the schedule.

#### Other Matters - General

7.82 This report has recommended a series of modifications both to the policies and to the supporting text in the submitted Plan. Where consequential changes to the text are required directly as a result of my recommended modification to the policy concerned, I have highlighted them in this report. However other changes to the general text may be required elsewhere in the Plan as a result of the recommended modifications to the policies. It will be appropriate for WLDC and the Parish Council to have the flexibility to make any necessary consequential changes to the general text. I recommend accordingly.

*Modification of general text and other details (where necessary) to achieve consistency with the modified policies.*

#### Other matters – Monitoring and Review

7.83 Section 16 of the Plan helpfully comments about how it would be monitored and reviewed. It acknowledges that the review of the CLLP will be a key stage in this process. Since the neighbourhood plan was submitted, consultation has taken place on the Draft Local Plan review (between June and August 2021). It proposed the allocation of land to the north of High Street in Corringham (WL/COR/002A).

7.84 In this emerging context, I recommend that the Plan includes a more explicit reference to the ongoing review of the CLLP and its potential impact on a ‘made’ neighbourhood plan. This will be particularly important in the event that the strategic approach taken in that Plan differs significantly from the adopted version and/or the proposed allocated site to the North of High Street remains in the Plan.

*Replace the second and third sentences of paragraph 16.3 with:*

*‘The Parish Council will give particular attention to the ongoing review of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. Its eventual adoption will be a key element in the assessment of the need or otherwise for a potential review of the neighbourhood plan. In this context, the Parish Council will assess the need for a ‘made’ neighbourhood plan to be reviewed within six months of the adoption of the review of the Local Plan.’*

## 8 Summary and Conclusions

### *Summary*

- 8.1 The Plan sets out a range of policies to guide and direct development proposals in the period up to 2036. It is distinctive in addressing a specific set of issues that have been identified and refined by the wider community.
- 8.2 Following my independent examination of the Plan I have concluded that the Corringham Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the basic conditions for the preparation of a neighbourhood plan subject to a series of recommended modifications.
- 8.3 This report has recommended some modifications to the policies in the Plan. Nevertheless, it remains fundamentally unchanged in its role and purpose.

### *Conclusion*

- 8.4 On the basis of the findings in this report I recommend to West Lindsey District Council that subject to the incorporation of the modifications set out in this report that the Corringham Neighbourhood Development Plan should proceed to referendum.

### *Referendum Area*

- 8.5 I am required to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Plan area. In my view, the neighbourhood area is entirely appropriate for this purpose and no evidence has been submitted to suggest that this is not the case. I therefore recommend that the Plan should proceed to referendum based on the approved neighbourhood area.
- 8.6 I am grateful to everyone who has helped in any way to ensure that this examination has run in a smooth and efficient manner.

**Andrew Ashcroft**  
**Independent Examiner**  
**1 October 2021**