

James Newton

From: Nick Feltham
Sent: 22 May 2020 16:32
To: Nev Brown
Cc: NK - Planning; Anne-Marie Shepherd
Subject: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16

Dear Nev

I can confirm that NKDC has no comments to make on the GNP although I imagine that detailed commentary will be provided by Phil Hylton on behalf of Central Lincolnshire.

Regards

Nick Feltham



Nick Feltham
Principal Planning Officer

Tel: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]
www.n-kesteven.gov.uk
Kesteven Street, Sleaford, NG34 7EF

Go to gov.uk/coronavirus

STAY ALERT › CONTROL THE VIRUS › SAVE LIVES

From: Planning North [REDACTED] >
Sent: 26 May 2020 15:50
To: WL - Neighbourhood Plans
Subject: RE: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16

Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above neighbourhood plan.

Government planning policy, within the **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**, identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.

It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 96 and 97. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in **protecting playing fields** and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Playing Fields Policy and Guidance document.

https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#playing_fields_policy

Sport England provides guidance on **developing planning policy** for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded.

https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/planning-for-sport#planning_applications

Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Par 97 of the NPPF, this takes the form of **assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities**. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.

Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work.

<http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance>

If **new or improved sports facilities** are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.

<http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/>

Any **new housing** developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for

social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.

In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how **any new development**, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.

Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.

NPPF Section 8: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities>

PPG Health and wellbeing section: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing>

Sport England's Active Design Guidance: <https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign>

(Please note: this response relates to Sport England's planning function only. It is not associated with our funding role or any grant application/award that may relate to the site.)

If you need any further advice, please do not hesitate to contact Sport England using the contact details below.

Yours sincerely,

Planning Administration Team

[Redacted signature]

The information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Additionally, this email and any attachment are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email and any attachment in error, and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying, is strictly prohibited. If you voluntarily provide personal data by email, Sport England will handle the data in accordance with its Privacy Statement. Sport England's Privacy Statement may be found here <https://www.sportengland.org/privacy-statement/> If you have any queries about Sport England's handling of personal data you can contact Louise Hartley, Sport England's Data Protection Officer directly by emailing DPO@sportengland.org

James Newton

From: Simon Tucker <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 26 May 2020 11:20
To: WL - Neighbourhood Plans
Subject: RE: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16
Attachments: Gainsborough NP Response Reg 19.pdf

Dear Mr Brown

Thank you for your consultation. Please find our comments attached.

For our records, we would wish to be notified of WLDC's decision on the Gainsborough NP under Regulation 19.

Kind Regards

Simon Tucker MSc MRTPI
Area Planner North East, Canal and River Trust



Canal & River Trust
Fearn's Wharf; Neptune Street; Leeds; LS9 8PB

www.canalrivertrust.org.uk

Sign up for the Canal & River Trust e-newsletter www.canalrivertrust.org.uk/newsletter

Follow @canalrivertrust from the Canal & River Trust on Twitter

Please visit our website to find out more about the Canal & River Trust and download our 'Shaping our Future' document on the About Us page.



From: Nev Brown <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 22 May 2020 13:32
Subject: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16

CAUTION: This email originated from an external source. DO NOT CLICK/OPEN links or attachments unless you are certain of their origin.

Dear Consultee,
Gainsborough Town Council has formally submitted the final version of its Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents to West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. WLDC is now consulting interested parties on the submission Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan, in accordance with Regulation 16 of the same regulations. You are being notified because you

are either a consultee or you have previously made comments on the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan.

The plan and supporting documents can be viewed via the following link:

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

The consultation period is until 20 July 2020. However, we recognise this is a difficult time and should you require an extended period to consider the plan, please do contact us and we will seek to accommodate your request.

All representations on the submission Neighbourhood Plan should be made in writing (either by email or letter) and sent to:

Email: [REDACTED]

Post: Neighbourhood Planning, Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, Lincs, DN21 2NA.

When making your representations please indicate if you wish to be notified of WLDC's decision on the Gainsborough NP under Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. If you would like further information about this or other neighbourhood plans in West Lindsey please contact me.

Regards

Nev Brown

Senior Neighbourhood Planning Policy Officer

[REDACTED]
Guildhall | Marshall's Yard | Gainsborough | Lincolnshire | DN21 2NA



[Sign up](#) to our digital newsletter



[Sign up](#) to our digital newsletter

Keep in touch

Sign up for the Canal & River Trust e-newsletter <https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/newsletter>

Become a fan on <https://www.facebook.com/canalrivertrust>

Follow us on <https://twitter.com/canalrivertrust> and <https://www.instagram.com/canalrivertrust>

This email and its attachments are intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments, you must take no action based upon them; please delete without copying or forwarding and inform the sender that you received them in error. Any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of The Canal & River Trust.

Canal & River Trust is a charitable company limited by guarantee registered in England & Wales with company number 7807276 and charity number 1146792. Registered office address First Floor North, Station House, 500 Elder Gate, Milton Keynes MK9 1BB.

Cadw mewn cysylltiad

Cofrestrwch i dderbyn e-gylchlythyr Glandŵr Cymru <https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/newsletter>

Cefnogwch ni ar <https://www.facebook.com/canalrivertrust>

Dilynwch ni ar <https://twitter.com/canalrivertrust> ac <https://www.instagram.com/canalrivertrust>

Mae'r e-bost hwn a'i atodiadau ar gyfer defnydd y derbynnydd bwriedig yn unig. Os nad chi yw derbynnydd bwriedig yr e-bost hwn a'i atodiadau, ni ddylech gymryd unrhyw gamau ar sail y cynnwys, ond yn hytrach dylech eu dileu heb eu copïo na'u hanfon ymlaen a rhoi gwybod i'r anfonwr eich bod wedi eu derbyn ar ddamwain. Mae unrhyw farn neu safbwynt a fynegir yn eiddo i'r awdur yn unig ac nid ydynt o reidrwydd yn cynrychioli barn a safbwyntiau Glandŵr Cymru.

Mae Glandŵr Cymru yn gwmni cyfyngedig drwy warant a gofrestrwyd yng Nghymru a Lloegr gyda rhif cwmni 7807276 a rhif elusen gofrestredig 1146792. Swyddfa gofrestredig: First Floor North, Station House, 500 Elder Gate, Milton Keynes MK9 1BB.

Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan
Steering Group
c/o Neighbourhood Planning
Gainsborough Town Council
Morton Terrace
Gainsborough
Lincs

Tuesday 26 May 2020

Dear Sir/Madam

Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 19 (Submission) Consultation

Waterway: River Trent

Thank you for your consultation.

We are the charity who look after and bring to life 2000 miles of canals & rivers. Our waterways contribute to the health and wellbeing of local communities and economies, creating attractive and connected places to live, work, volunteer and spend leisure time. These historic, natural and cultural assets form part of the strategic and local green-blue infrastructure network, linking urban and rural communities as well as habitats. By caring for our waterways and promoting their use we believe we can improve the wellbeing of our nation.

The Trust are the Navigation Authority for the River Trent. Having viewed the submission draft of the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan, we wish to make the following comments:

13 Sustainable Development, Brownfield Sites and SUE's

NPP 1 Spatial Strategy

The Trust welcome part 2 of the draft policy in promoting new development on brownfield sites along the riverside.

We believe this could offer an opportunity to improve the riverside environment, which is currently diminished by the presence of several existing large scale overgrown brownfield sites. Subject to the adoption of a design to promote surveillance of the waterway and improved pedestrian connections to the riverfront, the redevelopment of such brownfield sites could offer an opportunity to encourage an increase in the use of riverside spaces. This could help to promote active travel, and the use of the riverside for leisure and recreation, which could benefit the wellbeing of future and existing residents.

14 Protecting the Natural Environment

We welcome the specific reference to 'Water: The Blue Network' within this section. This will make the role of the river Trent more apparent to decision makers, which should help to ensure that the plan is more effective in managing the biodiversity associated with the watercourse.

Canal & River Trust

Fradley Junction, Alrewas, Burton-upon-Trent, Staffordshire DE13 7DN
T 0303 040 4040 E canalrivertrust.org.uk/contact-us W canalrivertrust.org.uk

Measures to promote wildlife movement and the assessment of the contamination of riverside sites could help to enhance biodiversity and reduce the risk of pollution to the watercourse, which we welcome.

15 Creating a Local Green Network

We welcome the identification of the potential to improve the existing Green Network routes within the town, notably incorporating the improvement and creation of walkways in proximity to the river. This could help to promote the use of the riverside as a leisure and recreation resource, which could benefit the wellbeing of residents.

We welcome changes in the Neighborhood Plan from the draft version (upon which provided comments in October 2019), with regards to the terminology utilized for the 'Local Green Network', which is more precise and should avoid confusion with the Green Infrastructure Network promoted by Policy LP20: Green Infrastructure Network from the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

NPP 3: Creating a Local Green Network

The wording of this policy offers a relatively effective route towards ensuring that new development can contribute towards improvements towards the Green Network in Gainsborough.

We wish to highlight that there is an opportunity for this policy to be expanded to explicitly state that new developments will be expected to promote active surveillance and new connections to existing walking and cycling routes. This could help to encourage use of Gainsborough's Green network, and could help to ensure that new development does not result in the formation of tall boundary treatments or blank gable ends facing these routes, which could otherwise make them less attractive spaces to use.

17 Ensuring High Quality Design

NPP 6 Ensuring High Quality Design

We welcome the general principles of this policy.

We welcome the incorporation of part 5 of this policy, which seeks to address how development alongside water space should address that waterway. We believe this is important, and will make the neighbourhood plan more effective, as the river Trent is a central component of vision for development in Gainsborough.

Riverside Regeneration

We welcome the recognition of the regeneration of riverside sites being a priority for local people. We agree that the port and its historic interest are an important part of the experience on arrival in Gainsborough from the West. Sensitive regeneration could help to enhance the setting of these assets, and could help encourage the use of riverside spaces by residents.

NPP 9: Gateway Riverside CL 4686

This is an especially important site for Gainsborough, and sensitive redevelopment of the site could significantly enhance the setting of the riverside and the approach to the town from the West.

We welcome the general requirements attached to this policy. We do recommend, however, that an additional requirement is included to ensure that any new development promotes natural surveillance of the riverside (to limit the prominence of blank frontages or intrusive boundary treatments).

Canal & River Trust

Fradley Junction, Alrewas, Burton-upon-Trent, Staffordshire DE13 7DN

T 0303 040 4040 E canalrivertrust.org.uk/contact-us W canalrivertrust.org.uk

Within part 4, we recognise that there is a local aspiration for appropriate levels of parking to be provided. We would ask, however, that this part is expanded so that it ensures that new parking areas are appropriately sited or screened from the public realm; as the creation of prominent parking areas on site visible from the river could significantly compromise the benefits that could be brought about from the redevelopment of the site. Suggesting wording is provided below:

“The proposals must demonstrate that sufficient allocated and shared car parking spaces are provided within the site to meet the needs of residents and visitors based on an up to date assessment of the accessibility and frequency of public transport. Any new parking areas should be appropriately sited so as to not detract from the outward appearance of the development from the river”.

The use of waterborne freight on the navigation could provide a sustainable alternative transport option to the use of road vehicles, and we welcome the recognition of the potential role of the navigation in part 5 of the policy. This would promote sustainable development and decrease the number of HGV road vehicles that may be required during the construction phase. This could comply with the Local Transport Plan Objective to reduce the adverse impacts of HGV traffic (4th Lincolnshire Local Transport Plan).

NPP 10 Elswitha Hall/ Guildhall Site (CL 4688);

NPP 13 Albion Works Site (CL 1253); and

NPP14 Riverside North (CL 4689)

We welcome the promotion of the riverside walkway within the proposed policy wording for these three sites. We welcome the wording proposed in NPP145 regarding the promotion of natural surveillance towards the riverside, which would help to improve the quality of development and attractiveness of the neighbouring pedestrian route.

Aspirational Policy 2 – New Trent Crossing

We recognise that the Town Council seek to promote the formation of a second crossing of the Trent at Gainsborough.

As Navigational Authority of the Trent, we advise that any new bridge would need to be designed to accommodate navigation traffic below, including freight traffic. This would require sufficient clearance of the waterspace, and the likely need to avoid the formation of new piers in the river, which could otherwise form a hazard to navigation.

We would request to be consulted about any proposals for a new bridge, should this policy be developed into a viable financed scheme, so that we can provide feedback and information necessary to inform the final design.

I hope that the above is of use.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any queries you may have.

Yours sincerely,

Simon Tucker MRTPI
Area Planner

<https://canalrivertrust.org.uk/specialist-teams/planning-and-design>

Canal & River Trust

Fradley Junction, Alrewas, Burton-upon-Trent, Staffordshire DE13 7DN

T 0303 040 4040 E canalrivertrust.org.uk/contact-us W canalrivertrust.org.uk

James Newton

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 May 2020 15:07
To: Nev Brown
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16

Good afternoon,

Thank you for your email to HSE's Explosives Inspectorate.

HSE is not a statutory consultee for local and neighbourhood plans. However, HSE has provided LPAs with access to its Planning Advice Web App <https://pa.hsl.gov.uk/> and downloadable GIS consultation zones including those for explosives sites. These tools alongside HSE's published methodology (<http://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/>) can assist in ensuring that land allocations do not conflict with existing major hazard sites, pipelines or licenced explosives sites. Please be aware that any future licensed explosives site applications will be subject to the relevant planning application processes.

Many thanks

Gill

Gill McElvogue
CEMHD7 Operational Policy and Strategy (Explosives Inspectorate)
Health & Safety Executive,
Redgrave Court,
Merton Road,
Bootle,
L20 7HS
[REDACTED]

I am sure you will appreciate that the current coronavirus pandemic may have an impact on our capacity to process your application in the standard timeframes, as colleagues follow the government guidance to prevent the transmission of the coronavirus. E-mails continue to be monitored and we will endeavour to keep you updated on the progress of your application.

The current COVID 19 crisis is making receipt of, and access to, post extremely problematic. HSE would be grateful if you could avoid sending hard copy mail wherever possible and instead send electronic versions. Please let us know by phone or email of any instances where this is not possible and hard copy mail needs urgent attention.

From: Nev Brown [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 May 2020 13:40
Subject: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16

Dear Consultee,
Gainsborough Town Council has formally submitted the final version of its Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents to West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. WLDC is now consulting interested parties on the submission Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan, in accordance with Regulation 16 of the same regulations. You are being notified because you are either a consultee or you have previously made comments on the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan.

The plan and supporting documents can be viewed via the following link:
<https://www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building/neighbourhood-planning/all-neighbourhood-plans-in-west-lindsey/gainsborough-town-neighbourhood-plan/>
The consultation period is until 20 July 2020. However, we recognise this is a difficult time and should you require an extended period to consider the plan, please do contact us and we will seek to accommodate your request.

All representations on the submission Neighbourhood Plan should be made in writing (either by email or letter) and sent to:

Email: [REDACTED]

Post: Neighbourhood Planning, Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, Lincs, DN21 2NA.

When making your representations please indicate if you wish to be notified of WLDC's decision on the Gainsborough NP under Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. If you would like further information about this or other neighbourhood plans in West Lindsey please contact me.

Regards

Nev Brown

Senior Neighbourhood Planning Policy Officer

[REDACTED]

Guildhall | Marshall's Yard | Gainsborough | Lincolnshire | DN21 2NA



[Sign up](#) to our digital newsletter



[Sign up](#) to our digital newsletter

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

Please note : Incoming and outgoing email messages are routinely monitored for compliance with our policy on the use of electronic communications and may be automatically logged, monitored and / or recorded for lawful purposes by the GSI service provider.

Interested in Occupational Health and Safety information?

Please visit the HSE website at the following address to keep yourself up to date

www.hse.gov.uk

James Newton

From: Patience Stewart <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 05 June 2020 08:56
To: WL - Neighbourhood Plans
Cc: Bramley, Chris
Subject: Re: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan. The following comments are submitted on behalf of Anglian Water as water undertaker for the Parish.

I would be grateful if you could confirm that you have received this response.

The views of Severn Trent Water as sewerage undertaker should also be sought on the Neighbourhood Plan.

We note that the supporting text for the allocation policies has been amended to refer to the location of Anglian Water's existing water supply infrastructure within the sites.

Anglian Water had originally suggested that this should form part of the policy wording and also suggested the inclusion of additional supporting text.

Our preference would be to include the wording within the allocation policies to ensure that existing water mains are considered as part of the proposed site layout etc.

NPP 9: Gateway Riverside CL 4686

There are existing water mains within the boundary of this site allocation and it is important that Anglian Water can continue to access these assets for maintenance purposes.

It is therefore proposed that the policy include the following wording in the policy and supporting text: 'There are existing water mains in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. (Policy wording)'.

'This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing water mains should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. (Supporting text)'.

NPP 10: Southern Neighbourhood Renewal Area

There are existing water mains within the boundary of this site allocation and it is important that Anglian Water can continue to access these assets for maintenance purposes.

It is therefore proposed that the policy include the following wording in the policy and supporting text: 'There are existing water mains in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. (Policy wording)'.

'This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing water mains should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. (Supporting text)'.

NPP 11: Elswitha Hall/ Guildhall Site (CL 4688)

There are existing water mains within the boundary of this site and it is important that Anglian Water can continue to access these assets for maintenance purposes.

It is therefore proposed that the policy include the following wording in the policy and supporting text:

'There are existing water mains in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. (Policy wording)'.

'This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing water mains should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. (Supporting text)'.

NPP 11: Baltic Mill Site (Western Part of CL 4687)

There are existing water mains within the boundary of this site allocation and it is important that Anglian Water can continue to access these assets for maintenance purposes.

It is therefore proposed that the policy include the following wording in the policy and supporting text:

'There are existing water mains in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. (Policy wording)'.

'This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing water mains should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. (Supporting text)'.

NPP 13: Bridge Street Car Park Site and surroundings (Eastern Part of CL 4687)

There are existing water mains within the boundary of this site allocation and it is important that Anglian Water can continue to access these assets for maintenance purposes.

It is therefore proposed that the policy include the following wording in the policy and supporting text:

'There are existing water mains in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. (Policy wording)'.

'This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing water mains should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. (Supporting text)'.

NPP 14: Albion Works Site (CL 1253)

There are existing water mains within the boundary of this site allocation and it is important that Anglian Water can continue to access these assets for maintenance purposes.

It is therefore proposed that the policy include the following wording in the policy and supporting text:

'There are existing water mains in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. (Policy wording)'.

'This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing water mains should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. (Supporting text)'.

NPP15: Riverside North (CL 4689).

There are existing water mains within the boundary of this site allocation and it is important that Anglian Water can continue to access these assets for maintenance purposes.

It is therefore proposed that the policy include the following wording in the policy and supporting text:

‘There are existing water mains in Anglian Water’s ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. (Policy wording)’.

‘This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing water mains should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water’s existing assets may be required. (Supporting text)’.

NPP16: Land in the vicinity of Gainsborough Leisure Centre (CL 4691)

There are existing water mains within the boundary of this site allocation and it is important that Anglian Water can continue to access these assets for maintenance purposes.

It is therefore proposed that the policy include the following wording in the policy and supporting text:

‘There are existing water mains in Anglian Water’s ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. (Policy wording)’.

‘This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing water mains should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water’s existing assets may be required. (supporting text)’.

NPP 17: Middlefield School Site CL1248

There are existing water mains within the boundary of this site allocation and it is important that Anglian Water can continue to access these assets for maintenance purposes.

It is therefore proposed that the policy include the following wording in the policy and supporting text:

‘There are existing water mains in Anglian Water’s ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. (Policy wording)’.

‘This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing water mains should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water’s existing assets may be required. (Supporting text)’.

Future Notifications

We would wish to be notified of the outcome of the examination and any subsequent decision made by the Council relating to the Neighbourhood Plan.

Should you have any queries relating to this response please let me know.

Regards,

Stewart Patience, MRTPI

Spatial Planning Manager

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Anglian Water Services Limited

Anglian Water, Thorpe Wood House, Thorpe Wood, Peterborough, Cambridgeshire. PE3 6WT



From: Nev Brown <[REDACTED]>

Sent: 22 May 2020 13:34

Subject: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16

EXTERNAL MAIL - Please be aware this mail is from an external sender - **THINK BEFORE YOU CLICK**

Dear Consultee,

Gainsborough Town Council has formally submitted the final version of its Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents to West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. WLDC is now consulting interested parties on the submission Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan, in accordance with Regulation 16 of the same regulations. You are being notified because you are either a consultee or you have previously made comments on the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan.

The plan and supporting documents can be viewed via the following link:

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

The consultation period is until 20 July 2020. However, we recognise this is a difficult time and should you require an extended period to consider the plan, please do contact us and we will seek to accommodate your request.

All representations on the submission Neighbourhood Plan should be made in writing (either by email or letter) and sent to:

Email: [REDACTED]

Post: Neighbourhood Planning, Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, Lincs, DN21 2NA.

When making your representations please indicate if you wish to be notified of WLDC's decision on the Gainsborough NP under Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. If you would like further information about this or other neighbourhood plans in West Lindsey please contact me.

Regards

Nev Brown

Senior Neighbourhood Planning Policy Officer

[REDACTED]
Guildhall | Marshall's Yard | Gainsborough | Lincolnshire | DN21 2NA



[Sign up](#) to our digital newsletter



[Sign up](#) to our digital newsletter

The information contained in this message is likely to be confidential and may be legally privileged. The dissemination, distribution, copying or disclosure of this message, or its contents, is strictly prohibited unless authorised by Anglian Water. It is intended only for the person named as addressee. Anglian Water cannot accept any responsibility for the accuracy or completeness of this message. Contracts cannot be concluded with us by email or using the Internet. If you have received this message in error, please immediately return it to the sender at the above address and delete it from your computer. Anglian Water Services Limited Registered Office: Lancaster House, Lancaster Way, Ermine Business Park, Huntingdon, Cambridgeshire, PE29 6XU Registered in England No 2366656 Please consider the environment before printing this email.

James Newton

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 June 2020 14:11
To: WL - Neighbourhood Plans
Subject: Historic England advice on case PL00632035
Attachments: _HERef_PL00632035_L367741.doc

Dear Nev

I am writing in relation to the following:

NDP: Neighbourhood Development Plan
Gainsborough, West Lindsey
[Case Ref. PL00632035; HE File Ref. -; Your Reference. -]

Yours Sincerely

Sofia Fazal on behalf of Clive Fletcher
Business Officer
E-mail: [REDACTED]k
Direct Dial: [REDACTED]

We help people understand, enjoy and value the historic environment, and protect it for the future. Historic England is a public body, and we champion everyone's heritage, across England.

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. Please read our full privacy policy (<https://www.historicengland.org.uk/terms/privacy-cookies/>) for more information.



Historic England

Mr Nev Brown
West Lindsey District Council
Guildhall, Marshalls Yard
Gainsborough
Lincolnshire
DN21 2NA

Direct Dial: [REDACTED]

Our ref: PL00632035

5 June 2020

Dear Mr Brown

Thank you for consulting Historic England about your Neighbourhood Plan. Please refer to our letters of 10 December 2019 and 10 March 2020, we have no further comments to make at this stage.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Clive Fletcher
Principal Adviser, Historic Places

[REDACTED]



THE AXIS 10 HOLLIDAY STREET BIRMINGHAM B1 1TF

Telephone 0121 625 6888
HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.

From: Fletcher, Clive [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 December 2019 14:32
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for consulting Historic England about your Neighbourhood Plan.

The area covered by your Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of important designated heritage assets. In line with national planning policy, it will be important that the strategy for this area safeguards those elements which contribute to the significance of these assets so that they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area.

If you have not already done so, we would recommend that you speak to the planning and conservation team at your local planning authority together with the staff at the county council archaeological advisory service who look after the Historic Environment Record. They should be able to provide details of the

designated heritage assets in the area together with locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway (www.heritagegateway.org.uk). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society or local historic groups in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.

Historic England has produced advice which your community might find helpful in helping to identify what it is about your area which makes it distinctive and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. These can be found at:-

<https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/>

You may also find the advice in "*Planning for the Environment at the Neighbourhood Level*" useful. This has been produced by Historic England, Natural England, the Environment Agency and the Forestry Commission. As well as giving ideas on how you might improve your local environment, it also contains some useful further sources of information. This can be downloaded from:

http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf

We note that housing allocations form a part of your plan and, we therefore refer you to our published advice available on our website, "Housing Allocations in Local Plans" as this relates equally to neighbourhood planning. This can be found at <https://content.historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/historic-environment-and-site-allocations-in-local-plans/heag074-he-and-site-allocation-local-plans.pdf/>

We also have the following specific advice:

NPP9 (policy) Southern Renewal Area for site CL1246

This area is opposite the conservation area and includes the 19th Century Maltings, which is a building that has strong local historic and architectural interest and which retains much of its original form. We advise that the retention and conversion of this building as part of any redevelopment is included as a requirement in this policy.

NPP17 – Protecting Heritage Assets

While we support in principle the idea of local designations, we have concerns about this policy. The wording is vague and seems to interchange “non-designated heritage assets” with the broader term “heritage assets” which also encompasses listed buildings. The policy may also create hostages to fortune by effectively stigmatising buildings left off the list. It may be better simply to create a presumption against the loss of any building indicated as having value in Map 18 – Buildings of Heritage Value.

If you have any queries about this matter or would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Clive Fletcher, Principal Advisor and Lead Specialist, Historic Places
Mobile phone: [REDACTED]

Historic England | The Axis, Birmingham B1 1TF
www.HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England

We are the public body that helps people care for, enjoy and celebrate England's spectacular historic environment, from beaches and battlefields to parks and pie shops.

Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

From: Fletcher, Clive

Sent: 10 March 2020 14:10

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: Midlands ePlanning

Subject: RE: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - SEA / HRA Screening Report - Statutory Consultation

Dear Mr Brown

Thank you for your email consulting us on the SEA Screening Report for the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan. Further to our email of the 10th December 2019, we referred you to our advice on *The Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans*.

For the purposes of consultations on SEA Screening Opinions, Historic England confines its advice to the question, “Is it likely to have a significant effect on the environment?” in respect of our area of concern, cultural heritage. Our comments are based on the information supplied with the screening request.

On the basis of the information supplied and in the context of the criteria set out in Schedule 1 of the Environmental Assessment Regulations [Annex II of ‘SEA’ Directive], Historic England is of the view that the preparation of a Strategic Environmental Assessment is likely to be required.

We note that the proposed site allocations are described out as not having any significant effects but that conclusion is drawn based on the assumption that “4.37 Potential adverse impacts on listed buildings and

their setting could be addressed at a detailed level through the development management process and policies in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan”. This is in our view insufficient to demonstrate that the plan is sustainable and may put it at risk. Gainsborough has a very rich historic environment with the high potential for archaeology on the sites in question, with impacts on the settings of designated and non-designated heritage assets, including the grade II* Elswitha Hall.

The views of the other statutory consultation bodies should be taken into account before the overall decision on the need for a SEA is made. If a decision is made to undertake a SEA, please note that Historic England has published guidance on Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment and the Historic Environment that is relevant to both local and neighbourhood planning and available at:

<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/sustainability-appraisal-and-strategic-environmental-assessment-advice-note-8>

Should it be concluded that, overall, a SEA will be required for the Plan, Historic England would be pleased to discuss the scope of the assessment in relation to the historic environment in due course.

I hope that this information is of use to you at this time.

Yours sincerely,

Clive Fletcher, Principal Advisor and Lead Specialist, Historic Places
Mobile phone: [REDACTED]

Historic England | The Axis, Birmingham B1 1TF
www.HistoricEngland.org.uk

3

From: Helen Metcalfe [REDACTED] >
Sent: 26 March 2020 14:26
To: Fletcher, Clive <[REDACTED]>
Cc: Nev Brown <N[REDACTED]>; Tom Clay <[REDACTED]>; Mike Hopper <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan and the need for a SEA

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL: do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and were expecting the content to be sent to you

Dear Mr Fletcher

I am the consultant supporting Gainsborough Town Council to prepare their Neighbourhood Plan. Nev Brown from WLDC has forwarded your e-mail of 10 March where you reflect that a SEA may be required. I would like to provide you with more information in the hope that this enables you to reflect on this opinion.

The GNP does not propose any development in addition to those sites allocated in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. None of the sites are allocated through the neighbourhood plan they are all sites in the CLLP. The Town Council highly value the heritage in the town and the GNP took the opportunity to embrace the principles in the Gainsborough Heritage Master Plan and the recently updated Gainsborough Town Centre Conservation Area in its analysis in its substantive section on heritage in the NP. As such there is more appreciation of the impact of the potential site allocations on heritage and there was no intent to do anything that was not already assessed within the scope of the SEA undertaken for the Central Lincs Local Plan .

I did have very constructive and detailed meetings with WLDC and there was no suggestion that the neighbourhood plan policies would trigger a SEA. Nev Brown is of the same view and would be pleased to discuss this matter with you. Equally I would be pleased to provide further information if you need it to clarify this position.

The Town Council would be very grateful if you could further reflect on the foregoing. The Plan is almost ready to submit but if an SEA is undertaken it would need to be funded by AECOM (the organisation that did the SEA Screening) and given the current situation this could delay the Plan's progress to being made by very many months. I am also not sure what the position would be in securing this support to get an SEA done when they have concluded that an SEA is not required - this work is all done via the technical support offer of the Locality programme.

In the meantime developers continue to submit planning applications for these sites allocated in the CLLP. It is the Town Council's view that the neighbourhood plan, when made, will ensure development is more in sensitive to the heritage of the parish, of a higher quality and will provide more community gain (green connecting routes etc).

Kind regards

Helen Metcalfe BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI
Planning With People
M: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

www.planningwithpeople.co.uk

Sent from Planning With People the trading name of Metcalfe Planning Services Ltd.
Companies House Reg No 9273796: Registered office: 1 Maris Drive, NG14 5AJ

This email is solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify me and delete the email and all attachments immediately. This email (and any attachments) may contain confidential material. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure, distribution or copying of this email, or any attachments is prohibited. Whilst I use anti-virus software I do not accept liability for any damage sustained as a result of a virus introduced by the email/attachments.

From: Fletcher, Clive <[REDACTED]>

Sent: 27 March 2020 10:59

To: Nev Brown [REDACTED] >

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - SEA / HRA Screening Report - Statutory Consultation

Dear Mr Brown,

I hope you are well. Helen Metcalfe has written to me further to the email we sent you (below) on the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan SEA screening consultation, and has drawn our attention to the allocations in question being part of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, something I had somehow overlooked. Her email is attached. Please accept my apologies for this oversight. Naturally, this changes the nature of our advice as the sites in question are not new proposals and will already have been subject to SEA as part of the CLLP process. We see no other historic environment reasons necessitating the production of an SEA to support the neighbourhood Plan in line with the conclusions of the screening report.

Yours sincerely,

Clive Fletcher, Principal Advisor and Lead Specialist, Historic Places

Mobile phone: [REDACTED]

Historic England | The Axis, Birmingham B1 1TF

www.HistoricEngland.org.uk



Historic England

We are the public body that helps people care for, enjoy and celebrate England's spectacular historic environment, from beaches and battlefields to parks and pie shops.

Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

James Newton

From: Dave Carnell <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 05 June 2020 08:59
To: WL - Neighbourhood Plans
Subject: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan.

Thanks you for providing details of the Plan. The Inland Waterways Association is primarily concerned with promoting the development of tourism on Inland Waterways.
Having studied the Plan we have no comments to make on its contents.

Kind Regards

Dave Carnell

James Newton

From: SM-NE-Consultations (NE) <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 11 June 2020 11:11
To: WL - Neighbourhood Plans
Subject: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16 - NE Response
Attachments: 317795 NE Response.pdf

FAO Nev Brown

Please accept my apologies for previously sending this email without the attached file.

Please find Natural England's response in relation to the above mentioned consultation attached herewith.

Kind regards,

Ben Jones
Operations Delivery
Consultations Team
Natural England
Hornbeam House
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ
Email: [REDACTED]

www.gov.uk/natural-england

- During the current coronavirus situation, Natural England staff are working remotely to provide our services and support our customers and stakeholders. All offices and our Mail Hub are closed, so please send any documents by email or contact us by phone or email to let us know how we can help you. See the latest news on the coronavirus at <http://www.gov.uk/coronavirus> and Natural England's regularly updated operational update at <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/operational-update-covid-19>.
- Stay alert, control the virus, save lives.



From: Nev Brown [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 May 2020 13:32
Subject: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16

Dear Consultee,
Gainsborough Town Council has formally submitted the final version of its Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents to West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. WLDC is now consulting interested parties on the submission Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan, in

accordance with Regulation 16 of the same regulations. You are being notified because you are either a consultee or you have previously made comments on the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan.

The plan and supporting documents can be viewed via the following link:

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

The consultation period is until 20 July 2020. However, we recognise this is a difficult time and should you require an extended period to consider the plan, please do contact us and we will seek to accommodate your request.

All representations on the submission Neighbourhood Plan should be made in writing (either by email or letter) and sent to:

Email: [REDACTED]

Post: Neighbourhood Planning, Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, Lincs, DN21 2NA.

When making your representations please indicate if you wish to be notified of WLDC's decision on the Gainsborough NP under Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. If you would like further information about this or other neighbourhood plans in West Lindsey please contact me.

Regards

Nev Brown

Senior Neighbourhood Planning Policy Officer

[REDACTED]

Guildhall | Marshall's Yard | Gainsborough | Lincolnshire | DN21 2NA



[Sign up](#) to our digital newsletter



[Sign up](#) to our digital newsletter

This message has been sent using TLS 1.2 This email and any attachments is intended for the named recipient only. If you have received it in error you have no authority to use, disclose, store or copy any of its contents and you should destroy it and inform the sender. Whilst this email and associated attachments will have been checked for known viruses whilst within the Natural England systems, we can accept no responsibility once it has left our systems. Communications on Natural England systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.

Date: 10 June 2020
Our ref: 317795
Your ref: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg 16



Mr Nev Brown
Senior Neighbourhood Planning Policy Officer
West Lindsey District Council

Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

T 0300 060 3900

BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Nev Brown,

Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg 16

Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 22 May 2020

Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.

Natural England does not have any specific comments on this neighbourhood plan.

For any further consultations on your plan, please contact: [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely,

Ben Jones

Consultations Team

James Newton

From: National Grid (Avison Young - UK) <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 29 June 2020 15:30
To: WL - Neighbourhood Plans
Subject: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Regulation 16
Attachments: 29.06.20 West Lindsey DC - Gainsborough NP Reg 16 May-Jul 20.pdf

Dear Sir / Madam

We write to you with regards to the current consultation as detailed above in respect of our client, National Grid.

Please find attached our letter of representation. Please do not hesitate to contact me via [REDACTED] if you require any further information or clarification.

Kind regards

Chris Johnson

Christopher Johnson MRTPI
Planner
[REDACTED]

avisonyoung.co.uk



[Blog](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Property Listings](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [YouTube](#) | [Instagram](#)

Our Ref: MV/ 15B901605

T: +44 (0)191 261 2361
F: +44 (0)191 269 0076

29 June 2020

avisonyoung.co.uk

West Lindsey District Council

via email only

Dear Sir / Madam

**Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation
May – July 2020
Representations on behalf of National Grid**

National Grid has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to Neighbourhood Plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document.

About National Grid

National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales. The energy is then distributed to the electricity distribution network operators across England, Wales and Scotland.

National Grid Gas plc (NGG) owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use.

National Grid Ventures (NGV) is separate from National Grid's core regulated businesses. NGV develop, operate and invest in energy projects, technologies, and partnerships to help accelerate the development of a clean energy future for consumers across the UK, Europe and the United States.

Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets:

An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines.

National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area.

National Grid provides information in relation to its assets at the website below.

- www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/

Please also see attached information outlining guidance on development close to National Grid infrastructure.

Distribution Networks

Information regarding the electricity distribution network is available at the website below:
www.energynetworks.org.uk

Information regarding the gas distribution network is available by contacting:
plantprotection@cadentgas.com

Further Advice

Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our assets. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database, if not already included:

Matt Verlander, Director

Spencer Jefferies, Town Planner

Avison Young
Central Square South
Orchard Street
Newcastle upon Tyne
NE1 3AZ

National Grid
National Grid House
Warwick Technology Park
Gallows Hill
Warwick, CV34 6DA

If you require any further information in respect of this letter, then please contact us.

Yours faithfully,

Matt Verlander MRTPI
Director

For and on behalf of Avison Young

Guidance on development near National Grid assets

National Grid is able to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks and encourages high quality and well-planned development in the vicinity of its assets.

Electricity assets

Developers of sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets should be aware that it is National Grid policy to retain existing overhead lines in-situ, though it recognises that there may be exceptional circumstances that would justify the request where, for example, the proposal is of regional or national importance.

National Grid's '*Guidelines for Development near pylons and high voltage overhead power lines*' promote the successful development of sites crossed by existing overhead lines and the creation of well-designed places. The guidelines demonstrate that a creative design approach can minimise the impact of overhead lines whilst promoting a quality environment. The guidelines can be downloaded here: <https://www.nationalgridet.com/document/130626/download>

The statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground, and built structures must not be infringed. Where changes are proposed to ground levels beneath an existing line then it is important that changes in ground levels do not result in safety clearances being infringed. National Grid can, on request, provide to developers detailed line profile drawings that detail the height of conductors, above ordnance datum, at a specific site.

National Grid's statutory safety clearances are detailed in their '*Guidelines when working near National Grid Electricity Transmission assets*', which can be downloaded here: www.nationalgridet.com/network-and-assets/working-near-our-assets

Gas assets

High-Pressure Gas Pipelines form an essential part of the national gas transmission system and National Grid's approach is always to seek to leave their existing transmission pipelines in situ. Contact should be made with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) in respect of sites affected by High-Pressure Gas Pipelines.

National Grid have land rights for each asset which prevents the erection of permanent/ temporary buildings, or structures, changes to existing ground levels, storage of materials etc. Additionally, written permission will be required before any works commence within the National Grid's 12.2m building proximity distance, and a deed of consent is required for any crossing of the easement.

National Grid's '*Guidelines when working near National Grid Gas assets*' can be downloaded here: www.nationalgridgas.com/land-and-assets/working-near-our-assets

How to contact National Grid

If you require any further information in relation to the above and/or if you would like to check if National Grid's transmission networks may be affected by a proposed development, please contact:

- National Grid's Plant Protection team: [REDACTED]

Cadent Plant Protection Team
Block 1
Brick Kiln Street
Hinckley
LE10 0NA
0800 688 588

or visit the website: <https://www.beforeyoudig.cadentgas.com/login.aspx>

James Newton

From: Bramley, Chris [REDACTED] >
Sent: 08 July 2020 15:10
To: WL - Neighbourhood Plans
Cc: Nev Brown; Stuart Patience (spatience@anglianwater.co.uk); 'Warren Peppard'
Subject: RE: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16
Attachments: Gainsborough 2 Resp.pdf

ST Classification: OFFICIAL COMMERCIAL

Dear Sir / Madam

Thank you for giving Severn Trent the opportunity to comment on the regulation 16 submission version of the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan, Please find attached a copy of our response.

Kind Regards

Chris Bramley

Strategic Catchment Planner (Leics & Notts)

Drainage and Wastewater Management Planning (DWMP)

Severn Trent Water Ltd, PO Box 51, Raynesway, Derby, DE21 7JA (sat nav post code is DE21 7BE)

 **Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.**

From: Nev Brown <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 22 May 2020 13:32
Subject: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16

Dear Consultee,

Gainsborough Town Council has formally submitted the final version of its Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents to West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. WLDC is now consulting interested parties on the submission Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan, in accordance with Regulation 16 of the same regulations. You are being notified because you are either a consultee or you have previously made comments on the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan.

The plan and supporting documents can be viewed via the following link:

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

The consultation period is until 20 July 2020. However, we recognise this is a difficult time and should you require an extended period to consider the plan, please do contact us and we will seek to accommodate your request.

All representations on the submission Neighbourhood Plan should be made in writing (either by email or letter) and sent to:

Email: [REDACTED]

Post: Neighbourhood Planning, Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, Lincs, DN21 2NA.

When making your representations please indicate if you wish to be notified of WLDC's decision on the Gainsborough NP under Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. If you would like further information about this or other neighbourhood plans in West Lindsey please

contact me.

Regards

Nev Brown

Senior Neighbourhood Planning Policy Officer



Guildhall | Marshall's Yard | Gainsborough | Lincolnshire | DN21 2NA



[Sign up](#) to our digital newsletter



[Sign up](#) to our digital newsletter

Severn Trent Plc (registered number 2366619) and Severn Trent Water Limited (registered number 2366686) (together the "Companies") are both limited companies registered in England & Wales with their registered office at Severn Trent Centre, 2 St John's Street, Coventry, CV1 2LZ This email (which includes any files attached to it) is not contractually binding on its own, is intended solely for the named recipient and may contain CONFIDENTIAL, legally privileged or trade secret information protected by law. If you have received this message in error please delete it and notify us immediately by telephoning +44 2477715000. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, distribute, reproduce, retransmit, retain or rely on any information contained in this email. Please note the Companies reserve the right to monitor email communications in accordance with applicable law and regulations. To the extent permitted by law, neither the Companies or any of their subsidiaries, nor any employee, director or officer thereof, accepts any liability whatsoever in relation to this email including liability arising from any external breach of security or confidentiality or for virus infection or for statements made by the sender as these are not necessarily made on behalf of the Companies. Reduce waste! Please consider the environment before printing this email

08 July 2020

Our ref: Gainsborough 2

Dear Sir/Madam

Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan, Submission Version

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your consultation regarding the Submission version of the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan. Severn Trent are generally supportive of the principles behind the plan, however there are a few areas that we would recommend are reviewed to ensure that the plan delivers against its objectives and supports wider needs and sustainable development.

Policy NPP 1 Sustainable development

As per our response to the pre-submission draft, we note that Brownfield development has been highlighted as part of the delivery strategy for Gainsborough, we have no objection to this approach and welcome the addition of bullet point g relating to flood risk. It is however important to highlight the need to ensure surface water separation and attenuation is maximised within brownfield developments, whilst it is noted that individual policies reference SuDS as per our comments below, if it is felt that an overriding policy such as NPP 1 should also clarify this as it would cover windfall sites too. Bullet point g could be enhanced to detail the use of SuDS and the drainage hierarchy for example:

g) it does not increase the risk of flooding and reduces the risk where possible, including but not limited to the implementation of SuDS and that surface water is discharged in accordance with the Drainage Hierarchy.

Paragraph 98

Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to plant trees and hedgerows within development, but we would recommend that where planting trees and vegetation that developers also consider the additional benefits that incorporating source control SuDS such as Tree-pits and Bio-retention areas.

Paragraph 102

Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to create a wildlife buffer as part of the riverside walkway and would encourage that this area is enhanced using effective SuDS design that can support wider biodiversity and amenity space.

Paragraph 105

Severn Trent are supportive of the proposals to incorporate SuDS, but we would raise concerns about the potential for effective infiltration given the proximity of some of the proposals to the river Trent, and would recommend that this infiltration testing is carried out at an early design stage to ensure viability to prevent design changes that could have adverse impacts on the site design.

NPP 2 Protecting the Natural Environment and enhancing Biodiversity

Whilst Severn Trent are supportive of the inclusion of SuDS within policy NPP2 we would also highlight the importance that development follows the principles of the drainage hierarchy Paragraph 80 of Planning Practice Guidance.

NPP6 Ensuring High Quality Design

We would recommend that bullet point d also references watercourses so that the natural conveyance of surface water is maintained and not directed towards the sewerage systems. By keeping these features as open watercourses surface water can be connected and conveyed safely through the landscape in a sustainable way.

We are also supportive of Bullet point 6 which highlights the principles of good SuDS design, as with NPP 2, we would recommend that the Drainage hierarchy is mentioned to ensure that a sustainable outfall is highlighted from the outset of the design process.

Paragraph 167

Severn Trent would note that alongside Anglian water assets, there will be Severn Trent sewerage assets that would also be protected by easements. These assets should be protected from development and retained in public land, where proposal would result in a diversion Severn Trent would need to be contacted to review if a diversion is possible.

NPP 9 Gateway Riverside

Severn Trent welcome the inclusion of bullet points 7, 8 and 9 compared with the pre-submission version of the policy regarding Gateway Riverside, however we would note that the policy still makes no reference to the drainage Hierarchy, which would be a fundamental part of ensuring a resilient sewerage design, by discharging surface water to a sustainable outfall. As such we would recommend that a reference to the Drainage Hierarchy is made within this policy.

NPP 10 Southern Neighbourhood Renewal Area

As with our response to policy NPP 9 Severn Trent welcomes the inclusion of bullet points 6 and 7 but feel that a reference to the Drainage Hierarchy is still required to ensure that the surface water outfall is designed appropriately from the outset.

NPP 13 Eastern Part of CL 4687 Bridge Street Car Park Area B

As with our response to policy NPP 9 Severn Trent welcomes the inclusion of bullet points 4 and 5 but feel that a reference to the Drainage Hierarchy is still required to ensure that the surface water outfall is designed appropriately from the outset.

NPP 14 Albion Works Site

As with our response to policy NPP 9 Severn Trent welcomes the inclusion of bullet points 5 and 6 but feel that a reference to the Drainage Hierarchy is still required to ensure that the surface water outfall is designed appropriately from the outset.

NPP 15 Riverside North

As with our response to policy NPP 9 Severn Trent welcomes the inclusion of bullet points 4 and 5 but feel that a reference to the Drainage Hierarchy is still required to ensure that the surface water outfall is designed appropriately from the outset.

NPP 16 Former Castle Hills Community College

As with our response to policy NPP 9 Severn Trent welcomes the inclusion of bullet point 2 but feel that a reference to the Drainage Hierarchy is still required to ensure that the surface water outfall is designed appropriately from the outset. We would recommend that an additional point, as per the other policies a bullet point should be included to highlight that proposals should ensure flood risk is not increased to the site or to others and be improved wherever possible.

NPP 17 Middlefield School of Technology Site

As with our response to policy NPP 9 Severn Trent welcomes the inclusion of bullet point 2 but feel that a reference to the Drainage Hierarchy is still required to ensure that the surface water outfall is designed appropriately from the outset. We would recommend that an additional point, as per the other policies a bullet point should be included to highlight that proposals should ensure flood risk is not increased to the site or to others and be improved wherever possible.

Position Statement

As a water company we have an obligation to provide water supplies and sewage treatment capacity for future development. It is important for us to work collaboratively with Local Planning Authorities to provide relevant assessments of the impacts of future developments. For outline proposals we are able to provide general comments. Once detailed developments and site-specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead. We do this to avoid making investments on speculative developments to minimise customer bills.

Sewage Strategy

Once detailed plans are available and we have modelled the additional capacity, in areas where sufficient capacity is not currently available and we have sufficient confidence that developments will be built, we will complete necessary improvements to provide the capacity. We will ensure that our assets have no adverse effect on the environment and that we provide appropriate levels of treatment at each of our sewage treatment works.

Surface Water and Sewer Flooding

We expect surface water to be managed in line with the Government's Water Strategy, Future Water. The strategy sets out a vision for more effective management of surface water to deal with the dual pressures of climate change and housing development. Surface water needs to be managed sustainably. For new developments we would not expect surface water to be conveyed to our foul or combined sewage system and, where practicable, we support the removal of surface water already connected to foul or combined sewer.

We believe that greater emphasis needs to be paid to consequences of extreme rainfall. In the past, even outside of the flood plain, some properties have been built in natural drainage paths. We

request that developers providing sewers on new developments should safely accommodate floods which exceed the design capacity of the sewers.

To encourage developers to consider sustainable drainage, Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the sewerage infrastructure charge if there is no surface water connection and a 75% discount if there is a surface water connection via a sustainable drainage system. More details can be found on our website

<https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/>

Water Efficiency

Whilst Gainsborough is outside of the Severn Trent water supply area, and we would recommend that you obtain specific advice regarding water supply and efficiency from Anglian water. We would like to highlight our support for the implementation of water efficiency technology and design.

Part G of Building Regulations specify that new homes must consume no more than 125 litres of water per person per day. We recommend that you consider taking an approach of installing specifically designed water efficient fittings in all areas of the property rather than focus on the overall consumption of the property. This should help to achieve a lower overall consumption than the maximum volume specified in the Building Regulations.

We recommend that in all cases you consider:

- Single flush siphon toilet cistern and those with a flush volume of 4 litres.
- Showers designed to operate efficiently and with a maximum flow rate of 8 litres per minute.
- Hand wash basin taps with low flow rates of 4 litres or less.
- Water butts for external use in properties with gardens.

We would encourage you to impose the expectation on developers that properties are built to the optional requirement in Building Regulations of 110 litres of water per person per day.

We hope this information has been useful to you and we look forward in hearing from you in the near future.

Yours sincerely

Chris Bramley

Strategic Catchment Planner

[Redacted signature]

James Newton

From: Seldon, Martin <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 08 July 2020 14:38
To: WL - Neighbourhood Plans
Subject: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan Consultation
Attachments: Gainsborough NP Consultation Response Letter 080620.pdf

Dear Sir or Madam

Please see attached Highways England's response to the above.

Kind regards

Martin Seldon, Assistant Spatial Planner

Highways England | The Cube | 199 Wharfside Street | Birmingham | B1 1RN
[REDACTED]

Web: <http://www.highwaysengland.co.uk>

GTN: 0300 470 3345

This email may contain information which is confidential and is intended only for use of the recipient/s named above. If you are not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any copying, distribution, disclosure, reliance upon or other use of the contents of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender and destroy it.

Highways England Company Limited | General enquiries: 0300 123 5000 | National Traffic Operations Centre, 3 Ridgeway, Quinton Business Park, Birmingham B32 1AF |
<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/highways-england> | info@highwaysengland.co.uk

Registered in England and Wales no 9346363 | Registered Office: Bridge House, 1 Walnut Tree Close, Guildford, Surrey GU1 4LZ

Consider the environment. Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

Our ref:
Your ref:

Neighbourhood Planning
Guildhall
Marshall's Yard
Gainsborough
Lincolnshire
DN21 2NA

Martin Seldon
Assistant Spatial Planner
Highways England
The Cube
199 Wharfside Street
Birmingham
B1 1RN

Direct Line: 0300 470 3345

8 July 2020

Via Email:
[REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam,

Consultation on the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan

Highways England welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan which covers the period of 2020 to 2036. The document provides a vision for the future of the area and sets out a number of key objectives and planning policies which will be used to help determine planning applications.

Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In relation to the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan, Highways England's principal interest is in safeguarding the operation of the M180 and A1 motorway routeing about 15 miles to the North and South of the Neighbourhood Plan area respectively.

We understand that a Neighbourhood Plan is required to be in conformity with relevant national and Borough-wide planning policies. Accordingly, the Neighbourhood Plan for Gainsborough is required to be in conformity with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2012 to 2036) and this is acknowledged within the document.

We previously responded to a consultation for the pre-submission Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan in December 2019.

We note that Gainsborough is considered a 'Main Town' within the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan which allocates 12% (4,435) of the total homes needed over the Plan period to 2036. This growth is to be achieved through a combined strategy of urban regeneration and sustainable urban extensions, and this is reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan for Gainsborough.

It is noted that the northern SUE for 750 dwellings is outside the town's boundary and the southern SUE for 1,400 dwellings already benefits from outline planning permission. Furthermore, we note that Policies NP 8 – 16 aim to provide a policy framework for the development of those residential sites allocated in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan within the Gainsborough town.


Despite the significant level of growth proposed in Gainsborough, considering its distance from the SRN it is not expect that there will be significant impacts on the operation of the SRN.

From a review of the submission version of the finalised local plan there do not appear to be any changes that will impact upon the SRN, therefore our previous response remains.

We have no further comments to provide and trust the above is useful in the progression of the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan.

Yours sincerely,



Martin Seldon
Midlands Operations Directorate
Email: 

James Newton

From: Richard Horne CBOA [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 July 2020 18:58
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]; Tim West; John Dodwell
Subject: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16; also Morton NP Paper 6 - Roads and Traffic

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for advising CBOA of both the above.

We note the several references in the Gainsborough NP Submission Version and the Morton NP Paper 6 to the potential of the River Trent for freight carriage and agree fully with these statements in both Gainsborough and Morton Neighbourhood Plans.

As mentioned within, the benefits for carbon reduction and reduction of road freight transport improves the environment locally.

The retention and re-use of wharfs for local distribution of materials is also important as mentioned, whether this is for local construction or other purposes.

We hope that these plans/policies result in successful implementation of use of the River Trent locally for freight in the future, and thank you for including our previous request to include this information in the plans.

Yours faithfully,

Richard Horne

Commercial Boat Operators Association (CBOA)

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

<http://www.cboa.org.uk/>

The CBOA is the prime trade organization involved in sustaining and promoting freight carriage on our waterways for economic and environmental reasons.

"To reach climate change goals and reduce greenhouse gases, European countries want to give inland waterways shipping a bigger role in freight transport. They speak of more cargo, improving existing infrastructure and building new waterways". (Vice-President European Commission). Never before has there been such a policy in favour of inland waterways shipping.

There has been a 24% increase in the number of businesses demanding suppliers publish environmental data, according to a study conducted by the Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP) in May 2020.

James Newton

From: Foster Emma (Town Planner) [REDACTED] >
Sent: 10 July 2020 12:44
To: WL - Neighbourhood Plans
Subject: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16

Good afternoon

Thank you for providing Network Rail with an opportunity to comment on the final version of the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan (GNP).

We are pleased to see that our previous comments have been incorporated into the final version of the GNP. We would however like to correct a mistake made as part of our initial comments where we have referred to a level crossing. This is in fact a barrow crossing and therefore we would request the wording of paragraph 60 be amended as follows:

There are two railway stations located within the Plan boundary, Gainsborough Central and Gainsborough Lea Road, providing connections to Sheffield, Lincoln, Doncaster and Cleethorpes. Only one level crossing is present within the GNP plan boundary which is a barrow crossing located to the south of Gainsborough Central station providing pedestrian access between platforms for station users. Network Rail regards rail safety as a priority and will therefore seek opportunities for level/ barrow crossing closure/ improvements wherever possible. Given the planned growth of the Town Network Rail anticipate an increase in passenger numbers at Gainsborough's stations during the plan period

We would wish to be notified on the decision of the GNP in due course.

Kind regards



Emma Foster
Town Planner
Network Rail Property | Eastern Region
George Stephenson House | Toft Green | York | YO1 6JT

The content of this email (and any attachment) is confidential. It may also be legally privileged or otherwise protected from disclosure.

This email should not be used by anyone who is not an original intended recipient, nor may it be copied or disclosed to anyone who is not an original intended recipient.

If you have received this email by mistake please notify us by emailing the sender, and then delete the email and any copies from your system.

Liability cannot be accepted for statements made which are clearly the sender's own and not made on behalf of Network Rail.

Network Rail Infrastructure Limited registered in England and Wales No. 2904587, registered office
Network Rail, 2nd Floor, One Eversholt Street, London, NW1 2DN

James Newton

From: Sadie Weller [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 July 2020 22:42
To: WL - Neighbourhood Plans
Cc: Simon Wright
Subject: RE: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation

Dear Mr Brown

Thank you for your email regarding the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan. I am responding on behalf of the Place Directorate of Lincolnshire County Council, who own and manage land on Foxby Lane Business Park, including Mercury House Business Centre, which provides office space to rent for small businesses and start-up businesses. I also copy in Simon Wright, (Principal Officer, Regeneration, Economic Infrastructure, Place Directorate).

We have reviewed the Plan in detail and we have set out comments below on the areas which we feel are of relevance, or have an impact on us.

Whilst we need and therefore fully support the growth aspirations for Gainsborough, we note however that there is reference to building offices for small businesses and start up's.

We refer to the section of "The Green Infrastructure Study", Page 7 - Stating the plan to build offices for small business and start up use, and would request that prior to any planning of such kind, discussions are held with LCC who own Mercury House Business Centre, and the Foxby Lane Business Park Land, to ensure any plans do not compete unnecessarily with any we have in place already, to avoid over saturating. Perhaps the plan could involve this business area in the overall plan to grow the business economy in the area? We would be very happy to consult and discuss potential office space that we could offer already within Mercury House, before any proposals for building more are considered, or discuss the potential of the land at Foxby Lane for any new Industrial build proposals.

We also refer to the mention of the relocation of some Businesses – we would like to be considered in this area with the land at Foxby Lane, which is available for purchase.

We would like to be notified of West Lindsey District Council's decision, under Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 (as amended) in relation to the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan, please.

I trust these comments are useful, and would be happy to answer any queries or give further information as required.

Yours sincerely,

Sadie Weller

Please consider the environment before printing this email

This e-mail and any attachments may be confidential and are intended solely for use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you must take no action upon them, nor must you copy or share them. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error.

If your email is a response under the Freedom of Information Act please send this to CustomerInformationService@lincolnshire.gov.uk. This is the email account which is used to process Freedom of Information requests.

Note: We are a Microsoft Office site. Our base version is 2010. Please make sure that files you send can be read in this format. Any form of reproduction, dissemination, copying, disclosure, modification, distribution and/or publication of this e-mail is strictly prohibited save unless expressly authorised by the sender. The information contained in this message is intended for the named recipients only. It may contain privileged and confidential information and if you are not the addressee or the person responsible for delivering this to the addressee, you may not copy, distribute or take action in reliance on it. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender(s) immediately by telephone. Please also destroy and delete as soon as possible the message from your computer.

James Newton

From: Planning [REDACTED] >
Sent: 17 July 2020 15:10
To: WL - Neighbourhood Plans
Subject: Comments - Gainsborough Town Neighbourhood Plan

Good Afternoon

Please see our comments on the Gainsborough Town Neighbourhood Plan below.

The Trust commented on the draft version of the plan in late 2019. At that time we suggested inclusion of a policy which would support and protect Gainsborough's valued community, cultural and social facilities from loss. We also welcomed inclusion of the former Albert Hall Theatre/King's Bingo onto the local heritage list.

The Trust has interest in this plan as it contains two operational theatres/performance venues – Trinity Arts Centre and Old Nick Theatre/Gainsborough Theatre Group – and a vacant former theatre building. As noted previously we welcome and support inclusion of the latter on the proposed local heritage list. We still consider that a policy protecting Gainsborough's facilities from unnecessary loss would be beneficial, nonetheless we consider the plan to meet the basic conditions.

Kind regards

Tom Clarke MRTPI
National Planning Adviser

Theatres Trust
22 Charing Cross Road, London WC2H 0QL
T [REDACTED]
E [REDACTED]
W theatrust.org.uk

James Newton

From: LN Planning <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 17 July 2020 13:59
To: WL - Neighbourhood Plans
Subject: FAO Nev Brown: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16

Dear Nev

Thank you for giving the Environment Agency the opportunity to review the final version of the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan.

We are pleased to see that several of the suggestions we made at the Regulation 14 stage have been acted on, with references in the Plan to the 'blue network', biodiversity net gain, water quality and flood risk.

We do not wish to raise any concerns in respect of the final plan but would appreciate notification when a decision is made on its adoption.

Kind regards

Nicola Farr

Sustainable Places - Planning Advisor

Environment Agency | Ceres House, Searby Road, Lincoln, LN2 4DW



Creating a better place
for people and wildlife



From: Nev Brown [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 May 2020 13:32
Subject: Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Consultation Reg16

Dear Consultee,

Gainsborough Town Council has formally submitted the final version of its Neighbourhood Plan and supporting documents to West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. WLDC is now consulting interested parties on the submission Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan, in accordance with Regulation 16 of the same regulations. You are being notified because you are either a consultee or you have previously made comments on the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan.

The plan and supporting documents can be viewed via the following link:

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

The consultation period is until 20 July 2020. However, we recognise this is a difficult time and should you require an extended period to consider the plan, please do contact us and we will seek to accommodate your request.

All representations on the submission Neighbourhood Plan should be made in writing (either by email or letter) and sent to:

Email: [REDACTED]

Post: Neighbourhood Planning, Guildhall, Marshall's Yard, Gainsborough, Lincs, DN21 2NA.

When making your representations please indicate if you wish to be notified of WLDC's decision on the Gainsborough NP under Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. If you would like further information about this or other neighbourhood plans in West Lindsey please contact me.

Regards

Nev Brown

Senior Neighbourhood Planning Policy Officer

[REDACTED]

Guildhall | Marshall's Yard | Gainsborough | Lincolnshire | DN21 2NA



[Sign up](#) to our digital newsletter



[Sign up](#) to our digital newsletter

This message has been sent using TLS 1.2 Information in this message may be confidential and may be legally privileged. If you have received this message by mistake, please notify the sender immediately, delete it and do not copy it to anyone else. We have checked this email and its attachments for viruses. But you should still check any attachment before opening it. We may have to make this message and any reply to it public if asked to under the Freedom of Information Act, Data Protection Act or for litigation. Email messages and attachments sent to or from any Environment Agency address may also be accessed by someone other than the sender or recipient, for business purposes.

James Newton

From: Luke Bamforth <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 20 July 2020 10:55
To: WL - Neighbourhood Plans
Subject: GLNP: Response to consultation on Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan
Attachments: 20200720 GLNP Response to Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan.pdf

Good Morning,

Please find attached the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership's response to the consultation on the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan. If you have any questions or require further detail on any of the points made, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this response.

Kind regards
Luke Bamforth
Policy Officer
[REDACTED]

Achieving more for nature



Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership

Banovallum House, Manor House Street, Horncastle, LN9 5HF

This email and any attachments is intended for the named recipient only. If you have received it in error you have no authority to use, disclose, store or copy any of its contents and you should destroy it and inform the sender.

Neighbourhood Planning
West Lindsey District Council
Guildhall
Marshall's Yard
Gainsborough
DN21 2NA

20 July 2020

Re: Response to the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan consultation

Dear Sir or Madam

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the consultation for the Gainsborough Local Plan. Please find our comments below.

The Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. Each of these organisations may respond individually and as such we cannot give a definitive or comprehensive response.

7. Social and environmental matters outside the planning system (Pg16)

It is important for Plans to ensure biodiversity is both protected and enhanced (**NPPF 174**). While the GLNP understands that health and safety should be prioritised when managing green space, for instance maintaining visibility on roads, opportunities should be taken to manage local assets in a way which is sensitive to biodiversity. **Paragraph 34** should include text to reflect this. Text could be worded as follows:

"...This is, understandably, an important matter for local people. Management should seek to improve health and safety and the appearance of the Town while ensuring that biodiversity is protected and enhanced."

8 Gainsborough in Context (Pg17)

The GLNP feels that there should be a section which puts Gainsborough in the context of its surrounding natural environment; this would highlight the contribution of natural heritage to an area's sense of place. This should include reference to the wider landscape including National Character Areas, which are referred to later in section **16 Protecting the Landscape Character**, and local natural assets. It should also make reference to natural capital and the



ecosystem services that the natural environment provides to society, for example through opportunities for tourism and the health and wellbeing of residents.

13 Sustainable Development, Brownfield Sites and SUEs (Pg27)

NPP1 Sustainable Development (Pg28)

The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan refers to prioritising 'suitable brownfield' for development; some brownfield land can be of high ecological value and are therefore unsuitable for development. Where this is the case it should not be developed. Paragraph 2 of NPP1 should refer to this with wording such as:

"Securing the redevelopment of suitable brownfield sites, especially those along the river, is a priority for the community, in accordance with national and CLLP policies, those which are of high ecological value should not be developed."

14 Protecting the Natural Environment (Pg29)

Credible up to date data is integral to the planning system. Central Lincolnshire Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping developed in 2019 on behalf of the joint Local Planning Authorities, including West Lindsey, should also be used to inform the Neighbourhood Plan.

Paragraph 99 should make it clear that the Local Sites system which maps locally designated sites such as Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) is managed by the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership not the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust. A number of discrepancies in **Paragraph 99** and on **Map 6** regarding local sites have been identified, they have been described below. Please note some of these are due to recent updates to designations:

- An update to the local sites system means that there are no longer any SNCIs within West Lindsey.
- Theaker Avenue Urban Wildlife area is now a LWS, but follows the boundary of the Local Nature Reserve so does not include **site 11** within the designation.
- Pitt Hills Plantation has been designated as a LWS as of 2019 not a SNCI. Also, the site extends as far as the point where The Belt Road and railway line intersect in the North West corner, therefore **No.21** on **Map 6** is inaccurate.
- Warrens Wood was deselected in 2017 and is no longer designated as a LWS.
- White's Wood labelled **A** on **Map 6** is a LWS, but **site 17** also labelled as White's Wood is not included in that designation.
- The numbers on **Map 6** do not correctly correspond to the numbers in **paragraph 99**. For example, Gainsborough General Cemetery is mapped as **site 27**, but referred to as **site 29** in **paragraph 99**.

Paragraph 100 includes a spelling error "water vowl". It is unclear whether this refers to water vole or water fowl.

NPP2 Protecting the Natural Environment and Enhancing Biodiversity (Pg34)

LP21 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan requires that “Development proposals should ensure opportunities are taken to retain, protect and enhance Biodiversity”. The GLNP feels that the use of “where possible” in **principle 1** of **NPP2** is not strong enough and should be removed to read “Proposals are required to protect and enhance the natural environment, especially those areas identified on Maps 5 and 6.” This would also bring it in line with **principle 2** which requires net biodiversity gain to be achieved.

The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (LP21) requires that development should “protect, manage and enhance the network of habitats”. As such, reference to enhancing ecological networks should be included as either part of an existing principle or as its own. Wording could be as follows:

*“Development should ensure that ecological networks are protected and enhanced.
Enhancement of ecological networks should prioritise opportunities identified by the latest edition of Central Lincolnshire Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping”*

The GLNP supports the inclusion of a principle of biodiversity net gain in **Principle 2**.

15 Creating a Local Green Network (Pg36)

Green infrastructure is integral for ensuring positive health and wellbeing outcomes and therefore the GLNP support the inclusion of a Local Green Network. However, the Partnership feels that it is important that the multiple benefits of the network are recognised, for example, mitigation against habitat fragmentation and improving air quality.

Map 9’s (Pg41) key includes some formatting errors. As noted previously in regards to Pitt Hills Plantation, the site of the LWS extends to the point where the Belt Road and railway line meet in the North West corner.

19 Allocated Development sites (Pg60)

Map 15 (Pg60) shows that allocation CL4690 is adjacent to Gainsborough General Cemetery which is designated as an LWS. As such any detrimental effects, from both development of and the ongoing purpose of the site, to the biodiversity of the LWS should be avoided or mitigated against.

NPP16 Former Castle Hills Community College Site (CL4691) (Pg86)

Allocation CL4691 is adjacent to Pitt Hills Plantation LWS, a principle should be put in place to avoid or mitigate against any detrimental effects to the biodiversity of the site, either during development itself or due to increase in use by residents.

Once again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on this draft. If you have any questions or require any further detail on anything mentioned please do not hesitate to



contact me. The GLNP would be happy to work together on any of the issues raised in this response including helping to create any potential wording required.

Yours sincerely,



Luke Bamforth
Policy Officer



From: Nev Brown <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 10 August 2020 11:43
To: WL - Neighbourhood Plans <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Gainsborough NP- WLDC's comments Reg 16 Submission version

To Neighbourhood Plans Team

Please find attached WLDC's comments on the submission version of the Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan (Reg16) and also, for information, comments it made on the previous pre-submission (Reg 14) version of the plan.

Regards

Nev Brown

Senior Neighbourhood Planning Policy Officer

[REDACTED]
Guildhall | Marshall's Yard | Gainsborough | Lincolnshire | DN21 2NA



1

[Sign up](#) to our digital newsletter



[Sign up](#) to our digital newsletter

**Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan
West Lindsey District Council's comments**

PART 1

WLDC's comments on Submission version Reg 16 – July 2020

**(For WLDC's comments on Pre-Submission version Reg 14 – December 2019
see PART 2 of this document)**

Foreword

The Foreword still focusses heavily on the challenges facing Gainsborough, reasons for preparing the neighbourhood plan, and feedback from consultation. This is disappointing. Instead it would be good if it could say more about the GNP itself, its objectives, how its proposals will take the town forward over the next 20 years and also mention the place-making improvements already happening in the town. As well as being a planning document, the GNP will serve as a promotional document for the town. So it is important that the Foreword includes an upbeat message about Gainsborough's prospects particularly to those wishing to invest in the town.

Key Principle: Pre-Application Community Engagement

- | | |
|------|---|
| 2 c) | GHCA where? Cross reference/footnote needed.

.....or equivalent..... need to be more specific than this. |
| d) | Are brackets needed? |

How the Neighbourhood Plan works within the planning system	
3	Would still like to see more said about CLLP particularly around growth and housing targets it has set for Gainsborough.
Para 17	GNP needs to set out the housing growth context for Gainsborough/GNP eg Policy LP2 identifies that during the CLLP plan period Gainsborough will seek to deliver 4,435 new homes.
NPP 1 Sustainable Development	
1 a)	Cross reference is needed to townscape character areas and associated policy NPP7 with Map 12. These guide the design of developments within identified areas of the town.
1 b)	Complete or partial loss? How would loss be identified? ...maps 5 and 6..
1 c)	Complete or partial loss of..? How would loss be identified on Map 6 also?
4	Cross reference to LGN needed.
5	CIL funding may not be available in Gainsborough. How about instead saying ... Grant funding may.....

NPP 2 Protecting the Natural Environment and Enhancing Biodiversity

1	Any proposal or proposals specifically affecting the natural environment? Could be an onerous requirement for a minor development to meet.
2	Where can LBAP be viewed/ cross reference/footnote? More guidance/direction is needed as to what to look for in LBAP. What are Gainsborough's local conservation priorities?
4	It would help if ancient woodlands were identified on a map. Cross references needed.
6	Would be helpful if blocks and belts of woodlands could be shown on map and cross referenced to this policy.
7	All proposals? If not, need to be more specific as to which proposals this policy applies to.

NPP 3 Creating a Local Green Network

1	Not clear as to what the Local Green Network is. Map 8 calls it the proposed network which includes both existing and proposed routes. Is the LGN everything featured on Map 8 which includes woodlands or is it just the route around Gainsborough as stated in section 1 of policy? Clarification is needed to guide users particularly if contributions are to be sought from developments to enhance the network.
3	.. the Local Green Network... route

4	<p>It would be helpful if the GNP could explain how the missing parts of the Local Green Network could be delivered? Much of route is in private ownership and will require landowner support. How will development proposals contribute precisely to the Local Green Network? There appears to be no implementation/delivery plan. The GNP would benefit from having one.</p> <p>Developments in west Gainsborough are unlikely to be able to afford making extra contributions to the Local Green Network for Gainsborough. Viability is an issue with housing development in the west of the Town so much so that developers are already exempt from having to make community infrastructure levy payments. It may therefore be unreasonable to ask them to assist with the Local Green Network which would add to costs and make it difficult to deliver the development at all. Has the delivery of the Green Network been set out?</p> <p>It would benefit the Local Green Network route if it were protected/reserved from development that could infringe upon it in future?</p>
NPP 4 Designating Local Green Spaces	
4	Needs reference... to Local Green Space
NPP 5 Protecting the Landscape Character	

1	<p>Any development? Needs to be more specific. Where can the WLLCA be viewed? No footnote/link. Better directions needed as to where to look in WLLCA. Give in supporting text?</p> <p>Not convinced how workable NNP5 is considering it pretty much covers the entire 'downhill' area of Gainsborough. It might hinder potential Riverside developments which could really take advantage of being taller given their history as tall wharf buildings.</p>
2	View 5 looks eastwards and is from outside NP area.
3	<p>Again all development? Needs to be more specific otherwise could be onerous and unnecessary requirement for minor development schemes to meet. Where can the WLLCA be viewed. Better directions needed as to where to look in WLLCA. Give in supporting text?</p> <p>LCA should be given in full.</p>
NPP 6 Ensuring High Quality Design	
TCA 06	Supporting text needs a summary section on TCA 06 like for other TCAs. As it appears on Map 9 expect to read about it rather than be directed elsewhere. Not sufficient just a footnote and cross references. The Reg 14 GNP had a TCA 06 section.
1	Where can GHCA be viewed?
2 i)	Where can NDG be viewed?
3	What is a well-designed building? Views on this may vary.
4	Where possible?

5	Where possible? All development even minor?
6.	All proposals?
7	BFL12 in full. Where can this be viewed.. footnote .. cross reference ?
NPP 7 Ensuring High Quality Design in each Character Area	
1	The consecutive numbering of this policy is confusing. Doesn't align with the TCA numbering. Would it better to restart numbering for each TCA?
1	TCA in full or change policy title to ... in each Townscape Character Area. All development proposals?
2,5,6,10	Same comment as above.
10	Where is the guidance for TCA 6 as shown on Map 12
NPP 8 A Mix of Housing Types	
1	Size of housing scheme? NPP8 has taken into consideration WLDC's previous comments and now includes reference to the CLLP and the SHMA in terms of evidencing need. It has also removed the need for the housing in certain locations and actually does now support delivery of a mix of housing types.

	However much of this policy is covered in the CLLP and so raises the question does it needs repeating in this plan?
3 and 4	Developments in west Gainsborough may not be able to afford providing homes to accessible standards . Could make developments unviable. Need to provide viability evidence to justify such requirements. It would be useful if this policy had cross references to those allocated sites this policy would apply to?
4	Reword?and are suitable for older people will be supported.
NPP 9 Gateway Riverside (CL 4686)	
1 d)	There is some conflict here with the granted proposal (137763) eg cafes do not front on to riverside.
1 h)	Cross reference to Local Green Network needed.
3	.. complements..
5	Reword would be supported.
8	SuDS might not be possible at Riverside/ town centre locations, due to nature of soil, suggest inserting 'where possible'
Para 179	LDO design guide.
NPP 10 Southern Neighbourhood Renewal Area (including CL 1246 West Primrose Street and CL 1247 Land enclosed by Thornton Street, Bridge Street, Kings Street and Bridge	

Road)	
1	<p>The grant of planning permission depends on other factors not just high design quality. Suggest reword.</p> <p>This site is in TCA 06 but policy refers to NPP 7 (10) which is TCA 05.</p>
4	The grant of planning permission depends on other factors not just reinforcing existing character. Suggest reword.
6	SuDS might not be possible at Riverside/ town centre locations, due to nature of soil, suggest inserting 'where possible'
NPP 11 Elswitha Hall/ Guildhall Site (CL 4688)	
Map 10	Shows two allocations. Need to identify each site.
1	The grant of planning permission may depend on other factors not just those listed in this policy. Suggest reword.
1 b)	In bold type
2	Reference? Footnote?
4	SuDS might not be possible at Riverside/ town centre locations, due to nature of soil, suggest inserting 'where possible'
NPP 12 Western Part of CL 4687, Baltic Mill, Area A on Map 21	

Map 11	Where is the boundary between sites A and B?
1	The grant of planning permission may depend on other factors not just those listed in this policy. Suggest reword.
3	...complements...
5	SuDS might not be possible at Riverside/ town centre locations, due to nature of soil, suggest inserting 'where possible'
NPP 13 Eastern Part of CL 4687 Bridge Street Car Park Area B on Map 21	
1	The grant of planning permission may depend on other factors not just those listed in this policy. Suggest reword.
4	SuDS might not be possible at Riverside/ town centre locations, due to nature of soil, suggest inserting 'where possible'
NPP 14 Albion Works Site (CL 1253)	
1	<p>The grant of planning permission may depend on other factors not just those listed in this policy. Suggest reword.</p> <p>Policy says that allocation is in TCA 01. But from TCA Map appears site is actually in TCA 06. Part 1 of policy needs amending.</p>

1 b) onwards	Needs to be in bold type.
3	..complements..
5	SuDS might not be possible at Riverside/ town centre locations, due to nature of soil, suggest inserting 'where possible'
NPP 15 Riverside North (CL 4689)	
1	The grant of planning permission may depend on other factors not just those listed in this policy. Suggest reword.
2 and 3	Cross reference to Local Green Space chapter.
4	SuDS might not be possible at Riverside/ town centre locations, due to nature of soil, suggest inserting 'where possible'
NPP16 Former Castle Hills Community College Site (CL 4691)	
1 a) onward	In bold type.

1	The grant of planning permission may depend on other factors not just those listed in this policy. Suggest reword.
NPP 17 Middlefield School of Technology Site (CL1248)	
1	The grant of planning permission may depend on other factors not just those listed in this policy. Suggest reword.
NPP 18 Protecting and Enhancing Heritage Assets	
1	Not sure that buildings just appearing on HER are protected.
2, 3, and 4	Consistency of term? Locally valued and important heritage assets or local important heritage assets or local listed building? Instead what about the term non-designated heritage asset as referred to in NPPF?
3	Reword .. heritage assets in Conservation Areas...
5	Register? Where can this be viewed. What about locally valued and important heritage assets that do not appear on current Local List? What about their restoration?
8	Shop front improvement scheme –cross reference/footnote needed.
NPP 19 Improving the Vitality of the Town Centre	

1	<p>Doesn't recognise importance of residential uses in town centre.</p> <p>How could part 1 of policy be delivered when the majority of proposals would possibly front but not lie inside the Market Place itself? Does the NP need a map defining this area and an illustration showing the improvements to be achieved?</p>
2 a)	Footnote needed.
3	<p>..reinforces..</p> <p>Market Place</p>
22 Aspirational Policies	
Para 314	The town council can promote community engagement but this would not be part of WLDC's pre-application function.
Appendix A: Community Projects	
Intro parahas resulted...
Intro para	The Gainsborough Action Plan .. is this a separate document? or is it the 6 projects listed?
Project 1	Extend Ashcroft Park .. should this be a proposal in Local Green Space section

General

eg policy NPP7	Several policies provide guidance for “proposals”. But which ones? All proposals or specific ones? Ones in a particular location or of a certain size? Are minor proposals also expected to meet what can be daunting requirements? Suggest tweak wording.
eg policy NPP10	Several policies say that planning permission will be granted if criteria are met. But the grant of planning permission has to be made in accordance with the development plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. It cannot simply be granted on the select requirements of a policy. Suggest tweak wording.
eg policy NPP2	Several policies refer to guidance in supporting documents. But there are instances where links/footnotes/cross references are not provided. Also all such policies need to provide signposts to most relevant sections of that document. Just referring to the document in general is not sufficient. Directions could be listed in the supporting text to help the policy user. Suggest tweak wording.

Gainsborough Neighbourhood Plan
West Lindsey District Council's comments

PART 2

WLDC's comments on Pre Submission version Reg 14 - December 2019

(For WLDC's comments on Submission version Reg 16 – July 2020 see PART 1 of this document)

Page/Chapter/Paragraph/ Map/Figure/Policy etc	WLDC comments
FOREWORD	
Pg 5 Foreword	The Foreword focusses heavily on the challenges facing Gainsborough, reasons for preparing the neighbourhood plan, and feedback from consultation. But it would be good if it could say more about the GNP itself, its objectives, how its proposals will take the town forward over the next 20 years and also it needs mention the place-making improvements already happening in the town. As well as being a planning document, the GNP will serve as a promotional document for the town. So it is important that the Foreword includes an upbeat message about Gainsborough's prospects particularly to those wishing to invest in the town.
Pg 5 Foreword line 6	Grade 1* category doesn't exist. Should it be Grade 2* instead?
1.WHAT IS THE GAINSBOROUGH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN	
Pg 6 para 1	Should abbreviation be GNP and not WNP?

	Reference to the Walkeringham Neighbourhood Plan?
4.HOW DOES THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN WORK WITHIN THE PLANNING SYSTEM AND WITH OTHER STRATEGIC POLICIES	
Pg 9 section 4	Would like to see more said about CLLP particularly around growth and housing targets it has set for Gainsborough.
Pg 9 para 17	Are the figures right for the SUEs? CLLP policy LP39 allocates 2,500 homes for each SUE and 1400 (SUE south)and 750 (SUE north) homes to come forward by 2036. Also GNP needs to set out the housing growth context for Gainsborough/GNP eg Policy LP2 identifies that during the CLLP plan period Gainsborough will seek to deliver 4,435 new homes.
Pg 9 para 18	These are CLLP policies not district ones.
13. SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, BROWNFIELD SITES AND SUE'S	
NPP 1 b) c) e)	<p>b) Those open spaces important to character areas need to be identified or cross referenced somewhere.</p> <p>b) and c) How would loss would be identified?</p> <p>c) where are locally valued habits? Are they identified in a supporting document?</p> <p>e) It would assist if the NP provided guidance as to what would be appropriate parking provision.</p>
NPP 1 Part 2	<p>What constitutes sustainable development? The brownfield sites along the riverside are already allocated in the CLLP and as part of that process were subjected to sustainability appraisal which confirmed their sustainable development credentials.</p> <p>The grant of planning permission has to be made in accordance with the development plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. It cannot simply be granted on the requirements of Part 2.</p>
14 ENGAGING WITH THE COMMUNITY	

NPP 2	<p>Pre-application is encouraged but cannot be forced. There needs to be a clear differentiation between pre-application and community consultation prior to submission.</p> <p>“Pre-application” is already an established stage associated with the planning applications procedure. Its requirements should not be confused with those of policy NNP 2. Recommend that reference to pre-application be avoided in policy.</p> <p>As currently worded part 2 of policy expects planning applications to address certain details as given in a) b) and c). This suggests that a planning application should be refused if such details are not provided. This would be unreasonable expectation on say a small scale heritage asset proposal and also on WLDC if proposal was found to be acceptable.</p>
Map 7	<p>Need a far more detailed map/s here to confirm exact route especially as green network features in many GNP policies eg site allocations.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to reproducing larger scale inset maps from the Green Infrastructure Study or giving cross-references to relevant parts in this Study.</p>
15. GAINSBOROUGH’S GREEN SPACES AND CREATING A GREEN NETWORK	
Chapter 15	<p>WLDC has produced a high level Gainsborough Green Infrastructure Strategy to complement Gainsborough Town Council’s vision for a green wheel/network in August 2019. It includes potential projects that could be carried out to improve the quality and accessibility of green infrastructure in Gainsborough. WLDC is currently considering the deliverability and benefits of the potential projects and implications on resources. It is important that the Strategy’s evidence base and outcomes feed into the GNP and that both documents align closely with each other. To achieve this, it is suggested that the steering group liaises closely with WLDC when finalising this part of the submission version of the GNP.</p>

NPP 3	<p>It would be helpful if the GNP could explain how the missing parts of the Green Network could be delivered? Much of route is in private ownership and will require landowner support. How will development proposals contribute to the Green Network? There appears to be no implementation/delivery plan. GNP would benefit from having one. Developments in west Gainsborough are unlikely to be able to afford making extra contributions to the Green Network for Gainsborough. Viability is an issue with housing development in the west of the Town so much so that developers are already exempt from having to make community infrastructure levy payments. It may therefore be unreasonable to ask them to assist with the Green Network which would add to costs and make it difficult to deliver the development at all. Has the delivery of the Green Network been set out?</p> <p>It would benefit the Green Network route if it were protected/reserved from development that could infringe upon it in future?</p>
Map 8	<p>It would be worth mentioning that many of these sites are already protected in some way by the CLLP.</p> <p>Site 1, ensure cross referencing with site allocation policy NPP 14 in which Mercer's Wood is located.</p> <p>Site 2, already identified as important open space and local green space in CLLP.</p> <p>Site 3, shown as local nature reserve in CLLP.</p> <p>Site 4, bottom part of site already recognised by CLLP as important open space and local green space.</p> <p>Site 5, site already identified as important open space and local green space by CLLP.</p>
NPP 4 Part 1	<p>Mercer's Wood is in a CLLP residential allocation CL 4689. This needs to be mentioned in text.</p>
NPP 4	<p>This needs tightening as could be interpreted to mean developments surrounding the green spaces rather than developments on these spaces,</p>

	and needs to be consistent with Local Plan. What would be the special characters of open spaces? Delete "very".
16. PROTECTING THE LANDSCAPE CHARACTER ACROSS THE PLAN AREA	
NPP 5 and Map 5	Should it say Gainsborough Town Parish rather than just Gainsborough Parish? It would help if guidance could be given as to what would be a significant visual intrusion? How would a new development like Whittons Mill be considered against this policy? 1b) is this only limited to development in CAs? Rather than any development? Not clear what is the difference between a vista and a view corridor particularly when looking at Map as all seem to have similar amounts of view.
17. DESIGN PRINCIPLES FOR DEVELOPMENT	
Chapter 17 Design Principles for Development	This is a lengthy chapter and there is repetition. How about condensing text and providing more cross references to relevant parts in Heritage and Character Assessment.
NPP 6	Quite restrictive BFL12 2012 and also out of date. There is a new NPPF on design that should be referenced instead. "i.e" is too woolly and this sentence should be removed. Need for developments to accord with recently released – National Design Standards. Appears that remaining parts of policy TCA 05 and all of TCA06 are missing. The consecutive numbering of this policy is confusing. Would it better to restart numbering for each TCA? How about separate policy for each TCA? Is it red brick, clay tiles everywhere?
18. A MIX OF HOUSING TYPES	
Chapter 18 pg 54	It would benefit the plan if more context was given to the CLLP here and what it already requires of new housing developments in Gainsborough in terms of housing mix and specialist housing. It is important for the GNP's own requirements to align with the CLLP's. The CLLP requires for example: housing mix: housing schemes to provide housing mix based on SHMA and local evidence / accessible homes: 6 or more dwellings

	<p>must provide 30% accessible and adaptable dwellings / affordable housing: sites of 11 dwellings or more provide 20% affordable housing</p> <p>Although the plan talks about what housing is needed in Gainsborough there are no references to the SHMA for Central Lincs or any local housing needs assessment. Where is the evidence to support the housing assumptions made in this chapter? Also some of the requirements in policy NPP7 could potentially make every site in Gainsborough unviable.</p>
Pg 54 para 145 -148 NPP 7 3&4	No mention of how viable it would be to impose such space standards. No link/reference to space standards as included in SPD for CLLP for affordable housing that are already in place.
Pg 54 para 147	If this is an expectation then it needs to be included in NPP 7.
Pg 55 para 152 & 153	GNP mentions affordable housing in these paragraphs but details shared equity which is not an affordable housing product – shared ownership is the affordable housing product. Would have liked to have seen reference to NPPF new/other types of affordable housing and also reference to housing need in the SHMA and housing register. No links to CLLP LP11 and requirements or identified need for affordable housing.
Pg 55 para 152	Whittons Mill is all rented – no shared equity schemes available in this development. Also refers to pg 62 but info on Whittons Mill is at pg 58.
Map 12	Perhaps best to remove distance circles crossing and west of the River Trent. Also how do distances equate to times given in policy NPP 7 400m and 800m 5-10? and 10mins?
NPP 7	The GNP needs more evidence to justify the need for smaller houses. Not much of a housing mix only wanting small dwellings? Evidence does exist for the need for larger 4 bed homes in the town. It would benefit GNP if a local housing needs assessment was undertaken. Also, developments in west Gainsborough may not be able to afford providing homes to accessible standards too. Could make developments unviable. Need to

	<p>provide viability evidence to justify such requirements. Little mention of affordable housing provision.</p> <p>It would be useful if this policy had cross references to the allocated sites this policy will impact on? For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - encourage smaller market housing esp for older people within 10 minute walk of town centre eg Sites CL1247, CL 1246, CL1244, CL 4687, CL4688, CL 1253?
NPP 7 1) 2)	<p>Demonstrable need is open to interpretation and could be difficult to decide. There are no details on what this evidence should/would be? Does this mean every planning application for housing should be supported by its own independent needs assessment? Policy only mentions smaller dwelling and does not state who these dwellings are for – older people, young people, families?</p>
NPP 7 4)	<p>10 minute walk is very subjective. Agree that housing for older people should be within a short distance of local amenities, might be beneficial to put a distance on that rather than a walk time.</p>
19. ALLOCATED DEVELOPMENT SITES	
<p>Chapter 19</p> <p>Allocated Development Sites</p>	<p>It is noted that not all the CLLP allocations for Gainsborough feature in this chapter. From the GNP's spatial strategy, priority is given to brownfield sites along the riverside. It would help to set more of a context as to the selection of sites for specific design led guidance in the NP. How about providing background to all CLLP allocations in Gainsborough including SUEs and strategic employment allocations and explain why the plan focusses on a selection only? For example it may simply be that the sites are no longer available or are dealt with specifically elsewhere eg SUEs.</p> <p>At the moment the plan comes across as a bit riverside west centric and there appears to be little coverage in the background text of eastern/southern parts of Gainsborough.</p>

	<p>Several Transport Strategies are being rolled out for Gainsborough by Lincolnshire County Council including one for walking and cycling. WLDC and Gainsborough Town Council are involved in this process. The purpose of these transport strategies is to provide improved access for the town's people and organisations. The demand for access is currently met by a range of transport modes, such as private motor vehicles, road freight, bicycles, on foot, public service buses, trains and taxis. The GNP steering group is advised to consider the outcomes of these strategies, expected early 2020, as they could have land use implications for the GNP.</p>
NPP 8: GATEWAY RIVERSIDE CL 4686	
NPP 8	<p>Need to be reminded that this site is for primarily residential use in line with CLLP LP50. The site plan excludes the school but this is included within CLLP CL 4686.</p> <p>b) says facing Bridge Street? Bridge Street is the other side of the bridge. Should this not be Lea Road? What is a town house? 2 or 3 storey?</p> <p>c) there is some conflict here with the granted proposal (137763) eg cafes do not front on to riverside</p> <p>f) "High design quality" is used in this policy and many other policies in this NP not only in relation to housing but to other regeneration in the town. There is no standard set for this so very subjective and so is left open for interpretation.</p> <p>g) From looking at the Green Network map it is not clear if this route would provide a full length riverside corridor along River Trent.</p> <p>....complement....</p>
Pg 63 para 169	<p>As the GNP states, the site is already the subject of a Local Development Order which grants outline planning permission for its redevelopment subject to various stipulations and also there is a supporting design brief. The GNP recognises the LDO in its requirements for the site. However as the GNP and LDO are planning documents (material considerations) it is</p>

	crucial that they closely align with one another for when a development proposal comes forward for the site. As a final check, it is suggested that the steering group liaises with WLDC when completing this section of the submission version of the GNP.
NPP 9 SOUTHERN NEIGHBOURHOOD RENEWAL AREA	
NPP 9	Stick to CLLP titles for sites CL1246/CL1247 to help cross referencing and avoid confusion. Where is the WLDC Delivery Plan Map? Why is this called the Southern Neighbourhood Renewal Area when the site is west of Gainsborough? Site should be called the same as in the CLLP. It's too confusing with the southern neighbourhood urban extension.
NPP 9	Part 2, CLLP says site primarily for residential use so doesn't rule out other minor uses. This policy appears to say site for housing use only. Also, no mention of connectivity with other areas.
NPP 10 ELSWITHA HALL/GUILDHALL SITE CL 4688	
NPP 10	The site should be called the same as in the CLLP. Site CL4688 is allocated as housing in the CLLP yet only A1, A2, A3, A4 and D1 will be granted. Conflict here with the CLLP. CLLP LP50 CL 4688 says that site is suitable for primarily residential use. This policy proposes a mix of uses with no specific mention to residential. Part of the site lies in the town centre as defined by the CLLP. For this area main town centre uses would be supported. The map of site should show town centre boundary. Development needs to meet NPP 7 requirements.
NPP 11 BALTIC MILL SITE (WESTERN PART OF CL 4687)	
NPP 11	Site should be called the same as in the CLLP.

	<p>Allocated for housing yet appropriate uses in the policy state A1, A3, A4 and D1. Conflict here with the CLLP. See above re town centre mix Missing a bracket after leisure.</p> <p>Have split an allocated housing site. Should just be one policy for the site.</p> <p>CLLP says site suitable for primarily residential use. But policy gives the option for a mixed use scheme with no mention of residential.</p> <p>Part 2 no mention of residential uses.</p> <p>Development needs to meet NPP 7 requirements.</p> <p>Site lies in CLLP town centre area and also appears that northern part is in primary shopping area. NPP 11 needs to align with these CLLP land use policy requirements.</p>
NPP 12 BRIDGE STREET CAR PARK SITE AND SURROUNDINGS (EASTERN PART OF CL 4687)	
NPP 12	<p>Site should be called the same as in the CLLP.</p> <p>Have split an allocated housing site. Should just be one policy for the site. Where is the dividing line between east and west parts? Does the CLLP policy primary shopping area cover part of this site?</p> <p>Development needs to meet NPP 7 requirements.</p>
NPP 13 ALBION WORKS SITE (CL 1253)	
NPP 13	<p>Mixed use scheme? Appears to be contrary to CLLP policy LP50 which says site for primarily residential use.</p> <p>Part 2 what about residential uses?</p> <p>Development needs to meet NPP 7 requirements.</p> <p>Site lies outside town centre, but if includes retail 500 sq m then should not affect town centre ? How does this sit with CLLP policy?</p> <p>How would development maximise benefits adjacent to Whitton Gardens is this in land use or design terms?</p> <p>Is it necessary to also say.. along the site's external boundaries facing.....</p>

NPP 14 RIVERSIDE NORTH (CL4689)	
NPP 14	<p>Riverside Walk is already there and is adopted by LCC.</p> <p>No space between NPP and 14 like the other policies.</p> <p>Development needs to meet NPP 7 requirements.</p> <p>Should cross reference to proposed local green space in NPP4 – Mercer’s Wood site 1</p>
NPP 15 MIDDLEFIELD SCHOOL SITE CL 1248	
NPP 15	<p>Site should be called the same as the CLLP.</p> <p>Viewpoint 1 doesn’t come into question?</p> <p>No space between NPP and 15.</p> <p>Development needs to meet NPP 7 requirements.</p> <p>Would help if openness could be defined.</p>
NPP 16 MIDDLEFIELD SCHOOL SITE CL1248	
NPP 16	<p>Can’t control site to the north of it re public access</p> <p>Development needs to meet NPP 7 requirements.</p> <p>Need to refer to planning application for redevelopment of site and provision of public right of way to Scouts Hill.</p>
NPP 17 PROTECTING HERITAGE ASSETS	
NPP 17	<p>Part 1 Perhaps best not to specify exact number of assets as could change.</p> <p>Part 2 Total loss of all 32 buildings or just one?</p> <p>Part 3 What is the ‘At Risk Matrix’ above? Where can the heritage at risk register be viewed? Isn’t it just for listed buildings not non-designated heritage assets? Where is the risk matrix? It is for the developer to assess their proposal against the risk matrix and not WLDC. This is not clear in the policy. The policy would benefit from rewording as currently difficult to understand. Not clear if policy is intended for just non-designated assets or a mix applying to listed buildings in certain parts of</p>

	<p>policy too. Permitted development rules may allow such assets to be demolished without the need for planning permission.</p> <p>Part 4 Use is also compatible with other policies and CLLP.</p> <p>Part 6 Is more an aspiration rather than a policy matter.</p> <p>Part 7WLDC's..... shop front scheme won't be forever but appreciate the sentiment.</p>
NPP 17	<p>WLDC's Conservation Officer has made comments on this policy which can be found at end of the document. It would be beneficial for the GNP if the Conservation Officer could meet with the steering group early in the New Year to discuss these comments as part of the preparation of the submission version of the GNP.</p>
NPP 18 IMPROVING THE VITALITY OF THE TOWN CENTRE	
NPP 18	<p>Part 1 Doesn't recognise importance of residential uses in town centre. How could part 1 of policy be delivered when the majority of proposals would possibly front but not lie inside the Market Place itself? Does the NP need a map defining this area and an illustration showing the improvements to be achieved?</p> <p>2. c) Provides active shopping frontages too restrictive. Just say .. active frontages...</p> <p>d) What about promoting living over the shop, residential uses on upper floors? But recognise that difficult to achieve in such places, often properties not big enough.</p> <p>Would residential development - living over the shop need to meet NPP 7 requirements?</p>
23 ASPIRATIONAL POLICIES	
Paragraph 278	<p>The town council can promote community engagement but this would not be part of WLDC's pre-application function. Please see comments on NPP 2.</p>
Diagram 1	<p>Issue spots, cross reference to details given in Appendix F needs to be made here.</p>

Aspiration Policy 1	sites across.. the.. Plan area
25 MONITORING AND REVIEW	
Monitoring and Review	Text needs formatting.
APPENDIX A : COMMUNITY PROJECTS	
Appendix A	<p>.....has resulted...</p> <p>The Gainsborough Action Plan .. is this a separate document? or the 6 projects listed?</p> <p>Extend Ashcroft Park .. should this be a proposal in local green space section and policy NPP 4?</p>
APPENDIX D :	
Appendix D	<p>WLDC's Conservation Officer has made comments on this Appendix which follow below. It would be beneficial for the GNP if the Conservation Officer could meet with the steering group early in the New Year to discuss these comments as part of the preparation of the submission version of the GNP.</p>

From: Liz Mayle <Liz.Mayle@west-lindsey.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 December 2019 11:54
To: Nev Brown <Nev.Brown@west-lindsey.gov.uk>
Subject: Gainsborough Local Plan - Heritage Section

Nev,

Thank you for the consultation on the Gainsborough Local Plan. I have the following comments to make:

1. Appendix D – Heritage Report on Proposed Non-Designated Heritage Assets.

- a. A large map showing all of these buildings would assist greatly. The maps showing a very approximate location, combined with photos showing only half the buildings and no proper address in some cases. This will not be easy to use for development management purposes. An example is on page 120, '2 shops next to old Black Bull Hotel'. Proper addresses and a clear map based on OS where an individual building can be readily seen is strongly advised. This google map used is simply too vague.
- b. I have considered the plan against the new but not yet adopted conservation area appraisal for Gainsborough and I cannot see all of the buildings in this noted in the local plan. The heritage policy seems to refer to those with green shading (clear value to the townscape) as 'the Town Council support the identification of those buildings that have a clear value on the map'. What about the blue buildings of townscape value? There are buildings in the Town Centre Conservation Appraisal contained in Annex D. Why are some included and others not? What criterion is used here? Again for development management purposes, this could introduce issues in terms of a perceived hierarchy by developers and planning officers, where some buildings noted of 'clear value' in terms of townscape significance, but are not on the local list, such as the Natwest, and '2 shops next to the old Black Bull Hotel' and the town hall being perceived to be of less significance than a building on the local list. The criterion for choosing to add buildings to a local list should be clearly set out (in case any more are considered for being added or if there are omissions on the list, this is also useful, and should be encouraged), and if buildings are added that are in a conservation area, then it should be noted that these buildings are also noted as having clear or townscape value in addition to being on the local list, and this should be clarified clearly in policy 21 (1) in order to avoid a lesser value being placed on non-designated heritage assets in the conservation area, being afforded, however unintentionally.
- c. I have made a comparison of the Conservation Area Appraisal Maps for Britannia Works and Riverside conservation areas which show buildings of local interest, and although these appraisals are quite old, unless any of these buildings are demolished (e.g. Sun Inn, and building opposite the Guildhall, any unlisted buildings shown as buildings of interest should be included in the local plan for consistency. It seems to me that only the Town Centre CA appraisal (new unadopted version) has been utilised. There are several unlisted historic buildings in the other conservation areas, note in the appraisals as 'important buildings' that should be mentioned in the same context as building with 'clear value' and 'townscape value' list. There are buildings in other conservation areas worthy of inclusion on the local list, including the Sack Store on Lea Road, and its adjoining office, which is no 19 in the Riverside Conservation Area Appraisal, and building no 20 in the Riverside Conservation Area Appraisal (Marshall's Power Station of 1918 - also a building at risk) just south of the Sack Store. Any extant unlisted building north of the bridge shown in the conservation area appraisal as buildings of interest should also be included (or if these have been assessed and dismissed, why and against which criterion?). I am concerned that there is some conflict and a lack of consistency of approach. Consistency is needed, without undermining any historic building in the conservation area.
- d. I do not think that this list has not covered all non-designated heritage assets in Gainsborough outside of the conservation area. The list also lacks industrial buildings, and some of the fine unlisted domestic dwellings in the town. The local cemetery is another highly notable omission from this list, and this is of listable quality, architect designed, and along with its lodges and railings.

These are some (there are more) of the buildings should also be considered:

Cemetery – all of it and its railings;

Gainsborough Maltings, Bridge Street (industrial heritage, shown on the 1906 OS map, revised in 1898);

St. John's Parish Hall, Trent Street;

Fanny Marshall Institute (what remains is still of architectural merit);

Highfield House and park, Summer Hill, Gainsborough (which is on the HER) Reference Name MLI89172

Another large house, The Lawns is shown on old maps, is this still there?

Wefco Buildings (behind Tesco) are of similar architectural quality of Britannia Works before major demolition.

Morton Terrace – good quality domestic house at the end of a group of listed buildings (or is this location now into Morton Parish?)



e. Horsley's on Church Street is a grade II listed building and should not be on the local list.

f. The Co-op funeral building appears to me to lack architectural merit.

2. Policy NPP 17. I would advise as follows:

a. Policy NPP 17 – appears only to cover the town centre. There are three conservation areas and only one is mentioned. What about the Riverside and Britannia Works conservation areas? Isn't this the town's heritage too? I would advise that these areas are included in policy 21.

b. What about heritage outside the town centre conservation area?

- c. NPP17 (2) Protecting Heritage Assets – I have concerns about this policy being used for locally listed buildings in and outside the conservation area. Buildings in conservation areas over 115m cubed (which would be a very small building) have protection from demolition. Those outside it do not have any specific protection from demolition. It is not appropriate for policy 2 (d) to be utilised in a conservation area, where there is a much higher legal requirement upon the LPA to ‘pay special attention to the desirability to preserve or enhance the conservation area’. Separate policies are needed for locally listed buildings in the conservation area and those outside it, recognising the hierarchy of primary legislative duties placed on the council when performing its planning duties with regard to conservation areas. A local plan should not result in primary legislation being watered down, offering less protection to historic buildings but should instead augment this. Likewise, policy 21 (5), the first part of the policy is fine, but must include all three conservation areas. The second sentence about harm being identified, again, refers to the NPPF. I would reiterate that the hierarchy is in planning in a conservation area and for listed buildings is primary legislation, followed by the Local Plan and NPPF. This needs rewording to give added strength over and above the local plan and the NPPF based on the special qualities of the conservation area and should support the policies in the management plan.
- d. Neither is policy NPP 17 (2) strong enough to protect non-designated heritage assets outside a conservation area, where there is no specific legal requirement or deterrent to stop demolition under a 28 day notification to building control in many cases (unless Article 4 Directions are used) and all the planning authority can do is require details of how the site will be left tidy. Article 4 directions are supported in both the Gainsborough Town Centre Draft Conservation Area Appraisal and Policy 21 (6), but it should be recognised that many of the unauthorised changes that occur, do so on commercial and flatted properties that have very few permitted development rights. It is swift enforcement that is lacking and needed. Article 4 Directions cannot be used to take away PD rights where there are none to take away! Perhaps it would be give more protection if policy 2 of Policy 21 were to add that in cases where total loss is proposed, that an Article 4 Direction to stop demolition be utilised to avoid the loss of a locally listed building without first being able to consider merits of any proposed development, and to ensure that every effort has been made to incorporate the locally listed building into the new development. This will avoid situations where no Article 4 Direction exists, or these only cover alterations (basically, used only on residential buildings) and until a programme of Article 4 Directions is complete, would offer an opportunity for some protection, as would the serving of statutory notices, such as Section 215 notices to secure repair works if and when locally listed building fall into poor repair, and to consider serving notices, prior to any demolition being approved.
- e. Policy NPPF 17 (3) makes reference to the heritage at risk register. This needs to make clear whether this is the Historic England Heritage at Risk Register (which is for grade I & II* listed buildings only, and of which Gainsborough has only two, the parish church, and the Old Hall), or whether this means an at risk register undertaken in 2013, by volunteers with Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire. The latter is out of date, and a new WLDC heritage at risk register is needed. It is a good idea to apply the Historic England at risk criterion to any buildings that are the subject of development proposals, but for listed buildings any new use will always be in accordance with the NPPG and finding its optimum

viable use. Again a single policy covering all heritage assets could water down primary legislation that requires the local planning authority to 'have special regard for the desirability of preserving a listed building, its features and its setting. A clear distinction should be made.

Policy NPP 17 (3) a. and b. shouldn't these be combined? Don't these repeat, or even weaken LP25 of the adopted local plan as these policies are not as specific?

Policy NPPF 17 (4) d. states that development proposals should be in accordance with the conservation area appraisals, and site specific briefs and or management plans that have been adopted. This needs to state which conservation area appraisals, because most of this policy disregards the Riverside and Britannia Works conservation areas, and both of the latter require urgent review (and indeed this is an issue that I would expect the local plan to pick up).

Policy 4 of Policy NPP 17 is also of concern. What does this policy offer over and above the local plan and the NPPF (optimum viable use is set out clearly in the national PPG).

- f. The policy is absolutely correct about poor quality development affecting the setting of the CA. The KFC is cited. Not only does this impact on the setting of the conservation area, it impacts on the setting of the church too. I think the local plan should reflect on why this kind of development has been approved in the past. It is the case that in areas where investment is low, that sometimes 'any development is seen as better than no development'. This approach must cease if Gainsborough's heritage is to prosper in the long term, and perhaps could be referenced in the wording of a policy.
- g. Unauthorised works must also be swiftly addressed, and account for much incremental damage (e.g., replacing first floor timber windows with PVCu above shops and offices, where this work requires planning permission). Where unauthorised works occur and are contradictory to the character of the conservation area or a historic building, then swift enforcement action should be undertaken to ensure that results to improve the character of the conservation area are not undermined through a lack of sufficient resource to take action in a timely manner and to ensure a fair planning system operates.

I hope the above assists.

Liz