

# Scothern Neighbourhood Plan



## Consultation Statement

July 2016

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction .....	3
2	Preparation of the pre-submission Plan .....	3
2.1	Initial survey, February – April 2015.....	3
2.2	Second village survey: July 2015.....	4
2.3	Vision, Objectives and Housing Options.....	4
2.4	Awareness raising:.....	5
2.5	Development of the evidence base:.....	6
3	Consultation arrangements for the Pre-Submission Plan: .....	6
3.1	Publication of the draft Plan and associated documents.....	6
3.2	Distribution of a questionnaire.....	7
3.3	Statutory consultees.....	7
3.4	Non-statutory consultees .....	8
3.5	Landowners directly affected by proposals in the Plan: .....	8
4	Consultation responses: Pre-submission Plan.....	8
	Appendix A: Summary of Neighbourhood Plan and Feedback form.....	46
	Appendix B: Letter to Statutory Consultees .....	59
	Appendix C: Letter to non-statutory consultees .....	61
	Appendix D: Letter sent to landowners of proposed Local Green Space designations .....	63
	Appendix E: Letter to owners of proposed Local Heritage Assets .....	66

## 1 Introduction

This Statement has been prepared by Scothern Parish Council (the Parish Council) to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2). Part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement should contain:

- (a) details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
- (b) explanations of how they were consulted;
- (c) summaries of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- (d) descriptions of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

## 2 Preparation of the pre-submission Plan

In January 2015, Scothern Parish Council formed a Steering Group to consider the viability of producing a Neighbourhood Plan for the village.

The steering group was formed by volunteers from the village who were sought to assist through advertising in the village (an advert was placed in the Parish magazine, Clarion (newsletter distributed by the Parish Council) and by word of mouth seeking people with appropriate skills. The steering group comprised members of the Parish Council, representatives from local businesses (Mark Harris Commercials and the Bottle and Glass Public House), community groups (Mother and Toddler group and the Church) and residents.

### 2.1 Initial survey, February – April 2015.

In the Spring of 2015 a survey was conducted to gather residents' views of Scothern and to help the Steering Group to decide whether or not to proceed with a Neighbourhood Plan. The steering group produced a 16 page A5 questionnaire booklet which was delivered to each of the 366 households in Scothern. Each copy of the questionnaire was given an area code in order to allow the steering group to confirm the returns were representative of the village and covered a wide geographical area. 176 households completed the survey which represents a return rate of 48%.

285 of the 335 people who responded agreed that the steering group should continue with developing a neighbourhood plan. The full results of the survey can be accessed as part of the evidence base.

As a result of this community support Scothern Parish Council, as the qualifying body, applied to West Lindsey District Council for the designation of the Parish as the Neighbourhood Plan area. This was approved by West Lindsey on 09/04/2015. Figure 1 shows the extent of the designated neighbourhood area.






Figure 1: Designated neighbourhood area

## 2.2 Second village survey: July 2015

Following designation of the Neighbourhood Area a further village survey was conducted in July 2015 and at this time views were sought on the draft vision, objectives and housing options. The options presented were based on the collection and analysis of the evidence base including residents' surveys, business surveys and the production of technical documents including a village character assessment, review of Environmental Records and buildings of heritage value. Over 52% of residents responded to this questionnaire and approximately 300 written comments were submitted. Of the 24 proposed objectives 95% of the 333 respondents agreed with the proposals. As part of this questionnaire residents were also asked to consider the most suitable sites for any future housing development and to place their choices in order of preference. Since this survey was conducted planning permission has been granted for housing development in Scothern and there is no need for Scothern to allocate additional land for housing. Should this position change then the results of this survey will be taken into consideration during the review of the Plan. A full copy of the survey and the results are provided as part of the evidence base.

## 2.3 Vision, Objectives and Housing Options

As a result of these comments the Vision, Objectives and Housing options were revised and a 'Policy Intentions' document prepared and circulated in November 2015.

The "Scothern Neighbourhood Plan (SNP) Policy Intentions" was delivered to every household in Scothern. Resident were invited to comment on the nine draft policies, either by completing the two-page feedback sheet, or by attending the SNP drop-in session held in the Village Hall on Saturday 28 November. 34 comments (mostly anonymous) were received on the document. A full copy of the survey and the report are provided as part of the evidence base.

## 2.4 Awareness raising:

In addition to the informal consultation outlined above the Steering Group has also kept the wider community involved as the plan has progressed. A summary of process followed by the Steering group in the development of the Pre-submission plan can be seen in Figure 2.

Task	Date
Discussion at Parish Council meeting	January 2015
Parish Council resolved to undertake feasibility of producing a neighbourhood plan	January 2015
Article in Parish Magazine to seek volunteers to assist with the production of the Plan	February 2015
Bridging grant awarded from Locality to undertake preliminary activities	February 2015
First meeting of Steering Group	February 2015
First survey carried out	February / March 2015
Consultation event held to inform / advise residents	March 2015
Formal decision to pursue developing a neighbourhood plan	March 2015
Neighbourhood area designated by West Lindsey District Council	April 2015
Applications for additional funding from Locality and the Big Lottery (successful)	May 2015
Task group and leaders identified to assist in the production of the Plan and the evidence base	May 2015
Second survey carried out (Vision, objectives and housing options)	July 2015
Creation of website for the neighbourhood plan	September 2015
Discussion of evidence and identification of issues and scope of policies	October 2015
“Drop in” session for residents and consultation on ‘Policy intentions’ document	November 2015
Statutory Consultees consulted on the SEA Scoping Report.	November 2015

*Figure 2: Key stages in development of the neighbourhood plan*

The steering group have met on a monthly basis and, since September 2015, a monthly progress report has been inserted into the Parish Magazine which is hand delivered to residents in the village.

## 2.5 Development of the evidence base:

A number of documents have been prepared which form the evidence base for the neighbourhood plan. Various members of the steering group took a lead role in preparing these documents and used the results of the informal consultations to assist. In addition, in order to understand the future requirements of businesses within the area the business community were directly consulted and their views were summarised in the business report.

Furthermore, during the preparation of the housing and medical report interviews were conducted with the following:

- Headteacher Ellison Boulton Church of England School
- Admissions Officer William Farr C of E Comprehensive School
- Practice Manager Welton Medical Centre
- Practice Manager Lindum Medical Practice

## 3 Consultation arrangements for the Pre-Submission Plan:

The legislation requires that before submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority, a qualifying body must:

- a) publicise, in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area—
  - (i) details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan;
  - (ii) details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan may be inspected;
  - (iii) details of how to make representations; and
  - (iv) the date by which those representations must be received, being not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposal is first publicised;
- (b) consult any consultation body referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 whose interests the qualifying body considers may be affected by the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan; and
- (c) send a copy of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan to the local planning authority.

Consultation on the Pre-Submission Plan was carried out from Saturday 23<sup>rd</sup> April to Monday 6<sup>th</sup> June. In order to achieve to meet the legislative requirements and ensure widespread awareness of the Plan the following strategy was adopted:

### 3.1 Publication of the draft Plan and associated documents

- The Pre-Submission Plan, associated evidence base and a feedback form were published on the Parish Council website.
- The Pre-submission consultation was advertised on West Lindsey District Council's website and a link provided to Scothern Parish Council website.
- Adverts were placed in the local newspaper, the Lincolnshire Echo
- Hard copies of the Plan were made available the following locations:
  - Nettleham and Welton Libraries
  - Garden Centre, Scothern
  - St Germain's Church, Scothern
  - Methodist Church, Scothern
  - Ellison Boulton CoE Academy, Scothern (Primary)
  - Copies were also made available to borrow from Cathryn Nicoll (Chair of the Parish Council) and resident Peter Montgomery.
- A public event was held on Saturday 7<sup>th</sup> May from 10am to 4pm at the Methodist Church. Copies of the Plan, and supporting documents, were made available at this event and members of the Steering Group



attended in order to answer any questions and to discuss any queries raised with residents. In addition, a 20 minute power-point presentation was given at regular hourly intervals. 31 people attended the session.

### 3.2 Distribution of a questionnaire

A summary of the Pre-submission plan was produced and this was distributed to every household in Scothern along with a feedback form.

- The leaflets were distributed by members of the steering group and assigned an area code in order to ensure wide spread coverage.
- The leaflets were distributed on the 23<sup>rd</sup> April and copies of the completed questionnaire were collected on Sunday 8<sup>th</sup> May. Comment forms could also be brought to the public meeting (drop in session) on Saturday 7<sup>th</sup> May in the Methodist Church, delivered or emailed directly to members of the steering group.

A copy of the summary and feedback form is provided in Appendix A.

### 3.3 Statutory consultees

The legislation requires that the qualifying body (Parish Council) consult any consultation body (referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1) whose interests the qualifying body considers may be affected by the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan.

A list of the relevant consultation bodies was provided by West Lindsey District Council and the following bodies were consulted. A copy of the letter is provided in Appendix B.

- West Lindsey District Council
- Bassetlaw District Council
- East Lindsey District Council
- Lincoln City Council
- Newark and Sherwood District Council
- North East Lincolnshire Council
- North Kesteven District Council
- Lincolnshire County Council
- Nettleham Parish Council
- Dunholme Parish Council
- Sudbrooke Parish Council
- Langworth Parish Council
- The Coal Authority
- The Homes and Communities Agency
- Natural England
- The Environment Agency
- Historic England
- The Highways Agency
- The Marine Management Organisation
- Mobile Operators Association
- Three
- O2
- Orange
- T-Mobile
- Vodafone
- Primary Care Trust/Clinical Commissioning Group
- Western Power Distribution
- National Grid

- Anglian Water (Water and Sewerage)
- Witham 3<sup>rd</sup> Internal Drainage Board
- Ellison Boulsters CofE Academy School

### 3.4 Non-statutory consultees

In addition to consulting the above statutory consultees the following landowners and local businesses were also informed and invited to comment:

- Mark Harris Commercials
- Nettleham Medical Practice
- Welton Medical Practice
- Barbers Farms Ltd
- Scothern Nurseries
- Heath Farm Day Nursery
- St Lukes Nursing Home
- Stuffins and Sons
- D J and J S Straw
- H R Bourn & Sons
- Moy Park Limited

A copy of the letter sent is provided in Appendix C.

### 3.5 Landowners directly affected by proposals in the Plan:

The neighbourhood plan seeks to allocate sites for housing development, areas of Local Green Space and Local Heritage Assets. The owners of these sites and buildings were directly informed and invited to comment.

A copy of the letter to the landowners of the proposed Local Green Space is provided in Appendix D and a copy of the letter to the owners of the proposed Local Heritage Assets is provided in Appendix E.

## 4 Consultation responses: Pre-submission Plan

A total of 87 responses were received on the Pre-submission plan; 77 from residents (representing the views of 120 residents) and 10 from external organisations.

Residents completed the feedback form and indicated their support for the policies on a scale from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree.' The vast majority of residents agreed or strongly agreed with the vision and objectives and policies in the pre-submission neighbourhood plan:



	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Vision and objectives	61	44	1	0	3
S1: Sustainability	49	44	12	5	1
H1: Housing need	41	40	13	4	3
H2: Housing mix	58	36	10	4	2
D1: Design and Character	70	28	2	0	3
D2: Local Heritage Assets	62	33	7	3	2
T1: Parking standards	63	32	12	0	1
T2: Pedestrian and cycle	70	34	4	1	1
B1: Business and Employment	46	48	11	2	6
B2: Working from home	51	30	13	0	3
E1: Open Spaces	79	24	3	0	1
E2: Local Green Space	79	23	5	0	4
E3: Biodiversity	64	21	0	0	3
E4: Scothern Beck Corridor	72	19	5	2	3
C1: Provision of new or improved community facilities	66	22	3	0	1
C2: Loss of existing community facilities	69	26	12	0	1

A number of written comments were also received (217 in total). The Steering Group discussed each of these comments in turn and the table below illustrates how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

A number of the comments on Policy H1: Housing Need and T1 (parking standards) and T2 (pedestrian and cycle routes) related to similar themes and issues that cannot be addressed in the neighbourhood plan for the following reasons:

- H1: Housing need – a number of comments were received which expressed concern over the number of dwellings to be built in Scothern over the Plan period. Furthermore, concerns were raised about the impact of the site allocations on the village infrastructure and traffic and that further infill development may be permitted.

The neighbourhood plan has to plan positively for the future of Scothern and it seeks to meet the identified housing need for both future and existing residents of Scothern. The sites that are allocated for development already have planning permission and infrastructure requirements have been considered as part of the planning application process. The neighbourhood plan cannot 'cap' future development and it seeks to ensure that any additional development is limited to small-scale sites within the existing built up area. The neighbourhood plan should be read as a whole and policies are included to ensure that future development contributes positively to Scothern.

- T1 (parking standards) and T2 (pedestrian and cycle routes): a number of comments were received which expressed concern about the speed of traffic passing through the village, inadequacy of existing parking provision and congestion within Scothern. Improvements were also sought to public transport. These issues cannot be addressed directly within the neighbourhood plan as they do not fall within the remit of the land-use planning system, however, the Neighbourhood Plan does state that improvements to traffic management should be considered as a local infrastructure project to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy (CA1). Consideration will be given to impact of new developments on existing infrastructure as part of the planning application process.

## Main modifications

In order to address comments received on the pre-submission plan the following 'main' modifications and amendments have been made:

- Policy S1: Sustainable Development – respondents requested further clarity on what the built-up area boundary is considered to be. A note has been inserted into the supporting text which seeks to define the 'built up area' of Scothern to which new development will be directed.
- Policy E1: Open Space - following discussion with West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) and a review of the comments received as part of the pre-submission consultation the Open Space policy is to be deleted. The Policy is considered redundant as open space is covered in more detail within the WLDC Local Plan and the emerging Local Plan. This includes the identification of Local Open space standards for new developments.
- Policy E2: Local Green Space - deletion of Manor Park area of Local Green Space ( LGS 3). It is a large and extensive tract of land which may conflict with the NPPF criteria identified within paragraph 77.
- Policy B1: Protection of existing businesses –following discussion with WLDC the 'protection of existing employment sites' policy is to be deleted. Concerns were expressed that the policy is too prescriptive and it does not meet the basis conditions. Proposals for the redevelopment of existing employment sites, and applications for new employment premises and facilities, will be considered against policies in the Local Plan.
- Policy D2: Local Heritage Assets –following discussion with WLDC and a review of the comments received as part of the pre-submission consultation the Local Heritage Assets policy is to be deleted. Concerns were expressed that the policy is too prescriptive. Policy D1: Design and Character has been amended to emphasise the important historic environment of Scothern.

The Neighbourhood Plan has been updated to reflect these changes which has resulted in the subsequent re-numbering of the policies. In addition, amendments have also been made to the supporting evidence base.

The following table summarises the main issues and concerns raised by all those who responded to the Plan. For ease, the comments are organised by Policy number and each respondent has been assigned an respondee identification number in order to ensure anonymity.

A copy all of the responses received and the 'uncoded' data can be provided to the examiner on request.

Each of the comments has been considered in turn and the column 'actions and notes' describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

## SNP Pre-Submission Consultation Report: Written Comments by Policy Numbers

**Notes:** Under Column 1: “Respondee”: “Res \*\*” Refers to Resident Identity Number (Details to be found in the initial “In Confidence” summary report file).

“External Agencies” are identified by their initials, followed by their file Identity Number i.e. **NKDC** (68)

Respondee	Policy No.	Comments	Notes and Action
	<b>V&amp;O</b>	<b>Vision and Objectives</b>	
		<div> <div>3. Vision &amp; Objectives</div> <div> <div>Comments</div> <div>Strongly Agree</div> <div>Agree</div> <div>Not Sure</div> <div>Disagree</div> <div>Strongly Disagree</div> <div>Totals</div> </div> </div>	
		<div> <div>18</div> <div>61</div> <div>44</div> <div>1</div> <div>0</div> <div>3</div> <div>109</div> </div>	
<b>Res 05</b>	V&O	I feel most strongly that remaining green spaces should be protected. Increased traffic and more housing with resultant cars and parking problems could put these at risk.	Policy E2: Local Green Spaces seeks to protect existing green space of local significance. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 09</b>	V&O	Unsure the village can cope with any further development	Planning permission has been granted for 71 units and infrastructure requirements will have been considered as part of planning application process. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 13</b>	V&O	The first housing objective is too open ended. It needs to be qualified so that no argumentative bureaucrat could land us with more than we bargained for, and also that it doesn't contradict later objectives / policies	Policy H1 delivers on this objective and will ensure Scothern meets the identified housing need. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 20</b>	V&O	The more “excellent facilities” we have the more houses will be built and we will totally change the village.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 29</b>	V&O	In-fill should avoid high wall enclosures; a village feature is where gardens blend into the road	Policy D1 ‘Design and Character’ seeks to ensure new development proposals are designed in a manner appropriate to the context and that contributes and enhances the local character of Scothern.

			No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 34</b>	V&O	I agree with objectives, although the planning process prevents enough influence on housing mix and style. I feel strongly that we should protect local green space.	Support noted. Policy E1: Local Green Space seeks to protect existing green space of local significance. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 36</b>	V&O	Some recent building has not reflected a rural village's character.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 43</b>	V&O	A balanced and well developed plan	Support noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 52</b>	V&O	Scothern is a small attractive rural village. The objectives, if achieved, will help greatly in maintaining this status, while still allowing for suitably controlled development.	Support noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 61</b>	V&O	Housing – meet future needs. 4:2 states 71 dwellings ensure future need will be met (no need for a statement).	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 63</b>	V&O	Strongly support concept of “distinctly rural parish” – but over-development would change all that.	Support noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 64</b>	V&O	No more <u>large</u> businesses – but keep to smaller, contained and home-based. Farming should be key and land reserved for agriculture.	Neighbourhood plan seeks to direct new development to within the existing built up area boundary and does not allocate land for employment uses. No amendments proposed
<b>Res 65</b>	V&O	“Protect, enhance the local green spaces” – very important that infill development is not allowed to spoil this critical concept.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 62</b>	V&O	Semi-rural? Due to being close to Lincoln and Sudbrooke slight question regarding term rural – not really an issue.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed
<b>Res 81</b>	V&O	I would only change the word “in” to “by” – we don't have to wait until 2035 for all those things to happen!	Change agreed. Vision amended.
<b>Res 82</b>	V&O	Should be more emphasis on helping young people from Scothern stay in Scothern, through sufficient affordable housing.	Affordable housing will be delivered in accordance with the Local Plan policies. Neighbourhood Plan policy H2 seeks to ensure a mix of housing is provided including smaller dwellings which should help to retain young people within Scothern. No amendments proposed.

<b>Res 84</b>	V&O	Agree with the Vision and most of the Objectives. Disagree with the Objective for sustainable development.	It is not clear what specific objection there is to the sustainable development objective. No amendments proposed					
<b>Res 85</b>	V&O	Generally agree, but have to recognise that whilst rurally located, Scothern is essentially a commuter satellite village to Lincoln and the majority of the residents have minimal rural connections.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.					
		<b>Sustainable Development</b>						
	<b>S1</b>	<b>Location of New Development</b>						
		<div> <div>4.1 S1 Sustainability</div> <div> <div>Comments</div> <div>27</div> </div> <div> <div>Strongly Agree</div> <div>49</div> </div> <div> <div>Agree</div> <div>44</div> </div> <div> <div>Not Sure</div> <div>12</div> </div> <div> <div>Disagree</div> <div>5</div> </div> <div> <div>Strongly Disagree</div> <div>1</div> </div> <div> <div>Totals</div> <div>111</div> </div> </div>						
<b>Res 05</b>	S1	This is a very reasonable policy, IF ONLY it can be implemented. I fear that the local and national government can, at will, ride roughshod over residents' concerns and wishes.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.					
<b>Res 09</b>	S1	Unsure the village can cope with any future development	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.					
<b>Res 13</b>	S1	Like this, but has the natural physical boundary been identified so that there can be no doubts. There is a lot of open space east and west to where one could imagine a natural boundary.	Plan amended – built up area defined					
<b>Res 17</b>	S1	The Parish Council and Planning Authority need to ensure that such policy is properly recorded and acted upon, rather than paying lip service to the same.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.					
<b>Res 20</b>	S1	This is so open to interpretation this seems meaningless. Developments are already passed that are on agricultural land.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.					
<b>Res 25</b>	S1	It is important to keep family accommodation well away from retirement property. Older residents don't want screaming youngsters and ball games within earshot	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.					
<b>Res 34</b>	S1	It could be argued that by promoting infilling one is at danger of losing all little pockets of space which add to the character of the village.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.					
<b>Res 36</b>	S1	I applaud the objectives, but am sceptical about their implementation.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.					
<b>Res 37</b>	S1	Enforcement of all policies should be carefully monitored to ensure no "Back Door" development / change is undertaken.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.					



<b>Res 41</b>	S1	We feel the reuse of previously developed sites is a good one but are concerned with the term “Infilling” to maintain boundaries – will this mean we develop our green spaces within our village to protect the boundary?	Policy E1 seeks to protect areas of local green space of local significance. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 44</b>	S1	Ref. Annex A, Item 5.5. I fail to understand the meaning / relevance of this chart - % and score – particularly the figures fro CL4022 where only 1.3% of votes were against this development. Are the figures correct? SD is about changes for the better. Infrastructure (roads, services – gas, water, drainage, schools, health) should be able to support all new developments.	Housing report amended to reflect accurate figures in ‘vision objectives and housing report, second village survey July 2015.’ This error does not affect the neighbourhood plan as only sites with planning permission have been allocated for development.
<b>Res 51</b>	S1	But care must be taken re pinch points for traffic – St Luke’s Nursing Home area in particular – too much development in this area would not be safe.	Traffic concerns considered as part of the planning application process. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 52</b>	S1	Scothern has neither the infrastructure nor amenities to cope with uncontrolled development. Small growth is perfectly acceptable, but it must be consistent with the size and character of the village.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 57</b>	S1	Define built up area.	Plan amended – built up area defined
<b>Res 62</b>	S1	Aren’t we already “in-filled” to its natural physical boundaries?	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 63</b>	S1	In-fill / reuse of previously developed sites should be limited to prevent over development – no more houses per site than originally existed on it. The gaps and green spaces in the village are an essential part of its character.	Comment noted. Policy E1 seeks to protect areas of local green space of local significance. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 65</b>	S1	The reuse of previously developed sites should be limited to the number of dwellings previously existing on each such site to prevent over development and the loss of important spaces between houses in the village.	Comment noted. Policy E1 seeks to protect areas of local green space of local significance No amendments proposed.
<b>WLDC (68)</b>	S1	It might be worth defining “built-up” area in order to make it clearer. “Developments” implies agricultural, economic, and recreational should be located within the existing built up area; is this correct? It might be worth considering a standalone policy for this which provides a detailed criteria in which new developments must consider.	Plan amended – built up area defined. Detailed criteria for infill development included in the Local Plan. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 69</b>	S1	Not opposed to very modest further extension to boundaries.	Comment noted No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 70</b>	S1	Agree – however, real concern about increase of traffic within the village.	Comment noted No amendments proposed.

<b>Res 71</b>	S1	Where <u>are</u> Scothern's natural physical boundaries?	Plan amended – built up area defined
<b>EA (77)</b>	S1	Additional text could be added to indicate that proposals will only be supported if they are outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3, to ensure that new development will be safe over its lifetime.	Flood risk addressed in the NPPF and there is no need to repeat national policy. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 78</b>	S1	Although agree with some infilling up to natural physical boundaries, we should retain some open spaces in the village to retain its character.	Comment noted. Policy E1 seeks to protect areas of local green space of local significance. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 81</b>	S1	Can the word “supported” be changed to “considered”? Supported sounds unconditional and may reduce the opportunity to object to specific proposals.	The neighbourhood plan has to plan positively for development. As part of the planning application process comments can be submitted on specific proposals. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 82</b>	S1	Allow development on Weir Farm Paddock and Lime Tree Paddock developments.	Scothern Neighbourhood Plan allocates 3 sites for development that meet (and exceed) the identified housing need. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 84</b>	S1	The character of the centre of the village should be preserved, including maintaining open spaces. Limited development on the outskirts of the village would be preferable to infill.	Comment noted. The neighbourhood plan includes Policy D1: Design and Character Policy that seeks to ensure development proposals contribute and enhance the local character of Scothern (including the centre of the village) and policy E1 seeks to protect areas of local green space of local significance. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 85</b>	S1	This is not what we understand by “Sustainable Development”. It is simply a statement aimed at limiting development.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
		<b>Housing</b>	
	<b>H1</b>	<b>Future Housing Needs</b>	

		<b>4.2 H1 Housing Need</b>	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals	
			24	41	40	13	4	3	101	
<b>Res 05</b>	H1	Never wanted them in the first place but now a fait accompli.								Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 09</b>	H1	Concerns about traffic management and infrastructure								Traffic management and infrastructure considered as part of the planning application process. Improvements to traffic management considered as local infrastructure project to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy (CA1). No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 13</b>	H1	These developments are already approved as per 4.2 housing statement. How can we therefore impose this plan								Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 17</b>	H1	In the draft local plan Scothern is categorised as a medium village with a growth expectation of 10%. Unless government policy changes this should be adhered to.								The sites that are allocated already have planning permission and will be developed over the lifetime of the neighbourhood plan. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 20</b>	H1	Land (new development) off Dunholme Road will spoil the vista of the property 16 as “locally listed”								Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 24</b>	H1	Not 100% keen; concerns about flooding from storm water and flash floods								Flooding and infrastructure concerns considered as part of the planning application process. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 25</b>	H1	71 new dwellings are going to make a drastic difference to the village – Will it still be a village? Can the schools cope? The roads are in a terrible state!								Infrastructure and highways concerns considered as part of the planning application process. Improvements to traffic management considered as local infrastructure project to be funded from the Scothern Parish

			Council allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy (CA1). No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 36</b>	H1	71 dwellings seems a large number for a small community – perhaps 280 more residents and perhaps 160 more children – school provision?	Education provision considered as part of the planning application process. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 40</b>	H1	Would have preferred smaller sites – 20 dwellings max.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 41</b>	H1	If planning has been granted – how can we agree / not agree?	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 43</b>	H1	As most of the proposed new housing is at one end of the village the road layout will need to be well thought out to give access to a busy road. Will the sewage system cope?	Infrastructure concerns considered as part of the planning application process. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 47</b>	H1	Far too many houses have already been agreed for the size of the village and infrastructure.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 52</b>	H1	The planned construction of 70+ dwellings in Scothern is already far more than should have been granted for a village of this size. It is important that the village does not morph into a dormitory suburb of Lincoln.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 53</b>	H1	Any new housing should have off road parking for at least 2 vehicles. On road / path parking is already an issue on the village roads.	Policy T1 seeks to ensure adequate off-road parking is provided for residents. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 54</b>	H1	Individual proposals should continue to be assessed in conjunction with WLDC and highways on their individual merit.	Comment noted – future planning applications will continue to be determined by WLDC. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 62</b>	H1	That is a great deal of housing that already has permission – if we are not careful they will all be young families as the school is the only currently well used facility in Scothern.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 63</b>	H1	Recent planning approvals have already increased the number of houses beyond a reasonable growth level. Infill should not be allowed to take that even further.	The Neighbourhood Plan has to plan positively and meet the identified housing need. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 65</b>	H1	We feel strongly that Scothern has taken more housing than is proportional, due to the lack of Central Lincolnshire Plan being in place. Any future development / reuse of land should not have more houses on a plot than previously existed to preserve village character and space.	Design and density issues will be considered as part of planning application process. Policy D1: Design and Character seeks to ensure development proposals are

			designed in a manner appropriate to the context and that contribute and enhance the local character of Scothern. No amendments proposed.
LCC (66)	H1	Scothern is designated in the Central Lincolnshire Proposed Submission Local Plan as a Medium Village. Under Policy LP4 growth will be limited to 10% in the number of dwellings, and it is agreed that this is already exceeded by the 71 dwellings with planning permission listed in Policy H1.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
WLDC (68)	H1	This section makes it clear that the village has already seen a high level of permitted growth from recently approved planning permissions.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
Res 72	H1	The number of planning permissions granted already exceeds the level of growth allocated to Scothern in the emerging local plan.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
Res 82	H1	The village badly needs more affordable housing <b>NOT</b> executive style housing. First time buyers have no chance.	Policy H2 seeks to deliver a mix of housing types to meet the requirements of existing and future residents. The Neighbourhood Plan encourages the delivery of smaller dwellings which should assist first time buyers and affordable housing will be delivered in accordance with the policies in the Local Plan. No amendments proposed.
Res 85	H1	National housing needs are likely to require more than just infill. Wider development is essential and should not be resisted. The pub, school, pre-school, etc. need more, younger families to sustain them. Housing mix <b>MUST</b> (not should!) provide a mix of housing sizes.	Scothern Neighbourhood Plan allocates 3 sites for development that meet (and exceed) the identified housing need. Policy H2 seeks to encourage a mix of housing types to meet the need of current and future residents – policy needs to retain flexibility. No amendments proposed.



	H2	Housing Mix							
		<b>4.2 H2 Housing Mix</b>	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals
			9	58	36	10	4	2	110
<b>Res 13</b>	H2	Agree – more smaller needed and affordable!							Support noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 17</b>	H2	There should be a mechanism for how a developer has sought to meet local needs with stringent criteria.							Policy H2 encourages the delivery of a mix of housing types to meet local needs (including smaller and accessible dwellings). Affordable housing will be delivered in accordance with the policies in the Local Plan. No amendment proposed.
<b>Res 23</b>	H2	It would be nice to have some bungalows built too							Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 29</b>	H2	In-fill should also include an economic mix of housing. This housing should not be “them over there”.							Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 32</b>	H2	Assurance on the provision of affordable housing to be provided – descendants of long term residents should have an option to be given first choice on any affordable housing so they can retain family ties.							Affordable housing will be delivered in accordance with the policies in the Local Plan. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 34</b>	H2	It will be a while before we can judge the impact of building on the sites which have already been granted planning permission. In general, we need to be more aware of the needs of the active elderly and single people.							Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 41</b>	H2	Homes bought outright by families should be encouraged; however, “smaller” houses encourage buy-to-let. These houses should be for families getting on to the property ladder.							Noted. The neighbourhood plan seeks to ensure a mix of housing types to meet the needs of future and existing residents. No amendments proposed.
<b>LCC (66)</b>	H2	Policy H2 only covers housing mix and not affordable housing. It is accepted that this is covered by Policy LP11 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan for Central Lincolnshire. This seeks affordable housing on all							Policy amended – reference to Lifetime Homes removed, policy consistent with

		qualifying sites of 4 or more dwellings. As background, however, the Government have won a Court of Appeal judgement potentially re-instating a threshold of 10 dwellings in Planning Practice Guidance. Also Lifetime Homes were superseded in March 2015 by new optional Building Regulation standard. Policy LP10 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan includes a requirement for 30% of homes on sites of over 6 dwellings to be built to the higher access standards in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations, except in exceptional circumstances. It is suggested that Policy H2 should be consistent with that. Perhaps there could also be reference to housing and wider developments being accessible to all those with physical and mental health limitations, including dementia (e.g. an aspiration to make Scothern a dementia friendly village).	emerging Local Plan and reference inserted to ensuring housing and wider developments are accessible to all those with physical and mental health limitations.																
WLDC (68)	H2	Look further into the particular type(s) of properties that are required to support the “needs” of the population. If smaller homes are identified, then it could be more specific as a requirement i.e. “developments for housing that provide 1 or 2 bedrooms will be encouraged”.	Policy amended – Census data illustrates that only 20% of the current housing in Scothern comprises 1 or 2 beds, however, the majority of households are comprised of 1 or two persons. Policy states: “A mix of housing on sites is encouraged and smaller dwellings of one or two bedrooms suitable for younger and older people are particularly encouraged.”																
Res 69	H2	Marinka being demolished - not opposed.	This comment relates to D2: Local Heritage Assets.																
		Design and Character																	
	D1	Design and Character																	
		<table><tr><td>4.3 D1 Design &amp; Character</td><td>Comments</td><td>Strongly Agree</td><td>Agree</td><td>Not Sure</td><td>Disagree</td><td>Strongly Disagree</td><td>Totals</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>18</td><td>70</td><td>28</td><td>2</td><td>0</td><td>3</td><td>103</td></tr></table>	4.3 D1 Design & Character	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals		18	70	28	2	0	3	103	
4.3 D1 Design & Character	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals												
	18	70	28	2	0	3	103												
Res 13	D1	But what about between Scothern and Langworth	Policy amended to include reference to Langworth.																
Res 14	D1	I would like to be assured that any alterations in keeping with our property will be a smooth process and not like a Grade II listing process. i.e our windows are gradually being replaced like for like and we wish to continue with this. (Note: This refers to a Local Heritage Asset)	Local Heritage Assets are covered in Policy D2. No amendments proposed.																

<b>Res 17</b>	D1	What local distinctiveness?	Comment noted – policy amended to refer to character as oppose to distinctiveness.
---------------	----	-----------------------------	--

Res 19	D1	<p>I <b>strongly disagree</b> that my property, Marinka, 43 Main street Scothern should be included in the Draft Neighbourhood plan, as a Local Heritage Asset. I give below my reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As its an old building, it is not fit for purpose to live in today and will not withstand the needs and stresses of modern living.</li> <li>2. It is not economically viable to modernize it compared to building a new one.</li> <li>3. The house was built in an era when there were no roads / motor vehicles.</li> <li>4. It is positioned very close to the road which makes it very unsafe for my family, pedestrians and road users.</li> <li>5. The pavement in front of my property is less than half the legally required width, by the county council.</li> <li>6. The house is positioned on a bend in the road, which makes it extremely unsafe for the road users and for anyone driving in and out of my house.</li> <li>7. The visibility for road users in the front of my house is significantly less (feasibility studies have been done) increasing the potential for accidents, especially with the increasing number of cars on the road.</li> <li>8. This road is also used by heavy farming machinery which will not be able to enjoy a good visibility and hence will not have a good safe stopping distance.</li> </ol> <p>More reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- My initial application to demolish the house and erect a replacement dwelling (application number 133384) was supported by the Parish council in their meeting in October 2015. (Minutes of this meeting on the Parish council website)</li> <li>- Only one resident objected to it. No other objections were raised from any resident of Scothern. This would suggest, at worst, that there were no strong feelings from the people of Scothern to keep the existing property.</li> </ul> <p>My proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I plan to build one family house from myself and my family. My wife and I are both hospital consultants and we think this place would fit in nicely with our regular commute to Lincoln county hospital.</li> <li>- I wish to demolish the house and build a sympathetically fashioned house, which aesthetically blends in and respects the surroundings.</li> <li>- I plan to use the stone and bricks from the old house to use in my new one and create a similar elevation</li> <li>- I plan to move the house back slightly from its present position which will enable me to increase the width of the pavement in front of my house. I plan to do this at my own cost using my own land as a way of showing my desire to do something good for my village and community.</li> <li>- This will also make it safe for the road users by improving visibility and helping with their stopping distance.</li> </ul> <p>Vel K Sakthivel Owner of 43, Main street Scothern.</p>		<p>Marinka has subsequently been demolished and because it no longer exists it cannot be and will not be identified as a building of local significance.</p>
--------	----	--	--	--

<b>Res 20</b>	D1	There is no local distinctiveness – village is a melting pot of styles and designs.	Comment noted – policy amended to refer to character as oppose to distinctiveness.
<b>Res 29</b>	D1	I believe people become fearful of cycling / walking on relatively narrow roads without a footpath. As in Cumbria, can policy be encouraged to create paths along and inside fields by the road (Nettleham Road). Dunholme Road has a fair amount of verge. A tended cinder track would be an asset over no path at all.	Policy T2 seeks to ensure new developments provide safe, direct and attractive pedestrian and cycle routes. In addition, the neighbourhood plan states that new developments on roads where there are no pavements should provide pavements or alternative pedestrian routes. The exact location of these routes will be considered as part of the planning application process. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 34</b>	D1	Although mature trees are valuable, they also need to be safe. Strongly support improving pedestrian / cycle routes.	Comment and supported noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 44</b>	D1	Planning must find ways to enhance and improve the village environment. It is important to protect the Green belt recognising and safeguarding the character and beauty of the countryside.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 52</b>	D1	Scothern has character. Any alterations or developments which are detrimental to this should be strongly resisted.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 54</b>	D1	This is ideal but in reality D&C is subjective.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 59</b>	D1	Perhaps careful consideration could be given to achieve a development of a site for Park Homes, which would appeal to elderly people, as Council Houses – particularly bungalows – are far too expensive. Most existing ones that I have visited are very well maintained and popular.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 61</b>	D1	D1 is very subjective.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 64</b>	D1	Care must be taken to prevent Scothern growing beyond its “small, characterful status”.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 65</b>	D1	The “undeveloped gaps” between settlements are important. But so are the undeveloped gaps within the village itself. These gaps are what makes the character of the village so special.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>LCC (66)</b>	D1	The bullet points on connectivity and carbon reduction in Policy D1 are also welcomed by Public Health. Recognising residents’ reliance on car, the Plan could ask for electric vehicle charging points to each new dwelling to encourage residents to choose an ultra-low emission car.	Supporting text amended to include reference to charging points for electric vehicles as an example of low carbon infrastructure that would be supported.



		<p>However, there is no mention of the underlying archaeology in the village nor is the Historic Environment Record (HER) noted as a source. The HER is the requisite for any planning applications. The Heritage Gateway is referred to as a source, and although it incorporates digital HER information, in the case of Scothern there is a lot of important non-digital information as many earthworks have been analysed for the area.</p> <p>There are a variety of archaeological find spots and earthworks recorded in and around the village demonstrating earlier usage. That should be included as part of the development of the settlement and in the case of the ridge and furrow a comment should be made on what this reflects about the history of the village.</p> <p>Appointments to see the HER can be made and we are happy to help interpretation of the archaeological information held. To book an appointment at the Lincolnshire HER please contact the HER staff by telephone on 01522 552363 or by email at <a href="mailto:lincssmr@lincolnshire.gov.uk">lincssmr@lincolnshire.gov.uk</a>. Appointments need to be made in advance of a visit and directions to the HER office at Stamp End in Lincoln will be provided.</p>	Policy amended to include specific reference to archaeological assets.																
WLDC (68)	D1	It might be worth specifically referring to the Scothern character assessment within D1. i.e. “Future development proposals are encouraged to have regard to the Scothern Character Assessment, and particularly, where they .....”	Policy amended to include specific reference to the Character Assessment.																
Res 71	D1	All the points made in D1 are very important.	Support noted. No amendments proposed.																
Res 78	D1	There is no reason why contemporary houses should not be included in any future development. Existing pedestrian routes should be upgraded for cyclists to make moving around the village safer.	Comment noted – policy is not prescriptive. No amendments proposed.																
	D2	Protection of Local Heritage assets																	
		<table><tr><td>4.3 D2 Local Heritage Assets</td><td>Comments</td><td>Strongly Agree</td><td>Agree</td><td>Not Sure</td><td>Disagree</td><td>Strongly Disagree</td><td>Totals</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>16</td><td>62</td><td>33</td><td>7</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>107</td></tr></table>	4.3 D2 Local Heritage Assets	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals		16	62	33	7	3	2	107	Following discussion with WLDC and a review of the comments received as part of the pre-submission consultation the Local Heritage Assets policy is to be deleted. Concerns were expressed that the policy is too prescriptive. Policy D1: Design and Character amended to emphasise the important historic environment of Scothern.
4.3 D2 Local Heritage Assets	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals												
	16	62	33	7	3	2	107												
Res 13	D2	Hope these heritage assets clearly recorded + accessible to future developers	Noted																

<b>Res 17</b>	D2	If a property was considered valuable it would have protected status under existing policies. I trust the owners of the properties listed were consulted and their permission sought prior to consultation. N.B. The Reading room was not part of the Old Vicarage but a separate entity given to the people of Scothern by Richard Ellison.	Noted
<b>Res 19</b>	D2	The following is an extract from an A4 page letter, strongly disagreeing with the inclusion of his property in Policy D2: "I strongly disagree that my property, Marinka, 43 Main Street, should be included in the draft Neighbourhood Plan as a Local Heritage asset." He then listed 8 reasons why he strongly disagreed, together with his proposed solution.	Marinka has subsequently been demolished and because it no longer exists it cannot be and will be identified as a building of local significance.
<b>Res 20</b>	D2	Isn't this already covered in planning application rules anyway y	Noted
<b>Res 34</b>	D2	Some properties have been included here which have no architectural merit. Buildings of historical interest should have particular significance to be included.	Noted
<b>Res 36</b>	D2	I would like to be informed of the criteria used to define "Local Heritage Assets".	Further information about the criteria and assessment of the proposed Local Heritage Assets in Appendix C of the Pre-submission plan.
<b>Res 38</b>	D2	Houses are very mixed in character and style and this is positive. Houses are meant to be lived in and should not be protected from change just because they are old.	Noted
<b>Res 40</b>	D2	Good list of local Heritage Sites	Noted.
<b>Res 44</b>	D2	Is Marinka indicated in correct position?	Noted.
<b>Res 53</b>	D2	Agree that some older properties have historical importance / local heritage interest and maintain character of the village. However, this should not be at the cost of improvement of derelict/ unused area or properties.	Noted
<b>LCC (66)</b>	D2	The section on the character and built heritage, and the Appendix with a considered "local list" is to be commended. Indeed, it is one of the best sections LCC has seen on built heritage and character.	Support noted.
<b>WLDC (68)</b>	D2	WLDC noted several points which should be removed. However, WLDC are happy to discuss this further with the NPG. The Conservation Officer is happy to work with the group on rewording the proposed policy D2.	Noted – policy deleted.
<b>Res 71</b>	D2	All the points raised in D2 are very important.	Noted
<b>Res 72</b>	D2	Should Marinka be removed from the plan, as it is due to be demolished prior to the publication of the SNP?	Marinka has subsequently been demolished and because it no longer exists it cannot be and will be identified as a building of local significance.
<b>Res 82</b>	D2	Completely disagree with any protection of existing local heritage assets. Present planning rules are sufficient. Stop interfering with villagers' property assets. Devalues properties. Not necessary.	Noted – policy deleted.

<b>Res 85</b>	D2	The following is a brief extract from an A4 page report, disagreeing to the D2 policy: “Overall, this policy looks like listed buildings status on the cheap, without any suitable regulatory or financial support process, with the whole burden falling on the owner of the property.”	Noted – policy deleted.
		<b>Traffic and Transport</b>	
	<b>T1</b>	<b>Parking Standards</b>	
		<div> <div>4.4 T1 Parking Standards</div> <div> <div>Comments</div> <div>27</div> </div> <div> <div>Strongly Agree</div> <div>63</div> </div> <div> <div>Agree</div> <div>62</div> </div> <div> <div>Not Sure</div> <div>12</div> </div> <div> <div>Disagree</div> <div>0</div> </div> <div> <div>Strongly Disagree</div> <div>1</div> </div> <div>Totals</div> <div>108</div> </div>	
<b>Res 05</b>	T1	In Craypool Lane, parking is a major problem and space at a premium, especially when some houses have 2, or even 3, cars. It’s not much fun when one has visitors!	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 09</b>	T1	Something needs to be done urgently about parking at school time before compounding the situation with added volume	Comment noted. ‘CA3: Enhancement to Village Facilities’ would support the use of land close to Ellison Boutlers Church of England Academy as a car park should the land become available over the plan period. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 13</b>	T1	Is 4 parking spaces realistically achievable – probably this will help keep larger house development to a minimum – developer won’t be able to able to “squeeze” space.	Comment noted No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 14</b>	T1	Any communal parking areas should be within a certain distance i.e. close to the relevant properties	Comment noted No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 17</b>	T1	Noted – Trust these can be enforced through planning	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 18</b>	T1	The village is a “rat run” from the A158 and traffic speed is a real problem with impatient drivers taking no notice of speed limits	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 20</b>	T1	Our main concern is as the village increases in size the roads into village are already inadequate, poorly maintained; for example, two buses have already had accidents and left the road.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 22</b>	T1	I think there should be the minimum parking standards – every house in a village is likely to have at least two cars	Policy T1 details the minimum parking standards. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 31</b>	T1	Please think of those of us who have no “off street” facilities	Comment noted.

			No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 32</b>	T1	Providing more parking places is not the answer. Better transport links must be provided to reduce car use. What about a Scothern car share scheme?	Public transport links and a car share scheme are not considered land use planning issues and are outside the remit of the neighbourhood plan. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 36</b>	T1	Village Hall car park “off limits” to visiting groups – i.e. walkers. Where are they supposed to park?	Comment noted – this is outside of the remit of the neighbourhood plan. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 37</b>	T1	Any development will impact on traffic and without a serious traffic calming scheme being introduced, the area in the centre of the village will not be a safe or pleasant part of the village.	Comment noted – improvements to traffic management considered as local infrastructure project to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy (CA1). Infrastructure and highways concerns considered as part of the planning application process. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 44</b>	T1	Inadequate off street parking at St Luke’s Nursing Home affecting Main Street, Lime Tree Paddock and Weir Farm Paddock.	Comment noted – improvements to existing private parking facilities falls outside the remit of the neighbourhood plan. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 45</b>	T1	The concern about the amount of traffic and behaviour of drivers does not seem to be something the plan is allowed to address. A pity. The Nettleham Road is now dangerous to pedestrians, residents, cyclists and horse riders. Traffic here has greatly increased and will further, as a result of development, but there is no affordable remedy, or even acknowledgement by the Highways Authority that this is a problem.	Comment noted – improvements to traffic management considered as local infrastructure project to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy (CA1) No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 49</b>	T1	We have concerns over vehicles parking on the crescent. Larger vehicles are encountering problems when making deliveries to properties, due to these stationary vehicles. We have had damage to our garage, gates and wall caused by vehicles trying to turn round as they are unable to get by parked vehicles.	Comment noted – this is outside of the remit of the neighbourhood plan. No amendments proposed.

<b>Res 52</b>	T1	Scothern does not have the road infrastructure to cope with uncontrolled development. There is already an issue with inconsiderate, and occasionally dangerous, parking in the village centre, especially at school peak times.	Traffic concerns considered as part of the planning application process. Comment noted – improvements to traffic management considered as local infrastructure project to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy (CA1) No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 52</b>	T1	Improvement of availability of public transport.	This is not a land use planning issue and it is outside the remit of the neighbourhood plan. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 55</b>	T1	We don't like the idea of parking areas of equivalent parking as this means building on other sites just to accommodate new houses. It should be the builder's responsibility to provide it in a way of drive-ways in the houses / property. Businesses, i.e. the pub and Mark Harris, parking cause problems already.	The policy seeks to ensure adequate off-street parking is provided for residents as part of any new development. Existing parking concerns cannot be addressed by the neighbourhood plan. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 56</b>	T1	The congestion around the school, and in neighbouring street (Juniper Drive and The Alders) at peak times needs to be urgently addressed – i.e. before there is a serious accident. Why is the available off-street parking totally monopolised by employees of the adjacent garage?	Comment noted – improvements to traffic management considered as local infrastructure project to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy (CA1) No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 59</b>	T1	Too much traffic uses Scothern as a short cut between the A15 and the A158 with speeding becoming increasingly evident. A speed reduction device is urgently required before a tragedy happens. (VERY IMPORTANT)	Comment noted – improvements to traffic management considered as local infrastructure project to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy (CA1) No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 62</b>	T1	Existing parking does not stop vehicles driving through the village.	This is outside of the remit of the neighbourhood plan.



			No amendments proposed.														
Res 65	T1	These parking standards are crucial if the village is not to be swamped with parked cars. Already too many cars park on footpaths and verges, causing walkers and wheelchair users etc. to go onto the roads.	Comment noted – improvements to traffic management considered as local infrastructure project to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy (CA1) No amendments proposed.														
LCC (66)	T1	The Plan mentions no bus service being available after 7.00 p.m., on Sundays and Bank Holidays a couple of times. It could just mention that use of alternatives could be made at these non-peak times (e.g. Call Connect or voluntary car schemes).	Not relevant to Scothern as the village falls outside the area of Call Connect. No amendments proposed.														
WLDC (68)	T1	No recommended modifications.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.														
Res 78	T1	I assume that these spaces are in addition to garages, which usually become a storage area.	Design of parking provision will be considered as part of the planning application process. No amendments proposed.														
Res 82	T1	Village is now a “Rat Run” mainly thanks to Police / Lincolnshire Show and Sat Nav systems. Need a weight restriction.	This is outside the remit of the neighbourhood plan. No amendments proposed.														
	T2	Pedestrian and Cycle Routes															
		<div>4.4 T2 Pedestrian &amp; Cycle</div> <table><thead><tr><th>Comments</th><th>Strongly Agree</th><th>Agree</th><th>Not Sure</th><th>Disagree</th><th>Strongly Disagree</th><th>Totals</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>8</td><td>70</td><td>34</td><td>4</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>110</td></tr></tbody></table>	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals	8	70	34	4	1	1	110	
Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals											
8	70	34	4	1	1	110											
Res 17	T2	Contradicts T1. In the age we live in very few utilise walking / cycling for work. Cars mainly used. Bus service is not secure for the future, and do not fit in with many workers working patterns.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.														
Res 23	T2	Pedestrian route down Church Street must be a priority. We use this route to school and it is becoming increasingly dangerous due to the speed of cars. This route will only become busier due to future developments down Dunholme Road	Comment noted – CA2 supports improvements to existing bridleways, walking and cycling routes. No amendments proposed.														

Res 28	T2	In addition to T2, we would like to see better pedestrian facilities / access between Scothern and Dunholme, and Scothern and Nettleham. The distances between the villages are walkable but the routes are dangerous by foot. (Appreciate this is probably a highways issue).	Comment noted – CA2 supports improvements to existing bridleways, walking and cycling routes. No amendments proposed.																
Res 29	T2	Particularly highlighted by earlier comments, we need to safeguard pedestrians / cyclists who may commute to Nettleham and Dunholme. It is unfortunate, but many drivers do not drive with safety in mind.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.																
Res 34	T2	Direct routes for pedestrian and cyclists which are safe would need to be shared in some parts of the village. This works perfectly well in other countries but would doubtless cause concerns.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.																
Res 47	T2	There seems to have been no improvement in cycle paths in recent memory. Particularly Nettleham Road is a prime candidate, regularly used by cyclists, alongside traffic at 60 – 70 mph.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.																
LCC (66)	T2	Both this specific T2 Policy reference, and frequent mentions of enhancing bridleways, paths and cycle routes to facilitate active travel are welcomed.	Support noted. No amendments proposed.																
WLDC (68)	T2	No recommended modifications.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.																
Res 85	T1	What is “..... direct and through linkage to the village centre”? Explain please, with an example.	Supporting access has been amended to provide clarity – reference has been removed to ‘through linkages’																
		Business and Employment																	
	B1	Protection of Existing Employment Sites																	
		<table><tr><td>4.5 B1 Business &amp; Employment</td><td>Comments</td><td>Strongly Agree</td><td>Agree</td><td>Not Sure</td><td>Disagree</td><td>Strongly Disagree</td><td>Total</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>9</td><td>46</td><td>48</td><td>11</td><td>2</td><td>6</td><td>113</td></tr></table>	4.5 B1 Business & Employment	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total		9	46	48	11	2	6	113	Following discussion with WLDC the ‘protection of existing employment sites’ policy is to be deleted. Concerns were expressed that the policy is too prescriptive and it does not meet the basis conditions. Proposals for the redevelopment of existing employment sites, and applications for new employment premises and facilities, will be considered against policies in the Local Plan.
4.5 B1 Business & Employment	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total												
	9	46	48	11	2	6	113												
Res 31	B1	Shop / PO facilities for us as we get older.	CA1: Proposals for CIL monies identifies a community shop / Post office as a local infrastructure project to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of																

			the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy.					
<b>Res 52</b>	B1	As with housing development, business development also needs to be in keeping with the character and size of Scothern.	Policy D1: Design and Character also applies to business development.					
<b>Res 54</b>	B1	I don't feel any struggling business should be penalised by terms in a village plan. I am very supportive of local businesses.	Comment noted.					
<b>Res 55</b>	B1	How about making the existing paths in Scothern useable + safe, first - i.e. between Sudbrooke Road, Orchard Close, Craypool Lane, using CIL monies? A shop would significantly increase vehicular traffic flow.	The first comment refers to Policy T2. Second comment noted.					
<b>Res 62</b>	B1	This does not stop existing businesses (e.g. garage) expanding to unreasonable size.	Comment noted – a planning application would need to be submitted for the expansion of local businesses.					
<b>WLDC (68)</b>	B1	WLDC recommend that the policy is reviewed to form a less restrictive wording. WLDC will be happy to come and discuss with the group.	Policy deleted.					
<b>EA (77)</b>	B1	The same approach as suggested for Policy S1 could be incorporated into Policy B1, saying that changes of use of buildings in employment use (considered less vulnerable to flooding) will only be supported if the site is outside of Flood Zones 2 and 3.	Flooding issues considered as part of the NPPF – there is no need to repeat national planning policy.					
<b>Res 82</b>	B1	Village does not need another mark Harris Commercials, or back-door use such as has happened at Barbers Farm and not approved, or with planning permission.	Comment noted.					
	<b>B2</b>	<b>Working from Home</b>						
		<b>4.5 B2 Working from Home</b> <div> <div>Comments</div> <div>Strongly Agree</div> <div>Agree</div> <div>Not Sure</div> <div>Disagree</div> <div>Strongly Disagree</div> <div>Totals</div> </div> <div> 5 51 30 13 0 3 97 </div>						
<b>Res 09</b>	B1	Concerns about parking if residents are working at home	Comment noted – this is addressed in the policy 'proposals will be supported if the development does not significantly increase vehicular traffic and has safe and suitable access to the site for all people.' No amendments proposed.					

Res 17	B2	Provided this does not breach any restrictive covenant on property involved.	Comment noted – this would be considered as part of the planning application process. No amendments proposed.
Res 64	B2	B2 to be encouraged!	Support noted. No amendments proposed.
LCC (66)	B2	LCC supports the intention of Policy B2 from an environmental perspective but questions the practicalities of such a Policy where no planning permission is needed.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
WLDC (68)	B2	No recommended modifications.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
Res 72	B2	Important to support small home run businesses as technological advances make this a growth sector – faster broadband?	High speed broadband encouraged by national policy – no need for a policy in the neighbourhood plan. No amendments proposed.
		<b>Environment</b>	
	<b>E1</b>	<b>Open Spaces</b>	
		<div> <div>4.6 Environment E1 Open Spaces</div> <div> <div>Comments</div> <div>9</div> </div> <div> <div>Strongly Agree</div> <div>79</div> </div> <div> <div>Agree</div> <div>24</div> </div> <div> <div>Not Sure</div> <div>3</div> </div> <div> <div>Disagree</div> <div>0</div> </div> <div> <div>Strongly Disagree</div> <div>1</div> </div> <div> <div>Totals</div> <div>107</div> </div> </div>	<p><b>Following discussion with WLDC and a review of the comments received as part of the pre-submission consultation the Open Space policy is to be deleted. The Policy is considered redundant as open space is covered in more detail within the WLDC Local Plan and the emerging Local Plan. This includes the identification of Local Open space standards for new developments.</b></p>
Pp	E1	Provided this can be protected by stringent planning conditions which are adhered to and how this will be policed.	Comment noted.
Res 22	E1	Especially important to protect existing green spaces / parks	Comment noted.
Res 34	E1	I know that funding is an issue but improved recreational facilities would be welcome.	Comment noted.
Res 40	E1 – 4	All good.	Support noted.
Res 48	E1	Green spaces, ponds and facilities all require agreement for maintenance.	Comment noted.

Res 52	E1	Open spaces are vital to the character and biodiversity of the village. Without them Scothern turns from a village into a housing estate.	Comment noted.																
Res 58	E1	Important to keep existing local open spaces.	Comment noted.																
LCC (66)	E1	Comments from the Public Health viewpoint these open spaces for people to go to exercise or meet up are important and help to maintain good air quality.	Comment noted.																
WLDC (68)	E1	WLDC recommend that that this policy is removed: The Policy is considered redundant as open space is covered in more detail within the WLDC Local Plan and the emerging Local Plan. This includes the identification of Local Open space standards for new developments.	Policy deleted.																
	E2	Local Green Spaces																	
		<table><tr><td>4.6 E2 Local Green Space</td><td>Comments</td><td>Strongly Agree</td><td>Agree</td><td>Not Sure</td><td>Disagree</td><td>Strongly Disagree</td><td>Totals</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>17</td><td>79</td><td>23</td><td>5</td><td>0</td><td>4</td><td>111</td></tr></table>	4.6 E2 Local Green Space	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals		17	79	23	5	0	4	111	
4.6 E2 Local Green Space	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals												
	17	79	23	5	0	4	111												
Res 16	E2	This comment refers to LG3 (Manor Park / The Paddocks) and has been submitted by the owner: “I completely and totally object to your plans regarding my property and its designation as a village green space etc. The following reasons for objection have been provided: land is privately owned and is not accessible to the public (and never has been) and the owner has indicated that he has no intention to sell the property in the immediate future.	LGS 3 to be deleted – it is a large and extensive tract of land which may conflict with the NPPF criteria identified within paragraph 77.																
Res 17	E2	Do not understand how Manor Park (LGS3) which is privately owned can be included whilst the Green which is owned by Parish is not. Para 77 of NPPF refers.	LGS 3 to be deleted – it is a large and extensive tract of land which may conflict with the NPPF criteria identified within paragraph 77.																
Res 24	E2	Grange Park is a large area to accommodate a large number of people for get together, such as garden fetes. Village Hall playing fields.: I am over 70 so will not be playing a lot of football. Manor Park is good to look at, to how the lord of the Manor used to live years ago.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.																
Res 33	E2	Bottle & Glass & the beer garden: are assets to the village, nice to look at when walking through the village, and when you stop to have a rest and a quiet drink. Heathlea greens: when coming from Nettleham the first thing you see is nice green mowed grass with a few trees and then the jewel in the crown is another grassed area with mature trees and a bench where anyone can rest. Great planning by WLDC, the trees filter the	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.																

		fumes and noise from the traffic, the old people can sit in their living rooms, look out at the green to watch the birds feeding and the rest of the world go by.	
<b>Res 33</b>	E2	Trees, hedgerows and roadside verges are a great habitat for wildlife, which has been lost due to farming and development. Scothern Beck: a must for wildlife so they can move from one area to another, also to take storm water away from land drains and overspill from development. Waterside walkways an excellent idea. Where the pathways go along the grass they should be made from wood chippings or bark mulch, which is good to walk on and not slippery, looks good and cheap to replace. It also contains bugs for the birds to feed on, self draining and environmentally friendly.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 34</b>	E2	I don't think that Manor Park should be excluded prior to consultation. It was highlighted as an important green space in previous consultations. We need to support democracy!	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 36</b>	E2	Provision for young children in the playing area is below par.	CA1: Proposals for CIL monies identifies replacement facilities in the children's play park as a local infrastructure project to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 39</b>	E2	Not sure where Manor Park or Heathlea Greens are!	Comment noted – see proposals map. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 48</b>	E2	Obviously land owners consent is required where green spaces are privately owned.	Comment noted – consent has been sought. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 58</b>	E2	Important to keep existing local open spaces.	This will be addressed in a Local Plan policy and afforded protected by the NPPF (paragraph 74) No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 64</b>	E2	Suggest including school playing field as a protected green area.	School playing fields are afforded protection by the NPPF (paragraph 74) No amendments proposed.
<b>LCC (66)</b>	E2	From the Public Health viewpoint these open spaces for people to go to exercise, or just to meet up, are important and help maintain good air quality.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>B&amp;G / EI /BSP (67)</b>	E2	The following are extracts from an 8 page report, strongly objecting to Policy E2:  “It is maintained that Policy E2 is not wholly compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).	LGS 3 (Manor Park) to be deleted – it is a large and extensive tract of land which

	<p>Paragraphs 76-77 states:</p> <p><i>“76. Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.</i></p> <p><i>77. The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:</i></p> <p><i>- where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; - where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquility or richness of its wildlife; and - where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</i></p> <p>Appendix D of the Neighbourhood Plan sets out more detail on the proposed LGS allocation sites. The first section states that all the sites meet the criteria set out in paragraph 77. However, there is little evidence set out to demonstrate this.”</p> <p>The report then goes on to object to all the other Local Green Spaces, and a copy of their summary is as follows:</p> <p><b>“Summary</b></p> <p>Overall, it is maintained that Policy E2 ‘Local Green Space’ and the associated site allocations are not in accordance with paragraph 77 of the NPPF. As such the plan does not accord with several of the basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. These are:</p> <p>a. having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the order.</p> <p>d. the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) contributes to the achievement of sustainable</p>	<p>may conflict with the NPPF criteria identified within paragraph 77.</p> <p>The proposed LGS designations have been assessed against the criteria in the NPPF – see evidence base document ‘Local Green Space designations’ for further information and justification.</p>
--	---	--



		<p>development.</p> <p>e. the making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).</p> <p>In light of this it is maintained that Policy E2 should be removed from the Neighbourhood Plan, prior to it being submitted for independent examination.</p>																	
WLDC (68)	E2	LGS 3 is a large and extensive tract of land which may conflict with the NPPF criteria identified within paragraph 77.	LGS 3 (Manor Park) to be deleted – it is a large and extensive tract of land which may conflict with the NPPF criteria identified within paragraph 77.																
Res 72	E2	Page 31 of full document + Appendix D – area indicating the Bottle & Glass beer garden is incorrectly marked as LGS3 – should be LGS4.	Comment noted –map and text amended.																
Res 82	E2	Maintain Local Green spaces better. These enhance our village.	Comment noted.																
Res 85	E2	E2 is very subjective. For example, the future viability of the Bottle & Glass will probably (Note: missing word) on development in the garden!	Comment noted – justification for proposals provided in the evidence base and ‘Local Green Space’ document. No amendments proposed.																
	E3	Biodiversity																	
		<table><tr><td>4.6 E3 Biodiversity</td><td>Comments</td><td>Strongly Agree</td><td>Agree</td><td>Not Sure</td><td>Disagree</td><td>Strongly Disagree</td><td>Totals</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>5</td><td>64</td><td>21</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>3</td><td>88</td></tr></table>	4.6 E3 Biodiversity	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals		5	64	21	0	0	3	88	
4.6 E3 Biodiversity	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals												
	5	64	21	0	0	3	88												
Res 14	E3	The phrase “unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated” should be removed as any impact on habitats, species of principal importance should be protected without exception.	Sentence needs to be retained to ensure sufficient flexibility. No amendments proposed.																
Res 17	E3	Provided protection can be assured and maintained	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.																
Res 37	E3	Should have been considered to a greater degree in housing development sites already granted.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.																

Res 48	E3	Green spaces, ponds and facilities all require agreement for maintenance.							Comment noted – the policy includes reference to the management of biodiversity assets. No amendments proposed.
WLDC (68)	E3	It is recommended that the NP include a plan of identified site or assets, and can provide this plan if requested.							Biodiversity in Scothern is not limited to specific sites and cannot be mapped. No amendments proposed.
	E4	Scothern Beck Green Corridor							
		4.6 E4 Scothern Beck Green Corridor	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals
			13	72	19	5	2	3	101
Res 17	E4	Provided protection can be assured and maintained							Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
Res 18	E4	The Beck could be a major attraction if the ugly walled area from the church to the pub could be “softened”. Heavy vehicles travelling past our house are degrading the bank							Enhancements to Scothern Beck identified as a project on which the neighbourhood proportion of CIL receipts could be spent (Aspiration CA1: Proposals for CIL Monies). No amendments proposed.
Res 22	E4	Important to consider surface water flooding impact on the Beck and current pumping arrangements							Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
Res 34	E4	Not sure how this can be achieved.							Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
Res 37	E4	Traffic calming throughout the village should also be considered.							This is not a land-use planning issue and is outside the remit of the NP. No amendments proposed.
Res 39	E4	I see little in the way of any existing green corridor bounding the Beck.							Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
Res 55	E4	Residents whose gardens back onto the Beck should maintain the banks so as to prevent the build up of plants which prevents the flow of water.							Comment noted. No amendments proposed.

LCC (66)	E4	LCC welcome that the Plan acknowledges the importance of Scothern Beck as a flood defence mechanism and the need to to continue to work with 3 <sup>rd</sup> Witham Internal drainage Board and, where applicable, Lincolnshire County Council.	Support noted. No amendments proposed.																
WLDC (68)	E4	No modifications recommended.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.																
EA (77)	E4	A five page A4 letter was received from the Environment Agency, dated 6 June 2016, and the following are brief extracts referring to Policy E4: “We are pleased to see the Plan considering habitat options and valuing the natural environment of the Beck. When considering proposals in the Scothern Beck green corridor, there may be some scope for “making space for water”, helping to reduce the flood risk within the village. The final bullet point of the policy could be expanded to reflect this, for example: “.....ensure that they do not negatively impact upon its capacity to act as a flood defence and to regulate water flow, and where possible enhance this to reduce flood risk.””	No amendments proposed – this is adequately addressed in the Policy.																
Res 78	E4	Strongly agree with extending access through the formation of waterside walkway, outside of the village boundary.	Support noted. No amendments proposed.																
Res 85	E4	Agree, but doubt very much that there is anything substantial that can be done to improve access to the Beck.	Support noted. No amendments proposed.																
WTDIDB (87)	E4	The following are extracts from Witham Third District Internal Drainage Board (WTDIDB) 6-page letter referring to Policy E4: “No new development should be allowed to be built within flood plain. Also risk from surface water flooding should also be considered.”	Flooding issues considered as part of NPPF – no need to repeat higher level policy. No amendments proposed.																
		Community Facilities																	
	C1	Provision of New / Improved Community Facilities																	
		<table><tr><td>4.7 Community C1 Provision of Facilities</td><td>Comments</td><td>Strongly Agree</td><td>Agree</td><td>Not Sure</td><td>Disagree</td><td>Strongly Disagree</td><td>Totals</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>5</td><td>66</td><td>22</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>89</td></tr></table>	4.7 Community C1 Provision of Facilities	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals		5	66	22	0	0	1	89	
4.7 Community C1 Provision of Facilities	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals												
	5	66	22	0	0	1	89												
Res 29	C1	Very important the issue of pedestrian / cycle routes.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.																
Res 64	C1	Strongly prefer proposals <u>within</u> the current boundaries, and at least not expanding “built up” area beyond area boundary. I would prefer village hall to be improved rather than replaced.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.																
Res 65	C1	Any proposed new development should involve a contribution from the developer towards village community facilities.	Community Aspiration CA1 identifies a list of local infrastructure projects to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council																

			allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy. No amendments proposed.						
Res 82	C1	Enlarge village hall car park using barely used tennis court. Support building of new up to date village hall.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.						
Res 85	C1	Hopefully, CIL can be used to support a new village hall and cricket field.	Comment noted. Community Aspiration CA1 identifies a list of local infrastructure projects to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy and includes improvements / enhancements to the Village Hall. No amendments proposed.						
	C2	Loss of Existing Community Facilities							
		4.7 Community C2 Loss of Facilities	Comments	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Totals
			7	69	26	12	0	1	108
Res 17	C2	Consideration should be afforded to how these can be managed and by whom. If a commercial venture with paid employees this would require different consideration to voluntary organisations.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.						
Res 20	C2	Unsure that we should try to save facilities people aren’t using	C2 seeks to ensure that this does not happen – if people aren’t using the facilities other uses will be considered if application accords with this Policy. No amendments proposed.						
Res 31	C2	Burial / Remains essential.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.						
Res 34	C2	Item 3: no need for “equal”	Comment noted – no changes proposed as cannot insist on a greater level of provision being provided. No amendments proposed.						
Res 52	C2	If community facilities are lost, people will use similar facilities elsewhere, and the village could start to decline.	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.						

<b>Res 62</b>	C2	Any developer would be able to get round these proposals – is it possible to “tighten up” proposals?	Sufficient flexibility is required within the Policy. No amendments proposed.
<b>WLDC (68)</b>	C2	C2 identifies the Garden Centre as a community facility; it is a local business and should be removed. The Primary school should be added. It may be useful to include a map of community facilities within the text before the policy.	Policy amended: reference removed to the Garden Centre and reference to primary school added. The community facilities have been mapped.
	<b>CA</b>	<b>Community Aspirations</b>	
		<b>General Comments</b> (See below for details on CA1, CA2, CA3, CA4 and CA5)	
<b>Res 05</b>	CA	Wonderful aspirations – IF ONLY! Community shop would be good but I doubt we’ll ever have a Post Office again. Car parking needed – but where? People would still want to park right outside their doors.	Comment noted.
<b>Res 09</b>	CA	We fully support improvements to traffic management, especially at school peak times. A purpose built car park adjacent to the school would be ideal. Cricket ground should stay where it is.	Comment noted.
<b>Res 10</b>	CA	I approve of them all	Support noted.
<b>Res 13</b>	CA	With forward thinking like this there will be a community in Scothern for the foreseeable future.	Support noted
<b>Res 14</b>	CA	No need for a shop with facilities at Dunholme and Nettleham so near. Children’s play park facilities need improving – could teenagers be considered in this?	Comment noted. No amendments proposed.
<b>Res 15</b>	CA	I believe that several of the community aspirations are in fact non-directly achieved through the neighbourhood plan and I fully support the community aspirations as they stand.	Support noted.
<b>Res 17</b>	CA	Would like assurances that any funding designated for such projects is used properly in accordance with pre-agreed criteria	Comment noted.
<b>Res 22</b>	CA	Car parking for Ellison Boulsters school would be a real improvement to the village as this road can become hazardous and difficult to pass at school times	Comment noted.
<b>Res 25</b>	CA	I’m not sure about the increase in traffic – the volume is high through the village at present and you are looking at a possible increase of around 100+ cars. NOT GOOD	Comment noted – improvements to traffic management considered as local infrastructure project to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy (CA1)

<b>Res 31</b>	CA	Why is Parish Church not in CAs?	The Parish Church is Grade 2* listed and is adequately protected by current legislation.
<b>Res 32</b>	CA	Transport and housing is still a major concern. More houses mean more cars, which in turn concerns me regarding road safety and the speed at which some cars enter Main Street, from both sides of the village, and needs to be addressed.	Comment noted – improvements to traffic management considered as local infrastructure project to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy (CA1)
<b>Res 33</b>	CA	Proposals seem to be in the best interests of the village.	Support noted.
<b>Res 34</b>	CA	I am not sure that a shop / PO is viable. A pleasant / useable burial ground would be great.	Comment noted – a community shop and post office would only be provided if viable.
<b>Res 35</b>	CA	This is a well prepared and thought out document. Congratulations to the hard working committee.	Support noted.
<b>Res 36</b>	CA	Allotment provision.	See Community Aspirations CA3
<b>Res 38</b>	CA	If we have a shop, can we sustain it? Will it encourage more house building?	Comment noted.
<b>Res 40</b>	CA	Thorough and far-reaching. Prospect of a new village hall is a great start.	Comment noted.
<b>Res 41</b>	CA	Speeding through the village – not just cars but large agricultural vehicles is a huge concern. 2. The extremely poor state of the roads in the area- there needs to be huge improvements (junction of Scothern / Dunholme / A46 junction) is dangerous and an increase in traffic will only make this worse.	Comment noted – improvements to traffic management considered as local infrastructure project to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy (CA1)
<b>Res 42</b>	CA	Congratulations on your good work.	Support noted.
<b>Res 47</b>	CA	Cosmetic improvements to the beck seem less worthy than enhancements that are of more general benefit such as community facilities, improved walking / cycling routes, children's play area, etc.	Comment noted
<b>Res 52</b>	CA	All options to enhance village amenities, reduce congestion, and protect the character and atmosphere of Scothern should be encouraged and fully supported.	Comment noted
<b>Res 53</b>	CA	It sounds as though there are already plans to relocate the cricket club? If so, should include adequate parking and existing cricket pitch should remain a green space for community / public use.	Comment noted – there are no plans yet, but it may be an aspiration.
<b>Res 54</b>	CA	Replacement village hall would be great. Not too concerned about having a shop or not, but would be supportive of any new local business.	Comment noted.

<b>Res 55</b>	CA	Having a shop would go against points in B2. The pub causes traffic problems + parking problems already. Someone pulled out of there right in front of me the other day; they weren't looking properly – more interested in the pub – luckily, I was only doing 20 mph.	Comment noted – improvements to traffic management considered as local infrastructure project to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy (CA1)
<b>Res 56</b>	CA	Strongly agree / agree with all the suggested aspirations.	Support noted.
<b>Res 57</b>	CA	The aspirations are welcome.	Support noted.
<b>Res 58</b>	CA	Anything that gets cars and people off the roads has to be an improvement.	Comment noted.
<b>Res 59</b>	CA	Well done the Neighbourhood Plan Steering group.	Support noted.
<b>Res 64</b>	CA	Any scope for bridleway to avoid horse riders past school? Perhaps next to the development near Grange Park, through to Nettleham Rd from Sudbrooke Road.	Comment noted
<b>Res 65</b>	CA	Preservation, promotion and enhancement of the Lincoln / Nettleham /Welton bus service (an important community , traffic, transport facility) should be added.	Comment noted. Not a land use issue
<b>LCC (66)</b>	CA	LCC notes that these aspirations do not form part of the statutory development plan for Scothern, but does wish to make some comments, for information, on the specific CA aspects below. <b>7 Evidence base:</b> Please note that the recently adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan, produced by LCC, is part of the wider 'development plan' and so should be referred to in Neighbourhood Plans alongside the relevant Local Plans and national planning policy already listed. This will enable issues such as under CA3 above to be picked up early on in the process. In updating the Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan you will also be able to reference the Central Lincolnshire Proposed Submission Local Plan, which it is planned to submit to the Secretary of State shortly.	Plan amended to include reference to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.
<b>Res 71</b>	CA	Agree with all the points, especially traffic / traffic speed.	Support noted.
<b>Res 80</b>	CA	Agreed.	Support noted.
<b>Res 81</b>	CA	<b>General Comment:</b> No where does the NP say that developments must contribute to community facilities and well being (as per National Planning Policy framework). I think that this should be very clearly stated.	The neighbourhood plan does not need to repeat policies in the NPPF.
<b>Res 85</b>	CA	Generally agree all community aspirations, but must make sure the needs of the Football Club are also recognised and supported.	Comment noted.
	<b>CA1</b>	<b>Proposals for CIL Monies</b>	
<b>Res 39</b>	CA1	Shop & PO would neither be viable nor approved. Traffic management improvement should be pursued.	Comment noted.



<b>Res 46</b>	CA1	Should CIL monies become available then serious consideration should be given to how the monies are spent. The community should be given the opportunity to make comment and suggestions.	Comment noted.
LCC (66)	CA1	These aspirations are broadly supported and the Parish Council is directed to the Central Lincolnshire Infrastructure Delivery Plan and asked to liaise with the district council when it comes to the distribution of any CIL revenue. Such liaison should enable delivery of infrastructure for the benefit of both the Parish and the wider District and area. As you may be aware, however, CIL does not apply retrospectively to planning permissions already granted before it is adopted. Policy H1, which LCC supports, does not allocate any new housing sites beyond those with planning permission, so unfortunately the scope for CIL revenue is likely to be small. The Parish Council may need to consider other sources of funding as well.	Comment noted.
<b>Res 81</b>	CA1	I presume that CA1 list is not in any order of priority.	The list is not in order of priority.
	<b>CA2</b>	<b>Improved Bridleways, Walking &amp; Cycling Routes</b>	
<b>Res 23</b>	CA2	This is a high priority in my view	Comment noted.
LCC (66)	CA2	These would be broadly supported, but there are no specific comments at this stage.	Comment noted.
	<b>CA3</b>	<b>Enhancement of Village facilities</b>	
<b>Res 39</b>	CA3	Strongly approve of car parking development to replace the ludicrous situation existing. Some form of drive-through might be best. If land off Nettleham Road is ever built on, urge Council to have included in any plans the tidying up of fences and PROW (and ditches) on the northern and eastern sides of the development.	Support and comments noted. No amendments proposed.
LCC (66)	CA3	LCC Children's Services requests the addition of 'school playing fields' to the potential uses listed in CA3. Ellison Boulters school is currently at capacity on an undersized site, with a number of permissions and applications in Scothern/Sudbrooke that would impact on it. Whilst the HSE zone surrounding the oil field is acknowledged, potential use as school playing fields could facilitate increased capacity on the existing site. Dual use by the community of facilities at the school could also possibly be explored. It must be emphasised that there are no current plans to purchase the land or expand the school. The reference to allotments is also supported, but there could perhaps also be mention of creating community growing spaces or community orchards for access to healthy food.	Policy amended to include reference to school playing fields.
<b>Res 81</b>	CA3	Inclusion of a cricket pitch could undermine current fundraising for improvements for cricket.	Noted. This is currently an aspiration only
<b>Res 82</b>	CA3	Fully support enhancement to village facilities. Urgent requirement needed – especially school car parking.	Comment noted
	<b>CA4</b>	<b>Redevelopment of Cricket Ground</b>	
<b>Res 62</b>	CA4	Why do we need another cricket pitch?	It is an aspiration to have a larger cricket pitch to improve their facilities.
<b>Res 81</b>	CA4	Fully supported.	Support noted.

	CA5	Assets of Community Value	
Res 78	CA5	Can't the Manor Park be included in assets of community value? Although in private ownership Heathlea Green, which is also in private ownership, has been included.	Comment Noted.
Res 81	CA5	Surely Grange Park should be added.	Comment noted.
LCC (66)	CA5	This policy is supported, as it is consistent with and reinforces earlier policies which are also supported by LCC, notably D2, C1 and C2.	Support noted.
		<b>Other Comments From Outside Agencies, Not Already Included Above</b>	
WLDC (68)	All	An eight-page report from West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) was received on 7 June 2016, and comments have been added to the specific Policy Numbers above. General comments were also made, and the following are some extracts: "WLDC believes that the submission draft Neighbourhood Plan meets the requirements of the basic conditions. However, there are some issues identified (in Part 2) within certain policies that are unclear and might impact on the quality and usability of the policies within the plan. The proposals map is a useful and informative tool. It is suggested that the existing proposals map (section 6) is replaced with an A3 (inserted) to make it clearer for people to identify the heritage assets. No direct negative impact on the existing Human Rights Act and associated European social legislation have been identified."	Comment noted – larger proposals map to be included in the submission plan.  Statement regarding compliance with EU obligations inserted in the basic conditions statement.
NG AFW (73)	All	Amec Foster Wheeler, on behalf of the National Grid (NG), responded in a two-page letter, dated 10 May. The following are brief extracts: "National grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity system in England and Wales. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission service. National Grid has identified that it has no record of gas reducing pressure tier apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area. National Grid has also provided information in relation to electricity and transmission assets. The electrical distribution operator in West Lindsey is Northern Powergrid. They also said: "Please remember to consult National grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site-specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database: Robert Deanwood, Consultant Town Planner <a href="mailto:n.grid@amecfw.com">n.grid@amecfw.com</a> and Spencer Jefferies, Development Liaison Officer, National Grid <a href="mailto:box.landandaquisitions@nationalgrid.com">box.landandaquisitions@nationalgrid.com</a> "	Comment noted – consultation request forwarded to WLDC who are responsible for publicising the neighbourhood plan.
HE (74)	All	Highways England (HE) replied on 1 June, with a two page A4 report. The following is an extract from that letter: "Highways England considers that, due to the limited scale of development being proposed and the distance of the strategic road network from the plan area, there will be no impacts on the strategic road network,"	Comment noted.
SPC (75)	All	Sudbrooke Parish Council (SPC) acknowledged receipt of the SNP Pre-Submission Consultation Plan on 25 April, and confirmed that it would be brought to the attention of the Parish Council.	Letter noted.

NKDC <b>(76)</b>	All	Thank you for notifying the North Kesteven District Council of the above, however in this instance I can confirm that we have no comments to make.	Comment noted.
NE <b>(86)</b>	All	A four page A4 reply was received from Natural England (NE) dated 26 May 2016, and the following is a brief extract: "Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood plan.	Comment noted.

## Appendix A: Summary of Neighbourhood Plan and Feedback form.

Copies were distributed to all residents in Scothern and the feedback form was made available online.

---

# SCOTHERN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

## PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

---



### 1. Why a Neighbourhood Plan?

Neighbourhood Planning is a new right that communities can use to help shape the future development of the area. Once made, it will form part of the development plan for the area against which planning applications will be assessed. The Steering Group has carried out a number of evidence gathering activities including several surveys of residents' views.

This Plan covers a 20-year period from 2015 – 2035 and includes a vision, objectives and planning policies. These look to address current issues in Scothern as well as looking forward: seeking to shape, strengthen and improve the future of the village. Although the Plan period is 20 years, it is recognised that circumstances may change and as a result the Parish Council proposes to complete a formal review of Scothern Neighbourhood Plan once every five years.

### 2. What Happens Next?

We are reaching the final stages and this document is a summary of the 'draft' neighbourhood plan, called the Pre-Submission Plan and your further comments would be welcomed. Once this six-week consultation period has closed on 6<sup>th</sup> June, the comments received will be considered and, where appropriate, the Plan amended before it is submitted to West Lindsey District Council. The Council will then carry out a further six-week consultation on the Plan and it will then be assessed by an independent examiner.

There are **six weeks** from 23<sup>rd</sup> April to give feedback. The **final deadline is Monday 6<sup>th</sup> June**.

There are a number of ways of giving your feedback:

- You can bring your form to the public meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> May in the Methodist Church
- There will be a doorstep collection on Sunday 8<sup>th</sup> May – please leave your form outside in the plastic bag
- You can drop your form at 4 or 19 Church Street or The Pines, Northing Lane (until 6<sup>th</sup> June)
- You can download a copy of the form from the Parish Council website, complete it and e-mail to [REDACTED]

A **full copy** of the Plan is available for you to read on the Parish Council ([http://www.scothern.org.uk/Neighbourhood\\_Plan.html](http://www.scothern.org.uk/Neighbourhood_Plan.html)) and WLDC websites. Hard copies may also be read at Ellison Boulters, the Garden Centre, the Methodist Church and St. Germain's. If you wish to **borrow a copy** to read at home, please call at 4 or 19 Church Street. It is hoped that copies will also be in Nettleham and Welton libraries.

## Vision

In 2035, we will be a thriving, supportive, rural community in which people enjoy living and working.

Scothern will:

- Remain a distinctive, rural parish which treasures its heritage assets
- Ensure housing meets the needs of current and future residents
- Retain its high quality natural environment
- Sustain a thriving community with excellent facilities

## Objectives

### Sustainable development

- To direct new development within the built up area

### Housing

- To provide sufficient housing to meet the future housing need
- To ensure that the mix of housing reflects the growing needs of the diverse community of Scothern

### Design and Character

- To ensure all new development is of high quality design which reflects local distinctiveness and enhances the character of the village

### Traffic and transport

- To reduce congestion in the village and encourage sustainable modes of transport
- To respect, conserve and enhance the historic features of Scothern

### Environment:

- To protect and enhance the local green spaces; to ensure that new development responds appropriately to local landscape character and supports and enhances local wildlife and habitats

### Business

- To support and encourage local businesses and home working

### Community

- To maintain and where required enhance existing community, recreational and sports facilities

## Policies

This section of the neighbourhood plan contains a series of land-use policies that seek to address the objectives and deliver the vision.

### 4.1 Sustainable Development

Scothern is a small rural village surrounded by open countryside. The majority of the community facilities are located within the centre of the village within walking or cycling distance for many residents.

#### **S1: Location of new development**

New developments will be directed within the built up area boundary of Scothern.

Proposals for development located within the built up area boundary will be supported, provided they accord with the provisions of the Neighbourhood Plan and other relevant development plan policies. This will ensure:

- future housing, economic and community related development is directed to the village to enhance its role as a resilient and sustainable community
- the spread of the village is contained by promoting infilling up to its natural physical boundaries
- the re-use of previously-developed sites

### 4.2 Housing

Planning permission has already been granted for 71 dwellings on 3 sites in the village. In order to provide certainty for developers and for the community, these sites are to be allocated in the neighbourhood plan. The delivery of these 71 dwellings will ensure that the future housing need of Scothern is met and any additional housing requirement will be limited to small scale infill within the existing built up area of the village. Furthermore, planning permission has been granted for development on two smaller sites: two dwellings are to be built on Heath Road and two on Back Lane.

#### **H1: Future Housing Need**

The neighbourhood plan allocates land for approximately 71 new dwellings on the following sites:

<u>Site reference</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Anticipated no. of dwellings</u>
H1	Land off Dunholme Road	33
H2	Land at Heath Road	30
H3	Land adjacent to South Dene off Langworth Road	8

Planning permission will be granted on the above sites provided the development meets the requirements set out in this Plan and the Local Plan.

It is recognised that affordability is an issue of concern in Scothern. The neighbourhood plan will seek to ensure that a balanced mix of housing is provided which meets the local housing requirements of current and future residents:

#### **H2: Housing Mix**

Proposals for more than six dwellings should demonstrate how the applicant has sought to meet local needs. Proposals should provide for a mix of housing sizes and the delivery of more small and fewer large dwellings is encouraged.

At least 25% of dwellings should meet Lifetime Home Standards or its equivalent.



### 4.3 Design and Character


The following design policy provides a positive framework for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design that will help Scothern to retain its strong sense of place.

#### **D1: Design and Character**

Development will be supported where it:

- respects the historic and natural assets of the surrounding area, and takes every opportunity, through design and materials, to reinforce local distinctiveness and a strong sense of place; and
- recognises and reinforces local character in relation to height, scale and space of buildings; and
- does not unacceptably erode the important, predominantly undeveloped gaps between Scothern and the settlements of Scothern, Dunholme, Nettleham and Sudbrooke; and
- enhances pedestrian and cyclist connectivity. This can include the improvement and upgrading of existing routes; and
- respects local landscape quality ensuring that views and vistas are maintained wherever possible; and
- retains mature or important trees of good arboricultural and / or amenity value; and
- takes every opportunity, where practicable and viable, to incorporate features that improve its environmental performance thereby reducing carbon emissions. These can include both energy efficiency measures and green energy generation; and
- responds to and enhance the setting of Local Green Spaces and other valued green spaces

The following features, buildings, structures and spaces are considered to be local heritage assets worthy of protection. By identifying these assets as 'local heritage assets' the Plan seeks to ensure that their special status is taken into account when future decisions are made which may affect these buildings. For example, alterations should respect the character and interest of the building and any works carried out should use appropriate materials and retain any features of architectural or historic interest. Furthermore, proposals for development which may impact upon these locally listed buildings must demonstrate how they will protect or enhance the heritage asset.



#### Key to Local Heritage Assets:

**1 Little Acer and Barber's Cottage**

**3. Old School House**

**5. Bottle & Glass Pub & Garden**

**7. Methodist Church**

**9. Marinka**

**11. Magnolia**

**13. Old Vicarage & Reading Room**

**15. Brinkburn House & Old Smithy**

**2. Stonefield House & Outbuildings**

**4. Farndon House & Outbuildings**

**6. Beck House & Outbuildings**

**8. Weir Farm House**

**10. Townend Farm and Outbuildings**

**12. Peartree Cottage & Old Smithy**

**14. The Old Post Office**

**16. Ashwell House**

#### **Policy D2 - Protection of Local Heritage Assets**

Proposals requiring consent which affect Local Heritage Assets as identified on the map and listed here must demonstrate how they protect or enhance the heritage asset.

Development which affects a Local Heritage Asset should take account of its individual significance and seek to promote the conservation and enhancement of the Asset and its setting.

The renovation or alteration of buildings or structures on the Local Heritage List should be designed sensitively, and with careful regard to the heritage asset's historical and architectural interest and setting.

## 4.4 Traffic and Transport

Many residents have expressed concern about the number and type of vehicles that pass through the village on a daily basis. There is also concern about congestion around the school at peak times and the problems caused by inadequate off street parking.

### **T1: Parking standards:**

New residential development must provide the following minimum number of off street parking spaces per dwelling:

1 or 2 bedrooms	2 spaces
3 or 4 bedrooms	3 spaces
5 or more bedrooms	4 spaces

Accessible communal car parking areas of an equivalent provision will be considered as an acceptable alternative in appropriate locations.

The issue of pedestrian and cycle linkages was highlighted by residents during the Spring 2015 and Summer 2015 surveys. The neighbourhood plan will seek to ensure that, where appropriate, new developments provide direct and through linkage to the village centre as this will reduce traffic, congestion and parking issues and encourage sustainable modes of transport.

### **T2: Pedestrian and Cycle Routes**

New developments should provide for safe, direct and attractive pedestrian and cycle routes - through the developments and into the village centre, where these are required by the development and do not currently exist or are in need of improvement.

## 4.5 Business and Employment

There are a number of existing employment sites in Scothern that play an important role in the local economy and contribute towards the liveliness and activity in the Parish. In recognition of the importance of home-working to residents in Scothern, the neighbourhood plan seeks to encourage working from home:

### **B1: Protection of existing employment sites**

Proposals for the redevelopment or change of use of land or buildings in employment or service trade use to non-employment uses will only be supported where:

- it can be demonstrated that the existing use is no longer economically viable; and
- the site has been actively marketed at a reasonable price for a minimum of 12 months and that no sale or let has been achieved

### **B2: Working from home**

Planning permission for development that enables home working will be supported if the development:

- is in keeping with the scale, form and character of its surroundings; and
- does not significantly adversely affect the amenities of residents in the area; and
- does not significantly increase vehicular traffic flow; and
- has safe and suitable access to the site for all people.

## 4.6 Environment

The provision of accessible, quality open spaces, sports and recreational facilities are important for the health and wellbeing of residents.

### **E1: Open Space**

New development will be required to provide new or enhanced provision of public open space, sports and recreational facilities in accordance with the standards set in the Local Plan.

The Neighbourhood Plan will seek to ensure that where open space and recreational facilities are provided they are multi-functional, usable, fit for purpose and meet the needs of both existing and new residents.

The rural nature of Scothern is one of the village's greatest assets. In addition to being surrounded by open countryside there are numerous areas of Local Green Space within Scothern which contribute towards the attractive natural environment and are valued by the community.

### **E2: Local Green Space**

The Neighbourhood Plan designates the following locations as Local Green Spaces (as shown on the proposals map):

- Village Hall Playing fields
- Grange Park
- Manor Park
- Bottle and Glass beer garden
- Heath Lea Greens, Nettleham Road

Applications for development on the identified local green spaces which would adversely affect their function as open green spaces will not be permitted.

The neighbourhood plan will seek to ensure that the natural environment is protected, managed and enhanced.

### **E3: Biodiversity**

All development proposals should:

- not result in the loss of or negatively impact upon local wildlife sites and habitats / species of principle importance unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated; and
- protect, manage and enhance the network of habitats, species and sites of importance including trees, hedgerows and roadside verges; and
- minimise impacts on biodiversity; and
- where possible seek to deliver a net gain in biodiversity

Over 97% of respondents to the Summer 2015 survey supported the aim of encouraging proposals to retain a green corridor either side of the Beck, to improve the setting of the Beck (in particular to the appearance of the concrete sections) and to enhance the amenity, biodiversity and recreational value of the Beck.

#### **E4: Scothern Beck Green Corridor**

Proposals which enhance the setting of the Beck and its associated amenity value will be supported. Where appropriate development proposals adjacent to the Beck should:

- seek to retain public access and extend access through the formation of waterside walkways; and
- preserve and enhance its amenity, biodiversity and recreational value; and
- ensure that they do not negatively impact upon its capacity to act as a flood defence and to regulate water flow.

Development proposals which encroach upon or materially harm the function, character or appearance of the Beck will not be supported.

## **4.7 Community Facilities**

There is a wide range of community facilities within the village and a number of active social groups and sports clubs.

#### **C1: Provision of new and / or improved community facilities:**

Proposals for new and/or improved community facilities will be supported subject to the following criteria:

- the proposal would not have significant harmful impacts on the amenities of surrounding residents and other activities; and
- the proposal would not have significant harmful impacts on the surrounding local environment; and
- the proposal would not have unacceptable impacts on the local road network; and
- the proposal would provide appropriate car parking facilities; and
- the proposal is located within or immediately adjacent to the built up area boundary

The community has expressed support for the redevelopment and or refurbishment of the existing village hall and this is also considered as part of Community Aspirations.

The neighbourhood plan will seek to ensure the retention, continued use and refurbishment of existing facilities and to prevent their loss.

#### **C2: Loss of existing community facilities**

The retention, continued use, refurbishment and improvement of all the community buildings and their associated uses will be supported.

Proposals for the redevelopment or change of use of land or buildings that would result in the loss of community facilities will only be supported where:

- it can be demonstrated that the existing use is no longer economically viable; and
- the site has been actively marketed at a reasonable price for a minimum of 12 months and that no sale or let has been achieved; and
- any replacement use will provide equal or greater benefits to the community



## Community Aspirations:

During the development of the neighbourhood plan, the community suggested a number of projects and proposals which do not directly relate to land-use or that may not be delivered over the lifetime of the neighbourhood plan.

More information about these aspirations can be found in the full Plan.

### **CA1: Proposals for CIL Monies**

The Neighbourhood Plan identifies the following local infrastructure projects to be funded from the Scothern Parish Council allocation of the West Lindsey Community Infrastructure Levy:

- Establish a Community Shop / Post Office
- Replacement facilities in the children's Play Park
- Improvements / enhancements to the Village Hall
- Enhancement of Scothern Beck, as identified in Policy E4
- Improvements to traffic management
- Improved cycle and walking routes (identified in Community Aspiration, CA2)
- Improvement and enhancement of Local Green Spaces, designated in Policy E2.

### **CA2: Improvements to bridleways, walking and cycling routes**

Support will be given to proposals which would increase or improve the network of cycleways, bridleways, footways and footpaths, either by making land available for that purpose or by means of financial contributions through legal agreements or (when adopted) the Community Infrastructure Levy.

### **CA3: Enhancement to Village Facilities**

Should land close to Ellison Boulters Church of England Academy become available over the plan period, the following uses would be supported:

- Car-parking
- A burial ground
- Recreational facilities including a cricket pitch
- Allotment provision

### **CA4: Redevelopment of the cricket ground**

Should the existing cricket ground become available because of relocation of the cricket club, expansion of the village hall and provision of recreational facilities will be supported.

### CA5: Assets of Community Value

The neighbourhood plan proposes the following buildings are assessed by the local planning authority for designation as Assets of Community value as a result of their acknowledge importance to the life and enjoyment of the community:

- The Methodist Church
- The Village Hall and associated playing fields
- Bottle and Glass public house and associated beer garden
- The Pinfold
- Heath Lea Green

Proposals that will enhance the viability and/or community value of these assets will be supported and proposals that would result in their loss or cause significant harm will be resisted.

### Feedback

Your feedback is essential to the success of this Plan. It is important to note that the policies and proposals in this Pre-Submission plan are 'draft' and may change as a result of your comments received during this consultation period. There may also be further changes due to recommendations and proposed modifications from the examiner.

It is necessary at this stage to collect information about who is giving this feedback and we would be grateful if you would provide the following:

**Name(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Address:** \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ **Postcode:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Organisation (if applicable):** \_\_\_\_\_

For each policy listed below, please indicate your level of satisfaction by putting a number in the box.

5 - Strongly Agree    4 - Agree    3 - Not Sure    2 - Disagree    1 - Strongly Disagree

*If you disagree with any aspect of a policy, we would especially value your comments to help inform the Plan. Feel free to include additional paper if required.*

Vision & Objectives	Score
<b>Comments:</b>	
Sustainable Development	Score for S1
<b>Comments:</b>	



Housing	Score for H1	Score for H2
<b>Comments:</b>		
Design and Character	Score for D1	Score for D2
<b>Comments:</b>		
Traffic and Transport	Score for T1	Score for T2
<b>Comments:</b>		
Business and Employment	Score for B1	Score for B2
<b>Comments:</b>		
Environment	Score for E1	Score for E2
<b>Score for E3</b>	Score for E4	
<b>Comments:</b>		
Community	Score for C1	Score for C2
<b>Comments:</b>		
<b>Do you have any comments on the community aspirations?</b>		

If you would like a member of the steering group to contact you to discuss your comments further, please provide an e-mail address or phone number:

E-mail address: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone number: \_\_\_\_\_

Just a reminder that the final deadline for feedback is 5pm on Monday 6<sup>th</sup> June 2016. Please e-mail to  
[REDACTED] or post to [REDACTED]

**Thank-you**

**Scothern Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group**





# SCOTHERN PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Laura Richardson

T: [REDACTED]  
E: [scothernpc@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:scothernpc@yahoo.co.uk)  
W: [www.scothern.org.uk](http://www.scothern.org.uk)

22 April 2016

## ADDRESSED TO STATUTORY AGENCIES LISTED BELOW

## TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

Dear Sir/Madam

### SCOTHERN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

As part of the requirements of the Localism Act 2011, Scothern Parish Council is undertaking pre-submission consultation of its Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). As a statutory consultee we are seeking your views.

The pre-submission consultation runs for a period of six weeks from Saturday 23 April 2016 to Monday 6 June 2016 at 5pm.

The plan and supporting evidence base can be viewed here:

[http://www.scothern.org.uk/Neighbourhood\\_Plan.html](http://www.scothern.org.uk/Neighbourhood_Plan.html)

Please send any representations to [REDACTED] or to [REDACTED]

All responses must be received by **17:00 on Monday 6 June 2016**.

Yours faithfully

Cathryn Nicoll (Mrs)

Chair – Scothern Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Appendix C: Letter to non-statutory consultees – including landowners of proposed housing site allocations.



# SCOTHERN PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Laura Richardson



T: [REDACTED]

E: [scothernpc@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:scothernpc@yahoo.co.uk)

W: [www.scothern.org.uk](http://www.scothern.org.uk)

22 April 2016

Dear Sir / Madam,

## SCOTHERN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

As you may be aware Scothern Parish Council is producing a Neighbourhood Plan for the village. I am pleased to inform you that we have now reached a significant milestone and are publishing for consultation our Pre-Submission Plan.

Everyone with a connection to Scothern is invited to submit comments during the consultation period that runs from Saturday 23 April 2016 to Monday 6 June 2016.

The document and associated evidence base can be found on the Parish Council website ([http://www.scothern.org.uk/Neighbourhood\\_Plan.html](http://www.scothern.org.uk/Neighbourhood_Plan.html)). Copies are also available in the Garden Centre, Ellison Boulsters and in the Methodist and St. Germain's churches. You are also invited to attend a 'drop in session' on Saturday 7 May 2016 that will take place in the Methodist church from 10am – 3pm.

Please send any comments to [REDACTED] or to [REDACTED]

All responses must be received by **17:00 on Monday 6 June 2016**.

Yours faithfully

Cathryn Nicoll (Mrs)  
Chair Scothern Parish Council and Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group

## Appendix D: Letter sent to landowners of proposed Local Green Space designations



# SCOTHERN PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Laura Richardson  
reply to:

Please

[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
T: [Redacted]

E: [scothernpc@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:scothernpc@yahoo.co.uk)  
W: [www.scothern.org.uk](http://www.scothern.org.uk)

22 April 2016

Dear Sir / Madam

## SCOTHERN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

As you may be aware Scothern Parish Council is producing a Neighbourhood Plan for the village.

Following extensive community consultation and a review of the evidence base, a draft plan, called the Pre-Submission Plan, has been prepared and is being consulted on for a six-week period.

As part of the Scothern Neighbourhood Plan, we are seeking to introduce a Local Green Spaces Policy which proposes that five areas of local green space be designated in accordance with the provisions of Paragraphs 76 and 77 of the National Planning Policy Framework:

*"Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.*

*The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:*

- *where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;*
- *where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and*
- *where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land."*

We are writing to inform you that part of your land is proposed to be designated as local green space. The full report and justification for this proposal can be accessed on the Parish Council website ( [http://www.scothern.org.uk/Neighbourhood\\_Plan.html](http://www.scothern.org.uk/Neighbourhood_Plan.html)) and for Policy E2: Local Green Space in the Neighbourhood Plan.

If you have any comments about this proposal, please send your comments to [Redacted] or add them to your feedback form.


The formal consultation period will run from Saturday 23 April 2016 to Monday 6 June 2016. The document and associated evidence base can be found on the Parish Council website and copies are also available in the Garden Centre, Ellison Boulsters and the Methodist and St Germain's churches.

You are also invited to attend a 'drop in session' on Saturday 7 May that will take place at the Methodist church from 10am - 3pm.

All responses must be received by **17:00 on Monday 6 June 2016.**



Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Cathryn Nicoll', with a horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.

Cathryn Nicoll (Mrs)  
Chair Scothern Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group





# SCOTHERN PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Laura Richardson  
reply to:

Please

[Redacted]

T: [Redacted]

E: [scothernpc@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:scothernpc@yahoo.co.uk)  
W: [www.scothern.org.uk](http://www.scothern.org.uk)

22 April 2016

Dear Sir / Madam,

## SCOTHERN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

As you may be aware Scothern Parish Council is producing a Neighbourhood Plan for the village.

Following extensive community consultation and a review of the evidence base a draft plan, called the Pre-Submission Plan, has been prepared and is being consulted on for a six-week period.

As part of the Scothern Neighbourhood Plan, we are seeking to introduce a Local Heritage Assets Policy which proposes protection of 16 buildings as 'locally listed buildings' in recognition of their value as irreplaceable historic assets. These buildings have been identified as they contribute to the quality and character of the local environment by enhancing the street scene and the local distinctiveness of the village.

By identifying these assets as 'locally listed buildings', the Plan seeks to ensure that their special status is taken into account when future decisions are made which may affect these buildings. For example, alterations should respect the character and interest of the building and any works carried out should use appropriate materials and retain any features of architectural or historic interest. Furthermore, proposals for development which may impact upon these locally listed buildings must demonstrate how they will protect or enhance the heritage asset.

We are writing to inform you that your building is proposed to be designated as a Local Heritage Asset. The full report and justification for this proposal can be accessed on the Parish Council website ([http://www.scothern.org.uk/Neighbourhood\\_Plan.html](http://www.scothern.org.uk/Neighbourhood_Plan.html)) and for the Policy D2: Local Heritage Assets in the Neighbourhood Plan.

If you have any comments about this proposal, please can you send your comments to [Redacted] or add additional comments to your feedback form.

The formal consultation period will run from Saturday 23 April 2016 to Monday 6 June 2016. The document and associated evidence base can be found on the Parish Council website, copies are also available in the Garden Centre, Ellison Boulsters and the Methodist and St. Germain's church.

You are also invited to attend a 'drop in session' on Saturday 7 May that will take place at the Methodist Church from 10am – 3pm.

All responses must be received by **17:00 on Monday 6 June 2016.**

Yours sincerely

Cathryn Nicoll (Mrs)  
Chair Scothern Parish Council and Neighbourhood Steering Group