

Policy ref	Response from	Comments	NPC response
E1 Green Wedge	<p data-bbox="461 276 645 427">West-Lindsey District Council</p> <p data-bbox="461 475 645 667">Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (GLNP)</p>	<p data-bbox="672 276 1684 347">Add wording that developments in the identified green wedge (maps 2, 2a and 6) will be carefully controlled.</p> <p data-bbox="672 475 1684 667">Suggested wording could be “It is also considered that this area forms an important green corridor to the north east of Lincoln for migration of wildlife and connects with other green corridors identified within the emerging Local Plan, making an important component of the wider ecological network”</p>	<p data-bbox="1729 276 1832 308">Agreed</p> <p data-bbox="1729 459 2078 595">Agreed: This comment applies to 5.2 and requests the deletion of the word insects.</p>
E2 Settlement Breaks	Examiner	Is this necessary given the contents of CLLP review.	<p data-bbox="1729 711 2083 1241">This provides additional support and clarification; to ensure clear demarcation between Nettleham and Sudbrooke; Nettleham and North Greetwell. This is an important broad corridor and therefore retains the distinctive characteristics of each village. This follows from settlement breaks in the adopted NP for our adjacent village of Sudbrooke .</p> <p data-bbox="1729 1249 2078 1385">Other adopted plans with settlement breaks or green gaps include Langold Neighbourhood Plan Made</p>

	<p>West-Lindsey District Council</p> <p>Fytche-Taylor</p>	<p>Green wedge boundary needs to align with the CLLP.</p> <p>The neighborhood plan review has not undertaken any scrutiny or provided any evidence for the allocation of the Settlement Breaks and the Settlement Breaks appear skewed to specific landowners (one of our clients).</p> <p>Nettleham is a Lincoln Fringe Village. The recently adopted CLLP has allocated appropriate sites within the village or the current plan. In the next call for sites, settlement breaks such as those proposed would unnecessarily restrict sensible extensions to allocated sites and potential appropriate future allocations and divert these to more inappropriate locations. The neighbourhood plan is basically seeking to unnecessarily restrict and prevent future appropriate allocations without justification. We have recommended to our clients that where the settlement break prevents phase 2 of their site that should the Neighbourhood Plan proceed as currently drafted they should pursue legal action.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Settlement Break restrictions on development are not, currently needed due to the level of protection already given by the adopted CLLP and are unnecessary.</p>	<p>2020 (page 48-50) hodsock-02-neighbourhood-plan-referendum-version.pdf (bassetlaw.gov.uk)</p> <p>Walkeringham Neighbourhood plan Made 2019 (page 39-40)</p> <p>Walkeringham Neighbourhood Plan (bassetlaw.gov.uk)</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>The CLLP defines housing development sites for development until 2040, this NP does not seek to change those sites.</p> <p>We are not aware of a Phase 2 but this would need to comply with the CLLP at the time.</p>
--	---	---	---

		Given that the CLLP has recently been through examination with robust evidence for the allocated green wedges, offers further protection to the land already in question and in the absence of any suitable justification or evidence, policy E2 would be wholly inappropriate and unreasonable.	
E3 Local green spaces	WLDC	<p>Policy reworded to:</p> <p>1. The Neighbourhood Plan designates the following locations as Local Green Spaces as shown on Maps 3 and 4 and individually on Maps 3(1) to 3(21) with explanation given in the supporting document Appendix B: Local Green Space Justification.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>We do not agree as it is considered that the current maps provide adequate detail.</p> <p>Re: Map 4: Romangate: Suggested additional features for designation are drainage and water retention ponds and therefore do not meet the definition of Local Green Spaces</p>
E4 Historic Environment	Fytche-Taylor	<p>The proposed policy states "<i>Development proposals which would directly affect a heritage asset or its setting, as identified within the Nettleham Conservation Area Appraisal, should be accompanied with a Heritage Impact Assessment</i>".</p> <p>This statement is incorrect for the requirements of a Heritage impact Assessment. A Heritage Impact Assessment is needed for any application that directly affects a heritage asset or its setting whether that is within or not within the conservation area.</p>	Agreed reference to Nettleham Conservation area should be dropped as unnecessary
E5 Major and Minor green corridors	Examiner	<p>How have the buffer widths been selected?</p> <p>Where is the justification behind buffer width distances?</p> <p>.</p>	The principle of these has been established in the Bassetlaw Local Plan where the Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust proposed the 15m and 30m buffer for the Green Corridors within the Local Plan

	West-Lindsey District Council	<p>3. Mandatory BNG requires development to deliver more for nature, setting a requirement to increase biodiversity by a minimum of 10% compared to the baseline. Consideration should be given in NP to raising this requirement for developments in Nettleham.</p> <p>4. Ensure that creation of green corridors in NP's allocated housing sites link with green corridors.</p> <p>Policy reworded to:</p> <p>1. Major and minor Green Corridors, as identified on Map 5 and Maps 5a to 5e, have been.....</p> <p>To help identification of green corridors it would help if they could be numbered and also justification provided as to why they merited recognition. Something needed on similar lines to the justification provided for identification of local green spaces.</p> <p>Delete Biodiversity Corridors from key and replace with Minor Green Corridors with green line.</p> <p>Important to refer here to availability of more detailed maps showing corridors and footpaths in Section 14 List of Maps.</p> <p>What about showing those proposals identified in the excellent Ecology Report?</p> <p>What about the potential for improving linkages between green corridors, particularly where only small gaps exist?</p> <p>How about showing potential linkages on relevant maps with a similar requirement that relevant proposals contribute to their provision also?</p>	<p>As BNG is now mandatory it would seem unnecessary to raise it in the NP</p> <p>Green corridors are detailed in the Ecology Report Appendix c with justification</p> <p>Maps - agreed</p>
	Fytche-Taylor	<p>There is insufficient evidence and justification for the selection of the proposed green corridors with one corridor being a major A road to the north part of the ring road (A15)).</p> <p>The policy is unreasonable and overly onerous to expect all proposals (emphasis added) to be supported by an ecological study when they are located in a buffer zone. This would mean that even house holder extensions would have to provide an ecological appraisal which is unreasonable.</p>	<p>These are evidenced in the Ecology report</p> <p>Agreed, E5.2 should read “all new development proposals...”</p>

		<p>The Neighbourhood Plan Group (NPG) in their own response when this was raised by West-Lindsey District Council in the Consultation Statement have stated "the green corridors have, in places, lost their status due to overdevelopment or inappropriate development".</p> <p>The proposed policy states that green corridors have been "identified for their strong contribution to the character of Nettleham.</p> <p>There is insufficient justification as to why the green corridors have been chosen and the NPGs proposals... their own response would seem to contradict the policy as to why green corridors have been allocated. If they have lost their status, how can they have a strong contribution to the character?</p>	<p>In some places <u>some</u> green corridors may have lost their status but that does not invalidate all the designated green corridors.</p>
--	--	---	---

D1 Parking Standards	<p>Examiner</p> <p>West-Lindsey District Council</p>	<p>Justification of higher standards</p> <p>Car parking standards are set out in the CLLP Appendix 2. The NP requires more parking spaces for 1 and 5 or more bedroomed accommodation. The NP needs to provide justification for this.</p> <p>D1 Part 3, experience suggests that lowering standards could present problems.</p>	<p>Nettleham has a higher level of car ownership of 4 per household (or more) cars than Lincs County or West Lindsey (see table accompanying D1). Estate roads tend to be quite narrow and this is an attempt to minimise parking on the footpaths and in the roads. We see more older children (living with parents for longer) having cars for social and work commuting. We would expect a 5 bed house would have a sufficiently large plot to accommodate parking for 4 cars.</p>
----------------------	--	--	---

	Pickwell Family (Jamie Mather)	Not in accordance with the CLLP policy S49 appendix 2 and should be amended accordingly .	It is proposed that the standards could be eased for older peoples accommodation such as care homes as they will not have family members living with them. CLLP 2023: S49: Other considerations: In areas where there is a made Neighbourhood Plan containing residential parking standards, these will take precedent over the standards contained in Appendix 2: Car Parking Standards(Page 212)
D2 Parking standards for additional bedrooms to existing dwellings	Examiner West-Lindsey District Council	Will the contents always be practicable and could prevent otherwise acceptable development coming forward. This policy would be difficult to justify for all applications. It could be more onerous than standards for a new build property. For example, a 3 bed detached house having 3 spaces would need 4 spaces if it proposed a fourth bedroom. A 4 bed roomed new home only needs 3 spaces.	This is consistent with Policy D1. It does not seek to restrict development just to ensure that with any new extensions proposed that there is adequate off road car parking available. The policy makes it clear that the additional spaces

	<p>Lincs County Council</p> <p>Fytche- Taylor</p>	<p>We recommend that Policies D1 and D2 (Parking Standards) are modified to allow for flexibility. Within Lincolnshire Development Roads and Sustainable Drainage Design Approach, LCC recommend parking guidance rather than standards, with each development proposal to be considered on its merits.</p> <p>An existing property in most circumstances is unable to extend their plot to accommodate parking requirements. The NPG here is restricting minor extensions without significant justification and unreasonably penalising their own residents. The policy is unreasonable.</p> <p>Extending a property for a bedroom does not automatically lead to an increase in parking requirement.</p> <p>For example:</p> <p>An extra bedroom could be required for a newborn. This would not mean an extra parking space would be required. An extra bedroom <i>may</i> be required for a hobby room for the existing occupants. This would not require an extra parking space.</p> <p>There are many real-world reasons why residents wish to add additional bedrooms without the need for additional parking. Families' circumstances change throughout the years. A couple could live in a 5-bed house and <i>have</i> 1 car and a family could live in a 3-bed house with 5 cars. The number of bedrooms in a house does not necessarily correlate to the number of cars.</p> <p>The CLLP has a suite of climate change policies and would encourage the adaptation of existing buildings. The NPG should be supporting their residents in adapting their homes.</p> <p>Developments in the past, particularly in the 90s and 00s where "sustainable transport" was promoted, allowed for insufficient parking when developing housing estates and did not consider rural areas where there is ultimately a reliance on the private vehicle due to inadequate bus provision.</p> <p>The CLLP row includes parking standards in order for new developments to be built with an appropriate amount of parking. To retrospectively require this of existing properties is difficult to justify and will, in many cases be unachievable.</p>	<p>should not exceed the requirements of D1.</p> <p>The parking standards proposed in D1 reflect the standards already established in the 2016 adopted Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan policy D3.</p>
--	---	--	--

D3Water resources			
D4 Design of new development and design code principles	Examiner	Expand on the density figure which is low and may restrict delivery of strategic housing target for the village.	Reflects local density and retains local character of the village by maintaining historic standards. Two developments recently completed have achieved 20dph: Baker Drive and Stirlin -Lodge Lane developments. Nettleham has over-delivered above the strategic allocation in CLLP 2017 and 2023. Whilst still maintaining the 20dph identified in the 2016 Nettleham Neighbourhood Plan as typical of the newer estate developments in the village
	West-Lindsey District Council	Part 2a The Linelands allocated housing site in the centre of the village has a CLLP indicative density of 78 dph. The density requirement should be reconsidered. The Nettleham Character Assessment is useful in terms of describing the existing character of an area. It also identifies several character areas with existing features and defines views and vistas.	Linelands was originally designated for 30 places for a care facility for older people. This is no longer needed as appropriate accommodation has been built in Nettleham Parish by LACE at sites off Baker

	<p>Fytche-Taylor</p>	<p>Based on the CA, Policy D4 should set design code requirements for each of the character areas.</p> <p>Part 2(a) states that "The design-led approach should:</p> <p>a) achieve a density not exceeding 20dph (in Nettleham village) and having regard to the type and nature of uses proposed and the site context. in relation to the site's surrounding area, taking into account:</p> <p>I. Location setting; II local distinctiveness and built character. including the prevailing and/or emerging form and proportion of development; III public transport and cycle accessibility, taking into account current and future levels of planned public transport/cycle infrastructure;</p> <p>Firstly "Nettleham Village" is not defined so it is assumed that this is the entire Parish area.</p> <p>Secondly, before the current neighbourhood plan was adopted, the draft of the adopted Neighbourhood Plan published 31/01/15 and presented to the Neighbourhood Plan Examiner, contained a policy for the Design of new development and this was policy 0-9 in the draft and policy D-6 in the made plan.</p> <p>Initially the proposed wording with regards to density of housing was as follows:</p> <p><i>"Housing densities must reflect existing density of housing in the locality and must not exceed 20 per HA"</i></p> <p>This was changed by the examiner to:</p> <p><i>..Designing housing proposals to reflect existing residential densities in the locality of the scheme"</i></p>	<p>Drive and at Romangate. Its central location still makes it ideal housing location for older people with limited mobility.</p> <p>Nettleham village is shown on the maps.</p> <p>The housing densities in the locality of the CLLP identified development sites do not exceed 20dph</p>
--	----------------------	---	--

	<p>Pickwell Family (Jamie Mather)</p>	<p>The reason for the change, the examiner explained that as drafted the approach is prescriptive and may prevent innovative and attractive proposals coming forward. The successful incorporation of these sites into the wider geography of the plan area will be as much about the way they are arranged and designed in relation to the wider landscape and existing dwellings as the mathematical yield of the site itself. On this basis I have recommended a modification that provides a degree of flexibility on this matter".</p> <p>Given the examiner's modifications and reasoning, it would be unreasonable in the review to re-introduce a matter that has already been deemed obstructive to innovative and design-led schemes.</p> <p>Furthermore, the NPPF at paragraph 125(c) advises Local Planning Authorities to refuse applications which they consider fail to make efficient use of land. One density range is not appropriate for the Parish area.</p> <p>The NPPF also states "<i>it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site</i>".</p> <p>Paragraph 6.57 of the SNP in providing background for policy 07 which directly links into policy 06 states that '<i>Older people will be looking to downsize into high quality but smaller, higher efficiency buildings which more appropriately meet their needs. In addition, there is a need for lower cost starter homes for younger people. There is not perceived to be a great need for family homes to be built, as the ones that exist will be freed up by older people moving to the new smaller more suitable homes, which this policy would make available. It is therefore necessary to ensure that new housing development proposals take this demographic situation fully into account</i>".</p> <p>However, if this is to be addressed, it is likely to be on sites with a higher density than 20dph. To provide required smaller houses on larger plots to reduce the density, would increase the price meaning they would no longer be a downsizing option for older people. nor would it encourage young people to remain in or join the village.</p> <p>2a of D4 should be amended to clarify that it is a gross density of 20dph which is not to be exceeded which in accordance with the capacity of figures provided for site 11</p>	<p>Agreed it is gross density</p>
--	---	---	-----------------------------------

D5 Climate change mitigation and adaption	Examiner	Suggests no need for the EV charging points as this is a matter of national policy.	Building Regulations 44J: Minimum standard for EV is 7kw: we are reflecting and reinforcing existing/present national standards: useful aide-memoir. Non-strategic Policy 18 CLLP 2023: Electric Vehicle Charging
	West-Lindsey District Council	1 a) b) How do they demonstrate? Examples? Good practice? References?c) How would they demonstrate? Would they need to deliver identified projects? But which ones? d) What forms of renewable energy technology are there? e) Examples needed, such as water butts?	Noted
	Pickwell Family (Jamie Mather)	Criterion I of the D5 repeats the requirement for provision of a minimum 7Kw vehicle charger at each building as contained in D9 this criterion is inappropriate and should be removed.	Specified by Building reg 44J
D6 Housing development	Examiner	Is the final part of the policy needed given the CLLP content and other policies in the submitted Plan?	D6: paragraph 3 should be retained for clarification and emphasis.
	West-Lindsey District Council	Show Green Wedge and Settlement Breaks on this Map also: Re-reference sites as given in CLLP WL/NHAM/024A not WL/NHAM/24A WL/NHAM/034 not WL/NHAM/033 WL/NHAM/011 not WL/NHAM/11 WL/NHAM/018 not WL/NHAM/18 WL/NHAM/010 not WL/NHAM/10	Agreed

	GLNP	<p>Add site reference WL/NHAM/032</p> <p>Map 7: Development Sites Re-reference sites as above.</p> <p>Map 7a: Development Sites WL/NHAM/033 not WL/NHAM/034. This site excludes Megg House. All allocated sites shown on Maps 7 and 7a need to replicate those in CLLP 2023.</p> <p>3.The countryside is also covered by CLLP and NP green wedge policies and NP settlement break policy. Need to cross reference to these here and ensure no policy conflict with any.</p> <p>Add part 4 Housing development will be supported subject to compliance with relevant design codes in the NP. This could be strengthened by including the wording <i>Protecting natural assets, enhancing the natural environment, biodiversity and the ecological networks of which they are part.</i></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Agreed</p>
D7 Housing mix and affordable and specialist housing	West-Lindsey District Council	<p>Recommend adding these paragraphs to a new subsection in Housing Type and Mix section. The Provision of Custom and Self-Build Housing 6.67 Self-build and custom housebuilding covers a wide spectrum, from projects where individuals are involved in building or managing the construction of their home from beginning to end, to projects where</p>	<p>Covered by CLLP 2023 NS 24 and national policy.</p>

	<p>Fytche-Taylor</p>	<p>individuals commission their home, making key design and layout decisions, but the home is built ready for occupation ('turnkey'). Custom and self-build housing can secure affordable homes for local people enabling them to access home ownership, live in homes designed to meet their needs, and stay in their local areas.</p> <p>6.68 Central government guidance encourages the inclusion of self-build and custom housebuilding policies within neighbourhood plans, and Local Authorities are required to promote this alongside keeping a register of self-build housing demand. West Lindsey District Council's register indicates that there is a need for self-build and custom housebuilding within Nettleham, and this will likely increase over time.</p> <p>6.69 The NP encourages the provision of custom and self-build housing and welcomes the provision of multiple plots on allocated housing sites. The provision of at least 5% custom or self-build housing on these sites would be particularly welcomed.</p> <p>6.70 All custom and self-build housing proposals are subject to complying with relevant design codes in the NP. Add requirement for provision of such housing to individual housing allocation site policies. See comments on Policies D8, D9, and D10.</p> <p>Add new part requirement to policy D5- 5. Housing development will be supported subject to compliance with relevant design codes in the NP.</p> <p><i>Point 1 states that "Nettleham has an unevenly balanced housing market with a higher proportion of larger 4 and 5 bed room properties in comparison to smaller sized dwellings. To help rebalance the mix of housing types and sizes, development proposals for 10 or more units (per site) should demonstrate that at least 25% of the total number of dwellings are for affordable housing which shall be a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom affordable dwellings. •</i></p> <p>The percentage requirements for affordable housing are set within the adopted CLLP and does not need repeating. Furthermore, the requirements for the affordable housing needs should be</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Affordable housing is specified by CLLP, this plan adds local context</p>
--	----------------------	---	--

		<p>assessed by the Local Planning Authority and the Housing Strategy Team at the point of a planning application to accurately capture and deliver for needs in place at the time.</p> <p>This part of the policy should be amended to provide flexibility, or risks resulting in affordable housing provision for larger families being omitted from any future development. The draft plan's approach is counter intuitive and as written, the policy assumes that those in need of affordable housing only require smaller homes - this is prejudicial and plainly not the case when considering the evidence set out in the recently tested Central Lincs SHMA and Housing Needs Assessment. If this approach is adopted it would discriminate against multi-generational families, large families and kinship families etc from accessing new affordable homes.</p>	

D8 Land North of Lechlar close	<p>Examiner</p> <p>WLDC</p>	<p>Maximum dwelling yields are proposed, examiner proposes approximate yields are quoted.</p> <p>Map 8: Site 24a Land North of Lechler Close For consistency and to avoid confusion, give NP allocated sites same site reference as given by CLLP. Site 24A becomes WL/NHAM/024A Boundary should mirror that already shown for site in CLLP 2023. Remove Developable reference. Replace Biodiversity Corridors entry with Green Corridors How about extending green corridors to link with those outside the site. Policy D8: Land North of Lechler Close (Site 24A) – Design Code and Development Principles Design Codes welcomed. Trees alongside new roads requirement supported. Part 2 remove this wording...and this should be agreed by the Parish and District Council How about a code to help protect existing trees, where applicable?</p>	<p>In accordance with numbers in CLLP 2023. 72 which reflects local housing density</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>This should be the responsibility of the West</p>
--------------------------------	-----------------------------	--	--

		<p>Add new requirement to policy:</p> <p>The provision of custom and self-build housing on this site will be supported subject to compliance with relevant design codes. Proposals to deliver at least 5% of the total number of dwellings on this site as custom or self-build homes will be particularly welcomed.</p>	<p>Lindsey Tree Officer. At present we are reliant on national policy which is changing hopefully to give more protection to existing hedgerows and trees. Again this is subject to CLLP 2023 NS 24 and national policy.</p>
D9Land behind Brookfield Avenue	<p>Examiner</p> <p>West-Lindsey District Council</p>	<p>Maximum dwelling yields are proposed, examiner proposes approximate yields are quoted</p> <p>Map 9: Site 11 – Land behind Brookfield Avenue For consistency and to avoid confusion, give NP allocated site same site reference as given by CLLP. Site 11 to WL/NHAM/011 Boundary should mirror those already shown for site in CLLP 2023. Site access on to Brookfield Avenue needs including. Remove Developable reference. Replace Biodiversity Corridors entry with Green Corridors Policy D9: Land behind Brookfield Avenue (Site 11) – Design Code and Development Principles Same comments as for Policy D8 Add new requirement to policy: 3. The provision of custom and self-build housing on this site will be supported subject to compliance with relevant design codes. Proposals to deliver at least 5% of the total number of dwellings on this site as custom or self-build homes will be particularly welcomed.</p> <p>To be consistent with the CLLP, Policy D9 should be amended to allocate site 11 for approximately 59 dwellings rather than establishing a cap.</p>	<p>In accordance with numbers in the CLLP 2023 = 57, number reflects local housing density</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Subject to NS 24 CLLP 2023 and national policy</p> <p>The CLLP 2023 calls for 57on this site</p>

	<p>Pickwell Family (Jamie Mather)</p>	<p>D9 k requires provision of a charging point of at least 7kw for each property or to the latest best practice guidance for each property. This conflicts with the CLLP NS18 which provides guidance, but is not prescriptive. Therefore this is inconsistent with D9 k. D9 r requires a new pedestrian footway, cycle links to Brookfield avenue. This conflicts with the local plan S80 which requires a link to the south only.</p> <p>There is no way of connecting as required without crossing third party land meaning the requirements are undeliverable and should be removed. D9 t this should be removed as it requires vehicular access to Brookfield Ave. D9 u Requires provision of trees alongside new roads at a density of 1 tree per 2 houses which is considered overly prescriptive and should be removed as there is already a requirement for street trees within D4 which is considered appropriate. There is no justification for additional or more specific requirements to be imposed in relation to site 11.</p> <p>D9 -2 It is not considered appropriate to require the Parish Councils approval of the plan and no formal mechanism for this.</p>	<p>We disagree this is a minimum standard set by building regs 44J see D5 i</p> <p>There are properties for sale which could facilitate site access. Other developers have created vehicular access through purchase and demolition of existing property. E.g. Trueloves: Land behind 72 Scothern Lane. This link will avoid the need for residents to use their cars to visit the village centre and shorten their journeys so adding to the sustainability of the site, but we accept that the developer cannot be compelled to provide access over third party land and will reword to say “the developer will use their best endeavours to provide access...”</p> <p>The tree planting density reflects the character of the adjoining estates. We have</p>
--	---------------------------------------	---	--

			approximately 7,500 trees in Nettleham village.
D10 Land at Sudbrooke Lane	Examiner	Maximum dwelling yields are proposed, examiner proposes approximate yields are quoted.	CLLP 2023 proposes 63 for this site which a yield of 20dph and reflects the housing density in the adjacent developments.
	West-Lindsey District Council	<p>Map 10 Site 10 – Land at Sudbrooke Lane For consistency and to avoid confusion, give NP allocated site same site reference as given by CLLP. Site 18 to WL/NHAM/018 Boundary should mirror those already shown for site in CLLP 2023. Top tip end needs including. Remove Developable reference. Replace Biodiversity Corridors entry with Green Corridors Policy D10: Land at Sudbrooke Lane (Site 10) – Design Code and Development Principles Same comments as for Policy D8 Add new requirement to policy: The provision of custom and self-build housing on this site will be supported subject to compliance with relevant design codes. Proposals to deliver at least 5% of the total number of dwellings on this site as custom or self-build homes will be particularly welcomed. Add new requirement to policy.</p>	Agreed
	Anglian Water	With reference to the Larch Avenue site in the Local Plan, (Sudbrooke Lane – Site 10, page 70 onwards of the NNPr) we note that part p) refers to the proximity of the nearby sewage plant. It is therefore imperative that the Masterplan considers the site layout, boundary treatment (parts v and x) and green and blue infrastructure provision to maximise the buffer to the existing facility. As noted above local growth as allocated in the Local Plan and supported by NNPr policy would direct additional wastewater from new residents to the WRC. That growth may towards the end of the Local Plan period may need the WRC to be expanded to cater for that growth	As previous comments
			Agreed this will be added to the policy

<p>D 11 Land at Linelands</p>	<p>Examiner</p> <p>WLDC</p>	<p>Maximum dwelling yields are proposed, examiner proposes approximate yields are quoted.</p> <p>Map 11 Land at Linelands For consistency and to avoid confusion, give NP allocated site same site reference as given by CLLP. Site 10 WL/NHAM/010 Boundary should mirror those already shown for site in CLLP 2023.The site boundary is different to that shown in CLLP 2023 for instance Church View entrance. Remove Developable reference.? Replace Biodiversity Corridors entry with Green Corridors Policy D11: Land at Linelands, All Saints Lane – Design Code and Development Principles Design Codes welcomed. Orientation of dwellings ...supported but only where feasible.</p>	<p>There is no longer a requirement for 30 dwellings here as higher density apartment provision for older people has now been provided off Baker Drive and Romangate. This site is still ideal for older people with limited mobility as it is close to the village centre, we therefore propose a less ambitious development, we would want to see a limit in character with the area not to exceed 20dph</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>
<p>S1 Local community facilities</p>	<p>WLDC</p>	<p>Policy S1 – Local Community Facilities These community facilities need to be shown on a map.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

<p>Other comments</p>	<p>West-Lindsey District Council</p>	<p>12 Glossary All the terms defined in the glossary should appear in the main body of the NP. But there appears to be no mention in NP to, for example, greenspace, or local centre. Appendix B Local Green Space Justification Policy E2 is now Policy E3. Also, wording has changed with reference to maps.</p> <p>Appendix C Nettleham Ecology Report Actual document titled Appendix E Ecological Strategy This is an excellent piece of supporting work to the NP. It says that there are plenty of opportunities to enrich the Nettleham landscape for the benefit of residents and wildlife. To help achieve this, the report proposes schemes for example: to create and enhance walking corridors, woodland improvements, and identification of broad vistas and panoramas. The NP provides a superb opportunity to help deliver the report's proposals. Some are already taken on board by the NP but it is felt that other proposals could be included too.</p> <p>14 List of Maps These are helpful maps and should become policy maps and be referred to in relevant policy (see earlier Policy E1 and E5 comments). So, The Wider Green Wedge map is referenced Map 2a The same should be done for the green corridor related maps. So, Major Green Corridor – is referenced Map 5a Minor Green Corridors in Nettleham Village – Map 5b Minor Green Corridors to the South of Nettleham Village – Map 5c Footpaths around Nettleham Village – Map 5d Composite maps with Footpaths and Minor Green Corridors - Map 5e</p> <p>Individual Local Green Space Maps (LGS1-21) These are also helpful maps and should become policy maps and be referred to in relevant policy (see earlier Policy E3 comment). So, Rename maps and give them their policy reference eg 1 Mulsanne Park becomes Policy Map 3(1), 21 Gibson Road Arc becomes Policy Map 3 (21) etc Furthermore, for consistency ensure the full name of each local green space appears the same in: policy, map title, and on site itself eg Wolsey</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--	---------------------------

	Lincs County Council	<p>Way Link called Wolsey Way – Sanderson Road Link on Map title and on site itself but currently not in policy.</p> <p>Additions to NP How about having policies on?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -protecting important views and vistas taken from the Character Assessment?- as well as local green spaces, identifying and protecting nature habitats (biodiversity) in open countryside such as woodlands and watercourses. - in terms of encouraging active travel, it would be good to see the NP have a section on walking and cycling. This could seek to identify, protect, and improve both existing and proposed routes e.g. rights of way, permissible paths etc. The NP already includes a map showing the relationship between footpaths and green corridors. - the NP group has raised concerns about protecting notable trees in the village and on allocated sites not covered by TPOs. How about policies to help address these issues? <p>The suggestion at paragraph 6.4 that CIL can be used to replace a school playground to create staff parking (a pre-existing ‘problem’ unrelated to development) seems to ignore the wording of Regulation 59C of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended in this instance in 2013). This regulation states: <i>‘A local council must use CIL receipts passed to it in accordance with regulation 59A or 59B to support the development of the local council’s area...’</i></p> <p>The suggestion to change the playground at the school should also be considered against Section 77 of The School Standards and Framework Act 1998 which controls change of use of playing fields. Finally, it should be carefully considered in terms of its practical implications for the school and its pupils.</p> <p>Finally, paragraph 11.2, , specifically the section: ‘...compensating for additional development burden...’, should be reworded mindful of Regulation 59C (as above).</p>	<p>This is a late stage to introduce these additions, but they will be considered for the next review.</p> <p>Agreed, it was a suggestion as part of a list from consultation with residents and any use of CIL money would clearly be subject to consultation with LCC and Regulations.</p>
--	----------------------	--	--