

# Fiskerton Draft Consultation Statement



## Neighbourhood Plan

## **Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan**

An underlying principle in this Neighbourhood Plan is to have local people actively involved in ongoing consultation on important planning issues. The Neighbourhood Plan steering group has been committed in undertaking consistent, transparent, effective and inclusive periods of community consultation throughout the development of the Neighbourhood Plan and associated evidence base.

### **1.1 Why have we produced this statement?**

The Neighbourhood Plan Regulations require that, when a Neighbourhood Plan is submitted for examination, a statement should also be submitted setting out details of those consulted, how they were consulted, the main issues and concerns raised and how these have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Plan.

Legal Basis:

Section 15(2) of part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations sets out that, a consultation statement should be a document containing the following:

- Details if the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan;
- Explanation of how they were consulted;
- Summary of the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
- Description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

### **1.2 Our Consultation Statement**

This statement outlines the ways in which have led to the production of the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan in terms of consultation with local residents, businesses in the parish, stakeholders and statutory consultees.

In addition, this statement will provide a summary and, in some cases, detailed descriptions of the numerous consultation events and other ways in which residents and stakeholders were able to influence the content of the Plan. The appendices detail certain procedures and events that were undertaken by the Neighbourhood Plan group, including; producing questionnaires, school events and running consultation events.

### **1.3 The Neighbourhood Plan Designation**

As part of the process, a Neighbourhood Plan area needs to be designated in order to allow a scope of work to be produced. The neighbourhood plan area covers the entire Parish of Fiskerton and allowed the Parish Council to act as the quantifying body to lead and manage the Neighbourhood Plan process.





As previously stated, WLDC consulted people who live, work or carry out business in the area about the Neighbourhood Plan designation request along with the proposed area. The full application and relevant information on how to make representations was made available on the Council's website: <https://www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building/neighbourhood-planning/all-neighbourhood-plans-in-west-lindsey/fiskerton-neighbourhood-plan/> and within the Lincolnshire Echo and local newsletter.

During the six-week consultation period, no objections were received to the proposed Neighbourhood Plan area and on that basis, WLDC granted Fiskerton Parish Council the right to proceed with a Neighbourhood Plan.

#### 1.4 The Consultation Process

The steering group engaged with the whole community in establishing our issues, opportunities, future vision and our objectives for the next 20 years.

The benefits of involving a wide range of people and businesses within the process, included:

- More focus on priorities identified by our community;
- Influencing the provision and sustainability of local services and facilities;
- Enhanced sense of community empowerment;
- An improved local understanding of the planning process; and
- Increased support for our Neighbourhood Plan through the sense of community ownership.

The Neighbourhood Plan process has clear stages in which the steering group has directly consulted the community on aspects of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, including events, surveys and workshops. The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group have produced a detailed **Consultation Summary** that identifies the engagement methods used throughout the early stages of the process. This can be found on the Parish Council Website:

<http://fiskerton-lincs.org.uk/home/parish-council/neighbourhood-plan/>

**Table 1: Brief overview of consultation stages and methods**

Neighbourhood Plan stage	Consultation event methods	Who we consulted?	How we consulted?
Initial engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attending the local events</li> <li>• Discussions with local people and businesses</li> <li>• Questionnaires</li> <li>• Public meetings</li> </ul>	Local community Local businesses Young people	Advertised in local media i.e. Newsletter / letter drop  Local people and businesses informed by surveys, face-to-face discussions, newsletters or emails.

Neighbourhood Plan stage	Consultation event methods	Who we consulted?	How we consulted?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workshops</li> </ul>		Public notices and update on the 'hub' website.
Regulation 14 – draft plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussions with local people and businesses</li> <li>Public events</li> </ul>	Local community Local businesses Statutory consultees	
Regulation 16 – Final Plan	Not yet undertaken		

The Neighbourhood Plan complies with the general duty in the Race Relations Act 2000 to promote race equality and with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. These place a duty to ensure that all members of the community have equal opportunities for engagement.

It was also recognised that certain sectors of the community may not have the same opportunities to comment on the plan and additional methods have been undertaken in order to allow all sectors of the community to have their say.

**Table 2: Consulting 'Hard to Hear' groups within the community**

'Hard to hear' groups	Consultation methods
Younger people	<p>Younger people were encouraged to complete the village surveys and attend the various public consultation days.</p> <p>Discussions were held at Fiskerton primary school.</p>
Older people	<p>Workshops</p> <p>Attending public meetings</p> <p>Surveys</p> <p>Website information</p>
Those with disabilities	<p>Workshops</p> <p>Attending public meetings</p> <p>Large copy printing – if needed.</p>
Small businesses	<p>Workshops and event</p> <p>Attending public meetings</p> <p>Face-to-face discussions with businesses</p> <p>Complete a questionnaire</p>

**Table 3: A Summary of the Residents' Feedback (main issues) following the Regulation 14 public consultation**

As part of the Neighbourhood Plan, it is important to gather the thoughts of local people and on the draft proposals as identified within the draft version of the Neighbourhood Plan. In total, 158 responses were submitted and the main issues, included:

<b>Community Concerns</b>	<b>Neighbourhood Plan Opportunities</b>
The development of 200 new homes – how will this be developed and what benefit it will have for the village.	The Neighbourhood Plan enables greater influence to require specific development type. New development on the site will bring some community benefit in the form of housing and open space.
Location of new developments – the majority of the community felt that small developments were appropriate for the village with some affordable housing.	The Neighbourhood Plan can support the provision of growth and the requirement of some affordable housing. The Plan can also specify preferred types of new homes on a chosen site.
Protection of open spaces and the countryside – the majority of residents identified that the protection of the villages green spaces and the access to the countryside should be priorities in the Plan.	The Neighbourhood Plan can protect open spaces from redevelopment and improve access to the countryside through the provision of greater green infrastructure on new developments.
Traffic and congestion – people raised concern about the increased amounts of traffic through the village. Road safety was also identified as an issue.	The Neighbourhood Plan can introduce policies that support those developments that seek to reduce the use of the car and provide better connections to the rest of the village.
Preserve local heritage and character – preserving the villages heritage and local character was considered an important issue. There was concern that local character could lose its significance if new development occurs.	The Neighbourhood Plan can seek to preserve and enhance local character through some of its planning policies.

**Table 4: A copy of all residents' responses to the Regulation 14 public consultation and responses to the issues raised from the Neighbourhood Plan Group**

<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Section of Plan</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Neighbourhood Plan Group Response</b>
1			<p>Our views on building to the north of ferry road are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It will bring too much traffic to the middle of the village.</li> <li>2. We don't think Corn Close should be used as the main entrance and it is not wide enough.</li> <li>3. Flooding is a major issue.</li> <li>4. We think building to the west will ease traffic problems.</li> </ol>	<p>Corn close will inevitably be subject to more noise from increased traffic . See also 6 &amp; 10</p> <p>Width of road greater than Ferry Road</p>
2			<p>I feel development to the north of the village will be detrimental. The development should be to the west of the village as most people have 2 cars and if sited to the north all the extra cars will have to come through the main village road. What about safety for school children and people in general.</p>	<p>There may be an increased risk to children living south of Ferry road due to traffic increase. There is however a similar risk to children if WS is selected.</p>
3			<p>As other sites are available now, a new vote to include the west of the village. Policy 13 - new shops where? Are these definite and who have you consulted on a doctor's practice and pharmacy and butchers?</p>	<p>There are no plans to have another vote on the site location. All residents will have the right to either accept or reject the final neighbourhood plan. Policy 13 relates to loss of facilities only see also 5</p>
4			<p>Hall Lane is used by a lot of heavy vehicles. Machinery is kept at Hall Farm to run 4 farms - 2 owned by the CC. These include Combine Harvesters, heavy draining, corn lorries, livestock vehicles and spraying equipment. The electric site has vehicles on a daily basis. It is also a store site for telegraph poles - hence more heavy equipment. I do not think Hall Lane can cope with more traffic.</p>	<p>Hall Lane is designated as secondary access only, to minimise traffic. If this were to change then road widening up to the site entrance would be necessary.</p> <p>There could be an issue here if Hall lane is not improved &amp; the access to it is uncontrolled.</p> <p>The visibility on egress is very poor especially in winter when the sun is low making right</p>

				turns especially dangerous
5			West - because of traffic which will mainly go to Lincoln. Drainage problems will not affect existing houses. No houses will be over looked or affected. A vote is required.	The NS will have a 10m buffer zone & housing mix to reflect the adjoining properties, to preserve the privacy of existing homes see also 3, 6, 10. Housing may be overlooked
6			I do see the need for extra housing however, the site for this to happen is very important to the village and its residents. By placing 200 new homes to the north of the village will be severe impact on the village as we know it, and the residents that already live here. The village shop, school and hall, that incorporates the post office, are very conveniently situated for all residents. This would also be the case for an estate located to the west of the village. The biggest impact on the village in a detrimental way would be an estate to the north due to the poor infrastructure that would be caused by a large influx of vehicles using the centre of the village on a daily basis. 200 houses would mean an increase of approximately 400 cars with at least 800 movements a day in and out of the village without their being an improvement on the roads to support this number of vehicles. If these figures appear high, then look at the Holmfield estate and see how many vehicles are there per household. This increase can be sustained by building to the west of the village as the majority of movements would be towards the City and back. It therefore stands to reason that if these houses were to be built to the West of the village, the infrastructure is already in place. Some of the traffic would be using the road through Reephram to access Kennel Lane and the A158. The majority however would use the bottom road to access both the city and new bypass. The biggest fear and one that cannot be acceptable is that a large number of vehicles will impact on the safety of the inhabitants, particularly the children. One injury, or worse, cannot be justified if building was to be to the north of the	There is conflicting evidence about traffic volumes. It is not proven that volumes will be much lower which ever site option is chosen as some traffic will come from the west to attend the village school Etc. See also 2 The traffic through the village may be higher if north option is chosen  LCC have not made any differentiation between either site in term of traffic.



			village when building to the west can eliminate the risk.	
7			Neither Corn Close nor Hall Lane is suitable for increased traffic to and from a 200 house development. Most traffic would be in the direction of Lincoln, passing through the centre of Fiskerton. Development to the West would mean that additional traffic would mostly avoid the village centre, not passing via the school, shop, pub etc.... What are the prospects for a by-pass road to the South, which would also form an improved flood defence for the whole village?	A bypass to the North or South is most unlikely due to cost. The existing traffic flow through Fiskerton is not considered by LCC Highways as excessive. A bypass to the South would not be practical as the area is a floodplain and there is Archaeology of National importance in the area. See also 1 4 6
8			Infrastructure for drainage, electricity etc... needs to be upgraded before development takes place. Sewage system needs major work as the system overflows in various locations now. Anglian Water cannot be bothered to do anything about this now, why should they in the future? I think there is definitely a need for a plan, otherwise the village will be walked over.	Drainage infrastructure will need improving regardless of which site is selected. See also 114  Support for a NP is noted.
9			I do see the need for extra housing however, the site for this to happen is very important to the village and its residents. By placing 200 new homes to the north of the village will be severe impact on the village as we know it, and the residents that already live here. The village shop, school and hall, that incorporates the post office, are very conveniently situated for all residents. This would also be the case for an estate located to the west of the village. The biggest impact on the village in a detrimental way would be an estate to the north due to the poor infrastructure that would be caused by a large influx of vehicles using the centre of the village on a daily basis. 200 houses would mean an increase of approximately 400 cars with at least 800 movements a day in and out of the village without their being an improvement on the roads to support this number of vehicles. If these figures appear high, then look at the Holmfield estate and see how many vehicles are there per household. This increase can be sustained by building to the west of the village as the majority of movements would be	See 6

			<p>towards the City and back. It therefore stands to reason that if these houses were to be built to the West of the village, the infrastructure is already in place. Some of the traffic would be using the road through Reepham to access Kennel Lane and the A158. The majority however would use the bottom road to access both the city and new bypass. The biggest fear and one that cannot be acceptable is that a large number of vehicles will impact on the safety of the inhabitants, particularly the children. One injury, or worse, cannot be justified if building was to be to the north of the village when building to the west can eliminate the risk.</p>	
10			<p>The new development should be to the west of Fiskerton with infill and small development to the north of the village hall. Develop to the west to leave the village quiet country lane for dog walking, walking, horse riders etc...</p> <p>Good idea, should be done first.</p> <p>The road system in Fiskerton is most important, we run a business in the village and the roads out of the village to the west are dangerous now. An accident waiting to happen. Any major new development therefore must be to the west of the village or the problems will be worse as the majority of traffic will be travelling to and from Lincoln to the west. If a development to the west of the village was constructed, with a road running through it joining the Reepham road to the Lincoln road, it would in fact improve the safety of the whole village and the situation. If the village is developed to the north there would be greater problems regarding public transport into a new development, particularly with cul-d-sacs and restricted exits.</p> <p>Flooding will be a great problem if development takes place to the north and is of great concern. In the last 60 years, Fiskerton village, to the south of Ferry Road has been flooding extremely badly, at least 3 times due to run off from the north (water from the old airfield making it worse). The</p>	<p>The plan prescribes that the development should not increase flood risk (policy 8). It is up to the developer to provide an adequate solution that is fit for purpose, with proof and evidence. See also 2 12 108 102.</p> <p>There is no guarantee that a through road would be provided on the west site. Due to cost implications it is possible that to cover the additional cost of a county standard road through the site instead of an estate access road any developer would require an increase in numbers of dwellings.</p> <p>Anglian Water make no difference between both proposed sites with regard to flood risk. See also 20</p>

			<p>village residents were told on each and every occasion, that this was a one in one hundred year event!!! One of many reasons for this flooding, we believe, is that the fenland between the village and the North Delph (adjacent to the River) is situated with the development that has already taken place. The insurance companies are aware of this existing problem. The area required to hold back the additional volume of water, created by a large development to the north would be a threat and danger to the community.</p> <p>Hall Lane is the last quiet country lane left in the area, leading onto footpaths and bridleways. It is used by many people from the village to walk and enjoy the countryside e.g. walking dogs, horse riding even to take small children out for their first bike ride. If the development takes place to the north, we will lose this wonderful amenity.</p> <p>Any new facilities in the village e.g. shop, pharmacy, commercial enterprise could be situated within the old disused farm yard in the centre of the village, thereby keeping to the centre of the village near the church and Village Green. We feel the committee is not listening to the community.</p>	<p>This will not change with the exception of an improved access onto Ferry Road and possibly some widening of the first 50 or so metres up to the proposed new access to the development.</p> <p>There is no guarantee the Paddock will be offered if development is to be placed on the Western site.</p>
11			<p>I am in full agreement with the full policy of Fiskerton village building for the future. It would be to the advantage of all age groups to have a village green additionally for the use for everyone. I am in favour of development 2A to the north of the village. 2A is within easy walking distance of the school, shop, village hall, village green, church and public house. I disagree with development 2B as it will be further away from the main village and services.</p>	<p>Noted that resident agrees with North site option and the gain of the Paddock as a village green.</p> <p>Is close to central activities infrastructure</p>
12			<p>Now we can vote for the west, I think it is best. We should keep Hall Lane the lovely green space it is. This is quite unique in the village. Build on west would prevent traffic problems along Ferry Road. Much traffic already drives too fast here. Traffic by the church is very dangerous and would</p>	<p>The owners have not given any public assurance that the character of Hall Lane will be preserved.</p> <p>Only the first 50 or so metres up to the proposed new access to the development</p>

			only get much worse with increased traffic. The village already has drainage and flooding concerns all along Ferry Road. Don't think anyone along here not worried for future if building happens here.	would have to be improved. See also 4 6 55 10
13			West - we do not need extra traffic coming through the village. We do not want flooding and sewage problems. Keep Hall Lane a village lane for all to enjoy safely. Large farm vehicles travel up and down all the time. We do not need the extra cars.	See 6, 4, 12, 55, 10.
14			I support the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan, 2A to develop the school. I support option to north side. Option 3 and to keep the paddock as a public green space for the children of the village.	Noted that resident agrees with north site option. Supports paddock as green open space
15			I support the village Plan to build to the West of the village. My view is we have enough traffic in the middle of the village. Especially with the Bardney traffic using the village to cut through.	See 6
16	<b>Natural England</b>	General	Natural England generally welcomes the Neighbourhood Plan and considers that it provides a valuable framework for the future sustainable development of Fiskerton. We particularly welcome Policy 11: Green Infrastructure, which will protect existing green spaces and promote connectivity between new open spaces and the surrounding countryside. We have no further comments.	These Comments Noted Natural England Support Fiskerton NDP as a framework for future sustainable development of Fiskerton
17	<b>West Lindsey District Council</b>	General	<p>When reviewing the Neighbourhood Plan documents, it is clear the Neighbourhood Plan Group have undertaken a significant amount of public consultation when preparing the Plan. The evidence for Local Green Space, sustainability and housing growth is clear and supported by the District Council.</p> <p>In terms of compliance with existing planning policy, the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations make it clear that Neighbourhood Plans have to be in "general" conformity with existing statutory Local Plans. At present, the West Lindsey Local Plan (2006) identifies Fiskerton as a medium village due to its services and facilities. The emerging</p>	WLDC Agree and commend the plan and its aims generally

		<p>Vision and Objectives</p> <p>Central Lincolnshire Local Plan identifies Fiskerton as a medium village and proposes a minimum growth level of 15% to 2036 which equates to, at least, 90 new homes.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan Regulations also state that Neighbourhood Plans can seek to propose more growth than the existing Local Plans if appropriate. In this case, the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to promote around a 30% growth target over the plan period in order to meet the requirements of a changing population within the community.</p> <p>This is welcomed by the District Council.</p> <p>In respect to the content of the proposed Neighbourhood Plan, the District Council have the following comments to make:</p> <p>1. Vision and objectives – While this is clear there is no mention of the proposed 200 new homes within the vision or objectives. As this is a central part of the Neighbourhood Plan, it would be of benefit to make a linkage between the vision, objectives and the policies about the intention of encouraging the development of an extra 200 homes within the village.</p> <p>Add another bullet point to the list of community objectives:</p> <p>“To encourage the development of around 200 new homes in the Parish over the Plan period”.</p>	<p>Objectives WLDC agree with NDP</p>
		<p>Policy 1</p> <p>2. Policy 1 Sustainable Development – Again, no mention of encouraging the creation of 200 new homes within the village. As this is an overarching policy, it is crucial that this intention is mentioned in this policy.</p> <p>Change point 1 in the policy to say:</p>	<p>Agreed to amend Draft</p> <p>Policy 1 agreed suggested Amendment. This to be referred to Planning Consultant for amendment.</p>



		<p>Policy 2 and 3</p> <p>“Over the Plan period, the development of approximately 200 new homes in the settlement will be planned to meet the social, economic and environmental needs of Fiskerton in a manner that does not compromise the ability of future generations to thrive”.</p> <p>3. Policies 2 and 3 Development to the North and West of the village – West Lindsey welcomes the two options identified within the Neighbourhood Plan. It is evident that both options identify the potential to accommodate the projected ‘200’ new homes within the village.</p> <p>In order to select a ‘preferred’ site, the Neighbourhood Plan group must weigh up the evidence presented within the Site Selection and Sustainability Appraisal. Public opinion does also form part of the decision, but this should not take precedence over the evidence and advice from statutory consultees.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection do make some clear distinctions between both sites in terms of planning constraints. Although they do both score similar, it is our advice, and good practice in plan making, that the most suitable and least constrained site (as identified within the Sustainability Appraisal) goes forward into the next stage of the process. When reviewing the Sustainability Appraisal, it demonstrates that Option 1: Developing to the North of Ferry Road offers the most “positives” and therefore the least impact on the social and environmental fabric of the Parish.</p> <p>Feedback/ evidence from other key agencies and the wider community, should also be factored into your final decision.</p>	<p>“Over the Plan period, the development of approximately 200 new homes in the settlement will be planned to meet the social, economic and environmental needs of Fiskerton in a manner that does not compromise the ability of future generations to thrive”.</p> <p>3. Policies 2 and 3 Development to the North and West of the village – West Lindsey welcomes the two options identified within the Neighbourhood Plan. It is evident that both options identify the potential to accommodate the projected ‘200’ new homes within the village.</p> <p>In order to select a ‘preferred’ site, the Neighbourhood Plan group must weigh up the evidence presented within the Site Selection and Sustainability Appraisal. Public opinion does also form part of the decision, but this should not take precedence over the evidence and advice from statutory consultees.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal and Site Selection do make some clear distinctions between both sites in terms of planning constraints. Although they do both score similar, it is our advice, and good practice in plan making, that the most suitable and least constrained site (as identified within the Sustainability Appraisal) goes forward into the next stage of the process. When reviewing the Sustainability Appraisal, it demonstrates that Option 1: Developing to the North of Ferry Road offers the most “positives” and therefore the least impact on the social and environmental fabric of the Parish.</p> <p>Feedback/ evidence from other key agencies and the wider community, should also be factored into your final decision.</p>	<p>NPG Sites as included welcomed by WLDC.</p> <p>Agreed The NPG will take into account the evidence of this document and any other relevant evidence to enable a decision to be made on the final site to be included in the NP</p> <p>WLDC recommend the most sustainable site is the one to take forward (Developing to the North of Ferry Road) gives the most positives, least impact on social and environmental fabric of the village.</p> <p>Agreed this document and other statutory consultees to be analysed and included in any decision made.</p>
		<p>Policy 4</p> <p>4. Policy 4 Housing Type and Mix – it may be worth referencing the potential for self-build units. The</p>	<p>4. Policy 4 Housing Type and Mix – it may be worth referencing the potential for self-build units. The</p>	

			<p>Government is now promoting self-build opportunities and it is a way of increasing the housing type and mix within a local community.</p>	
		Policy 6	<p>5. Policy 6 Transport – This is a useful policy, but is it required for any development? It will be worth consulting Lincolnshire County Council on this policy and see whether they recommend a threshold to when this policy should apply?</p>	
		Policy 7	<p>6. Policy 7 Non Vehicular Routes – it would be worth adding some pictures of some public rights of way within the Parish. This will help give more context to potential developers in the area. Are there any footpaths that need to be improved such as the connections to Cherry Willingham?</p>	<p>NPG agree with the suggested changes and these have been included in policy 7</p>
		Policy 8	<p>7. Policy 8 Flooding – Again, some pictures of flooding will help provide context to potential developers. Proposal Map 5 that identifies the flood risk needs to be clearer and a new one should be included to provide a close up of the village and where any potential impact could occur.</p> <p>In addition, there is no mention of waste water or surface water drainage issues. It has been raised, previously, through public consultation that this was a concern? It is also recommended that the following is added as a new sentence with the policy:</p> <p>“Residential development will not be supported in Flood Zone 3”.</p>	<p>NPG agree with the suggested changes and these have been included in policy 8.</p>
		Policy 9 and 10	<p>8. Policy 9 and 10 Employment – Is there a need for two separate policies? Policy 9 is for the redevelopment of employment land within the Parish. Is there a need for this? Policy 10 seeks to encourage new employment within the Parish. Is there any particular reason/ evidence. WLDC</p>	<p>NPG agree with the suggestion with regards to flooding and the policy has been amended.</p> <p>NPG agree with the suggested changes and have included these in the plan.</p>

			<p>recommend that Policy 9 and 10 are removed and replaced with the following:</p> <p>New Employment Development</p> <p>“Proposals for the development of new, or re-development of existing, employment within Fiskerton will only be permitted providing that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It can be demonstrated that there will be no adverse impact resulting from increased traffic, noise, smell, lighting, vibration or other emissions or activities generated by the proposed development.</li> <li>2. It would have an acceptable impact to the character and scale of the village and the surrounding landscape.</li> <li>3. Where relevant, opportunities are taken to secure the reuse of vacant or redundant buildings as part of the development”.</li> </ol>	
		Policy 12	<p>9. Policy 12 Local Green Space – The evidence to support these 3 sites is acceptable and makes it clear that they are valued by the local community.</p> <p>It would be worth identifying what buildings would be acceptable i.e. pavilion, changing rooms, play area, car parking etc....Local Green Space designation is a strict criteria and can preclude a significant number of development types.</p> <p>It might also be worth the Parish Council producing a draft Action Plan for the Paddock in order to demonstrate what particular uses(s) may be acceptable for the site post NDP.</p>	<p>NPG to consult Planning Consultant for advice on improving policy 12 as suggested.</p> <p>The policy has been changed</p> <p>PC to be asked to prepare a plan for the use of the Paddock. this to be added as a project?</p>
		Policy 13	<p>10. Policy 13 Community Facilities – this policy makes no reference to the support of new facilities in the area. It is recommended that another point is included that supports the creation of new and additional services and facilities</p>	<p>NPG agree with the suggested changes and the support for new facilities has been added to the policy.</p>

		<p>Policy 14</p> <p>Policy 15</p>	<p>within the village such as health, convenience and community facilities. This would also support the potential reuse of the paddock as a community space.</p> <p>The heading should also be changed to; "Provision and Protection of Community Services and Facilities".</p> <p>11. Policy 14 Village Centre – WLDC believe that there is no need for this policy as policy 13 supports the protection and retention of the existing facilities. In addition, what justification is there for the proposed village centre boundary – who made that decision and were local residents consulted? It is recommended that this policy and justification are removed from the Plan.</p> <p>12. Policy 15 Short Ferry – the context to this policy is short and unclear. If the group have undertaken consultation with the community in Short Ferry, then this, and the outcome, needs to be make clear. Otherwise, the policy should be removed.</p>	<p>NPG agreed to remove policy 14.</p> <p>NPG Discussed and feel this policy in some form should be retained.</p>
18	<b>Lincolnshire County Council</b>	General Departments	<p>The following response incorporates all the comments received from relevant Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) services.</p> <p>Policy LP4 of the Submitted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan proposes a growth level of 15% in Fiskerton, and Appendix B shows a remaining requirement of 83 dwellings. It does, however, allow for proposals which demonstrate clear local community support through a Neighbourhood Plan exercise.</p> <p>From the strategic planning perspective a development of around 200 dwellings would be welcomed as a contribution to meeting the housing needs of the area and the wider Government aim to increase the housing supply, subject to clear community support and the specific comments set out below.</p>	<p>Quoting CLLP LP4 stating the minimum number of new dwellings noted for Fiskerton. The NDP is recommending appx 200 to increase sustainability and viability over the next 20 years</p> <p>LCC Welcome inclusion of 200 Dwellings</p>

			<p><b>Transport</b> LCC would re-iterate its comments on the Site Selection Assessment about the two potential housing sites as follows:</p> <p><b>North Option</b> Any new access adjacent to the school on to Ferry Road would need to address potential conflict issues with the existing access to the school. It may be necessary to combine the two access points. Access off Corn Close is acceptable in principle. Hall Lane would need improving in terms of width, footway provision and street lighting before a vehicular access point could be considered. A Travel Plan and Transport Assessment will be required. Mitigation works may be required following the assessment of these documents.</p> <p><b>West Option</b> Access from both Fiskerton Road and Reepham Road is acceptable in principle (subject to visibility requirements being met). An extension of the existing speed limit may be required. Frontage footways to connect to existing footways on Fiskerton Road and Reepham Road should be provided.</p> <p>A Travel Plan and Transport Assessment will be required. Mitigation works may be required following the assessment of these documents.</p> <p>On this option we have also already responded by email dated 16/11/2016 to a specific question from Cllr. Chris Darcel: As this proposal could involve a new road between Reepham Road and Lincoln Road, could this be classed as a minor road rather than an estate road? At this stage we do not know the details of the proposed access roads. This will depend on how the developer</p>	<p>For Transport "See Below"</p> <p>NPG agree points raised and take advice on action needed if any for inclusion in the NPG The Landowners have already produced a traffic analysis for the proposed development of this site.</p> <p>NPG have agreed based in the evidence from this consultation to remove the West Option from the final plan and have prepared a statement of reasons that is separate to this consultation statement, and will be included in the Proposed Final Plan</p> <p>Note: Link Road would have to be classed as Minor Road, not Estate Road. Therefore increasing the cost to any potential developer. The site is therefore more likely to be served by two cul-de-sacs without through access. This would have major traffic implications to the West of the Village with transverse</p>
--	--	--	--	---



			<p>and/or planning authority wish to form the site. However, access could be through the site (linking Reepham Road and Lincoln Road), or the site could for instance be served by cul-de-sacs (providing links through for pedestrians and cyclists only). What widths the carriageways would need to be would depend on what form the development takes.</p> <p><b>Surface Water Flooding</b>  It is welcomed that there is now direct reference to surface water flood risk in both the body of the document and Policy 8, and this does not conflict with national and local policy. The only comment is that the only relevant diagram in the Neighbourhood Plan illustrates EA Flood Zones. To provide a full picture of the all sources of flood risk it may be worth considering inclusion of surface water flood maps. There is ready access available to these through the Environment Agency website at <a href="https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map?map=Reservoirs#SurfaceWater_6-SW-Extent">https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map?map=Reservoirs#SurfaceWater_6-SW-Extent</a></p> <p><b>Education</b>  LCC has no comments on the alternative sites from an education perspective, as there is sufficient land available on the primary school site to allow for expansion if necessary.</p> <p><b>Historic Environment</b>  LCC is pleased to see that there is a description of the local archaeology, which is important; but there is apparently no characterisation of Historic Buildings. Although Listed Buildings are mentioned, there are also locally historic buildings which give historic character as can be seen by your cover page. There does not seem to be any analysis of this, nor of the historic setting of the village. The maps of</p>	<p>movements along Blacksmith Road and the single carriageway Plough Lane.  LCC have not identified a preference between these two options in terms of transport.</p> <p>NPG agree and the map has been changed to reflect LCC comments.</p> <p>Accepted and Agreed</p> <p>NPG have included the Character Assessment work within the body of the neighbourhood plan. Please see policy 2.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>historic development are confined (p.10) to post-war development – but could include older maps which date from the 19th century at the very least. Whilst there is no Conservation area, the village does have historic character in parts, but this only seems to be referred to under 'green spaces'.</p> <p>Policy 5 on Infill development does not take account of the impact of development on potential underlying archaeological remains.</p> <p>Policy 12 on designated local green spaces should also mention that Manor Farm Paddock has the potential for archaeological remains. It does say that it is important for the setting of the church and the Manor, both of which are Grade II Listed.</p> <p>With regard to allocating housing land one of the planning issues that will come up on any planning application will be impact on underlying archaeological remains. This will be an issue for the 'West' option where there are records of medieval tofts and crofts, Roman and Anglo-Saxon finds.</p> <p><b>Public Health</b> Map 1 indicates an area of allotments and it is not clear from the text as to whether these still exist and are used by the residents. Therefore this area or another in the proposed central core could perhaps be considered for a community growing area to encourage healthy eating and physical activity.</p> <p>The Community Objectives (p16) make specific mention of health &amp; wellbeing which is welcomed. However it would be useful to stress this more clearly within each Policy to explain how the policy will help to reduce health inequalities, promote healthy lifestyles and maximise health and well-being.</p>	<p>See Historic Environment. (Above)</p> <p>(See Above)</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Archaeology issue noted for Western Site.</p> <p>Yes the allotments are in use and additional area of land could be made available if there is further demand .</p> <p>Thank you this has been noted.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Policy 1: Sustainable Development in Fiskerton</p> <p>The use of a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process &amp; Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive are welcomed. Clearer reference to some of the more specific SA &amp; SEA points in the text of the neighbourhood plan would add depth to the health and wellbeing benefits linked to the wider determinants (social, economic, environmental).</p> <p>Policy 2a and b Potential Future Housing Development It is good to see that future community consultation will take place as to the most sustainable location for the larger development of 200 houses either to the North or West.</p> <p>If the green wedge is kept between Fiskerton and Cherry Willingham this would enable the village to keep its identity, whilst improving connectivity. There is little in the plan to clarify how this green wedge would be used or maintained. A cycle/walking path is mentioned, but perhaps outdoor exercise equipment could be considered, cycle hire, seating to encourage all age groups to utilise the area. It is good to see that the community acknowledge the need for housing mix and accessibility. However the last development of 79 houses (all detached) suggests that future planning proposals need to address the needs of all the community</p> <p>Policy 3: Design The implementation of Building for Life 12(BfL12) is supported</p>	<p>NPG have removed policy 1 from the final plan the SA/SEA information is available in the relevant documents.</p> <p>This document is the current consultation statement as referred to.</p> <p>Green Corridor approval from CC with clarity needed The Green Wedge would be retained farmland. It was taken out of the Plan to allow for the West option. If this option is not favoured the green corridor may be able to go back into the plan.</p> <p>This point noted and covered with the H/N Survey</p> <p>This Point noted</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p><b>Policy 4: Housing Mix</b> It is good to see that the demographic structure is considered within the suggested housing mix with the need for smaller properties for younger people and the older population to 'downsize' (9.7). This supports the public health objective of reducing isolation and promoting social cohesion. A mix of tenures is also welcomed.</p> <p><b>Policy 5: Infill Development</b> The use of the 'Residential Design Guide' is welcomed and should help to gain agreement from residents as well as protecting the character of the village centre The sustainability of a village hall/hub could be stressed more in relation to community cohesion and inter-generational enhancement</p> <p><b>Policy 7: Non vehicular</b> Pedestrian access &amp; cycle routes are mentioned throughout (11.3, 11.4) &amp; public health particularly supports continued and improved access to the existing Sustrans National Cycle Route and new non-vehicular routes to facilitate active travel. These score well on SAO 2,4,13 and this would be worth adding to the text. The wish to strengthen &amp; improve public rights of way is also good evidence of supporting health and wellbeing. Could a heritage trail be developed?</p> <p><b>Policy 8: Flooding</b> The flood risk for any future development is acknowledged and this is important from a public health perspective due to the negative effects of flood damage to the health and wellbeing of residents</p> <p><b>Policy 9: Employment</b> Reference to use of vacant and redundant properties for business &amp; employment opportunities to generate local employment are welcomed given the positive health and wellbeing benefits on people of being in work</p>	<p>This point noted</p> <p>This point noted and 'Building for Life 12 is to be our standards guide for any future development.</p> <p>Fiskerton PC to discuss this with the view of developing a Heritage Trail.</p> <p>This Point Noted and covered in policy</p> <p>This Point Noted</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>Policy 10: Green Infrastructure There is no mention of renewable energy within the plan e.g. renewable heat sources or micro generation of electricity, electric vehicle charging points for new dwellings, or points where bikes or electrical vehicles could be hired to travel to Cherry Willingham, Lincoln &amp; surrounding area, therefore improving health and minimising the emission of air pollutants. There is also little mention of the current public transport provision</p> <p>Policy 11: Designated Green Space The protection of 3 areas for public open space is commendable. However there is a lack of detail as to how these areas may be utilised e.g. orchard, growing space, play area. Wildlife/ biodiversity is mentioned and the link to health and wellbeing could again be mentioned – particularly with regard to mental health</p> <p>Policy 12: Protection of the community Facilities The wish to protect and develop community facilities in consultation with residents is welcomed</p> <p>Policy 13: Village Centre A doctor's surgery is listed here and there is no mention of a developer contribution for primary health care. This needs to be secured by the Lincolnshire West Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), which should be consulted on what this would deliver. It should be recognised that 200 dwellings alone might not have a significant effect on GP capacity but easy access to the present GP facilities in the neighbouring village would need to be maintained.</p> <p>Policy 14: Short Ferry The expansion and or the redevelopment of Short Ferry for its existing use or the further enjoyment of the local</p>	<p>NPG have not had this issue raised at consultation and therefore have no evidence to include this in the plan.</p> <p>NPG agree that this is for the PC to take forward at a later date and not for inclusion in the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>This Point Noted</p> <p>NPG have removed policy 13 from the plan. This however has been noted.</p> <p>This item to be discussed further after outcome of further consultation with Short Ferry owners. This Item has now been</p>
--	--	--	--	--



			<p>residents and potential employment opportunities has clear links to health &amp; wellbeing and community sustainability Appendix A</p> <p>The community aspirations and projects to install traffic calming measures such as “Rumble strips” in identified areas are key to the safety of the proposed pedestrian and cycle ways.</p>	<p>addressed and amendments made accordingly.</p> <p>Noted. This is a significant statement from LCC as The Traffic Authority. We need their input etc to achieve any of the traffic improvements we are hoping to implement within the NDP.</p>
19	<b>Environment Agency</b>	Policy 8	<p>The majority of the plan is located in fluvial Flood Zone 1 of our Flood Map for planning (Rivers and Sea), indicating a low probability of flooding. However, the southern extent of the village, close to the River Witham, is largely located in flood zones 2 and 3 (medium and high probabilities respectively). We therefore advise that the NDP advocates a sequential approach, steering new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding and preventing inappropriate development in the floodplain. This should be added to policy 8: Flood Risk it will add weight to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It is unlikely that the flood risk sequential test could be passed for more vulnerable development such as housing in Fiskerton: please consider including a statement that new housing will not be permitted in Flood Zones 2 or 3. We are pleased to note that the two sites proposed for housing development are in Flood Zone 1 (North - policy 2A and West policy 2B). However, given the concerns raised by residents at the community consultation, surface water flood risk also needs to be fully considered at both these sites.</p>	<p>NPG to consult Planning Consultant for advice on improving policy 8 as suggested</p> <p>The EA having given consideration to both proposed sites, do not differentiate between either site with regard to flood risk.</p> <p>NPG agree with the comments and have changed policy 7 accordingly.</p>
20	<b>Anglian Water</b>	Policy 8	<p>We note that this site and the alternative site to the west of Fiskerton is being considered for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan. There is limited capacity at Fiskerton Water Recycling Centre to accommodate this site and the alternative site to the west of Fiskerton. Therefore any proposals for the development of the preferred sites should demonstrate that there is capacity available to serve the development.</p>	<p>It has always been the understanding that improvements in capacity in both water recycling, water supply and foul sewerage will be needed to accommodate the proposed development for either of the two sites. This has the advantage for the Northern site to make major improvements to the existing inadequate service. This Point Noted</p>

			<p>It is important to note that improvements to both the water supply and foul sewerage networks are expected to be required to accommodate the development of this site.</p> <p>Anglian Water welcomes the reference made to the inclusion of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDs). We support the use of SuDs to reduce the risk of surface water and sewer flooding.</p> <p>Anglian Water welcomes the reference made to the inclusion of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDs). We support the use of SuDs to reduce the risk of surface water and sewer flooding. However, it is suggested that policy 8 should be amended to make it clear that SuDs will be required unless it can be shown that it is not technically feasible. Therefore the suggested wording of policy 8 should be amended as follows: the use of sustainable urban drainage systems will be required unless these can be shown to be unfeasible.</p>	<p>This point noted</p> <p>NPG agree with these comments and have changed the policy to include this.</p>
21			I support policy 2A - development to the north of Fiskerton. Policy 2A would provide accommodation closer to the school, shop and village hall. Policy 2A would have better use to the existing bus route. Policy 2A would keep the village shape, not a long thin narrow extension towards Cherry Willingham.	Prevents further elongation of village footprint
22			I have been a resident of Fiskerton for 72 years. I have seen a lot of changes over recent years. I am in favour of the North extension as it would have access to the shop, village hall and the school without having to use your vehicle and also meets all the criteria in the Plan.	See 11
23			I am in favour of the North Plan. Reasons being it will be close to everything we have to offer in the village. I have lived in Fiskerton for 70 years.	See 11
24			I support the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan and its aims and polices in full. Policy 2A - development on the northern site. Having read the draft Neighbourhood Plan I have come	The green corridor is maintained, however there is a 1km width to this, so the western development would not completely erode

			to the conclusion that the northern site would be a preferred choice for the following reasons. Policy 2B is too remote from the village, western site has a major pipeline running through it, and policy 2B flooding issues that flood Lincoln Road, Policy 2b heritage remains would to be given conservation. Policy 2A would be more part of village life, closer to the amenities; shop, village hall, scout hut, pub, school. Policy 2A is safer for children walking to the village school. Policy 2A established bus route. Policy 2A closer to the manor paddock once it returns to public use. Policy 2A will retain the village atmosphere whereas Policy 2B will make the village look like a small town, slowly encroaching onto Cherry Willingham.	this. See also 11 14 10 62 55.  Green corridor is reduced if developed to the west of the village.
25			FNP is to be supported. I am in favour of Policy 2A. This is closest to the village centre. Sustainably the North option is the best as it supports policy 2A. Policy 2A also proposes keeping the paddock of which I am in favour.	See 14.
26			I support the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Draft Plan and the aims and policies in general including policy 2A - development to the North site. The evidence given in the site selection and sustainability documents for this site show it as the better option. The Northern site is in the centre of the village near the existing facilities, school, shop, pub, bus etc.....Children would be in easy walking distance to school without crossing main roads. Building North of Ferry Road would also give the village residents the manor paddock back as a village green for residents use and provide open space for recreational and village functions.	See 11 14 52 56.
27			I support the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Draft Plan and the aims and policies in general including policy 2A - development to the North site. The evidence given in the site selection and sustainability documents for this site show it as the better option. The Northern site is in the centre of the village near the existing facilities, school, shop, pub, bus etc.....Children would be in easy walking distance to school without crossing main roads. Building North of Ferry Road would also give the village residents the manor paddock	See 11 14 52 56.

			back as a village green for residents use and provide open space for recreational and village functions.	
28			I support the Fiskerton Draft Neighbourhood Plan with policy 2A - the proposed development on the North site to ensure that Fiskerton remains a vibrant and enjoyable place to live and ensure that the paddock becomes a community space. The evidence in the Plan is that Fiskerton would upgrade its standing to a medium sized village.	See 14.
29			I am in support of the Fiskerton draft Neighbourhood Plan and its aim and policies, in particular Policy 2A - proposed development on the Northern Site, as the evidence in Plan shows this as the most suitable - being near the village centre. Also flooding - the evidence shows Fiskerton is subject to flooding from surface water run-off. The Plan will address this, and will look to help solve the future drainage in the village.	See 11 10 55
30			I support the Fiskerton draft Neighbourhood Plan and supporting policy 2A - development on the Northern site. As this shows, in the site assessment document, as being the most suitable site. It is close to the school and the village shop and centre.	See 11 56
31			I support the Fiskerton draft Neighbourhood Plan and supporting policy 2A - development on the Northern site. As this shows, in the site assessment document, as being the most suitable site. It is close to the school and the village shop and centre.	See 11 56
32			I support Policy 2A development for the Northern site. Building at this site would give the manor paddock back to the village. The evidence given to me is this is the better option for the village and safety for the children.	See 14.

33			I support the choice to build for policy 2A development on the Northern Site. This would have better facilities for the children of the village being near the school and reinstating the manor paddock. As well as children's safety.	See 14
34			Policy 2A seems the sensible option to me as there would be too many issues with access otherwise and would cause a massive increase in traffic on roads that are already very busy.	See 11 & 14.
35			Having recently read the Fiskerton draft Neighbourhood Plan, I whole hereby agree with the Plan. In particular policy 8 flooding and drainage, and any future development do not exacerbate the drainage issue and also Policy 2A - developing to the North of Fiskerton. Need to ensure appropriate flooding and surface water drainage are mitigated and the development must not lead to further issues elsewhere.	See 11 10 55
36			I would first like to say that I am sad that there is no brownfield land site option to consider. The redundant knitwear factory site would be perfect as it is an eyesore, and once cleaned up and given a clean bill of health would be ripe for redevelopment. It means much reliance to use good farmland for the need for housing. However, on the assumption that a greenfield must be used, then I endorse the option to the east as it will help keep the village compact and help to maintain a clear margin between Fiskerton and Cherry Willingham.	Brown field sites have been set aside for industrial/commercial use or classed as infill sites. They are not relevant to site selection as they cannot support appx 200 new dwellings which is the aim of the NDP. See also 21 & 24.
37			Looking at both proposed plans, I believe policy 2A is the better option. This is due to the aesthetics of the village as you enter Fiskerton. It will be much nicer to see fields and older houses and the Church, rather than a load of new houses! Also, with more houses in Fiskerton means more traffic, more traffic calming measures should be introduced to slow traffic down. More signs/ lining to remind 30mph speed limit.	Note that should the northern option be taken up the view from the river will be changed. See also 38. The view of the village when approaching from the west would be changed if the western option is chosen Also the view of the western option would be changed looking North from the river.

38			<p>I have looked at both drafts of the proposals and believe policy 2A would be the best option. If this goes forward, meaning more traffic for the village, then more traffic calming is needed, bigger 30pmh signs, speed humps on entering the village as currently speeding is a major issue. Also a one way system would be a good idea to traffic clam around the village. Also a weight restriction past the Church as large trucks vibrate our house on Lincoln Road and the Church. Plans to redevelop Bardney Sugarbeet Factory will bring more trucks through the village and current two-way past the church will result in more accidents as it is not wide enough. Do not put traffic lights, as we would strongly oppose this!</p>	<p>Several ideas have been discussed about traffic calming and the issue of the narrow road adjacent to the church these points will need further consideration and discussion with LCC. See also 11.</p> <p>This point effects both developments West or North. Although there is some debate over which site will generate the most traffic through the pinch point The beet factory redevelopment would affect both sites.</p>
39			<p>I believe policy 2A would be the better option - providing traffic levels are managed and a bigger speed reduction is introduced.</p>	<p>See 11 &amp; 38</p>
40			<p>Having looked at both proposed developments, policy 2A would be the better option. Please would you also consider traffic calming through the main road of the village as drivers do drive too fast? A one-way system is also doable if there is such a way in the village.</p>	<p>See 11 &amp; 38</p>
41			<p>I would prefer a series of small sites especially brownfield site such as the Tanya Knitwear Factory and the Manor Farm buildings. However, if this option is not viable, then I prefer the East location because it would give a nice rounded shape to the village. Also this would keep Fiskerton more separate from Cherry Willingham.</p>	<p>See 21 24 36 As multiple sites are not an option at this time it is noted that the preferred option is the Northern site</p>
42			<p>I support policy 2 in allocating 200 homes because I believe it gives the best chance of meeting policies 12 and 13 of protecting community facilities and the designation of the village centre for specific uses. I support the development of housing to the North of the village as I believe it is the most sustainable and best fits in with the development plan policies. It also fulfils the community objectives, especially the first two. It helps minimise the need for travelling by car.</p>	<p>See 11 14 &amp; 21</p>

			I believe that the development to the West of the village is wrong in principle because it elongates the existing settlement and minimises the gap between Fiskerton and Cherry Willingham and Reepham. Furthermore, it would generate more traffic in and out of the village centre as parents take and collect their children from school, use the village shop, the village hall and the Carpenters Arms.	
43			Policy 2A proposed development of the Northern Site which I support. I think the northern plan would be better for the village to encourage the use of the school, village hall and other facilities in the village. Manor Paddock should be used by the village like it did when I was younger bringing the community together.	See 11 & 14.
44			I support the Fiskerton draft Plan policy 2A Northern site. This is a better option for the village school, shop etc....it will also give us back the paddock.	See 14.
45			I am the landlady of the public house and feel strongly that we should support the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan. Also, the aims and policies, including Policy 2A proposed Development on the North Site. This, to me, would be the most suitable being near the centre of the village. Also, the benefit of building north of Ferry Road will give our village the paddock back as a village green as it should be.	See 11 & 14.
46			We support the north site near the village hall because; more central in the village - meaning village will be near the centre of the village and stops the village becoming long and thin. Makes the village more round.	See 11 & 21
47			We support the north site near the village hall because; more central in the village - meaning village will be near the centre of the village and stops the village becoming long and thin. Makes the village more round.	See 11 & 21
48			I opt for Plan 2A. I would like to keep the village as central as possible. Keeping the school and the village hall close by for everyone to take advantage of. I wouldn't like to see a one way traffic system as I feel it would create a rat-un.	A one way system is not relevant to the site selection but see 38. See also 11
49			The 2 options that now seem to be viable both have their merits, but I agree with the NPG that developing the land to	Home field green open space needs further clarification but this is not relevant to site

			<p>the north of the village would be the most sensible solution. I support this option because it continues the growth of the village around its central core of the school, shop and pub and will ensure that the paddock will be owned by the village. It will also force any developer to improve the existing roads around the area and more importantly, it will mean that the existing drainage system will also have to be improved, which should then eliminate the existing flooding problems that some people currently experience. The site to the West has merits because it will need new infrastructure that will not have a direct impact on the current village systems i.e. sewage and drainage, plus it will keep the additional traffic out of the centre. But it has disadvantage of making the village rather elongated and could end up almost a separate section that doesn't really belong to or be part of the village. I do not believe this separation would be a good thing because we want to build a strong vibrant community that lives and works together, not one that is disjointed or fragmented. I also support the 14 policies that are outlined in the draft plan as proposed by the NPG and would hope that the 2 open green spaces in Holmfield can also be included in policy 11.</p>	<p>selection.</p> <p>See also 11 14 10 55 21 49.</p> <p>West option could lead to village having 2 separate sections</p>
50			<p>I fully support the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan. Policy 2A - proposed development to the northern site. I strongly support this proposed policy on the following grounds; The evidence shown in the Site Selection and Sustainability documents for this is proven to be the better option. The northern site would be more able to integrate with village life as it is situated near the village centre, including the school, shop, village hall, playing field and youth clubs. Building to the north would gain the manor paddock for public use and provide additional public open space for recreational sports. Policy 2B proposed development to the Western site. I strongly reject this proposal on the following grounds; According to the Neighbourhood Plan, Sustainability Assessment and Site Selection Assessment on the website. This site is the least sustainable. Being remote from the</p>	<p>The North Site also has a footpath and this has been integrated into the CC proposed design.</p> <p>See also 11 14 49 52 56 10 55 6 &amp; 62.</p> <p>Presence of Foot path is not evidence against development as Fp's can be integrated into design.</p>



			village centre the new residents would not easily integrate into the village society. There are important archaeological remains on large areas of the site. There is a public footpath from Fiskerton to Cherry Willingham which is well used. The western site is not close to the village school therefore more likely children will be driven to school creating more traffic. Flooding issues on the site where the main road is frequently flooded.	
51			<p>I fully support the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan. Policy 2A - proposed development to the northern site. I strongly support this proposed policy on the following grounds; The evidence shown in the Site Selection and Sustainability documents for this is proven to be the better option. The northern site would be more able to integrate with village life as it is situated near the village centre, including the school, shop, village hall, playing field and youth clubs. Building to the north would gain the manor paddock for public use and provide additional public open space for recreational sports. Policy 2B proposed development to the Western site. I strongly reject this proposal on the following grounds; According to the Neighbourhood Plan, Sustainability Assessment and Site Selection Assessment on the website. This site is the least sustainable. Being remote from the village centre the new residents would not easily integrate into the village society. There are important archaeological remains on large areas of the site. There is a public footpath from Fiskerton to Cherry Willingham which is well used. The western site is not close to the village school therefore more likely children will be driven to school creating more traffic. Flooding issues on the site where the main road is frequently flooded.</p>	<p>The NS also has a footpath and this has been integrated into the CC proposed design. See also 11 14 49 52 56 10 55 6 &amp; 62.</p> <p>Presence of Foot path is not evidence against development as Fp's can be integrated into the design.</p>
52			With reference to the Fiskerton Draft NPG, I support the draft Plan - Policy 2A and the proposed development on the Northern site for the following reasons. The site scored the higher of the two sites in the NP Sustainability Assessment document. New residents on the northern site are more likely to integrate with the village i.e. the shop, school, pub	<p>North scores higher on sustainability assessment document.</p> <p>See also 11 &amp; 49</p>

			etc.....if it was on the western site they are more likely to use Cherry Willingham for shop, pubs and schools. If you need to expand the village, you would want people to take part in Fiskerton and no other nearby villages.	Development to the West would be more of an asset to CW businesses not Fiskerton.
53			I support the Fiskerton draft NPG policy 2A because given the evidence in the Site Selection and Sustainability documents this site looks the better option. The new residents on the northern site more likely to use the local facilities such as the shop, school bus stops etc..... with the western site, people would use Cherry Willingham shops etc.... and would not actually integrate with the current residents of Fiskerton.	See 49 52 & 56  Development to the West would be more of an asset to CW businesses not Fiskerton. Lack of integration
54			I am supporting the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Draft Plan and the aims and policies in general, including policy 2A - the proposed development on the Northern Site of Fiskerton. Having the development at the northern part of the village would be closer to our existing buildings including the pub, village shop, bus routes and the school. It would be safer for children to walk to the school as it's within walking distance from the proposed site. This wouldn't be the case if they had to walk from the western site as they would have to cross the roads which would be busier due to the increase of traffic from the western site. If the proposed western site was built on, it would cause more damage to our property, as it floods constantly due to heavy rain on Lincoln Road. Developing the northern site would give it back the village green to enjoy functions and festivities once again.	Children can walk to school without using any of the main roads.  See also 14 10 & 55.  Pedestrian access to village centre
55			I am supporting the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Draft Plan and the aims and policies in general, including policy 2A - the proposed development on the Northern Site of Fiskerton. I believe and understand that this is the best option, due to evidence given in the Site Selection and Sustainability documents for the site. Building on the northern site is more ideal for the future families that may live in the area as they will be closer to the school, our local shop, the pub and the bus route. The close proximity to the school would be safer for those with children as it's within walking distance on the	The same problem applies to the flooding of the road at the Eastern end of the village.  See also 52 56 & 11.

			main road. Due to flooding issues outside our property, building on the western site would make it worse.	
56			<p>Policy 2A - Proposed development on the Northern Site: I strongly support this policy the following grounds. This scores the highest in the NP Site Selection document. This site scores the higher of the two sites in the NP Sustainability Assessment document. It is important to secure the manor paddock and other small parcels of land which enhance the village and gives it a "village feel". The manor paddock, in particular is an asset which would allow residents to hold social events such as garden fetes and sporting events. The northern site would allow new/old residents to be closer to amenities i.e. School, Church Hall and village shop and might encourage new businesses into the area. Children could walk to school, reducing the amount of traffic travelling through the village which has difficult, narrow bends to negotiate and would mean children crossing roads to get to school. This would be extremely dangerous for both children and an extra hazard to car drivers, etc....New/old residents i am sure would feel more integrated into the community rather than being stuck out on a limb and they inevitably would be on the western site.</p> <p>Policy 2B - I strongly reject this proposed policy on the following grounds.....This site scores the lowest of the two sites in the Site Assessment Document. This site scores the lower of the two sites in the Sustainability Assessment document. New/old residents would not be able to integrate very easily being stuck out on a limb. Due to an important archaeological site, this would open up a can of worms from a planning and developers point of view. I personally have had a bad experience whilst driving on the Lincoln road with run-off water causing consequent flooding. Building to the west site would impinge on the more historic part of Fiskerton. I do not think we need to be any closer to Cherry Willingham.</p>	<p>North scores higher on site selection document.</p> <p>See also 11 14 52 54 49 62 10 &amp; 55.</p>
57			All in all, a sensible proposal for long term housing development to the North east and west of the village. But I	Request for WLDC to take responsibility for suitable infrastructure

			hope WLDC will be astute and proactive in supporting the villagers' needs by ensuring that any future developers make appropriate and significant contributions for improvements and development of the necessary village infrastructure, and that WLDC take responsibility for monitoring such processes until successful completion.	
58			I support the proposed plan for development on the North of Ferry Road, Fiskerton.	Noted that resident agrees with north site option. no evidence supplied
59			I prefer the East/ North of Ferry Road option. I consider it would best allow integration of the new buildings and residents into the existing village and the overall - beneficial expansion of it. I also think the paddock should be acquired if at all possible, as it will be with this option; both for amenity and visual aspects. I am very concerned about traffic. They are the same roads through the village I have known for 40 years when often yours would be the only car on the road. Flooding is a further major concern.	See 14 6 38 10 & 55. Integration of new development if sited North. also Paddock would be acquired for public use.  Flooding is addressed within the proposed plan policies as is traffic control
60			I will be supporting the development to the north of the village. I am in favour of Policy 2A - specifically points C and I. I believe the buffer zone would be a real asset to the village allowing residents to walk, horse ride or cycle to the village centre without using the main road, ditto for anyone coming from the centre to access Hall Lane. Also the residents that are adjacent to the development should see some impact reduction if policy 2A C is implemented correctly. My only reservation is that the tranquillity of Hall Lane will be lost, and this is a concern for a number of residents at the eastern end of the village.	The buffer Zone will be an asset to the village & allow safe pedestrian access to the village centre.  See also 14.
61			I support the Fiskerton for the village e.g. gaining the paddock. The west site does not seem to offer the same benefits and is too far from the centre of the village.	See 11 & 14
62			I support the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Draft Plan and the aims and policies in general, including policy 2A - development to the northern site. The evidence given in the Site Selection and Sustainability documents show it as the most sustainable site option. The Northern site is in the	LCC report that archaeological remains will be an issue on Western site.  See also 52 56 11 54 14 76 10 & 55.

			<p>centre of the village near the existing facilities, school, shop, pub, bus etc....for new residents to integrate into the village and children would be in easy walking distance to school without crossing main roads. Building north of Ferry Road would also give the village residents the Manor Paddock back as a village green for residents use and provide open space for recreational, school and village functions. Policy 2B - development to the Western site I do not support this site being outside the village and not a part of the existing village society. The site is too far from the school and village facilities and not within easy walking distance for older residents, and would result in even greater traffic pressure on the centre of the village and around the school. There is a high pressure pipeline crossing the site and evidence of archaeological remains on the site, and there are flooding issues with this site on Lincoln Road.</p>	<p>Records of medieval tofts, crofts Roman &amp; Anglo Saxon finds reported by LCC</p>
63			<p>I support the work of the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan group and the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. I am in favour of Policy 2A because the proposed development is close to the shop and school and it does not extend the village to the east or west. In the Sustainability Appraisal the North option (option 3) is the most favourable option for development which gives further support for policy 2A. Policy 2A also includes the acquisition of the paddock as an open green space for community access which i am in favour of.</p>	<p>See 11 21 14 &amp; 52.</p>
64			<p>I support the work of the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan group and the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. I am in favour of Policy 2A because the proposed development is close to the shop and school and it does not extend the village to the east or west. In the Sustainability Appraisal the North option (option 3) is the most favourable option for development which gives further support for policy 2A. Policy 2A also includes the acquisition of the paddock as an open green space for community access which i am in favour of.</p>	<p>See 11 21 14 &amp; 52.</p>
65			<p>I support the work of the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan group and the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. I am in favour of Policy 2A because the proposed development is close to the</p>	<p>See 11 21 14 &amp; 52.</p>

			shop and school and it does not extend the village to the east or west. In the Sustainability Appraisal the North option (option 3) is the most favourable option for development which gives further support for policy 2A. Policy 2A also includes the acquisition of the paddock as an open green space for community access which i am in favour of.	
66			I support the work of the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan group and the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. I am in favour of Policy 2A because the proposed development is close to the shop and school and it does not extend the village to the east or west. In the Sustainability Appraisal the North option (option 3) is the most favourable option for development which gives further support for policy 2A. Policy 2A also includes the acquisition of the paddock as an open green space for community access which i am in favour of.	See 11 21 14 & 52.
67			I support the work of the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan group and the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. I am in favour of Policy 2A because the proposed development is close to the shop and school and it does not extend the village to the east or west. In the Sustainability Appraisal the North option (option 3) is the most favourable option for development which gives further support for policy 2A. Policy 2A also includes the acquisition of the paddock as an open green space for community access which i am in favour of.	See 11 21 14 & 52.
68			I support the option of building on land to the north of the village behind the village hall to Hall Lane. This will allow a more rounded village development rather than a long narrow development helping towards a community feel for the village. It brings the paddock into ownership of the village which would hopefully encourage a wider use of the paddock for all residents. Whether for sport as in the past or purely social use. It would be near the village amenities (shop, pub, school etc.) If houses were built to the west of the village I believe it would cause problems such as increased traffic flow at a dangerous point in the road. The hill entering the village at Reepham Road already has serious issues with speeding traffic. Building on this area is	<p>The same point applies to a dangerous stretch of road at the eastern end of the village, namely the junction of Hall Lane &amp; Ferry road. It is an open question as to which is the most dangerous?</p> <p>See also 11 14 21 24 49 &amp; 70.</p> <p>This point affects both developments west or north site</p>

			<p>only encouraging accidents to happen. Houses built to the west will not look or feel part of the village community. Buildings must be made with due recognition to what already exists. Once building has commenced west of the village, at what point will it stop? Will subsequent building edge ever closer to Cherry Willingham? If the term "Neighbourhood Plan" is to mean anything at all, then any changes to the village layout must encourage feeling of community and neighbourhood. This is not done by pushing residents to the (new) boundaries of the village away from what already exists. Building to the west of the village will lead to a sense of "old and new, us and them" which will not help the village in the future. I therefore strongly feel/advise that the Neighbourhood Plan group choose the plan to the north of the village and do not under any circumstances pick the plan to the west of the village.</p>	<p>Building West will create and feel like a separate community</p>
69			<p>I read through all the documentation available at the public consultation 22nd November 2016 and I support the option to allow development north of Fiskerton. I want the village to remain centred on the Crescent and the option to develop north of the village will infill a gap in the existing housing and allow residents of the new development to access the centre of the village (school, shop and pub on foot. I consider the pedestrian accessibility to be a key component of village life, walking and meeting other residents as well as maintaining access to the surrounding countryside. Yes, there will be more traffic through the village, but there is always going to be more traffic through the village as outlying villages beyond Fiskerton develop and expand. So having some of those commuters reside in the village where they can also add to the numbers of people using and supporting local services and businesses within the village should be reviewed as a positive. The alternative proposal to develop the west of Fiskerton offers few of these benefits I would be concerned that it would merge Fiskerton with Cherry Willingham. I also believe that the greater distance from the centre of Fiskerton would deter the residents of the new</p>	<p>See 11 21 54 49 &amp; 6.</p>

			<p>development from walking. This would lead to either a larger increase in cars accessing the village from the west particularly at school time, or, due to the inevitable pull in the direction of Lincoln (work, leisure and travel) residents of the new development would fail to engage with Fiskerton at all. A new development to the west of Fiskerton would be a commuter hub and any benefit from the increased population would probably be felt by Cherry Willingham rather than Fiskerton.</p>	
70			<p>With reference to the Fiskerton Draft NPG I fully support the Draft Plan and it's aims and policies. With the exception below:-</p> <p>Policy No 2A:- Proposed Development on the Northern Site I strongly support this proposed policy on the following grounds According to the NP Sustainability Assessment and Site Selection Document on the Website this site is the most sustainable. New Residents on the Northern site would be more able to integrate with village life as it is situated near the existing village centre, including school, shop, bus routes etc. Children would be able to safely walk to and from school without crossing main roads, therefore less traffic would be created in the village centre. Building to the North would give the Village residents the planning gain of the Manor paddock for public use and provide additional public open space for recreational, Sports.</p> <p>Policy No-2B:-Proposed Development on the Western-Site I strongly reject with this proposed policy on the following grounds According to the NP Sustainability Assessment and Site Selection Document on the Website this site is the least sustainable. Being remote from the village centre the new residents</p>	<p>Proximity to listed Buildings.</p> <p>See also 52, 56, 11,54,14,49,24,6,55 &amp; 14.</p> <p>New build could detract from existing listed buildings care would be needed to blend in new build</p>



		<p>would not be easily integrated into the village society. The development of the Western site would be building towards Cherry Willingham, which is contrary to the consensus of opinion residents gave in the Parish Plan Survey 2012. And would prevent the creation of a green corridor to protect the encroachment of Cherry Willingham</p> <p>The Western site is not close to village school therefore more likely children will be driven to and from School, creating more traffic. Any children walk to school from the West site would have to cross and walk along main roads and bus routes.</p> <p>There are flooding issues with this site already tending to flooding Lincoln Road</p> <p>Development of this site would not give any planning gain to the existing village of any additional public open space of Manor Paddock for future public use and would be contrary to the responses and findings of the Parish Plan which wanted the paddock retained for public use.</p> <p>The Western site is also within 200M of a listed building and could be detrimental to its setting within the historic core of the village</p>	
71		<p>With reference to the Fiskerton Draft NPG I fully support the Draft Plan and it's aims and policies.</p> <p>With the exception of the policies as below:- Policy No 2A :- Proposed Development on the Northern Site I strongly support this proposed policy on the following grounds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) This site scores the highest in the NP Site Assessment Document.</li> <li>2) This site scores the higher of the two sites in the NP Sustainability Assessment Document.</li> </ol> <p>New Residents on the Northern site would be more able to</p>	See 56 52 11 54 14 21 10 55 49 21 24 62 6 37 & 70.

			<p>integrate within the village as it is situated inclusively near the existing village centre, including school, shop, bus routes etc.</p> <p>Children would be able to safely walk to and from school without crossing main roads, therefore less traffic would be created in the village centre.</p> <p>Building to the North would give the Village residents the planning gain of the Manor paddock for public use in addition to the statutory on site 10% open space The gifting of manor paddock to the village would provide additional public open space for recreational, Sports and health use by the residents of all ages. The gifting of the paddock would also be of benefit to the Fiskerton School as an additional sports and recreational area.</p> <p>The Northern site sits comfortably within the existing adjacent developed area of the village and is the closest to the existing amenities for any older residents.</p> <p>Development of the Northern Site is likely to improve the existing drainage problems on Ferry Road</p> <p>The development on this site of two hundred dwellings would allow some input to the cost of additional educational needs of the school.</p> <p>Policy No 2B :-Proposed Development on the Western Site</p> <p>I strongly disagree with this proposed policy on the following grounds</p> <p>1) This site scores the lowest of the two sites in the Site Assessment Document.</p> <p>2) This site scores the lowest of the two sites in the Sustainability Assessment Document.</p> <p>New residents would be less able to integrate with existing community, being remote from the village centre. The site is outside the village envelope (Curtilage), and does not sit comfortably with adjacent land uses and existing dwellings. the site would be remote from the rest of the village</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>The development of the Western site would be building towards Cherry Willingham, which is contrary to the consensus of opinion residents gave in the Parish Plan Survey 2012. and would prevent the creation of a green corridor to protect the encroachment of Cherry Willingham</p> <p>Archaeology maps show major archaeological remains on a large area of the site. This will cost the developer a not inconsiderable amount of money to explore and if needed protect.</p> <p>The Western site is not close to village school therefore more likely need for parents to drive children to and from School, creating more traffic in and out of the village at peak times. Children unlikely to walk to school from the West site but if so would have to cross and walk along main roads and bus routes.</p> <p>This site already has the tendency to flooding Lincoln Road due to surface water problems</p> <p>Development of this site would only produce the statutory 10% open space on site remotely from the rest of the village therefore there would be no gain to the existing village of any additional public open space as there would be no additional planning gain of Manor Paddock for future public and school use.</p> <p>The Loss of Manor Paddock for recreational use would again be contrary to the findings of the Parish Plan (86% of responses wanted to retain the Paddock)</p> <p>Developing the Western site would be detrimental to the historic core of the village and the current views and aspect when approaching the village along Lincoln Road from the West and approaching the village from North along Reepham Road. The Western site is also within 200M of a listed building and could be detrimental to its setting within the historic core of the village</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

72			<p>Policy 2A development to the North of the village. I strongly support this proposal. This site scores the highest in the NP Site Assessment document. The site scores the higher of the two sites in the NP Sustainability Assessment document. This site would sit very nicely and make the village more compact. It would be closer to the important facilities such as the school, church hall, village shop, not forgetting the public house. Building close to the school would allow the children to walk to school and avoid having to cross roads which are always busy. Not to mention how many bends we have in the village. Manor paddock land would be a huge gain for the village where social events could be held and used by a sporting facility. Policy 2B development to the west of the village. I strongly reject this proposal. I am lead to believe that there are very important archaeological remains on the western site. This would cause problems with planning and difficulties for any builder. I think any builder would be very cautious getting involved on this site. This land also has problems with flooding which makes Lincoln Road very dangerous at times. I think any new resident would feel very emote living on this site. It would make Fiskerton a long and thin village and getting too close to Cherry Willingham.</p>	See 11 52 56 14 54 62 & 55 .
73			<p>Policy 2A development to the North of the village. I strongly support this proposal. This site scores the highest in the NP Site Assessment document. The site scores the higher of the two sites in the NP Sustainability Assessment document. This site would sit very nicely and make the village more compact. It would be closer to the important facilities such as the school, church hall, village shop, not forgetting the public house. Building close to the school would allow the children to walk to school and avoid having to cross roads which are always busy. Not to mention how many bends we have in the village. Manor paddock land would be a huge gain for the village where social events could be held and used by a sporting facility. Policy 2B development to the west of the village. I strongly reject this proposal. I am lead</p>	See 11 52 56 54 14 62 55 & 49.

			to believe that there are very important archaeological remains on the western site. This would cause problems with planning and difficulties for any builder. I think any builder would be very cautious getting involved on this site. This land also has problems with flooding which makes Lincoln Road very dangerous at times. I think any new resident would feel very emote living on this site. It would make Fiskerton a long and thin village and getting too close to Cherry Willingham.	
74			<p>I support the plan to allow development of approximately 200 homes to 2036. Hopefully this will enable the village to be a thriving community.</p> <p>I support the allocation of the land to the North of Ferry Road from behind the Village Hall to Hall Lane for the development of 200 houses. This area is behind the ribbon development along Ferry Road. It is close to the village amenities, it "rounds" off the village rather than extending it east/west, it is a large enough area to allow open, village style development. Policy 2A parts C and I off some mitigation to the residents of Ferry Road for the development being next to their properties. Policy 2A part B brings the paddock into the ownership of the village in accordance with the views of over 400 people who signed the petition.</p>	See 11 21 14 & 60.
75			Fiskerton is a linear village. There is already a considerable distance between the first house on the western edge and the last dwelling on the eastern fringe. To build a whole new development on the west end between Fiskerton and Cherry Willingham would further the length. The people there would be a fair way away from the school, shop and village hall and there would be little incentive to integrate within the village. My preferred option is the development along the north of the village as this means houses in the centre. It would "round off" the village nicely.	See 11 21 & 49.
76			I support the Fiskerton Draft Plan and its aims and policies. With regards to proposed development I support policy 2A	High pressure pipeline runs across western site

			to the northern site. As the evidence shows it is the most suitable being near the village centre, school and shop etc.... And rounds the village footprint off rather than extending the village E/W. Building to the north of Ferry Road will also give the village residents the Manor paddock as a public area and green for residents use. Which the residents signed a petition a few years ago. Building to the west would be outside of the existing village, there are archaeological remains on the site shown plus there are existing drainage problems on the site and a high pressure pipeline crossing the site.	See also 14 21 & 62.  On June 19 <sup>th</sup> 2014 Rob Lawton (West Lindsey Planning) advised “rounding the village off” and for proposed plans to comply with the NPPF.
77			I would like to support the Fiskerton Draft Plan and its aims and policies in particular policy 2A - proposed development on the Northern Site. As the evidence for Site Selection etc....show it is as the most suitable being near the village centre. Building north of Ferry Road will also give the village residents the Manor paddock as a village green for residents use and providing open space for recreation and village functions.	See 11 14 56 & 52.
78			I support the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Draft Plan, its aims and its policies. Policy 2A - development to the north site. This would appear to be the most sustainable site. It is near the centre of the village and existing facilities and it has the benefit of a lot of land gain for the village, in particular obtaining the paddock as a green public open space. Policy 2B - proposed development to the western site. This seems to extend the village and put people a long way from the existing infrastructure and they would not be integrated within the existing community. Residents here would be more likely to use facilities at Cherry Willingham and so would be detrimental to the village. I would also be concerned with drainage and archaeology in this area.	See 11 14 49 62 & 55.
79			To the NPG, both my husband and I do support the development, but we also believe that we need definitive answers prior to building work starting. The development will go ahead regardless of what people say or do, so it's best to get on board and at least have a	See 80

say, so here is ours.

We think that the Proposal Map 1a: The North Option: Development to the North of Fiskerton, is likely to be the best option. It leaves room for the village to grow and can develop further back if needs be.

Our only concerns really are of course traffic and amenities. We have a little village shop which is quite well stocked, but for a growing village this one shop alone is not enough. They do not hold enough stock, for another 200 homes it is only a little village shop, meant for village life.

Reepham's post office is just a post office with a few other bits not somewhere reliable if people need the essentials.

The shops at Cherry are inadequate for 3 growing villages. The Co-op has empty shelves more often than not, this is due to Cherry having grown over the years. Reepham villagers have to use the Co-op, as their post office / shop doesn't stock a lot of things; and of course, us from Fiskerton having to use it as our closest amenity too. However our biggest concern is already the traffic, so adding to it is extremely disconcerting. The roads are narrow, when you come to a junction not all the turnings are clear. It is already an accident waiting to happen. How many deaths does there need to be for changes to be implemented? The answer should be none.

Ferry Road has a speed limit which is ignored by the majority of people who use it. Children need to cross this road to attend school, mine included (although she is 5 so I cross with her).

I think most people would agree that the very worst part of our route is the bend by the church. Without change an accident will occur here, let's hope it isn't fatal to one of our children. When the children go to the church, they use this route, it's a very narrow path and they walk hand in hand

			<p>pairs. I was in my car when I came face to face with a double decker bus coming round the bend at the church a few weeks ago. Luckily I drive slowly round there, as it is my biggest concern, something will have to be done prior to building new homes. Traffic lights or a one-way system implemented?</p> <p>Please don't read this as negative against what you are trying to put together, although you have mentioned amenities and traffic in your plan, we just feel that this is our time to ensure that we have our say, and ask that all amenity and traffic solutions are sought and put into place prior to the new development starting.</p> <p>You do have our support and I hope people start seeing this as new homes, new family rather than a new development blocking their view of a field.</p> <p>Thank you, Paul Higgs.</p>	
80			<p>To the NPG, both my husband and I do support the development, but we also believe that we need definitive answers prior to building work starting.</p> <p>The development will go ahead regardless of what people say or do, so it's best to get on board and at least have a say, so here is ours.</p> <p>We think that the Proposal Map 1a: The North Option: Development to the North of Fiskerton, is likely to be the best option. It leaves room for the village to grow and can develop further back if needs be.</p> <p>Our only concerns really are of course traffic and amenities. We have a little village shop which is quite well stocked, but for a growing village this one shop alone is not enough. They do not hold enough stock, for another 200 homes it is only a little village shop, meant for village life.</p> <p>Reepham's post office is just a post office with a few other bits not somewhere reliable if people need the essentials. The shops at Cherry are inadequate for 3 growing villages. The Co-op has empty shelves more often than not, this is due to Cherry having grown over the years. Reepham</p>	<p>Poor facilities in the village</p> <p>See also 21 6 38 54 &amp; 79</p>



		<p>villagers have to use the Co-op, as their post office / shop doesn't stock a lot of things; and of course, us from Fiskerton having to use it as our closest amenity too. However our biggest concern is already the traffic, so adding to it is extremely disconcerting. The roads are narrow, when you come to a junction not all the turnings are clear. It is already an accident waiting to happen. How many deaths does there need to be for changes to be implemented? The answer should be none.</p> <p>Ferry Road has a speed limit which is ignored by the majority of people who use it. Children need to cross this road to attend school, mine included (although she is 5 so I cross with her).</p> <p>I think most people would agree that the very worst part of our route is the bend by the church. Without change an accident will occur here, let's hope it isn't fatal to one of our children. When the children go to the church, they use this route, it's a very narrow path and they walk hand in hand pairs. I was in my car when I came face to face with a double decker bus coming round the bend at the church a few weeks ago. Luckily I drive slowly round there, as it is my biggest concern, something will have to be done prior to building new homes. Traffic lights or a one-way system implemented?</p> <p>Please don't read this as negative against what you are trying to put together, although you have mentioned amenities and traffic in your plan, we just feel that this is our time to ensure that we have our say, and ask that all amenity and traffic solutions are sought and put into place prior to the new development starting.</p> <p>You do have our support and I hope people start seeing this as new homes, new family rather than a new development blocking their view of a field.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	
--	--	---	--

81			<p>I would like to give my support to the Neighbourhood Development Draft Plan and policies.</p> <p>I support policy No 2A – proposed development on the Northern Site as this is shown as the better site for development within the village in accordance with the evidence given in the site assessment and sustainability documents.</p> <p>Being near the centre of the village it would be close to the school, shop and bus routes therefore newcomers will be able to easily integrate into the existing village life and children will be able to walk to school rather than being driven without crossing busy bus routes. This would keep the additional traffic within the village to a minimum.</p> <p>Building on this site also has the added advantage of returning the Manor paddock back to a public recreation space for residents and the school to use for the enjoyment of all in the village.</p> <p>I do not support policy 2B to the West of the village as it is outside of the existing village built area and new residents would be remote to all the existing village amenities, children would also have to walk along and cross main roads to get to the school and village hall etc.</p> <p>This site contains a large area of archaeological remains with it is understood the remains of a Roman Villa somewhere within the site.</p> <p>With this in mind development would be a very costly exercise which developers would not want to bear therefore it is unlikely that the wishes of the village to increase the community by 200 dwellings would ever be a reality and the NP would be a waste of public funding.</p> <p>Further to the above site problems there is also a high pressure pipeline within the site and the site is subject to major standing water problems.</p> <p>Building to the West of the village would also be contrary to</p>	See 11 52 56 6 14 21 62 76 55 10 & 24.
----	--	--	---	--

			<p>the findings of the Parish Plan of 2013 when a majority of residents elected to keep the distance between Fiskerton and Cherry Willingham to a maximum distance by using the site as a green wedge between the two villages.</p> <p>This site would not have the advantage of giving the paddock area to the village for community and sports use.</p>	
82			<p>I would like to express my support to the Neighbourhood Draft plan generally.</p> <p>I support policy No 2A – proposed development on the Northern Site as this is shown within the document to be the most sustainable site of the two and being close to the village centre would be more suitable for young families being close to the school etc.</p> <p>Building on the Northern site also will return Manor paddock back to a public recreation space for all residents to enjoy.</p> <p>I do not support policy 2B to the West of the village as it is extending the village further west and not rounding off the village centre, there are also major archaeological implications for this site plus a high pressure pipeline crosses the western boundary.</p> <p>There are also existing drainage problems with standing water on the site all of which would prove costly to overcome.</p> <p>This site also would not give the planning gain of the paddock to the community.</p>	<p>Western site would not give a planning gain of the paddock</p> <p>See also 11 14 21 49 62 76 55 10 &amp; 24.</p> <p>There is at present no deal on the table for the paddock if the West is chosen.</p>
83			<p>I would like to express my support to the Neighbourhood Draft plan generally.</p> <p>I support policy No 2A – proposed development on the Northern Site as this is shown within the document to be the most sustainable site of the two. This is also shown in the evidence given on the parish Council website and being close to the village centre would be more suitable for young families being close to the school etc. Where people could walk to use all the village facilities.</p>	See 82

			<p>Building on the Northern site also will return Manor paddock back to a public recreation space for all residents to enjoy.</p> <p>I do not support policy 2B to the West of the village as it extends the village further west and not rounding off the village centre. Newcomers would not be part of the existing community and find it difficult to integrate into village life. There are also major archaeological implications for this site plus a high pressure pipeline crosses the western boundary.</p> <p>There are also existing drainage problems with standing water. All of which would prove costly to overcome by any future developer.</p> <p>The use of this site would not be compatible with the wishes of the residents who elected in the Parish Plan to keep it as a green wedge between Fiskerton and Cherry Willingham. This site also would not give the planning gin of the paddock to the community.</p>	
84			<p>I support the draft plan and policies other than below.</p> <p>Policy number 2A. The proposed development on the northern site, I strongly support the proposed policy on the following grounds Children will be able to walk safely to and from school without crossing main roads. The northern site fits comfortably within the existing area of the village.</p> <p>Policy 2B Proposed development of the western site. I strongly reject the proposed policy on the following grounds This area covers major archaeological remains that are buried on this site. The western end of this site is within 100 meters of a high</p>	<p>Proximity to Prime take at northern end of western development</p> <p>See also 54 21 62 76.</p> <p>Confirmed by consultation with the school management</p>

			<p>pressure fuel line.</p> <p>The northern end of this site is within 200 metres of an ammunition factory.</p>	
85			<p>I would like to support the draft plan and policies with exception of those below.</p> <p>Policy number 2A. The proposed development on the northern site, I strongly support the proposed policy on the following grounds Children will be able to walk safely to and from schools without crossing main roads. The northern site fits comfortably within the existing area of the village.</p> <p>Policy 2B Proposed development of the western site. I strongly reject the proposed policy on the following grounds This area covers major archaeological remains that are buried on this site. The western end of this site is within 100 meters of a high pressure fuel line. The northern end of this site is within 200 metres of an ammunition factory.</p>	See 84.
86			<p>I support the draft plan with the exception of</p> <p>Policy number 2A. The proposed development on the northern site, I strongly support the proposed policy on the following grounds Children will be able to walk safely to and from schools without crossing main roads. The northern site fits comfortably within the existing area of the village.</p> <p>Policy 2B Proposed development of the western site. I strongly reject the proposed policy on the following</p>	See 84

			<p>grounds This area covers major archaeological remains that are buried on this site. The western end of this site is within 100 meters of a high pressure fuel line. The northern end of this site is within 200 metres of an ammunition factory.</p>	
87			<p>I support the neighbourhood plan with the exception of the policies below</p> <p>Policy number 2A. The proposed development on the northern site, I strongly support the proposed policy on the following grounds Children will be able to walk safely to and from schools without crossing main roads. The northern site fits comfortably within the existing area of the village.</p> <p>Policy 2B Proposed development of the western site. I strongly reject the proposed policy on the following grounds This area covers major archaeological remains that are buried on this site. The western end of this site is within 100 meters of a high pressure fuel line. The northern end of this site is within 200 metres of an ammunition factory.</p>	See 84.
88			<p>I give support to the draft NP and its general aims and vision except as follows</p> <p>Policy number 2A. The proposed development on the northern site, I strongly support the proposed policy on the following grounds Children will be able to walk safely to and from schools without crossing main roads. The northern site fits comfortably within the existing area of</p>	See 84.

			<p>the village.</p> <p>Policy 2B Proposed development of the western site. I strongly reject the proposed policy on the following grounds This area covers major archaeological remains that are buried on this site. The western end of this site is within 100 meters of a high pressure fuel line. The northern end of this site is within 200 metres of an ammunition factory.</p>	
89			<p>I support the draft plan and its policies with the exceptions below.</p> <p>Policy number 2A. The proposed development on the northern site, I strongly support the proposed policy on the following grounds Children will be able to walk safely to and from schools without crossing main roads. The northern site fits comfortably within the existing area of the village. Policy 2B Proposed development of the western site. I strongly reject the proposed policy on the following grounds This area covers major archaeological remains that are buried on this site. The western end of this site is within 100 meters of a high pressure fuel line. The northern end of this site is within 200 metres of an ammunition factory.</p>	See 84.
90			<p>For my opinion on the neighbourhood development plan you required facts</p> <p><b>Policies numbers 1 – 5</b> I couldn't really comment on as I would need to see more detail plans of the proposed</p>	<p>Footpath on the west could be an asset if improved &amp; lit</p> <p>See also 6 38 55.</p>

		<p>developments to both the west and the north I have seen one plan for the north that showed housing mix etc but nothing for the west so could not make a fair decision based on facts with the information available.</p> <p><b>Policy 6 transport</b>  I think transport in the village would be better if it was to the west you would not have two to three hundred extra cars coming through the village at least twice a day trying to get out of St Clements / Meadowbank / Nelson Road or any of the houses on the high St from Corn Close downwards would be greatly affected if the development was to the north the road past the pub and the church is already bad enough without this many extra vehicles I think this is a safety issue there have already been quite a few accidents on that stretch of road if it were to the west depending on where the road came out of the new development on to the main road (I would prefer just outside the village like they have done at Cherry Willingham from Lady Meres) put it there would not affect the current residents of the village getting into Lincoln only anyone who bought a new property.</p> <p><b>Policy 7 non vehicular</b>  If the development was to the west it would cut across a public footpath which would mean instead of having to walk all the way to Cherry Willingham across a field you would have at least two to three hundred yards of paved area with lighting for anyone walking to school the parade or Drs it is not an ideal solution but better than nothing.</p> <p><b>Policy 8 flooding</b>  If the development was to the west any drainage issues could be solved by putting a complete new system in that went across the main road round back of village to the facility off ferry side.</p>	<p>The footpath to CW could be made a safer access</p> <p>Assuming there is a through road Reepham Road to Lincoln Road. This is not an assured piece of new infrastructure. The Western site is more likely to be accessed by two cul-de-sacs due to the cost effectiveness to the developer. In which case 50% of the traffic would need to access the village from Reepham road to gain access to Lincoln Road</p> <p>Anglian Water make no difference between both proposed site with regard to flood risk. See also 20</p>
--	--	---	---



		<p><b>Policies 9 -11</b> I don't think it would make any difference if the development was north or west.</p> <p><b>Policy 12 protection of community facilities</b> I think the shop and village hall might be better off if it was to the north I think the pub and church might be better off it was to the west the school and paddock I think would be the same.</p> <p><b>Policy 13 village centre</b> I think the village centre is the pub paddock and church rather than the village hall and shop far more people in the village use the pub on a regular basis than the village hall and I don't think by putting the development to the north we will get a pharmacy or doctors or post office building 200 new houses is not going to get us any more facilities or jobs in the past 20 to 30 years we have built about 200 new homes in the village yet a pub has closed a post office has closed a factory has closed we no longer have a cricket or football pitch bus services are worse now than then. What benefits did building those 200 have for the village.</p> <p><b>Policy 14</b> I think whether it is north or west makes no difference.</p> <p>I am willing to go along with whatever the majority of the village want I want all the people who are eligible to vote to have a say in this matter not to be decided by the 12 people on the committee or by show of hands at a meeting. But forms go out to all the people who are eligible.</p>	Noted support for the majority option
91		<p>For my opinion on the neighbourhood development plan you required facts</p> <p><b>Policies numbers 1 – 5</b> I couldn't really comment on as I would need to see more detail plans of the proposed</p>	See 90.

		<p>developments to both the west and the north I have seen one plan for the north that showed housing mix etc but nothing for the west so could not make a fair decision based on facts with the information available.</p>	
--	--	---	--

**Policy 6 transport**

I think transport in the village would be better if it was to the west you would not have two to three hundred extra cars coming through the village at least twice a day trying to get out of St Clements / Meadowbank / Nelson Road or any of the houses on the high St from Corn Close downwards would be greatly affected if the development was to the north the road past the pub and the church is already bad enough without this many extra vehicles I think this is a safety issue there have already been quite a few accidents on that stretch of road if it were to the west depending on where the road came out of the new development on to the main road (I would prefer just outside the village like they have done at Cherry Willingham from Lady Meres) put it there would not affect the current residents of the village getting into Lincoln only anyone who bought a new property.

**Policy 7 non vehicular**

If the development was to the west it would cut across a public footpath which would mean instead of having to walk all the way to Cherry Willingham across a field you would have at least two to three hundred yards of paved area with lighting for anyone walking to school the parade or Drs it is not an ideal solution but better than nothing.

**Policy 8 flooding**

If the development was to the west any drainage issues could be solved by putting a complete new system in that went across the main road round back of village to the facility off ferry side.

		<p><b>Policies 9 -11</b> I don't think it would make any difference if the development was north or west.</p> <p><b>Policy 12 protection of community facilities</b> I think the shop and village hall might be better off if it was to the north I think the pub and church might be better off it was to the west the school and paddock I think would be the same.</p> <p><b>Policy 13 village centre</b> I think the village centre is the pub paddock and church rather than the village hall and shop far more people in the village use the pub on a regular basis than the village hall and I don't think by putting the development to the north we will get a pharmacy or doctors or post office building 200 new houses is not going to get us any more facilities or jobs in the past 20 to 30 years we have built about 200 new homes in the village yet a pub has closed a post office has closed a factory has closed we no longer have a cricket or football pitch bus services are worse now than then. What benefits did building those 200 have for the village.</p> <p><b>Policy 14</b> I think whether it is north or west makes no difference.</p> <p>I am willing to go along with whatever the majority of the village want I want all the people who are eligible to vote to have a say in this matter not to be decided by the 12 people on the committee or by show of hands at a meeting. But forms go out to all the people who are eligible.</p>	Noted support for the majority option
92		<p>Dear sirs, I have been studying your draft plan. Could you please tell me what feasibility studies have been to substantiate the viability of the claims of the Community Vision that there would be good access to a range of shops, services, and employment opportunities and that traffic and sewerage problems will be well managed and upgraded –</p>	No site selection comments made. Questions feasibility studies

			<p>what professional experts were involved in these, what are their names and qualifications and where can copies of their reports be seen?</p> <p>Has the Nettleham Doctor's practice been approached re their capacity to accept another 400+ patients?</p>	
93			<p>Map 1A For Close to village centre.</p> <p>Against Both Corn Close and Hall Lane are not wide enough for safe access, without being substantially upgraded. Surface water and sewer would need addressing. An increase in traffic through the village, especially past the church. Whilst construction work was going on all construction and delivery vehicles would be passing through the village. It would border forty four properties against six on the 1b plan. As for the church donating the paddock in the middle of the village, for a playing area it should be donated whichever plan is expected. A few years ago that was an excellent football and cricket field and still would have been if it wasn't for the then tenant and church commissioners, for whatever reason they wouldn't allow us to build a new pavilion or was it so they could hold the village to ransom to get their preferred planning application at a later date. Presumably the village would be expected to pay for the construction of the playing area or would it remain as a paddock for horses.</p> <p>Map 1B</p> <p>Against Would the existing sewer system be able to cope and if not who would pay to upgrade the system? Further away from the heart of the village. As for the playing field, the village shouldn't be held to</p>	<p>More homes will be impacted on the northern development</p> <p>See also 1 4 55 6 124 82 114 49 &amp; 6.</p> <p>Corn Close is acceptable for access see LCC 18</p>

			<p>ransom. Please read my comments about map 1A.</p> <p>For</p> <p>Less traffic passing through the village especially past the church, as most of the new traffic would be travelling via Cherry Willingham or Reepham.</p> <p>Better access to the site.</p> <p>Only backs on to six properties instead of forty four.</p> <p>Any surface water could be easily dealt with.</p> <p>The gap between neighbouring villages is negligible.</p>	
94			<p>My main concern is the potential increased traffic load on our village roads. It is generally considered, and agreed, the village has an ongoing issue with speeding and inappropriate driving standards. The 2011 census figures show a generally middle aged population of car owners. To increase the housing density by some 44% will undoubtedly increase traffic movements by a generally similar amount. The current proposed development in the North will result in every one of these additional vehicle movements impacting on the main routes through the village.</p> <p>Unfortunately, policy 2a makes no mention whatsoever of any measures to deal with such an increased traffic volume. It is for this reason alone that I cannot support this development option.</p> <p>The development area to the West would appear on, on face value, to mitigate many concerns regarding traffic movements through the village. However, closer inspection reveals a potentially worse situation. It has been stated that there would be a very low possibility of attaining a link road through the area. The lack of a link road will create unsustainable pressure on the surrounding roads. If, for example, the site were split in two with a northern access road from Reepham Road and a southern access road from Fiskerton Road then any residents living in the northern area wishing to leave the village by Fiskerton Road would use Plough Lane. Similarly, any residents living in the southern area of the development wishing to leave via Reepham</p>	<p>No site selection comments made. Does not support plan for development on either of the North or West sites</p> <p>See also 38 6 108</p>

		<p>Road would undoubtedly use Plough Lane. Obviously, this would create totally unacceptable traffic movements on what is already a narrow and misused road. Unfortunately, Policy 2b makes no mention whatsoever of measures to deal with this. Further, should propose a one-way system be introduced (see below) the effect on traffic through the village would be very little different to the Northern proposal. Without a link road, all traffic from the western development would be introduced into the one-way system in some way. For these reasons I cannot support this development option. However, my consideration go further. Referring to Policy 12 and Appendix A. It can be seen from above that Plough Lane is wholly insufficient for the volume of two-way traffic which will be generated by a western development. A significant road widening scheme would have to be undertaken to make Plough Lane a two-lane carriageway. Obviously, this cannot be realised due to the designated Green space area to the north of the road. Further, the Appendix proposes a one-way system with Plough Lane taking traffic in a south to north direction. Much traffic does currently travel south to north and much of it exits at the north-western junction, adjacent to Hill Rise, to turn left into Reephram Road. This junction is wholly unsuitable for left turning traffic. Almost without exception, traffic emerges swiftly without correct observation and at a speed which makes it almost impossible to stop should I or my family be emerging from my drive. Both my wife and I have had incidents in our cars resulting in vehicles either swerving on the wrong side of the road or stopping just inches short of a collision. I have had countless very near misses on my motorcycles. One such near miss can be viewed here: <a href="https://1drv.ms/v/s!Au1i871SoBx6getcXvVMFhmQDgGUAw">https://1drv.ms/v/s!Au1i871SoBx6getcXvVMFhmQDgGUAw</a> Note how at the point where I pull out of the drive no other vehicle is visible. Note how little time passes between my commitment to move and the emergence of the car. Note also how close the other vehicle comes, he is not travelling fast but neither does he seem to acknowledge my presence.</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>This event is quite benign in comparison to others but the scenario is played out over and over again. I have already lost two cats. One day I will be injured. Or worse. Therefore, two things should be included in any future planning.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any proposed one-way route involving Plough Lane should be north to south only.</li> <li>The north-western end of Plough Lane should be stopped off to all traffic. All traffic would then need to use the north-eastern entrance. This junction is pen, has full visibility and is inherently safer.</li> </ol> <p>It is with these views in mind that I find it impossible, at the moment, to support the neighbourhood plan as it is currently proposed.</p>	
95			<p>Thank you for the time you spent with me discussing the neighbourhood plan and my questions. You, Paul and Rob were very informative and helpful with your answers and brought me to speed with the history and the development of the plan to what it is now. I hope the village are able to respond positively to all the hard work you and the other committee members have put into the future of the village. However, I also hope that in soliciting a positive response, there is some scope for listening to the 'opinions' of the village in the event of strong feelings for one of the two options presented (North or West) bearing in mind the evidence of favouring the North is significant but not overwhelming.</p> <p>Please pass on my appreciation to both Rob and Paul also for their time and patient explanations, it is very much appreciated, thank you.</p> <p>I have passed a copy of this email on to Chris Darcel, my neighbour, I hope you don't mind. As you know it is my overwhelming desire that the village are united at the end of this process and that all that can be done to achieve this should be done by everyone.</p>	No site selection comments made. Supports the plan & sees evidence for the North site as more favourable but not overwhelming
96			<p>On reading the Nov NP I note that in the section Activity 12 that the favoured option of those that registered an interest was No1 but noting in the plan to state that at the time only</p>	No site selection comments made. See also 5

			<p>two options were deliverable, both on the North site, since there is another site (west) now deliverable would it not be prudent to have a second vote (judging by the objections that have been raised in other public meetings) before the favoured site of the NPG goes to a referendum to find out which villagers prefer, after all it's no good going ahead if it's not what the majority want and wasting more time and resources recent events of Brexit and US president have proved that. Also in light of the closure of GPs surgeries in Lincoln is the group still confident in delivering a surgery in the village. Finally it states that six houses were built in Corn Close this is incorrect, if this basic accumulation of figures is lacking what else in the plan is flawed?</p>	
97			<p>After receiving new information my preferred option would be to put the new development on the west side of the village. After speaking to many villagers the general feeling backs that up. Please disregard my referendum choice B. the referendum was not a true representation of the choices available at the time. <u>The reason for my choice is mainly surface water drainage.</u></p>	<p>See also 55. Surface water is addressed by the flood policy in the current plan for both of the sites included at this time. The NP Ballot at the time was a true representation of the sites available. this changed after September 2016</p>
98			<p>I would prefer the development to be built to the west of the village. It would be close to the village shop, pub and school. Also easy access to Cherry Willingham, Drs, shops, pharmacy and both infant and senior school. There is no guarantee we would get these facilities in our village. Building to the north would increase traffic through the village increasing safety issues. There have been quite a few accidents on the stretch of road High Street past the church. Flooding. If the development was to the west any drainage issues could be solved by putting a new system in that went across the main road to the facility off Ferry Side.</p>	<p>West development would provide better access to CW facilities.</p> <p>The traffic point is being argued for both sites equally with little proof at this time</p> <p>Surface water and drainage generally is dealt with by policy 8 Flooding Development to the North of Ferry Road would also entail new drainage development therefore improving the current drainage problems</p>
99			<p>I firmly believe the proposed development should be to the west of the village. This will minimise the impact of traffic congestion. It will also eliminate the risk of flooding with the eastern proposal –</p>	<p>See 6 10 55 124</p>



			which already has a flood mitigation scheme on it as a result of the flawed Holmefield development. The western development has the best access to the main road, and to the river for drainage. It could also be joined to Reepham Road, further reducing traffic congestion.	
100			I believe the western development is best. There will be far less traffic congestion. As an OAP I already think the road through the village is too busy and dangerous. We know there has been flooding issues as the land rises toward the aerodrome e.g. Holmefield, so why build more on it? The thought of 200 more cars in the middle of the village turning from Corn Close or Hall Lane onto the main road fills me with dread. I do feel this process seems biased and we will be forced to agree to the eastern development.	See 6 8 55 1 4
101			<p>I would prefer development west of the village, from the map it still leaves a good gap up to Cherry Willingham.</p> <p>2a- I would prefer less than 200 houses as in the distant future there would be another call for housing and I don't want the village swamped by too much housing.</p> <p>4 - I would support a good housing mix. Not just building for the better off.</p> <p>5 – Certainly use infill for development. Using spare plots should be the first thing to do. What about the old factory site?</p> <p>6 – West would be better for less traffic. Surely most of the new traffic will turn right, out of either site, more people going toward Lincoln. I cannot see many going toward Bardney. So the west development would keep extra traffic out of the village and away from the school. Plus the problem by the church bend.</p> <p>7 – I don't think putting houses on the north of Ferry Road will encourage people to integrate or use village facilities anymore than anywhere else.</p> <p>8 – Flooding could be better controlled on the west site Any builders must prove they can control extra water, so there isn't the same trouble as there was at the top of Holmefield.</p> <p>9 – I support provision for local employment. Perhaps proper</p>	<p>Speculation about village integration cannot be considered as evidence.</p> <p>The Plan proposes 200appx houses over a 20 year period (the life of the plan) therefore no further major development would be considered during that time.</p> <p>The proposed plan policies call for a mix of houses to be built to suit all needs.</p> <p>See also 24 36 6 10 55</p>

			<p>units in a sensible place. I don't want to end up living next to someone running a kerb-side autos outfit, with the nuisance it brings.</p> <p>Thank you for all the efforts put in by the members of the N.P group.</p>	
102			<p>We both consider the west site is the best option. 200 houses would easily generate an additional 300+ cars, most journeys would be to Cherry Willingham (for shopping, doctors, and library) and to Lincoln for work and major shopping. If the north plan were adopted most of this would have to pass the village hall, play area, primary school, the pub car park and, the most dangerous, narrow bends alongside the church. The local shop, pub and church are nearer the west option. The construction traffic during the building work would be considerable and a further hazard if the north was chosen.</p>	<p>The church &amp; pub are nearer to the west. This is true, but the centre should not just be seen as a geographical element but also as an activity centre e.g. school village hall, scouts</p> <p>See also 6 38 102 124</p> <p>Some residents believe that village centre is around pub/church</p>
103			<p>Building to the west is the only sensible place. It will avoid further flooding in the village and prevent congestion from traffic going through the village. We already get flooded in heavy rain but what would it be like if Ridings Field is covered in houses and driveways? Why do we need so many houses? 200+ is too large an increase for our village.</p>	<p>200 homes is one of the main policies of the plan to ensure the village thrives</p> <p>See also 6 10 55</p> <p>Flood risk protection is a key policy of the proposed plan</p>
104			<p>From the draft site assessment there are only 2 siting locations that are defined as deliverable NP03 and NP04. Of the 2 locations, I am firmly in favour of NP03 land to the west. Additionally at from all the meetings I have been to in the village hall I have people voice their preference for development to the west and opposing development to the north.</p> <p>Of all the arguments that have been voiced these are the ones I feel most relevant.</p> <p><b>Traffic</b> - If we are looking to increase the size of the village by 35% (200 properties) then the amount of vehicles in the village will also increase by 35%. The majority of these will commute to Lincoln for work and recreational purposes. The flow of traffic through the village will further be impacted by the closure of Hawthorn Road when the eastern by-pas is</p>	<p>also to keep development to a minimum. The plan does not cover this in its policies.</p> <p>See also 6 54 1 10 55 37 102.</p>

		<p>built.</p> <p><b>NP03</b> - By building to the west of the natural traffic flow will keep the majority of the additional vehicles out of the centre and away from the High Street blackspot past the church. Reducing the quantity of vehicles traveling through the village will also provide added protection to areas around the school and village hall making the village centre a safer place.</p> <p><b>NP04</b> - Building to the north of the village will increase vehicle traffic through the village will raise concern over child safety around the school and the play area around the village hall; this will probably require additional traffic calming measures at additional cost. The access through Corn Close is inadequate for the amount of site traffic during the construction phase and in the future it will struggle to handle the additional vehicles once the properties are occupied.</p> <p><b>Flooding</b> - Living on Ferry Road I was a victim of the flooding that used to occur prior to the flood mitigation scheme being developed. even now though the holding pools frequently become very full during heavy rain periods even though surface run off is minimised as a lot of the rain water soaks into the ground and is held by the roots of the crops. By building to the north the amount of natural soak away will be reduced which will increase the surface run off. Either the flood mitigation will require enlarging or the likelihood of flooding will become a real threat to the residence of Ferry Road.</p> <p><b>Employment</b> - Policy 9 in the executive summary seeks to support local employment. As it stands there is very little opportunity for employment in the village (1 shop, 1 pub). The lack of employment opportunities in the village will force people to have to commute toward Lincoln for work, or become self-employed. Either of these options will increase the numbers of vehicles on the roads. Self-employed people generally run a van and although the average of 1.6 cars per</p>	<p>Interesting comment on flooding. They would seem to indicate that there is not the regular flooding most of the objections make out, and that the existing mitigation scheme is working.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>household is true in rural locations it is also a fact that a greater number of residents of rural locations have to commute to work, therefore increasing the actual number of vehicles on the road per household greater than a similar development in an already urban area would. These factors increase the impact of traffic issues mentioned above.</p> <p><b>Village Centre</b> - Policy 13 in the executive summary seeks to designate a village centre for uses such as a pharmacy, nursery, post office, butchers, and doctors. The current village centre on the shop and village hall does not have the capacity to grow to allow all these additional facilities to be established, therefore the need for a location for a new village centre needs to be considered. Although areas NP03 and NP04 are similar in size to allow the selected site to grow further to create a new village centre would be considerably more acceptable to the west. To expand further to the north would impact on the wooded areas on the airfield and into the solar farm areas and would be limited by the exclusion zone around Primetake, whereas to expand to the west will only take the additional development nearer to Lincoln City and nearer to the transport networks and business support industries (suppliers, banks, waste removal) that a new village centre would require</p> <p><b>A thriving village</b> - At one of the NPG meetings in the summer one of the committee members said that the NPG set out to grow Fiskerton into a thriving, bustling town for the future. It is my opinion and that of everyone I speak to in the village that if I wanted to live in a thriving bustling environment I would move to Cherry Willingham or Lincoln or Nottingham, I chose to live in Fiskerton to live in the countryside away from the bustles of a thriving town. As the UK population is continually growing more and more of the countryside is being destroyed to make way for residential housing. The last thing this country needs is another bustling town, we should strive to preserve the countryside and all the beauty that comes with it and if we are forced to</p>	<p>The NPG aims to develop Fiskerton as a thriving and sustainable village for future generations.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>accept development in our neighbourhood then it should be in a respectful manner and in a way that does not pollute the beauty of an old English village. It is therefore my opinion that any new development should be as far away from the current village centre as possible and should not interfere with the views and the atmosphere of the countryside currently enjoyed by our children in the school, visitors to the village hall and the residents in the village. By building to the west of the village the modern development and the issues associated with an increasing population is directed towards Lincoln and away from the countryside that would be swallowed up by development to the north.</p>	
105			<p>3.2 Edward Leigh Forward – “Fiskerton is leading the way by providing a model for sensible, well thought out limited growth” <b>(not true!)</b></p> <p>3.4 Neighbourhood plan produced by local people – supported by a majority of people <b>(not true)</b>.</p> <p>3.5 CLLP “Agreed for limited amount of development for medium village”. No mention of the 15% e.g. 90 properties limit <b>(economical with the truth)</b>.</p> <p>3.7 “to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the local plan area” <b>(not so – it does not recommend linear development which the W/E is nor does it agree building to be good agricultural land)</b>.</p> <p>3.8 Community infrastructure levy. Will the 25% for the Parish Council be graduated in line with building development?</p> <p>4.1 Has there been any aerial photography of the whole village? Are there any archaeological records for the fields above Ferry Road? David Needham says there are finds. Is there archaeological evidence of finds over the whole area marked with blue on the map to the west or just some part of it?</p>	<p>This resident is against any development on the North and raises many points. The best solution would be for the resident to look at all the responses listed in this document.</p> <p>see all comments to responses</p>

		<p>4.9 Tofts and crofts are mainly ploughed out.</p> <p>P.14 Activity 6 – chart 15/1/2015 and 23/1/2015 – <b>were these open consultations?</b></p> <p>P.15 Activity 8 24/8/2015 – <b>which two businesses attended?</b></p> <p>Activity 9 9/9/2015 Meeting at the Tyrwhitt Arms – <b>was this an advertised open meeting?</b></p> <p><b>(One year without public consultations?)</b> 5 “Fiskerton will thrive and provide good access to a range of shops, services, and employment opportunities” <b>(what services, what employment?)</b></p> <p>“Traffic and sewerage problems will be managed and upgraded” <b>(Is this true and what evidence is there for this to happen?)</b></p> <p><b>I think the CLLP indicates that all appropriate infrastructure should be in place before or in tandem with any new development.</b></p> <p>P.17 Policy 1 – 3 Shall not cause detrimental harm to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) amenity</li> <li>b) landscape character, heritage assets and the wider setting of the area</li> <li>c) wildlife and biodiversity</li> </ul> <p><b>(adjacent properties will lose value advised by an estate agent our property will lose up £5000. Landscape will be ruined and if houses are built on the higher ground above Ridings Close they will look directly into the bungalows living room. This would not be so with development to the west because the few existing properties which it might affect would be higher than</b></p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p><b>any new development).</b></p> <p><b>7.2 Who are the professional planners?</b> The village will not be upgraded – it is already a medium village – this contradicts the comment on 3.5.</p> <p>“New housing should be located next to the existing village amenities” <b>(Ridings Field is no nearer the centre than the west site).</b></p> <p><b>Who thought 200 homes reasonable?</b> The housing survey responses 2016 have been carefully disregarded. 60 did not want more than 0-80 houses, 40 wanted 81-120 (120 in total), only 58 wanted more than 121.</p> <p><b>It is proving to be much more than 200 homes – now approx. 230 on new development, plus land at Tanya Site, the Old Dairy, Short Ferry and infill sites it will be more like 300 houses. Please tell the residents as it is and not hide details from them. Please can we have a total estimate for predicted building for the whole of Fiskerton?</b></p> <p>7.4 In 2014 by a show of hands people believed they had voted for a N/S development.</p> <p><b>7.5 Which professional planners suggested only 2 of 9 sites met the criteria for development?</b></p> <p><b>P.20 Has no one seen through the church commissioner’s plan?</b> If they build to the south side north of Ferry road, then the land above will not be adequate for renting to a farmer so they will apply to build on that land in the future.</p> <p>P.21 Ridings Field is not located next to the village centre and does not round off the existing settlements – it lengthens them.</p>	<p>The Tanya site is designated within the NDP for business development and employment. In addition there are is no plans for residential housing at Short Ferry.</p>
--	--	--	---

P.22 Pol 2a.

c) The height of new properties should reflect that of the surrounding area **(will there be bungalows behind Ridings Close?)**

d) Loss of wildlife

e) Direct access to areas of public open space – **not so.**

l) Buffer zone to Hall Lane – What will that be? What is green? Trees. Pathway, cycle track? These could make properties on the north of Ferry Road vulnerable to burglary.

7.13 Why does the west option not include the paddock?

7.15 There still would be a green wedge between Cherry Willingham and Fiskerton.

**The community has not had opportunity to relay concerns regarding the west development.**

Cannot see that flooding, access, drainage, school are a problem with the west option.

It could also incorporate the small link road between Lincoln Road and Reephram Road.

Sustainability is little different from the north of Ferry Road.

P.26 Policy 2b

b) Height of buildings a lesser problem to the west because existing properties are on higher ground.

10.2 “Try to source and implement the solution to traffic issues” **(need to be in place before building).**

10.3 What will change on street parking on Ferry Road and Corn Close?

10.4 What policies will help mitigate the problem of on street parking?



			<p>P.36 Rights of way – Hall Lane – Viking Way.</p> <p>12.1 <b>Will surface water run-off from fields above Ferry Road draining towards the river extend the flood risk areas? Not such a problem for the W. site.</b></p> <p>12.4 <b>6 Why have existing ditches not been maintained? Is there anything to say they will be maintained in the future?</b></p> <p>P.40 Where and what is being projected for local employment opportunities?</p> <p>P.43 Public Open Spaces – Ridings Close pond is not included. It is not supported or maintained by the PC. Unfairly the residents of Ridings Close have to maintain the area and pay annual insurance of around £392.00 annually in case someone falls into the pond which often has no water in it and no one has seen any great crested newts which was the reason for retaining that area as public open space. All other open spaces are to the west of the village.</p> <p>The area by Jessamine Cottage has been include. Why? This was available for road widening on Plough Lane <b>(this speaks of committee members who live nearby putting forward personal views with little consideration for others).</b></p> <p>P.46 LG2 and LG3 are not very advantageous to wildlife whereas Ridings Field attracts a wide range of biodiversity including 2 winter visiting very rare hen harriers. Additionally, there are nesting magpies and sparrow hawks. There are great spotted woodpeckers, buzzards, barn and tawny owls among other smaller nesting and visiting birds. There are bats, hares, rabbits, foxes, muntjac and hedgehogs. The field hedges and verges support a mixture of ancient hedgerow and wildflowers all providing seeds and</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>berries for winter feeding birds. They also provide a corridor for hunting barn and tawny owls.</p> <p>P.48 Where are pen spaces to the east?</p> <p>18.2 Is Short Ferry caravan site likely to expand? Will that increase the number of properties, residents, traffic etc. in Fiskerton and by how much?</p> <p>18.8 Rumble Strips – already loud traffic noise with potholes on Ferry Road. Is there still a proposed road through the development to the North of Ferry Road from Corn Close to Hall Lane? For the west / east development there will be a high nuisance level of movement of vehicles to and from the proposed site past existing residences and an unacceptable proliferation of vehicular access on to Corn Close and Ferry Road to the detriment of highway safety and to the character of the street scene.</p> <p><b>I believe there is a very real need for a further ballot since the west site has now been included on the draft plan and there has been no opportunity for the residents to make their views known about this. The previous ballot of 6 options (4 of which were deemed possible) must be null and void especially since I believe someone delivered a number of ballots at the final drop in. These were supposed to be gathered from people not able to attend but that same option was not available to all. Additionally, it should include the size of development residents are prepared to accept since figures on the 2016 Housing Needs Survey seem to have been largely ignored. I think the paddock should be left out of the equation because there are other ways to obtain pen spaces for the community through grants etc.</b></p> <p><b>You have rightly asked for name and address on the</b></p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<b>comments form. Will it be [possible for the questions and comments provided to be answered individually otherwise how will we be able to know the answers and explanations?</b>	
106			<p>We support the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, however we are in favour of Policy 2b: Development to the West of Fiskerton.</p> <p>Although we personally do not wish to see any development to the rear of Ridings Close, our decision is supported and based upon factors and issues that have been discussed and raised during the Neighbourhood Plan process.</p> <p>Community Consultation 7.9</p> <p>The concerns raised by local residents during the consultation in relation to the North option include * Flooding * Access * Drainage * Housing Mix * Public Amenity to surrounding properties * Traffic moving through the village * School capacity * Impact on Hall Lane and Corn Close.</p>	<p>Housing mix is covered in the plan policy number 4</p> <p>See also 10 1 4 55 6 57 12.</p>
107			<p>I am concerned that the NPG has a determination to enlarge the village by approximately 300 properties. This incorporates the 230 projected development to the north of Ferry Rd. Perhaps 20 social housing properties in the rear of the old dairy, a possible 20 additional park homes at Short Ferry, potential development of the Tanya site and an infilling that might occur in and round the village. Added to this is a “pensioner’s village” which has been suggested located behind the village hall. An excellent position for such a development as it would be near the shop and the village hall as well as most of our public open spaces.</p> <p>The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP) already regards Fiskerton as a medium sized village and calculates that the additional housing requirements or Fiskerton should be 15% i.e. 90 houses. According to the NPG’s own survey of 2016, 65% of residents want no more than 120 new properties. I estimate that 55% will want no more than 90. It seems that the NPG are representing the church commissioners (CC) rather than the existing residents which should be their</p>	<p>This resident is against any development on the north and raises many points. The best solution would be for the resident to look at all the responses listed in this document.</p> <p>These sites and figure are all speculation and have not been included in the plan. see all NPG comments to responses.</p>

			<p>function. When I asked a question about this at the public meeting early this year your chairman greed that this was an NPG function so why does the NPG propose 230+?</p> <p>I agree with the CLLP that we should have no more than 90 new homes. This is based on many reasons:</p> <p>1 – Most residents of Fiskerton do not want more than 90 new homes.</p> <p>2 – The traffic situation – we do not want an increase in traffic along Ferry Rd and High St if it can possibly be avoided. Most Fiskerton residents travel to or from Lincoln rather than the direction of Bardney. This suggests that most development should be to the west of the village centre.</p> <p>3 – Where to locate the village centre is significant. I suggest that it should be at the junction of Ferry Rd, High St and Chapel Lane. Placed here the distances from a {illegible} entrance / exit on Reepham Rd to a western development is about identical to that to Corn Close thus giving the main access to / from development to the north of Ferry Rd no advantage.</p> <p>4 – The fact that land to the west of the village has now been made available for development by the CC. When the village voted early in 2016 on preferred sites land to the west was “not available” so NPG told us not to vote for it. The situation has been reversed and I consider that a new vote should be organised by the NPG. Would you please arrange this? This is very urgent.</p> <p>5 – A short link road between Lincoln Rd and Reepham Rd should be constructed. This could forma feeder road for the new development to the west of Fiskerton. High Street could become one-way for west bound traffic and so overcome the problem of the bottleneck between the church and Manor House.</p> <p>No parking zones are required along Ferry Rd from my proposed village centre to the east of Tanya. This would need strict enforcement. If a large development north of Ferry Road is built, Corn Close should have similarly</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>enforced restrictions.</p> <p>Hall Lane is part of the Viking Way and therefore an important national public right of way for walkers. It should not be widened or become an entrance / exit road for any new building development for use of construction traffic driving development which might take place or for use of residents in such properties.</p> <p>As a retired family doctor who worked as a principal in the Lincoln area for 30 years I do not believe there is any chance of a surgery opening in Fiskerton. The government has discouraged new single handed practises opening for 50 years. Funding for branch surgeries (e.g. that at Cherry Willingham) has been withdrawn. I have discussed the situation with the practice manager at Nettleham and she agrees that no such development is a practicable proposition. Could the NPG bear the facts in mind when communicating with villagers?</p> <p>On p18 para 7.2 of the Fiskerton Draft Neighbourhood Plan you refer non-specifically to “professional planers”. Who are they and are they more authoritative than the CLLP who already regard Fiskerton as a medium sized village which warrants an increase of only 15% of residential properties, not the 50%+ that the NPG is advocating. Why should residents have to tolerate this discrepancy and its possible consequences?</p> <p>A local farmer tells me that the land to the north of Ferry Rd is better farmland than that to the west of the village – another reason for development to the west.</p> <p>If the fields to the north of Ferry Rd were developed as you suggest it would leave three ‘half fields’ each too small for economic farming and therefore likely to be unused. This would leave an area similar to that already proposed by the NPG and there might be little objection to yet a further 230 houses being approved, an opportunity the CC would probably jump at. For this to occur it would totally change the character of Fiskerton. Does anyone really want this to happen?</p>	
--	--	---	--

			<p>Ridings Close and Ferry Rd nearby quickly gets flooded during and after heavy rain. Photographs of the situation are in possession of WLDC planners. If homes are built above Ridings Close extensive and therefore expensive flood management would be required to overcome the problem. I believe that much less of a flood problem would occur if building to the west.</p> <p>In the field above Ridings Close I have observed some very interesting wildlife. During last winter and again this year hen harriers have visited us. They are a very rare species of bird of prey. I also see foxes, muntjac, grass snakes, hares, rabbits, rooks, jackdaws, barn owls, tawny owls and both spotted and green woodpeckers as well as a large range of garden birds. An occasional sighting of the now rare hedgehog occurs and in the pond area nearby there is historical evidence of great crested newts. They have not been seen in recent years but could still be present. Most of these species would be seriously disturbed if the field above Ridings Close were developed. Some would disappear altogether from the area.</p> <p>I would like to see some plan for the maintenance of the pond area and adjacent open space. Recently other areas such as the green area on Plough Lane have been declared a green open space which I imagine the NPG has requested the District Council to provide. Could a similar application be submitted for the Ridings Close / Pond area? Would the appropriate council be responsible for its maintenance?</p> <p>I have shown above where I believe that any development of Fiskerton should take place and why. The main development should be to the west but the Tanya Site needs clearing and would then be suitable for development. I would support housing for the elderly being located behind the village hall – perhaps 20 – 40 units and say 20 units developed on the old dairy site. There may be reasons to endorse Short Ferry.</p> <p>P.S. Sorry this is in (poor) handwriting but I am hopeless with a QWERTY keyboard. I hope you can read it!</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

108			<p>North is Nuts!!</p> <p>Any new housing development would be better to the west because:</p> <p>Traffic from the new residents and construction vehicles would not have to travel into the village past the school and the main residential areas.</p> <p>A purpose-built link ad between Lincoln Rd and Reepham Rd could be constructed thereby reducing the amount of traffic using High St which is a very dangerous stretch of road for vehicles and pedestrians.</p> <p>There are less complex drainage issues to the west and the risk of flooding is reduced.</p> <p>The church would return to being the centre of the village which would in turn balance the village.</p> <p>Are the proposed houses on the Brownfield site on Blacksmith Rd (old farm buildings) which I have been assured are on the neighbourhood plan included in the figure of around 200 new homes which keeps getting quoted or are these an extra 30 is new homes to be snook in?</p> <p>If paddock was granted local green space status in Spring, why has the issue of the paddock being built on been hung over our heads at every NPC public meeting and in most literature?</p>	<p>Linking of Reepham &amp; Lincoln roads. This has been discussed at NPG meetings. It could be too onerous on the developer. It is also regarded by some as not good village planning policy as it splits communities</p> <p>See also 6 55 10 102 36 &amp; 82.</p>
109			<p>Preference: site to the WEST of the village.</p> <p>Reasons: Two main roads feed in to the west end of the village which would help with the flow of the traffic towards the city.</p> <p>It would help keep traffic off the main road in the village.</p> <p>Reduce the flood risk from run-off water, especially down St. Clements Drive, as the proposed eastern site is on the higher side of the village.</p>	See 6 10 55
110			<p>I would propose and like the site for planning in the village to be set to the site to the west of the village. The reasons for this choice are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Initial site voting – There was no option to vote for the west side of the village in the initial village poll. This I hazard agues is why the low turnout of votes and a</li> </ol>	Site access, H&S is relevant to both sites see also 124 6 10 55 1 4 93 & 111.

			<p>vote for the north site, as in affect, there was nothing else to vote for. With the west now becoming available, this would be my preferred site of development within the village.</p> <p>2. Ease of traffic congestion though the village, any new development on this site would have to have new roads and would negate increase of traffic though the core part of the existing village, which has had issue with speeding vehicles and poor roads. This site would also mean in affect a trunk road being established from the bottom road to the top road which would stop the existing roads, Plough lane and Blacksmiths, being used as rat run by motorists.</p> <p>3. Drainage – o drainage issues are related with this end of the village and any new development would mean that new sewage and drainage would be included and developed. The site to the north (Ferry Road) has had issues with excessive run-off and subsequently new French drains created. It also has been stated that the existing drainage system wold not cope with additional buildings in the village. This was demonstrated by the flooding of the village in 2002 – 2006 with poor drainage system constructed on the new estate which overloaded the existing drainage system. There was also significant flooding to properties on Ferry road, including ours, in 2007 with excess water run-off and the riparian drains being unable to cope with flood water. The site to the west, being a virgin site could have a new system established which does not feed into the existing old and overloaded system.</p> <p>4. Access to the development, a site to the west would mean that new access and egress to the site would be constructed which would be sufficient width and appropriation for vehicles. At present, the proposed site to the north would have ineffective access and egress points. Corn Close road is too narrow, as is</p>	
--	--	--	---	--



			<p>the access from the school. The road from hall Lane is dangerous and does not have suitable visibility; it is too narrow and would require significant remedial work.</p> <p>5. The sites of access to the proposed north site would also create potential health and safety issues as in accordance with the Construction Design and Management Regulations (CDM) 2015. Sufficient access would be required for heavy plant and machinery, which would cause excessive wear and tear to the existing highway, noise, vibration to existing properties and potential damage to the sewage and system. The north site would also have to take into considerable account of working hours and site access times due to the school and local residents. All of which would cause significant problems and costs in the Construction Stage Plan. The site to the west would negate the majority of these issues faced by planning and construction companies due to openness, limited existing residential impact and easy access routes to and from the construction site, negating the need for significant cost and consultation with residents and the school over hours of operation, dust, noise, site traffic, light pollution and vibration exposure etc. Under the CDM regulations in layman's terms it means a construction site located that near to a school would not be allowed to run construction traffic through the village at school start, lunch and closing times, they would also have to cease operations at these times and at play times, meaning a loss of approximately 4 hours of construction time per day, this would significantly increase the cost and prolong the construction time of the project. A project undertaken to the west of the village would mean that this would not happen and the site could run at normal 07.00hrs to 18.00hrs, giving full productivity to</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>the construction company and minimising discomfort to the existing residents of the village.</p> <p>6. A significant bat population are seen most evenings over the north proposed site, The Bat Conservation Trust have been contacted to undertake a survey. Approximately 20 – 30 bats have been seen over the field at any one time. There are also Barn Owl, Red Kite and Tawney Owl which use the site for hunting. It would not be surprising that Great Crested Newts and Common Newts are using the drainage hollows created; these species are currently found in ponds in houses on Ferry Road. Fiskerton is a village which has a number of Great Crested Newts and is noted in the Local Biodiversity Plan as having a high number. Significant surveys of newts would be encouraged to be undertaken on the north site due to the wetland areas created by the Environment Agency. Any finding of Great Crested Newt could potentially stop any construction on the site, or even moving the construction a further 100 metres away from their existing habitat. No indication of these species has been seen to the west of the village due to the openness of this site. Therefore, the west would be a better proposition due to the ecological benefit the north site currently presents to existing wildlife.</p> <p>In conclusion, the site I would propose as the better of the sites for the construction and development to take place on would be the west of the village.</p>	
111			<p>I would propose and like the site for planning in the village to be set to the site to the west of the village. The reasons for this choice are as follows:</p> <p>1. Initial site voting – There was no option to vote for the west side of the village in the initial village poll. This I hazard agrees is why the low turnout of votes and a vote for the north site, as in effect, there was nothing else to vote for. With the west now becoming available, this would be my preferred site of</p>	<p>Wildlife &amp; Bats over NS &amp; Hall Lane. It is likely that the same wildlife exists on the WS</p> <p>The above comment is a fact and is equally valid for wildlife on the western site.</p> <p>See also 6 10 55 1 4 93 124.</p>

			<p>development within the village.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Ease of traffic congestion though the village, any new development on this site would have to have new roads and would negate increase of traffic though the core part of the existing village, which has had issue with speeding vehicles and poor roads. This site would also mean in affect a trunk road being established from the bottom road to the top road which would stop the existing roads, Plough lane and Blacksmiths, being used as rat run by motorists.</li> <li>3. Drainage – o drainage issues are related with this and of the village and any new development would mean that new sewage and drainage would be included and developed. The site to the north (Ferry Road) has had issues with excessive run-off and subsequently new French drains created. It also has been stated that the existing drainage system wold not cope with additional buildings in the village. This was demonstrated by the flooding of the village in 2002 – 2006 with poor drainage system constructed on the new estate which overloaded the existing drainage system. There was also significant flooding to properties on Ferry road, including ours, in 2007 with excess water run-off and the riparian drains being unable to cope with flood water. The site to the west, being a virgin site could have a new system established which does not feed into the existing old and overloaded system.</li> <li>4. Access to the development, a site to the west would mean that new access and egress to the site would be constructed which would be sufficient width and appropriation for vehicles. At present, the proposed site to the north would have ineffective access and egress points. Corn Close road is too narrow, as is the access from the school. The road from hall Lane is dangerous and does not have suitable visibility; it is too narrow and would require significant remedial</li> </ol>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>work.</p> <p>5. The sites of access to the proposed north site would also create potential health and safety issues as in accordance with the Construction Design and Management Regulations (CDM) 2015. Sufficient access would be required for heavy plant and machinery, which would cause excessive wear and tear to the existing highway, noise, vibration to existing properties and potential damage to the sewage and system. The north site would also have to take into considerable account of working hours and site access times due to the school and local residents. All of which would cause significant problems and costs in the Construction Stage Plan. The site to the west would negate the majority of these issues faced by planning and construction companies due to openness, limited existing residential impact and easy access routes to and from the construction site, negating the need for significant cost and consultation with residents and the school over hours of operation, dust, noise, site traffic, light pollution and vibration exposure etc. Under the CDM regulations in layman's terms it means a construction site located that near to a school would not be allowed to run construction traffic through the village at school start, lunch and closing times, they would also have to cease operations at these times and at play times, meaning a loss of approximately 4 hours of construction time per day, this would significantly increase the cost and prolong the construction time of the project. A project undertaken to the west of the village would mean that this would not happen and the site could run at normal 07.00hrs to 18.00hrs, giving full productivity to the construction company and minimising discomfort to the existing residents of the village.</p> <p>6. A significant bat population are seen most evenings</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>over the north proposed site, The Bat Conservation Trust have been contacted to undertake a survey. Approximately 20 – 30 bats have been seen over the field at any one time. There are also Barn Owl, Red Kite and Tawney Owl which use the site for hunting. It would not be surprising that Great Crested Newts and Common Newts are using the drainage hollows created; these species are currently found in ponds in houses on Ferry Road. Fiskerton is a village which has a number of Great Crested Newts and is noted in the Local Biodiversity Plan as having a high number. Significant surveys of newts would be encouraged to be undertaken on the north site due to the wetland areas created by the Environment Agency. Any finding of Great Crested Newt could potentially stop any construction on the site, or even moving the construction a further 100 metres away from their existing habitat. No indication of these species has been seen to the west of the village due to the openness of this site. Therefore, the west would be a better proposition due to the ecological benefit the north site currently presents to existing wildlife.</p> <p>In conclusion, the site I would propose as the better of the sites for the construction and development to take place on would be the west of the village.</p>	
112			<p>I apologise for the late response to the Fiskerton Neighbourhood plan however we have only just moved into the village. Our knowledge of the village however extends to visiting with family up here for over three years and the decision ourselves to relocate from the south to this part of the country and we would therefore like to express our concerns over the plans to develop the area behind the houses on Ferry Road. We have always been aware of the problems i.e. increased traffic to an already busy road and the problems development would bring to the infrastructure of a small village, but we feel that the areas to the west of Fiskerton (NP03) would be a much better option in terms of</p>	See 6, 10 & 55

			road traffic, access to the development, flooding issues etc.	
113			<p>Option 2</p> <p>My preferred option is option 2b – to the west of the village because there would, in my opinion, be less traffic coming into the centre of the village using the facilities to and from their homes. The argument of building too close to Cherry Willingham is not founded I think because the distance between Reepham and Cherry Willingham is a small field away. This option I also think has the best option of also complying with better flood risk options, it is on a slope with no houses to the south of it whereas the north option, option 2a, has houses to the south putting more risk onto the south aspect.</p> <p>Option 7</p> <p>Any improvement to existing non-vehicular routes can only be of benefit to the ones we currently have. I would like to see the route from the village hall running north to the airfield, also known as ‘mucky lane’ or sometimes ‘green lane’ is crying out to be redeveloped and this would the leave pedestrians not having to walk up the side of the field. This used to be a clear path years ago, but seems to have been left to overgrow ever since the school was built.</p> <p>Option 11</p> <p>It would be fantastic to have the Paddock back in use for villagers again, nut can we have an area designated for everyone to use and not ban people enjoying whatever they want to play e.g. ball games.</p>	<p>Existing footpaths are supported in the plan. The path listed here is not currently a right of way. The existing parallel path is currently indistinct your point is noted.</p> <p>See also 6 24 10 55 &amp; 14.</p>
114			<p>I have looked at the draft proposals and would like to advise that our preferred option would be land to the west of the village. Reasons being we live on Ferry Road and we are concerned very much about access, amount of extra traffic. Surface water drainage is a real worry because we already see what comes off the field and of course sewerage. The</p>	<p>Anglian water statement: improvements to both water supply &amp; foul sewerage networks are expected to be required to accommodate either site</p> <p>See also 6 1 4 10 55 102</p>

			<p>last development on the Holmefield area was a complete disaster as far as water was concerned.</p> <p>The speeding traffic on Ferry Rad is major concern now so adding more coming through and turning into a new development adds to the concerns.</p> <p>One of your reasons for supporting the north of Ferry Road is that it will be closer to centre of village and amenities, I really don't think that's valid as everyone in this village would be close due to the size. The school is also small could it cope with larger intake?</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to have a say on the proposals.</p>	
115			<p>At the public vote no mention was made of land available to west. This would seem to be the better option. It is close to the Lincoln side of the village, access does not rely on traffic going through the narrow gap by the church. In fact it would have direct access to both of the main roads into the village, and to Lincoln. So less traffic would be traveling through the main part of the village each day. New drainage could be put in towards the river that will not interfere with any drainage currently in place. The area to the north is on a very steep slope that is already subject to flooding the properties below it, and to the sides. Even after the installation of the bung, the main road is awash with water after heavy rain. Once that field is concreted over with roads and buildings, there is going to be less natural drainage through the soil. So where is that surface water going to go. To the lost point, which is through the properties already on Ferry Road that's where. It's stated that the pond / bung cannot cope already, so where will more surface water be going.</p>	See 6 ,10, 55 & 114.
116			<p>We believe that the site to the west of the village which is now available for development would be a good option for the village. It would help with the traffic problems, especially from Ferry Road to Lincoln Road, in the vicinities of the church and the Carpenter's Arms. It is only a matter of time until there is a very serious accident in that area. A</p>	See 6 38 108 114 55 10 113 r

			<p>development in the west would hopefully include a through link road from Reepham Road to Lincoln Road, helping to ease traffic problems in the church and manor area</p> <p>This site would, however, require major works on the sewage and drainage systems at present in wet weather the capacity from the south end of the village is not adequate and over spilling takes place outside Ashwell Cag and in St Clements Drive. In our opinion, this would need action before any development is commenced. An additional benefit of a site to the west of the village is that it would not destroy as many public footpaths / bridleways used by villagers for recreation purposes.</p>	
117			<p>As per my email below, my firm opinion following your most recent leaflet is the west is best, possibly a half and half idea of 100 homes each side would be ideal for al opinions??</p> <p>{email below}</p> <p>I would like to cast a vote for the village plan in Fiskerton. My vote is for the west of the village. As this is now an option it make perfect sense to move forward with the better location with less risks to the rest of the village and its small roads with regards to traffic.</p> <p>The development plan should have access to the lower road and at the top of the new estate have access to the Reepham Road. This is the least impact on the village.</p> <p>Traffic calming as you enter the village could also slow the bike speed issues in the summer.</p>	<p>Half of housing on NS &amp; half on WS is not proposed by NPG noted. This resident supports WS. See also 6 108 38.</p> <p>Note this is not a vote but a consultation of your views based on your evidence for your statements</p>
118			<p>We know up to 200 houses are to be built in Fiskerton, we don't know what infrastructure will be put in place and it is for this reason we are choosing the west option, as we believe the traffic in the village will increase as a result of having up to 200 houses built in the centre of village and increase the volume going past our house. This will in turn have a negative impact on our quality of life in the village. We don't agree with the suggestion off traffic lights near the church as this would cause Blacksmith Road to become a 'rat run'.</p>	See 6 38 98 90



			<p>We like the idea that this option (1b) is closer to Cherry Willingham. We have family there and would like to see a designated footpath or cycle route from our village to the other, rather than an often muddy footpath or dangerous main road. This would bring the resources of Cherry Willingham closer as we have little in Fiskerton.</p>	
119			<p>We prefer the site to the west.</p> <p>We live on St. Clements Drive on the Church View estate and like many of our neighbours suffer flooding problems. During heavy rainfall the level of the sewer manhole in the drive has on several occasions almost reached the top. Rainfall in the garden has nowhere to go and is added to the by water draining from the north of our house. At the same time, grey water pumps back up from the drains and sometimes reaches the dpc level. As the group has already been advised, residents have had problems arranging insurance cover against flooding., although we are not on a flood plain, or been asked for higher premiums. Presumably this also has a negative effect on property values.</p> <p>Whatever infrastructure could be put in place on the northern site there will still be run-off to the south via access roads and footpaths as they act as channels for water in heavy rain. A prime example of this occurs presently on Ferry Road between the High Street and Mucky Lane.</p> <p>We also reject any infill housing for the same reason.</p> <p>The site to the west does not score as highly on points SA02, SA05 and SA06 but has the great advantage that water draining from it can reach the fields without impacting on any dwellings at a lower level. Regarding the points about location it should be borne in mind that a western site could provide level pedestrian access of between 600 – 700m from the footpath in Plough Lane to the village centre.</p> <p>Regarding the impact on the historic core, it may be that one or two houses have their view restricted but their setting does not appear greatly impacted as viewed from the paddock area. The views of the approach to the village from Reepham are already spoilt by the oil well, Primetake and</p>	<p>Scale of archaeological significance is questioned and noted here. For Impact on historic core see 62.</p> <p>See also 10 55 114 37 &amp; 62.</p> <p>LCC do not support this view.</p>

			<p>modern housing and coming from Lincoln by twentieth-century buildings and a pumping station. Supplementary planting of trees and hedgerows would help here.</p> <p>Regarding the possibility of archaeological remains on Pipers Hill, there is a map by The Historic Environment Record compiled from cropmarks, earthworks mapped from aerial photographs and find spots. It shows the location of a Romano-British farmstead at TF0360 7200 and TF0360 7207 with associated finds. This is in the Parish of Cherry Willingham. There is also mention of a post Roman or unidentified site to the rear of Mill House but this would not appear to be affected by the suggested location of the west site. The traces of tofts and crofts on Perrins Hill are described elsewhere as ploughed out. Looking at previous planning applications nearby at Eastfield Rise Farm and Bleak House Farm the LCC stated that any historical assets discovered within a site should be recorded prior to their destruction which seems to imply there would be no constraints on a developer laying out a site.</p>	
120			<p>I should like to give my response to the neighbourhood plan consultation.</p> <p>Policy 1</p> <p>I think the only sustainable and, to me, obvious location is to the west of the village. From a development there, other parts of the village can then be developed in an appropriate manner.</p> <p>This encompasses several of the other policies, including flooding, transport, design and housing mix. There will be less impact on the centre of the village as vehicular movements, on the whole wont impact too greatly, especially during peak times.</p> <p>Sewerage and flooding can be managed from the outset, instead of trying to firstly improve and then add to what we already have as would be the case in a development to the north.</p> <p>With the intended bypass, access routes can be included from the start. The roads through the village would need</p>	<p>See 6 10 55 114 104 108 90 &amp; 57.</p> <p>The NDP proposes appx 200 houses to be built over the next 20 years with appropriate infill in addition</p>

			<p>significant repair / widening / improvement to support a development to the north. The introduction of a public footpath to Cherry Willingham can also be addressed in a development to the west.</p> <p>I support a development to the west of the village wholeheartedly.</p>	
121			<p>I would like to make it clear that my preference of site for the future development of housing within the village of Fiskerton is the site to the west of the village (NP03).</p> <p>The reasons for my preference will follow, however, first I wanted to highlight a few issues which give the impression to me, that interested parties (i.e. home owners, tenants, those who will be affected by the future development, and who have a right to influence the outcome) have been missed regarding the facts about potential sites and the relevance of 'The Paddock'.</p> <p>Firstly, I refer to the ballot that was held between 14<sup>th</sup> Jul and 13<sup>th</sup> Aug 16, which was counted on 16<sup>th</sup> Aug 16. The options on the ballot paper clearly indicate that the site to the west of the village (NP03) was not an option, hence the overwhelming response in favour of the site to the east (NP04).</p> <p><b>“Option 4. 200 houses west of the village to be explored. The land owners say the land is not available for development.”</b></p> <p>The 'Site Assessments' document produced by WLDC directly contradicts this statement, where the planning status clearly shows this site as <b>“Available”</b>. There is no production date on this document, however, if it has only recently been produced, and indicates the availability of the western site as a strong option, why has this not been highlighted clearly and obviously to all interested parties sooner?</p> <p>In addition, the wording within the 'Site Assessments' document for each of these two sites is different, regarding the community support for each, despite the information matrix containing exactly the same wording.</p>	<p>Supports development to the west and makes many valid points please read all responses.</p> <p>see all comments</p> <p><b>Note:</b> the Western option was not available to the village until September 2016</p>

		<p>e.g. Community support for NP03 is described as ‘<b>Limited</b> community support for development2, whereas support for nP0 is described as ‘<b>Some</b> community support for development’.</p> <p>The information matrix that follows these assessments shows community support for both as ‘<b>some expressed</b>’.</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate that this difference in wording may seem trivial, it gives the perception that community support for one is different to the other, which in-turn, may influence people’s decision in favour of the eastern site.</p> <p>A ballot response of 112 residents, from a total eligible of 982 1.4%) indicates that either the majority population of residents don’t care about what happens to their village, or that the means of communicating with them, and thus obtaining their opinion, has been inadequate.</p> <p>The paddock has long been an issue of debate, and a centre point of discussion around the development of the village. The issue I have regarding the paddock is twofold; firstly, I see absolutely no reason why the village cannot be granted ownership of the paddock if the site to the west (NP03) is chosen, yet it can be if the eastern site is chosen. Why would the paddock ownership be acquired for one option, but not the other? This gives the impression to me that the paddock is being used as a sweetener in order to encourage interested parties to vote for the eastern site.</p> <p>My second issue is regarding what the Parish Council is going to do with the paddock, if the village does acquire ownership. All these ideas of making it into a sports field, adding a pavilion or maybe even a café, sound fantastic, but is this really going to happen? At the moment, the village is not particularly well maintained, in terms of litter, and amenity maintenance. The wall outside the village hall has been derelict since I moved into the village in May 2014, and the area around the children’s play park / village hall is always littered with rubbish. Even last year’s Christmas tree, outside the village hall was left to die. The Parish council don’t seem too keen to ensure that a basic level of upkeep around the village is maintained by the District and County</p>	<p>A Cafe has never been suggested during public consultation.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Councils, and yet are hell bent on acquiring the paddock, which I very much doubt will ever be available for the benefit of the residents, as much as I hope it will be.</p> <p>The reasons behind my preference for the site to the west of the village (NP03) are as follows:</p> <p>This site affects fewer current properties within the village in terms of views, privacy, noise, property value and traffic congestion on what is already a well abused portion of road. Speeding is a major issue going along the straight of Ferry Road the Crescent and Hall Lane, and despite many attempts personally, to persuade the Lincolnshire Road Safety Partnership to implement safety measure, it seems they are not interested in doing so until a tragedy confirms the need. An extra 200 properties to the east, will bring with them several hundred more cars travelling straight through the village centre every day, which will exacerbate this problem. In contrast, the site to the west will contribute far less transient traffic, as the majority of vehicles will enter this site, from both Reepham and Fiskerton Road (i.e. from the Lincoln side of the village), here they will have direct access into this site without the need to continue on through the village centre due to the current village configuration of being orientated along an east / west road, the western site will extend the village towards the west by a few hundred metres, rather than padding out an already built up area. This means that far fewer properties will be backed on to, and therefore view impairment, privacy, property value, and noise will be much less of an issue.</p> <p>Another major concern from developing the site to the east is flooding. It is already well known that Fiskerton has had many problems regarding flooding. The area to the east (north of Ferry Road) has historically been very bad, proven by the need to spend a lot of money building the flood defence 'lagoon' just north of the village hall to control the excess water flow through the village and into the River Witham on the southern side. Developing the site to the east could possibly have the effect of saturating this land,</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>meaning that no more water could be absorbed, and thus increasing water run-off directly towards the properties that span from the school to Hall Lane. This then creates the risk that the lagoon could become overwhelmed, and these properties flooded. The site to the west will have no properties directly south of them to affect, and new drainage systems could easily be installed to direct the water run-off under Fiskerton Road and into the River Witham.</p> <p>In my opinion, the points made by the NPG, regarding the site to the east being closer to the village centre, is invalid. Whilst this may be true for the most western end of the eastern site, the eastern end will be just as far from the village centre as the western end of the western site. Therefore I feel that this is another misleading argument. The site to the west is squarer in configuration, and so provides an opportunity to capture more useable green space, that can be used by residents, as the development can be designed around its own green area. This will add to the current green spaces of the paddock, crescent, and area south of Jessamine Cottage. Due to the long / thin layout of the eastern site, the opportunity to capture more useable green space is very limited.</p> <p>As I alluded to above, I see no reason why the paddock cannot be brought into ownership of the village with the selection of the western site.</p> <p>I summary, I strongly believe that the site to the west of the village (NP03) is the better option for all the reasons I have detailed above, and I would encourage the NPG to ensure that <b>all</b> interested parties are given every opportunity to have their say, and that they are equipped with all the unbiased information they need, to make an informed decision on which site is best for the future of our village.</p> <p>I would also encourage the Fiskerton Parish Council to apply more pressure on the District and County Councils, to improve the maintenance of our village. I believe Fiskerton has so much more potential, and could be a much nicer village, if the basics are maintained.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

122			My option would be development to the west as I believe it would take the additional traffic out of the centre of the village.	See 6
123			We have studied the proposed plans and would prefer the development to the west as in (Policy 2a & b). With the west proposal we feel that traffic in the village would be less as opposed to the north development. (Policy 6 & 7) Transport definitely needs to be addressed especially to the road past the church before there's a major accident. Also flooding as in (Policy 8) needs to be addressed in fact I think I think you have got it covered with all the policies. The ones I have mentioned are the priority ones on our list.	See 6 38 10 55
124			This is a no brainer, the western site can be developed with minimal impact on the main village infrastructure, other than any minor impact on thru traffic levels. As a Greenfield site, the design can be "future proofed" in terms of e drainage and potential flooding risks. It will also have a direct road access to both the routes to Lincoln minimising the impact on the existing problems past the church. This is the logical solution.	Impact on village is considered to be less. This may be true during construction works but refer to point no 6  See 6, 108 10 55 & 38. Both sites are greenfield therefore both can be developed equally re: drainage Impact on village infrastructure due to construction traffic
125			West of the village. We live south of Ferry Road opposite the proposed east development. We already have major problems with flooding (we are lower than ferry Road and certainly lower than the fields behind it). Also, can this part of the village cope with more drainage coming through it? We already have main drains and manholes in our garden and under our garage which takes a lot of the sewage from the rest of the village. The west development would also be easier for traffic control.	See 6 10 55 114
126			Preferred west. I think high volume of traffic that we already have then putting houses behind us would cause unsafe and even more high volumes of traffic plus the safety of the children and school, not only that the high volume of flooding that we already get would cause even more I have been waiting two years already for the water board to come	See 6 ,10 & 55

			sort the flooding out so I am not holding my breath for it to be sorted if the planning goes ahead for behind us.	
127			<p>I have real difficulties in the new housing being placed north of Ferry Road. My reasons for concern that have not been addressed except in a very biased way, by two members of the committee who live near the west side of the village, are drainage which will not only have to cross Ferry Road but also skirt the houses to the south of Ferry Road, and the very serious and possible fatal increase of traffic through the centre of the village.</p> <p>It does not make sense to have to drain water past other housing when to the west of the village there will be no houses between the development and the river Witham. If the plan entails 200 houses being built and I am led to believe it does, there will be a significant increase in vehicles.</p> <p>This increase could be as many as two vehicles per household. With the majority of these vehicles travelling in one direction towards Lincoln and the reverse journey at night will place a figure of at least 800 vehicle movements a day in the village.</p> <p>For the last forty years councils and communities have fought tooth and nail to obtain bypasses around town and villages to avoid the traffic upsetting these communities and keeping the populous safe.</p> <p>With the housing being placed to the west of the village it will avoid the traffic coming through the village centre as most of it will leave and return on Lincoln Road. Therefore keeping the village centre and its occupants safe. It would appear to be a no brainer for the increase in housing to be west of the village.</p>	See 6 ,10 & 55
128			Good evening that we would like to make our choices known for the development plan. Both of us would support development to the west of the village reducing the impact of traffic coming through the village.	See 6
129			West is BEST.	See 6 ,10 55 102 & 108.



			<p>Being almost an independent I consider the west option better by far because of the following points, 1. Better for traffic from the development. 2. Less complex drainage. 3. Lower risk of surface water flooding for existing homes. 4. Achieves link road between Lincoln and Reepham roads. 5. Rebalances village back to original centre being the church.</p>	
130			<p>Re proposed further development of Fiskerton rural village.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does Fiskerton really need any more housing. The village has had about ninety new homes in the last 15teen years.</li> <li>2. The middle of the original Fiskerton village is the church the paddock and the Manor house, this is why the west side of the village is where the new development should be to keep the village symmetrical, not where the NPG thinks it is. Fiskerton is a village not a small town if I wanted to live in a small town I would have moved to somewhere like Wragby!</li> <li>3. The objection that we have to the NPG suggestion that the best place to build houses is behind the village hall, this is not a feasible suggestion because of the infrastructure of the sewage system will not cope with any more dwellings being piped into it, the drainage system for the run off of top water will over flow and flood the existing property to the south of Ferry Road.</li> <li>4. The new 200 dwellings will have at least 400 cars and create chaos to the existing road system. The best place to build these new dwellings if we have to have them would be to west side of Fiskerton.</li> <li>5. The west side will give the developer room to put a new drainage system in to cope with the roof and road water run-off. They will also be able to build a new sewage work in the fen to cope with the effluent that the new residents will create. They will also be able to put a new road in to connect Reepham and Cherry Willingham roads without creating any</li> </ol>	<p>Supports development to the west and makes many valid points made by others please read all NPG responses</p>

			<p>disruption to the village and its residents. The traffic around the church would be a lot less with this development.</p> <p>6. If passed records are anything to go by developers will do anything to build what they want like when they connected the ninety or so houses to the sewerage system which could not cope and flooding the houses out with sewerage near the Carpenters public house! The developers that build Corn Close cut through the main drainage pipe this is one reason that Ferry Road got flooded and we needed a flood prevention system behind the village hall. Who is going to police the developers because they do not seem to have done a proper job before.</p> <p>7. Hall Lane Fiskerton is the only country lane left in Fiskerton for recreational walks, dog walking and horse riding. If the development goes ahead to the north of the village this facility will be lost and the excess traffic will spoil the rural pleasantness of the village. E&amp;OE</p>	
131			<p>Re proposed further development of Fiskerton rural village.</p> <p>1. Does Fiskerton really need any more housing. The village has had about ninety new homes in the last fifteen years.</p> <p>2. The middle of the original Fiskerton village is the church the paddock and the Manor house, this is why the west side of the village is where the new development should be to keep the village symmetrical, not where the NPG thinks it is. Fiskerton is a village not a small town if I wanted to live in a small town I would have moved to somewhere like Wragby!</p> <p>3. The objection that we have to the NPG suggestion that the best place to build houses is behind the village hall, this is not a feasible suggestion because of the infrastructure of the sewage system will not cope with any more dwellings being piped into it, the</p>	<p>Supports development to the west and makes many valid points please read all NPG responses</p>

			<p>drainage system for the run off of top water will over flow and flood the existing property to the south of Ferry Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The new 200 dwellings will have at least 400 cars and create chaos to the existing road system. The best place to build these new dwellings if we have to have them would be to west side of Fiskerton.</li> <li>5. The west side will give the developer room to put a new drainage system in to cope with the roof and road water run-off. They will also be able to build a new sewage work in the fen to cope with the effluent that the new residents will create. They will also be able to put a new road in to connect Reepham and Cherry Willingham roads without creating any disruption to the village and its residents. The traffic around the church would be a lot less with tis development.</li> <li>6. If passed records are anything to go by developers will do anything to build what they want like when they connected the ninety or so houses to the sewerage system which could not cope and flooding the houses out with sewerage near the Carpenters pubic house! The developers that build Corn Close cut through the main drainage pipe this is one reason that Ferry Road got flooded and we needed a flood prevention system behind the village hall. Who is going to police the developers because they do not seem to have done a proper job before.</li> <li>7. Hall Lane Fiskerton is the only country lane left in Fiskerton for recreational walks, dog walking and horse riding. If the development goes ahead to the north of the village this facility will be lost and the excess traffic will spoil the rural pleasantness of the village.</li> <li>8. Brownfield sites would surely be a better place for building on instead of taking out good arable land that produces our nation's food? E&amp;OE</li> </ol>	
--	--	--	---	--

132			<p>Policy 13. We need a Doctor's surgery before anything else. I think the houses would be best put Reepham Rd towards Reepham, the we will not get more cars &amp; vans coming through the village, the cars, vans what we get now come far too fast, also we need a bigger opening at the school entrance then the cars that come here on Holmfield Estate might just go there and stop coming here so fast and so far no child has been hurt, it's a wonder it has not happen. Before we get all the houses whatever end of the village that school needs to do a bigger car park not just for teachers but for parents so they can drop their children off , only I don't know why but a lot of parents come from the other end and just past the school and some come from Cherry and all come here and onto Holmfield , there's just no space for all the cars that come here, the school needs to close this gate before a child is hurt, it is not a good idea who ever had it because not a lot of parents walk even on this estate they bring the children in the car.</p>	<p>See 6 &amp; 57.</p> <p>This comment with regards to the school and traffic upholds the NPG argument that building North adjacent to the school and off the main road would prevent more traffic on the main road attending the school run. It also supports the argument that building to the west would increase traffic to the school from the western site.</p> <p>If residents of Holmfield (living that Close) use cars, then residents living west of the village would certainly drive from the west. Twice if not four times per day.</p>
133			<p>West site. Less impact on existing villagers, improved road infrastructure, simpler flood mitigation.</p>	See 6 10 55 124
134			<p>West of the village. Lessens the volume of traffic coming through village to Lincoln.</p>	See 6
135			<p>The site to the west of the village. Mitigate the traffic problem that would be caused by a development to the east – decreased likelihood of flooding.</p>	See 6, 10 & 55.
136			<p>There are a great many issues to consider but as far as we can see the two which are causing the most concern amongst the villagers are; 1 – Flooding. 2 – Traffic. 1. There are already too many example of flooding to the east of the village. Further alleviation measures</p>	Supports development to the west and makes many valid points please read all response

			<p>may be enough, but they will have to be massive to remove the fall from 200 houses, associated roads, pavements etc. that come with any development. Then the continued success depends upon regular maintenance and cleaning! With local authority budgets being stretched every year we are sceptical as to how high the cleaning will be on any priority list. We are looking at mixing new and old here; never a good idea.</p> <p>To the west we are looking at new work – a clean sheet. The fall of the land is good to divert water away from the village. New drains can be dug and laid. We agree there is still the maintenance issue, but the failure or delay of implementing it will not be so bad as it would be to the east.</p> <p>2. Traffic flow is a major issue. Firstly, there are the lorries etc. which will be needed to prepare the ground and then build the 200 or so houses. If we pick the east option, all this traffic will have to come though the village, either past the church or via Reepham. We dread to think of the accident risks, noise, dirt and air pollution, not to mention jams and delays to those who need to use the same roads for work or other reasons. But that would be only the start.</p> <p>Secondly, 200 houses will produce approximately between 300 and 4000 cars. Most of them will carry people who need to travel away from the village for work. Getting out of and into the village during the ‘rush hour’ is not easy. Imagine an extra 200+ cars being added to the mix! Jams, accidents, pollution etc. etc.</p> <p>Using the west with a link road from the development to the Lincoln Road will ensure that the majority of commuter traffic avoids the village. There will of course be a backup of traffic, along Lincoln Road, but</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>it will not be spoiling our village and detracting from its appeal. We do need to consider the long-term view and immediate impression of people who may want to move to Fiskerton.</p> <p>On the question of the paddock, our memory is that it was offered in exchange for an agreement to build 200 houses. The only location at that time was the north / east. Surely the same agreement holds if the location is changed? Has the question been asked?</p>	
137			We would like to put our vote for the 200 new homes in the village to be placed to the west. The reason being we think would make more sense for access and availability. Thanks.	See 6
138			We would like to submit our preference for the site to the WEST of the village. It makes sense due to resulting in less traffic in the village; the construction of new sewage and drainage systems and the opportunity to address the problem of dangerous road traffic passing the church. It would also alleviate problems associated with construction traffic passing through the village.	See 6, 10 55 114 38 124
139			<p>Would like to cast a vote for the village plan in Fiskerton. My vote is for the west of the village. As this is now an option it makes perfect sense to move forward with the better location with less risks to the rest of the village and its small roads with regards to traffic.</p> <p>The development plan should have access to the lower road and at the top of the new estate have access to Reepham Road. This is the least impact on the village.</p> <p>Traffic calming as you enter the village could also slow the bike speed issues in the summer.</p>	<p>See 6 108 38</p> <p>NB this is a consultation not a vote</p>
140			<p>The site to the EAST (north of Ferry Road).</p> <p>To keep the village as 'a village' if the west option is used it will elongate the village making it an even longer ribbon development. The east option will ensure new residents are part of the village within a circle with access to the school, church, pub etc.</p>	See 11 & 21.
141			Duplicate of response 97	Duplicated response 97

142			Duplicate Entry of 105 & 107	Duplicated response 105 & 107 Residents have made two responses
143			Development north of Ferry Road (East Fiskerton) Location best suited for development, not expanding the village west towards Cherry Willingham.	See 21 & 24.
144			Duplicate Entry :-	Duplicated entry No 4 resident has made two responses
145			WEST ONLY Hall Lane and Corn Close won't sustain the daily traffic from north site. Less traffic through the village and disruption during / after building of housing. It's still close to the village if built to west, less disruption to whole village during putting in drains and services.	See 6, 1, 4 & 124
146			The West. So not to bring more traffic through the village so to keep children safe when playing also avoid flooding to properties on Ferry Road streets off it.	See 6, 2, 10 & 55.
147			The site west of the village. Being on the edge of the village I think and hope there would be less traffic going through the village. Ideally, smaller developments would be preferable to one large one.	See 6.
148			West site. To keep traffic out of the village. Flood risk?	See 6, 10 & 55
149			1 – Site to west of village 2 – Additional high quality housing on paddock. 1 – Because it is the safest option for traffic flow through the village. 2 – Would enhance the appearance of the village. Ownership of this space by the village would create problems – maintenance etc.	Build on the paddock as this will prevent future maintenance problems. The petition raised by NPG does not support this. See also 6.
150			West of village. All the traffic would not have to come all through the village & there would be less likely hood of flooding affecting existing homes. Ferryside Gardens already floods more	See 6, 10 & 55

			houses above will only make it worse.	
151			<p>1 &amp; 2A. The new development should be to that of the village. Less impact on the resident. The manor field is unsuitable for recreation, build on it &amp; e farmyard &amp; infill open spaces to reduce the traffic &amp; keep the village compact, not spread out to the north.</p> <p>To build on good agricultural land is a scandal. The field to the north it slopes down to Ferry road, our houses a prone to flooding as it is &amp; extra houses, concrete and roads will make it worse. Hall Lane is a narrow country road, with a dangerous exit to the main road. It is about the only open space for people to roam &amp; enjoy the peace.</p> <p>The committee have their own ideas &amp; are not listening to the villagers.</p>	<p>Building on agricultural land is the same for both sites</p> <p>See also 93 149 6 10 55 4 12.</p>
152			<p>We are both registered voters and would like this email to count as two votes.</p> <p>We would both prefer the option of building to the west of the village. Primarily, we believe this will keep unnecessary traffic out of the village centre, and avoid exacerbating present concerns in the village on road safety and I, as a qualified engineer and having been trained in land drainage, believe the site to the west will be easier to meet the requirements of SUDs and for disposal of foul water. Also I have an HNC in building construction and have had a small involvement in many similar sites over the last 10 years.</p> <p>Further, with the knowledge that the Paddock, the Crescent, and Plough Lane are now Local Green Spaces (April 2016) the previous option of widening Plough Lane is likely to be no longer so easily available, developing to the west of the village with a suitable road linking Reepham Road to Lincoln Road would seem to be the most sensible choice.</p> <p>We are both disappointed that the latest NPG flyer contained the inferred threat that if building takes place to the east the village will get ownership of the Paddock but if development takes place to the west it will not! We do not believe this to be true.</p> <p>We are also both disappointed that e NPG do not seem to</p>	<p>One response can only count as 1 response voting is N/A, as this is not a vote but a consultation.</p> <p>Only Responses are being considered here.</p> <p>Husband &amp; wife would need to send in a response each .</p> <p>see all comments by NPG</p>



		<p>have either read or understood the NPPF guidelines on Neighbourhood Plans and that imprecise information has been fed to the village on numerous occasions for nearly one year.</p> <p>The process has been most unsatisfactory!</p> <p>The current plan for the village does nothing to improve the shortage of infrastructure that clearly exists in the village and that residents requested both in the parish plan 2013 and the Open Forum survey conducted in July 2016 when 80% of the responders wanted open spaces built into the plan.</p> <p>Neighbourhood plans are there to give villagers an opportunity to say what they would like to see in the village and where it should go.</p> <p>We also both believe that one big development the times the size of the Holmfield Estate is NOT ideal for building a sustainable community in the village context.</p> <p>This could be partly remedied by including a small retirement village north of the village hall and shop and by splitting the new site to the west into smaller sections. These could be defined by drawing sight lines from the main receptors to the Cathedral and due south. The site lines could form a green corridor grid that would help protect present views and provide a network for a soft bend link road joining Lincoln Road and Reephram Rd and for footpaths and cycle ways, play areas and pocket parks.</p> <p>Such a layout would protect the visual amenity of the site, and this could be further enhanced by using the contours of the site and low pitched roofs with north facing green roofs if south facing roofs were “solar” tiled the site would achieve a high level of “eco friendliness” with reduced surface “runoff” and a low electricity demand.</p> <p>The brownfield sites should be included in the plan. Tanya site, app 30 homes, and the Old Dairy app 15, and should space be allocated for self builds and extra car parking for the school, church and High Meadows and for a new sports field.</p>	
--	--	---	--

			In conclusion, NIMBYism, lack of vision and stubbornness seem to have been the driving force in the development of the current plan. The village deserves a rethink and independent expert planners, such as Globe or Ann Skipper, brought in to help with the process.	
153			These are our views regarding the planning of new houses in Fiskerton. We would like to propose the WEST of the village. We feel it would have a detrimental effect with increased number of vehicles due to the present poor infrastructure. We also strongly believe that the issue of water drainage has not been remedied and that the villagers has not had proper reassurance on this subject.	See 6, 10 & 55
154			<p>Sustainable development. Ferry Road has already been developed and any further development would require major expenditure on facilities and services. By building to the west it would allow a new plan on a blank piece of paper for want of a better expression, and would allow for improvements to the infrastructure that the village already has. It is said that there will be over 200 hundred houses built whilst we are only being asked for thoughts on two areas for development. What about the land at the Old Manor House where the old barns currently stand, and the land at the old Tania factory site. Are these to be included in the 200 plus.</p> <p>Transport. This is one of the major areas of concern for me, and the main reason why I suggest that any building work should be to the west of the village. It really is the only viable option for the future of Fiskerton. By building to the north of Ferry Road, and with 200 houses this is likely to add 600 plus vehicle movements through the village a day along Ferry Road. Hall Lane is not wide enough, nor strong enough to take any additional traffic, and is in a poor state of repair. Footpaths will be needed, and safe crossing area built for pedestrians. Corn Close is another road that is not suitable for additional traffic. As for Ferry Road itself, the County Council have failed to resolve the ponding traffic issues on both the road and the footpath in more than one</p>	Many valid points please read all NPG responses

		<p>area and it is very unlikely that they will ever do so. The road surface itself is in a very poor state of repair, and no end of poor repairs haven't rectified the problems that there are. The opportunity to use Plough Lane as part of a one-way system that was planned for many years ago now seems to be out of the question. This will mean that more traffic will be suing what is a throttle close to the village church. The County Council have already declined to make it safer by installing automatic traffic signals, and it is a place where accidents have occurred. With the closure of Hawthorn Road, and the coming of new Eastern bypass, the Lincoln Road is likely to see a great deal more traffic, with the potential for more accidents. By building to the west it would give the village the chance to install a new bypass road linking Lincoln Road and Reepham Road. The junctions could be controlled by roundabouts, which would slow traffic down. It would also serve a new development to the west of the village, and with traffic calming measures built in road safety would be assured. A one way system past the church for westbound traffic could be installed to alleviate the problems there.</p> <p>Flooding. Building to the north of Ferry Road would increase the problems of flooding, and the removal of sewage. The only way for the water to leave the proposed development would be either via Hall Lane or Corn Close. There have already been issues with flooding to the south of Ferry Road and with additional water this is not going to ease the situation. Again the authorities have failed to maintain the drainage that it already in place, and with lack of maintenance there have been flooding issues in Five Mile Lane. The drains in Ferry Road are constantly blocked and not cleaned out. Building to the west would give that part of the village the chance to resolve the water issues that they already have. Sewerage is another problem, and the current plant is already at maximum capacity. Building to the west would mean that the sewerage can be pumped across to Washingborough, as currently happens for part of the</p>	<p>The NDP is proposing a one way system to improve the traffic through the heart of the village and Plough Lane is included in this scheme.</p> <p>Re Flooding there is no proof or evidence for an increase of flood risk any more for the Northern site than for the Western site. In fact to the contrary, If building took place to the North of Ferry Road the NDP policy ensures that no risk is increased and it is likely that any existing problems are improved upon</p>
--	--	---	---

			village. Building to the west of the village is, in my opinion, the only viable option.	
155			West side of the village. Endless building contractors coming through the village and residential traffic. Access to new estate causing problems for current residents. Spoil views behind current properties. Drainage? Balance village better. Easier for new residents to get into Lincoln.	Spoilt views behind current housing See also 37, 6, 1, 24, 55 & 10. Views from river to the North would be spoilt. With the planted buffer strip to be included to the North of Ferry Road it is likely that the view from river will be enhanced by the planting of trees and general landscaping
156			West Flooding, traffic, also I bought my home because it had open fields at the back, I do not wish to be overlooked.	See 6 no one has the exclusive right to a view. See also 10 55
157			West of the village. Less disruption, better access for development. No flooding concerns. Safer routes in and out, to Lincoln, village etc.	See 6, 124, 55 & 10.
158			The site to the west of the village. We need a one way system past our church before we bring extra traffic to the village centre.	See 6 & 38.