



Fiskerton Consultation Summary

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Neighbourhood Area Designation	6
4	Interest Meeting.....	7
5	First Consultation Activity	8
7	Second Consultation Activity.....	9
8	Third Consultation Activity	10
9	Forth Consultation Activity.....	10
10	Fifth Consultation Activity	12
11	Sixth Consultation Activity	12
12	Business Consultation of the Neighbourhood Plan Activity.	13
13	Seventh Consultation Activity.....	13
14	Eighth Consultation Event: Open Meeting in the Village Hall	14
15	Ninth Consultation Event: Drop in Session and meeting in the Village Hall.....	14
16	Appendices	16
	Appendix A: Neighbourhood Area Designation Confirmation.....	16
	Appendix B: Leaflet Drop of the Event on the 21 October 2014.....	17
	Appendix C Article in Fiskerton Parish News.....	18
	Appendix D: Flyers for the 21 December Meeting.....	19
17	Appendix E: Flyer for the 1 st December 2014.....	20
18	Appendix F: Consultation Information for the Initial Draft Plan	21
19	Appendix G: West Lindsey Response to the Initial Consultation on the Draft Plan...	24
20	Appendix H: Response from Natural England to the Initial Draft Plan.....	34
21	Appendix I: Anglian Water Response	37
22	Appendix J: Coal Authority Response.....	38
23	Appendix K Church Commissioner Response.....	39
	Appendix L: Flyer to Advertise Concultation Events on the 15th & 23rd January	44
25	Appendix M : May's Parish News Letter	45
26	Appendix N: Flyer for the Event on the 24 th August 2015	46
27	Appendix O: Flyer for the Event on the 9 September 2015	47
28	Appendix P: September Newsletter	48
29	Appendix Q: Options for Development.....	49

1 Introduction

What is the Summary of Consultation?

- 1.1 The Fiskerton Neighbourhood Development Plan has been produced by the Parish Council, but has been led by a Steering Group comprised of residents from across the Plan area. The Plan has also been produced exclusively using the views and opinions expressed by all the stakeholders in the area, such as; local residents, local business owners and local landowners. The aim of the Plan is to positively plan for the future development of the area to create a sustainable place for people to live, work and visit.
- 1.2 This Statement sets out the chronological order of events that have led to the production of the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Development Plan in terms of consultation with local residents and other leading stakeholders and statutory consultees. This consultation has in particular led to the production of the Development Management Policies contained within the Plan that aim to control and promote the sustainable development and growth of the area. In this Statement, the Steering Group has taken a broader approach in setting out the consultation for both the land-use and non-land-use policies and projects contained in the Plan.
- 1.3 Provided in this statement is an overview and description of the numerous consultation events and periods involved in the production of the final Neighbourhood Plan. In some instances more detailed reports or responses have been produced by the Steering Group or other statutory bodies, where this is the case, this report is referred to in the overview of that event and it is included in the Appendices of this document.

Aims of Consultation

- 1.4 To ensure that the local community truly can feel a sense of ownership of the Neighbourhood Plan, and feel they are truly being empowered to control the development and growth of the Plan area, the consultation undertaken in production of the Plan itself must be thorough clear and transparent. To ensure the consultation undertaken in production of the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan can achieve such, the Steering Group developed several aims that the consultation process would work towards achieving. The aims of the consultation process of the Neighbourhood Plan were:
 - **Front load:** The Steering Group decided early in the process that as much consultation with local residents would be undertaken before any contents of the plan were discussed and decided. This would ensure that the contents of the Plan have been wholly influenced and decided upon based on consultation undertaken with the local community.
 - **Reach all aspects of community:** Another key aim of the consultation process was to ensure that all different sections of the community were allowed the opportunity to participate in the Plan process. This involves ensuring that local residents of all ages and both genders engage in the process guaranteeing that the final Plan is truly representative of the local community and their aspirations for the Plan area.

- **Ensure ‘hard to hear’ groups participate:** In addition to ensuring all sections of the community are involved in the process, special effort must be made to include those sections of the community described as ‘hard to hear’ groups, such as: young people, young adults and over 65’s. This can be achieved by utilising consultation techniques and events specifically aimed at including these groups.
- **Ensure transparency:** The Steering Group are keen to ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan process is viewed as open and transparent. This involves not only making all documents and consultation results used to produce the contents of the final Plan publically available. But also ensuring that local residents are kept up to date with progression of the plan and also how they can engage and participate at different stages of the process.

General Overview

1.5 The Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group considered different engagement techniques and sort advice from consultation specialists such as Community Lincs and West Lindsey to ensure any consultation that was undertaken was correct and that all sectors of the community were given the opportunity to have their say on the contents and policies within the plan. The methods to be used are listed below:

- Questionnaires to local groups
- Attendance at community events
- Public Consultation Events/Meetings
- Flyers
- Press releases in the Local Newsletter
- Website
- Social media

1.6 The bulk of the work was done by the steering Group, assisted by about a dozen other local people, who helped with framing questionnaires and distributing material to all households.

.

2 Neighbourhood Area Designation

Overview

- 2.1 The decision to produce a Neighbourhood Plan for the area was first explored by the Parish Council in late 2013, With regards to Part 2 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 Fiskerton Parish Council submitted an application for designation of the Neighbourhood Area (for the Fiskerton Parish) for the purpose of creating a Neighbourhood Plan. This application was received by West Lindsey District Council on the 4 July 2014 and a statutory 6-week consultation period was enacted, running from 6th July until 31st August 2014 and there were no comments made.
- 2.2 As outlined in the Regulations the Local Authority have a duty to publicise the Area Application and the 6-week consultation period in a manner that will bring them to the attention of people who live, work or carry out business in the area. The full Application and information on how to comment was made available on the Council's website.

Conclusions

- 2.3 During the 6-week consultation period, no objections were received to the Neighbourhood Area as outlined in the initial application. Therefore on the 14 October 2014 West Lindsey District Council contacted Fiskerton Parish Council to confirm that they may proceed with the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan for the parish (See Appendix A).

4 Interest Meeting

Purpose

- 4.1 To gather interest in the undertaking of the Neighbourhood Plan the Fiskerton Parish Councils held a Pie & Peas meeting on the 19 June 2014 in the village hall. The meeting was open to all who held an interest in the local area. The initial purpose of the meeting was to decide whether a Plan should indeed be produced for the area. Prior to the meeting information about what a neighbourhood plan is and the neighbourhood plan process was made available to local residents.
- 4.2 The neighbourhood plan process was explained and any interested residents were invited to form a Steering Group with the role of producing a neighbourhood plan for the area.
- 4.3 The meeting was advertised both in the local newsletter, which goes out to every house in the neighbourhood every month, together with a specific flyer delivered to all homes a few days before the meeting.

Attendance

- 4.4 Over 60 residents attended the meeting. The general consensus of the residents that attended the meeting was that a neighbourhood plan should be produced and local residents were invited to form a Steering Group to lead in the production of the plan.

Conclusions

- 4.5 The initial steering group formed before the meeting on the 19 June 2014 agreed that the Steering Group leading the plan would be an open group that anyone from the local community could join if they wished at any time.

5 First Consultation Activity

Purpose

- 5.1 Following several Steering Group meetings where initial themes that the Plan could cover were discussed, it was decided that consultation with local stakeholders should begin and several upcoming events in the Plan area were identified and organised that the group could attend to consult with local stakeholders.
- 5.2 The first of these was held on the Tuesday 21st October 2014 (Cheese and Wine night) at the village hall. Members of the Steering Group attended this event and invited everyone in the Parish to attend to discuss the Plan area. The Local Planning Officer from the District Council was invited to attend to answer local resident's questions.
- 5.3 The event was advertised in the monthly newsletter (see **Appendix B**) and delivered to all houses in the Neighbourhood Plan area along with a leaflet that was dropped to every household.

Attendance

- 5.4 Over 54 people attended the event.

Conclusions

- 5.5 The event was not meant to produce firm conclusions, but to give the Steering Group an initial idea of what the neighbourhood plan can cover and to discuss initial ideas. It was felt that in general this was overall quite positive meeting and a neighbourhood plan was required.

7 Second Consultation Activity

Purpose

- 7.1 The second community event was held on the 1st December 2014. One of the Neighbourhood Plan steering group members explained the Neighbourhood Plan process. It was explained that this event was to show the alterations to the Neighbourhood Plan for Fiskerton that will be submitted to West Lindsey District Council for initial consideration. It was then pointed out the changes made to the Plan following feedback from the previous public meetings.
- 7.2 The residents were asked if they would like to ask any questions or state any facts that could contribute to the plan. The following issues were then raised by the residents attending the meeting:
- Issues with car parking.
 - Corn Close is not suitable for the amount of vehicles a new development would attract.
 - How many houses will be built in the Corn Close area shown on the map? - The steering group responded with the council guidelines were 250 homes over a 20 year period.
 - What is being proposed, if anything, for the extra traffic? - Speed bumps and a one-way system were also talked about in light of the question asked.
 - Where will the bypass go? - answered south of Ferry Road it would make a more direct route. But that will be a Highways Authority decision.
 - Fiskerton residents must use all they can to ensure that the village does not become another Cherry Willingham (over developed).
 - Will there be building towards and including Shortferry? - answer at the moment there are no plans for building in between. If it ever happens building would be controlled by the normal planning process.
 - As we have to prove that Manor Paddock is very much a needed and wanted piece of the village would it be better if it was taken over by the Parish Council and turned back into the sports field that it once was? - Answer an application for Manor Paddock to be classed as a green open space belonging to the village has been lodged with WLDC.
 - The land south of Ferry Road is it owned by the Church Commission and has it been removed from the second draft? - Answer not at the moment it was not up for development but it could be at a later date.
 - Could we not reduce the number of houses on Corn Close and add opposite on the ridings? - Answer the parish at previous meetings had expressed concerns that the village would end up like Langworth ribbon development with a straight through road with houses on either side with a school, pub and shop. And that this second draft had taken that and individuals wishes into account.
 - What about access to the school? - Answer the school access could be moved as it was not the main entrance for the children but a secondary entrance and there is also a school entrance on Chapel Rise which is now used a lot.

- Are there any development plans on the land between Primetake and the beginning of Fiskerton village? - Answer the land cannot be touched as it is in an exclusion zone for residential building and any other types of building would have to meet certain criteria due to the ammunitions testing that takes place at Primetake on a regular basis.

Advertisement

- 7.3 The event was again advertised in the monthly newsletter that goes to every home. For the advertisement material for this event please see **Appendix C** of this document.

Attendance

- 7.4 In total approximately 70 people attended at the evening. The steering group members present actively encouraged local residents to participate in the Neighbourhood Plan related activities at the meeting.

Conclusions

- 7.5 Chairman of the Neighbourhood Plan Mr. Robert Wall then asked for a show of hands of those in favour, those against and those who wished to abstain. There was 1 against vote, 2 abstained and the rest voted for.
- 7.6 Afterwards a meeting was arranged for Wednesday 10th December 2014 7.30pm at William Roberts home.

8 Third Consultation Activity

Purpose

- 8.1 To raise awareness amongst local residents about the fact the second draft of the plan had been sent to West Lindsey District Council planners and also local residents needed to write to the District Council to help protect the Paddocks as a Local Green Space.

Advertisement

- 8.2 A flyer was issued in the Fiskerton Parish News Letter on the 21 December 2014 See **Appendix C** and **D**.

9 Forth Consultation Activity

Purpose

- 9.1 The purpose of the fourth consultation activity was to show the initial draft to the community to gather support for the content and also to receive comments from the statutory consultees. The consultation started on the 15 December 2014 and had a six week period to allow for all parties to comment.

Advertisement

- 9.2 The event was advertised in the Fiskerton News Letter and by providing all villagers with a flyer and questionnaire sheet (shown in **Appendix F**) to allow residents to respond to the initial draft document.

Responses

9.3 During the 6 week period West Lindsey District Council, Natural England, Church Commissioners, Anglian Water and the Coal Authority these comments can be seen in **Appendices G to K**. The comments received from local residents are summarised below:

- I fully support the Draft Plan; it has been very well thought out embracing needs of all age groups. It is essential and logical that local people determine their future and environment; they are the ones who have to live with the results.
- This paragraph states that houses in Fiskerton cost 10 - 20% less than similar houses in neighbouring villages. If the Church Commissioners are allowed to rape the village, by tearing out the heart and develop the Paddock, this situation will remain. They will not be able to maximize their investments. However, if the Plan as submitted is accepted, the Paddock will become the focal point of the village and transform it. It will create an enormous amount of aesthetic appeal, encouraging people to settle in the village and thus increasing house demand and prices. It is a win win solution with the CC getting a higher price for the land they do sell (barns?) and the village becoming even more desirable.
- We are happy with the draft plan
- The parking policy relates to homes. Should there be a parking policy for other types of development
- Re woodland walks, "mucky Lane", shown as a footpath on the O.S. map would be a good woodland walk but is presently impassable.
- A one-way system for through traffic is an excellent idea.

Conclusion

9.4 From the initial draft consultation it was advised by West Lindsey District Council that more work was required on the planning policies, the group decided to continue with further consultation work with the community and seek external help with the plan.

10 Fifth Consultation Activity

Purpose

- 10.1 The fifth consultation event was held on Thursday 15th and Friday 23rd January 2015 in the village hall. The event was an open consultation event.
- 10.2 The purpose of the event was to look at the initial draft plan (Issue 3) which had been looked at by West Lindsey District Council, the local community and other statutory consultees. This event was aimed at local residents with any issues with the plan in which they wished to discuss with the steering group members. At the meeting the steering group also wanted to raise the issue about the protecting the area known locally as the Paddock as a Local Green Space.

Advertisement

- 10.3 The event was advertised by displaying posters and delivering leaflets to every household. See **Appendix L**

Attendance

- 10.4 Over the two day events 60 local residents attended the event. The response to the draft plan was positive and the general feedback from the event was support for the proposals in the plan.

Conclusion

- 10.5 The conclusion drawn from this event was that further work on the draft plan was necessary in particular the orientation of the development of the new homes to the North of the village should be East/West direction instead of North/South.

11 Sixth Consultation Activity

Purpose

- 11.1 May update in the Fiskerton Parish magazine notifying them of the outcome of the pre planning proposal on the Manor Farm Paddock proposal. The article also highlighted that a forth drafting of the neighbourhood plan was taking place (the article is available in **Appendix M**).

12 Business Consultation of the Neighbourhood Plan Activity.

Purpose

- 12.1 On the 24th August 2015 7.00pm to 9.00pm at Fiskerton Village Hall a meeting for the businesses and local residents in Fiskerton.

Advertisement

- 12.2 All local businesses were invited to the event and a flyer was sent to every business and this is shown in **Appendix N**.

Attendance

- 12.3 The two businesses that attended were Louise Harrison from Loobylous Childcare and Dave Houlden from Dave Houlden Transport. Initially people were invited to look at information boards placed around the village hall.
- 12.4 There was an introduction from the steering group as to what the meeting was about and what the Neighbourhood Plan consisted of along with an explanation of the Local Plan. Manor Paddock was discussed as an open green space with community asset designation. This had been requested by the Neighbourhood Plan group back in December of 2014.
- 12.5 The Neighbourhood Plan history was discussed (as the two members of the public had not been to a meeting previously), and then Luke Brown, a representative from West Lindsey District Council who is currently helping with the Neighbourhood Plan, was introduced to the two visitors.

13 Seventh Consultation Activity

Purpose

- 13.1 A public consultation event was held on the 9 September 2015 at the Tyrwhitt Arms in Short Ferry to provide an update to local residents on the progress of the plan.

Attendance

16 people attended the event where a presentation was given on the Neighbourhood Plan and the history of what has been done so far. The initial draft plan and ideas were discussed. The feedback from local residents attending the event was very positive and no negative responses.

14 Eighth Consultation Event: Open Meeting in the Village Hall

- 14.1 On the 19 May 2016 the steering group held an open public consultation event to discuss the development options to the North of the village. These possible development options had been provided by the Church Commissioner (The Land Owner).
- 14.2 Many questions were asked at the event about how the group had come to the conclusion that the North was the best development option for the village. Many residents raised the issue about whether the local facilities could cope with the development to the North.
- 14.3 Over a 100 local residents attended the event and express a variety of views over where future development should take place in the village. There was no clear consensus on the location of development and no vote was taken on which development option to the North should go forward, as the community wanted further work to be undertaken and wanted development to the West Of the Village to be considered.

Conclusion

- 14.4 The steering group agreed to consider the development to the West of the village and further discussions with the land owner (Church Commissioners as they own land to the North and West of the village) were required to consider both development options.

15 Ninth Consultation Event: Drop in Session and meeting in the Village Hall.

Purpose

- 15.1 The purpose of the event was to feedback to the village on the potential development options to the West and North of the Village. Both development options were considered and options were given for local residents to vote on. The development options are outlined below:

Option 1:. Develop approximately 200 houses North of Ferry Road. Running East to West from the school to Hall Lane. This option with the Paddock gives 26% open green space and the development itself has more than the minimum 10% required by the statutory regulations. The Paddock to be acquired as a community asset.

Option 2:. Develop approximately 200 houses North of Ferry Road. In an L shaped from the school to Hall Lane. This option with the Paddock gives 29% open green space and the development itself has more than the minimum 10% required by the statutory regulations. The Paddock to be acquired as a community asset

Option 3. The community asked for the option of 100 houses to be developed North of Ferry Road and 100 houses developed to West of the village to be explored. The land owners say the land is not available for development. This option is therefore not deliverable and cannot be considered.

Option 4. The community asked for the option of 200 houses West of the village to be explored. The land owners say the land is not available for development. This option is therefore not deliverable and cannot be considered.

Option 5. No allocation for housing in the Neighbourhood Plan. This would then mean the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan's option for the indicative 15% (approximately 90 homes) growth of Fiskerton as a minimum without a maximum being indicated, so this could lead to houses on the Manor Farm Paddock, houses to the North of Ferry Road and none, or not as many, of the benefits to the local community that are being proposed as part of the neighbourhood plan.

Option 6. No Neighbourhood Plan. This means the community will have no influence or say on planning matters that effect Fiskerton.

15.2 The events were advertised by delivering a leaflet to every household. The leaflet can be found in Appendix Q. The events were held on the 01/7/2016, 14/07/2016, 23/07/2016, 09/08/2016 and 13/08/2016.

15.3 The steering group held five consultation events to enable local residents to cast their vote and ask questions about the potential development options. Each resident on the electoral role were provided a voting slip and were able to cast their vote privately. After each session all votes were taken from the ballot box and put into a sealed envelope. After all five events had taken place on the 13 August 2016 in front of two independent witnesses the envelopes were opened and the votes for each option were counted. In total 112 residents voted and option 1 was voted as the best option.

Conclusion

15.4 The steering group decided following this consultation they would proceed to regulation 14 consultation but they would contain both development options to the West and North of the village and see what the statutory consultees had to say about both development options and which site would be the most sustainable.

16 Appendices

Appendix A: Neighbourhood Area Designation Confirmation



Guildhall
Marshall's Yard
Gainsborough
Lincolnshire DN21 2NA

Telephone 01427 676676
Web www.west-lindsey.gov.uk

Your contact for this matter is:

Luke Brown
Luke.brown@west-lindsey.gov.uk

14/10/2014

Dear Chairman

FISKERTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN AREA DESIGNATION APPROVAL

Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan area was formally approved by West Lindsey District Council on the 14th October 2014. There were no comments made to the formal six-week consultation period and we are happy for you to proceed.

If you need any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me on the above details.

Yours Sincerely

Rob Lawton
Neighbourhood Planning Officer

Appendix B: Leaflet Drop of the Event on the 21 October 2014
FISKERTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



**WE ARE HAVING A WINE AND CHEESE EVENT ON TUESDAY 21ST
OCTOBER AT 7.30 PM IN THE VILLAGE HALL**

**SEE THE EARLY DRAFTS OF OUR PLANS AND SUGGESTIONS AND
DISCUSS YOUR PREFERRED OPTIONS FOR OUR VILLAGE WITH THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE AND PARISH COUNCIL MEMBERS**

Appendix C Article in Fiskerton Parish News

ARTICLE FOR OCTOBER FISKERTON PARISH NEWS

FISKERTON PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Neighbourhood Plans will become part of the planning application and approval process in the near future and parishes without a Neighbourhood Plan will have less control of development in their area. Fiskerton Parish Council's application to form a Neighbourhood Plan has been accepted by West Lindsey District Council and the Parish Council has formed a Neighbourhood Plan subcommittee to take it forward. The planning group consists of Robert Wall (Chairman), Bill Roberts (Vice Chairman), Pam Smith (Secretary), Paul Forman, Stuart Canner, Barry Canner and Chris Darcel (West Lindsey District Council). We have already had several meetings and formed a draft plan for the Fiskerton area as a discussion document.

WLDC will require evidence of consultation with parishioners in the formation of the plan and if WLDC approves the plan it will then be put to the parishioners as a referendum to accept or decline. 50% of those that vote must vote to accept the plan for it to be approved so obviously getting people in the Parish involved is very important. Our next meeting is on Mon 22nd Sept. and we are organising a Wine and Cheese event in the Village Hall on Tuesday 21st Oct. at 7.00pm. All parishioners are invited and we intend to show you the provisional planning done to date, to answer questions and listen to your valued comments.

If you feel strongly about the future structure of our village please contact any of the above planning committee members, come to our meetings/events and get involved.

REMEMBER THE WINE AND CHEESE EVENT ON 21 OCT.

Robert Wall

7.9.14

Appendix D: Flyers for the 21 December Meeting

FISKERTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



WE ARE HAVING A WINE AND CHEESE EVENT ON MONDAY 1ST
DECEMBER AT 7.30 PM IN THE VILLAGE HALL

SEE THE SECOND DRAFT OF OUR PLANS AND SUGGESTIONS AND
CONTINUE THE DISCUSSION ON YOUR PREFERRED OPTIONS FOR
OUR VILLAGE WITH THE PLANNING COMMITTEE AND PARISH
COUNCIL MEMBERS

17 Appendix E: Flyer for the 1st December 2014

FISKERTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



THANK YOU FOR SUPPORTING OUR SECOND DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN ON DEC 1ST. IT HAS BEEN SENT TO WLDC PLANNERS. OUR INTENTION IS FOR THE MANNOR FARM Paddock TO REMAIN AS OPEN GREEN SPACE AND WE NEED **YOU** TO WRITE TO THE FOLLOWING TO TELL THEM THAT BUILDING ON THE Paddock IS WRONG AND HOW IT WILL ADVERSLY IMPACT ON **YOUR** LIVES:

John Weir, Church Commissioners, Church House, Great Smith Street, London. SW1P 3AZ. Or email: john.weir@churchofengland.org

Lauren Knox, WYG, Arndale Court, Otley Road, Headingley, Leeds. LS6 2UJ. Or email: lauren.knox@wyg.com

18 Appendix F: Consultation Information for the Initial Draft Plan



Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan Sub Committee

On behalf of

Fiskerton Parish Council

The Government Localism Act 2011 Legislation has empowered communities to be able to shape their future with Neighbourhood Plans which will become Key Elements in the County's Central Development Plans through to 2031. The Neighbourhood Plan has been developed based on your opinions gathered over the past 3 years on the following planning matters: provision and location of new facilities and infrastructure, improvement of public spaces, protection of green spaces, social housing, housing designs and preferred sites and locations for new housing and businesses, transport, environment & sustainability, and shopping.

We have now produced an initial draft document covering the findings of the consultations and proposed policies for Fiskerton Village.

The current stage of the process entails a 6 weeks (minimum) formal consultation under Regulation 14 of the ACT commencing **15th December 2014** with various statutory consultees, service providers, and of course the residents of Fiskerton.

Where can you see the Plan

- 1 You will be able to view the Plan on the Parish Council Website <http://fiskerton-lincs.org.uk/home/parish-council/neighbourhood-plan/>
- 2 Printed copy is available for viewing at the village Hall and Parish Office.
- 3 In addition we have arranged drop in sessions in the Village Hall for 2 days (9th and 15th January 3.00-7.00pm) where you can call in to see copies and discuss contents with members of the Neighbourhood Plan Sub Committee.

- 4 Printed copies will be available from the Parish Office and the drop-in sessions for you to take away.

Responses should be made via the response form attached and should be received at the Parish Council Office, no later than **31 January 2015**.

Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan

“PLANNING OUR FUTURE” - WHAT I THINK

Please ensure your response is returned by **Saturday, 31 January 2015** to:

Fiskerton NP, Parish Council, The Bakehouse at Roma Cottage,
Sloothby Road, Willoughby, Roma, Alford LN13 9NW or by email to

nplan@fiskerton-lincs.org.uk

NAME	
ADDRESS and EMAIL	
CONSULTATION RESPONSE If your comment is specific please let us know which paragraph number or policy number your comments refer to in the left-hand column. You can attach additional paper if the space below is inadequate.	

Paragraph
or Policy
Number.

Continue on separate sheet if required.

View the Plan online at <http://fiskerton-lincs.org.uk/home/parish-council/neighbourhood-plan/> , or at Fiskerton Village Hall Parish Office.

19 Appendix G: West Lindsey Response to the Initial Consultation on the Draft Plan

Firstly we would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan Group on their progress to date.

This document is intended to assist the group in finalising the plan. It includes changes which are necessary in advance of the plan being submitted. It also includes recommendations which will improve the effectiveness and usability of the plan.

N Plan Policy	Comment
General Comments	<p>Pages and paragraphs should be numbered, as this will make the document more user friendly and will enable people to quote parts of the plan more easily.</p> <p>There are numerous spelling and grammar errors throughout the plan which need to be addressed.</p> <p>For ease of reference, it would be helpful to include a policy list at the start of the document with the page number for each policy clearly stated.</p> <p>Your plan should be accompanied by a key diagram or proposals map that shows the exact location of land to which policies apply, e.g. the green wedge and wetlands to the south of the village. Whilst you currently have some policies mapped in the appendices it would be preferable to have these on one map. If this is not achievable, for every policy that refers to a specific location this should be clearly shown on a map in the appendices and clearly referenced in the policy or supporting text.</p> <p>All appendices should be included within the neighbourhood plan itself, rather than as separate documents.</p>
Front Cover	<p>The timeframe of the plan should be clearly included on the front cover of the final plan to make it clear when its policies apply.</p> <p>The cover includes 'October 2014' and '(Issue 3) Amended December 2014)' – the differing dates are confusing. Also, the term 'Issue 3' is confusing- is this the 3rd draft which you are formally consulting on?</p>
Contents	The sections listed in the contents do not wholly correlate with the section titles within the plan.
Foreword	A positive and concise introduction to the plan.
Section 1: Intro and background	<p>1.2- suggest that the term 'qualifying body' is used rather than 'submitting body' in the title for the subsection.</p> <p>1.3 –Would suggest that the map of the neighbourhood area is included on this page/ at the front of the document rather than as an appendix so that the reader can see the area to which the plan applies.</p> <p>1.4 – there is a fourth basic condition that the plan must not breach EU obligations.</p> <p>1.5- the terminology 'Neighbourhood Plan Authority' is not recognised terminology- suggest that the term 'qualifying body' is used as this term is used in planning legislation.</p>
Section 2: Fiskerton the	The wording '... and if the village has its say WILL NOT change...' is quite negative and aggressive. It also seems out of kilter with the point of preparing

N Plan Policy	Comment
community then and now	<p>a neighbourhood plan, which is indeed to allow local communities to have a greater influence on development in their area rather than preventing it. The paragraph formats seem to have gone wrong in this section with sentences stopping half way along a line and then going onto the next line. This should be amended.</p> <p>There seems to be a plug for some books in the last sentence here. This seems out of place in a planning document. It is suggested that these books should be included in a list of reference documents in the appendix rather than in the main body of the plan.</p>
Section 3: Fiskerton the plan development process	<p>The background to the plan process will be useful to those unfamiliar with neighbourhood planning. As you have started to outline the process in your introduction and background (section 1), it could be worthwhile combining most of this section within section 1, to avoid repetition.</p> <p>As an alternative to listing the names of those involved within the body of the plan, you could consider inserting these as acknowledgments on the inside front / back cover.</p> <p>With regards the Section 3: (Con't) part on the second page of this section, the following comments are provided:</p> <p>2nd para: 'Draft plans of were place on the...' – this sentence does not make sense. Also, when referring to plans, it is important to provide the full title of the plans you are referring to for clarity.</p> <p>3rd para: again, details which 'plans' you are referring to should be provided.</p> <p>Last para: this paragraph is factually incorrect. Specifically: Before West Lindsey District council can decide whether the neighbourhood plan progresses to referendum, WLDC must publicise the plan for a further six week consultation and arrange an independent examination of the draft plan. The Inspector appointed for the independent examination will recommend to WLDC whether the plan should or should not progress to referendum. The wording 'assuming this is a positive outcome' is quite presumptuous, perhaps more neutral wording could be used.</p> <p>'To be enforced by the people of Fiskerton Parish'- the plan will not be 'enforced' by the parish. Rather, the role of a neighbourhood plan is that it will be used by West Lindsey District Council alongside the adopted Local Plan to determine planning applications within the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Area. This wording should be reviewed.</p>
Section 4: Fiskerton	<p>It is not clear which part of this is the 'vision' (it actually seems to feature in section 5?)- highlighting the vision by putting it in a box would be helpful. If all of this text is intended to be the vision, it is suggested that it is condensed to remove the background information.</p> <p>1st para: the wording 'the power of decision shifted' could be misleading. Decisions on planning applications will still be made by West Lindsey District Council (i.e. the Local Planning Authority).</p> <p>2nd para: again this could be misleading and is incorrect- parish plans are not part of the Localism Act and whilst a useful tool, carry very little weight in planning decisions.</p> <p>5th para: The neighbourhood plan will not be able to achieve all of these as they are outside the remit of planning. This should be amended to read 'The Neighbourhood Plan will help to achieve some of these ambitions.'</p> <p>6th para: it would be helpful (particularly for the Inspector) to clarify what Primetake and The Old Hall are.</p> <p>6th para: 'more people will undoubtedly work from home' – what evidence do you have to support this assumption?</p> <p>Last para: the wording 'lets finish the job' implies that there is an 'end goal',</p>

N Plan Policy	Comment
	when in fact places continue to evolve over time.
Section 5: Neighbourhood plan policies	<p>To avoid repetition and to assist the reader, it is suggested that the text on this page is redistributed to earlier sections of the plan so that section 5 can focus on just presenting the policies themselves and their supporting text. Specifically:</p> <p>'What is a neighbourhood plan?' would be useful under Section 1.</p> <p>'Where are we in the process?' repeats some of what is already stated in Section 3, which (as noted above) could be incorporated in Section 1.</p> <p>'What's next?', again, this repeats some of what is already stated in Section 3.</p> <p>'The Vision for Fiskerton', this would seem more logical under section 4.</p> <p>'Policy intentions', again, this could work better under Section 1.</p> <p>General comments on policies:</p> <p>The use of boxes to highlight the policies is very helpful, however for absolute clarity we would suggest that policies are presented in individual boxes. In some instances policies are worded 'new development must...': as worded, this would make the policy applicable to all development, i.e. small porch extensions as well as large new housing estates. In some instances it may be appropriate for policies to apply to all development, however it is not appropriate in all instances- e.g. policy D10 states that developments must retain mature trees (which is acceptable) however the policy also goes on to say that an approved planting scheme will be required, which is an unreasonable requirement for <i>all</i> development. In such instances, it would be more appropriate to state the threshold at which such a policy requirement would apply.</p> <p>Some policies feature the wording 'There will be a policy...' - as this is the policy, this wording is not appropriate.</p> <p>There are instances of repetition across some policies. It is recommended that this is avoided in all instances as it will cause confusion for the users of the document. See more detailed notes below on duplication.</p> <p>Some policies have titles while others do not-it is essential that all policies have titles so that users of the document can easily identify which policies are relevant to the planning application being assessed.</p>
E1 Environment	<p>See general comments above re. wording and title.</p> <p>There is no subsection heading here.</p> <p>The area to which this policy applies should be clearly mapped either in a key diagram or in a map in the appendices and referenced in this policy.</p>
E2 Green spaces	<p>The policy states that proposals which would adversely affect its 'value' will be 'resisted'- what 'value' is this referring to? Amenity value? Environmental value? This should be clarified. The term 'resisted' implies that a proposal will be opposed, but the purpose of policy is to outline criteria against which proposals will be assessed. Suggest the use of this term is reconsidered. If criteria is set out, this term could be replaced by the term 'refused'.</p> <p>Your evidence base (and appendix if you desire) should outline how each of the sites you are designating as local green space meet the criteria which sites must meet to be designated as local green space (see NPPF paragraphs 76 and 77 for criteria).</p> <p>Policy wording, 'There will be a policy...' see above.</p> <p>Policy references appendices B, C and G but only B seems relevant to local green space? Also, the areas highlighted in green in appendix B and C do not</p>

N Plan Policy	Comment
	<p>match up.</p> <p>The policy should state specifically what is being designated. The wording states that the designations 'will include...'. This should be amended to make it clear what is being designated.</p> <p>Item 4 on the list is not appropriate: this list should be specific about the individual sites that are being designated (and all sites should be clearly mapped).</p> <p>As for item 4, item 5 is not specific. Furthermore, it is worth considering whether it is necessary to designate local heritage sites as local green space also, given the protection that they are already afforded as heritage sites.</p> <p>The last sentence of the policy refers to including open space in new development and this does not relate to the rest of the policy, which is about designated Local Green Spaces. This part should be addressed separately as a separate issue.</p>
E3 Local Heritage	<p>The supporting text refers to development adjacent to listed buildings. This should instead refer to development in the setting of listed buildings as development that affects listed buildings may not be immediately adjacent to them.</p> <p>While the policy states that the 3 sites must be protected, it does not set out the criteria for how they should be protected (i.e. criteria for officers to assess planning applications against) and therefore as currently worded the policy is not useable. As worded, the policy could be misunderstood to only apply to listed buildings in the three locations specified. The wording should be amended.</p>
5.2 Development	<p>'The public consultations showed clearly that...' – where you have used results from your public consultations to inform policy your evidence base should clearly explain how your consultation was undertaken, what the results show and how you have used this information in the formulation of your policies. This evidence will need to be readily available to download from your website.</p>
D1 Access	<p>Looking at the map of Fiskerton there seem to be few development opportunities within the centre of the village so question the need for this policy.</p> <p>The village centre is not defined on a map and as such would be difficult to assess in an application. This should be addressed if a policy such as this is retained.</p>
D2 Pedestrian and cycling access	<p>The second sentence should include flexibility as improvements may not always be possible, e.g. due to a narrow road, ownership issues, etc.</p>
D3 Parking	<p>This wording 'suitably sized and accessible dedicated parking areas to the same standard may be considered as an alternative' is unclear and needs to be clarified - an alternative to what?</p> <p>Also, presumably the wording quoted above refers to shared parking areas, in which case it should be explicit.</p> <p>Your evidence base should provide justification for the parking requirements outlined. WLDC are unable to comment on the appropriateness of the parking standards proposed as no justification has been provided.</p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, you should clarify if the standard includes/ excludes garages.</p>
D4 SUDS	<p>See general comments re. wording and policy applying to all development. It would be helpful to clarify how applicants can demonstrate that it satisfies this policy, i.e. through annotated plans, a drainage strategy, etc.</p>
D5 Drainage	<p>The requirement for Drainage Strategies to be approved by a number of</p>

N Plan Policy	Comment
strategy	bodies is a good idea, however, there may not always be capacity at all of these bodies to approve them. The policy should either be amended to provide some flexibility for applicants or you should gain written confirmation that these bodies can accommodate the requirements of this policy. This will help to ensure that the policy is deliverable. In this instance, it would be useful to clarify the result of not providing a drainage report or not providing an acceptable drainage solution – i.e. will be refused.
D6 Fiskerton North Delph	The policy should state what development this policy applies to (it would not be reasonable to apply it to <i>all</i> development). The policy should refer only to significant increases in surface water discharge (as opposed to just an increase, as some increase could be unproblematic). If this policy is included, it should clarify the physical area to which it applies.
5.2.3 Design	Check tenses, e.g. 'The intention is to produce policies which ensure...' should be 'The intention of the following policies is to ensure ...'
D7 design	While the latter part of this policy is quite clear, the first part is quite ambiguous in that it states that the 'characteristics' must be respected, but does not specify what characteristics the policy relates to. The first sentence of the policy should therefore be removed or clarification provided.
D8 design	Suggest minor amendment to first part of policy- the current wording states 'located adjacent to existing buildings', but this may be impractical due to the curtilage surrounding buildings. Therefore suggest that this wording is amended to be 'adjacent to the existing footprint of the village' (and define footprint in the policy as <i>'the continuous built form of the settlement, excluding: i. individual buildings or groups of dispersed buildings which are clearly detached from the continuous built up area of the settlement; ii. Gardens, paddocks and other undeveloped land within the curtilage of buildings on the edge of the settlement where land relates more to the surrounding countryside than to the built up area of the settlement; iii. Agricultural buildings and associated land on the edge of the settlement; iv. Outdoor sports and recreation facilities and other formal open spaces on the edge of the settlement'</i>).
D9 design	There is opportunity within this policy to expand and specify how you would like to see the amenity value enhanced.
D10 design	This policy seems to address a variety of different topics, therefore it is suggested that the policy is subdivided into separate topics. 1st point re. housing proportions (within 1 st para) Requiring housing to be of similar proportions to other housing in the vicinity could limit the number of smaller start homes/downsizing homes and larger family homes coming forward, which could mean that local need is not met- is this what you intended to achieve from the policy? 2 nd point re. positioning (within 1 st para) The intention of the wording 'infill buildings should reflect their local positioning' is not clear. The term positioning suggests that this relates to dwelling orientation and/ or position within the site, however this is not clear and furthermore the policy wording does not specify how the 'local positioning' should be reflected. 3 rd point RE. eco construction/ design styles (within 1 st para) This policy seems to relate to point 7 below and these points could therefore benefit from being integrated into one policy. The policy would benefit from 'eco construction' being defined as this term is

N Plan Policy	Comment
	<p>open to interpretation. However, it should be borne in mind that the current policy wording implies that modern design will only be acceptable if it is eco-constructed - this could restrict otherwise excellent modern developments if they do not meet your eco construction criteria.</p> <p>The term 'eco construction' is used, which could include matters such as minimising construction waste sent to landfill, sourcing materials locally etc, however, as the title of this section is 'design', do you mean eco design (e.g. inclusion of solar panels, ground source heat pumps, etc) rather than construction?</p> <p>4th & 5th points re. trees (2nd/ 3rd paras) The first part of the policy wording is good- the inclusion of 'wherever possible' is good as this adds the necessary flexibility to the policy. The second part of the policy could add unreasonable burden to developers as the current policy wording does not specify the circumstances in which a planting scheme would be required- it would be unreasonable to expect a planting scheme for all development (see general policy comments). Therefore suggest that the policy clearly stipulates the instances where a planting scheme is required.</p> <p>6th point re. boundary styles (4th para) Policy wording generally ok, but as for the other design policies, the policy wording should be clear on what developments it applies to, rather than simply stating 'developments'.</p> <p>7th point re. extensions (5th para) See comments in relation to '3rd point' above. Policy would benefit from wording being reordered/ amended- '...should be in keeping with the architectural style and type of buildings within the immediate surrounding area. However, modern design will be supported if the design is to a high standard and would not have an adverse impact on the quality of the built environment.' Flexibility to allow modern design where appropriate is supported. Be careful of terms like 'dwellings should be aware' as dwellings are inanimate objects and as such do not have awareness. Instead it should be 'through design and access statements and plans, applicants for development on infill plots must demonstrate how the proposals take account of nearby buildings and features.'</p> <p>8th point re. adjacent dev (5th para) The use of the word 'aware' here is confusing. See comments in relation to points 3 and 7 above.</p>
5.3.1 Housing	<p>Rather than state 'see 5.2', it would be better to subdivide 5.2 and incorporate the relevant parts at the start of each policy as appropriate. This would make the document more user friendly as the reader would not have to flick back and forth through the document.</p>
H1 Managed housing growth	<p>Many elements of this policy duplicate points made elsewhere. The current wording of this policy means that each individual proposal can be up to and including 200 new homes- is this the intention of the policy? See comments above in relation to D8- again, suggest that the term village footprint is used (and clearly defined) rather than 'the built up part'. However, see general comment about need to avoid duplicating policy principles.</p>

N Plan Policy	Comment
	<p>Unable to comment on site allocations for the following reasons:</p> <p>Most importantly, the plan does not feature policies for the development of the allocated sites. While the key in appendix F states ‘mixed residential, 2 storey’, ‘bungalows’, ‘likely expansion area’, there are no policies which allocate these sites to stipulate these ‘requirements’ and it is the policies of the neighbourhood plan which carry weight and which will be used to assess planning applications rather than the map.</p> <p>No details of how the sites were identified have been included in the plan and no supporting evidence documents have been provided as part of this consultation. WLDC would like confirmation of how the sites allocated were identified: specifically, the sites should have been identified through a process of public call for sites, site appraisal and site evaluation and identification of preferred options, with the reasons for discounting any sites clearly defined.</p> <p>With regards to the map in Appendix F, the key is not clear Same colour used for ‘hazardous site’, ‘likely expansion area’ and ‘no additional building zone’. These should correlate with specific wording used in policies and supporting text to have meaning. Not clear whether areas shown are as existing or proposed (e.g. recreational/sports use). ‘protected space’ – does not detail what protection the space has, e.g. conservation area, local green space, etc. Key includes additional criteria in relation to affordable housing which is not stipulated in the policy itself. Furthermore, wording ‘of more than one or two’ is not acceptable due to ambiguity. If this is incorporated into policy the wording needs careful consideration. Wording on sites is illegible. Difficult to distinguish between mixed residential and buildings due to similarity in colours used. Key includes ‘cottage industries’ but this term is not used anywhere in the plan so unclear on what this use/ designation is.</p> <p>RE. village design statement This part of the policy relates to design and not housing growth so would be more appropriate under the design section. When referring to other documents, to avoid the reader having to flick between different documents it is preferable to include the relevant principles within the policy itself, or at least include the relevant sections as an appendix. The Fiskerton Village Design Statement does not appear to be publicly available on the internet so it was not possible to review whether this document remains up to date.</p>
H2 Housing mix	<p>Policy wording seems repetitive- suggest that second sentence is removed as this seems to simply repeat the first sentence.</p> <p>Perhaps clarify in the last sentence that you mean size in terms of number of bedrooms, rather than square footage.</p>
H3 Housing for older people	<p>Policy would benefit from the addition of a flexibility clause in relation to viability: for example, a scheme may come forward for 6 dwellings, and may propose that 2 of these dwellings are affordable dwellings. The provision of these two affordable dwellings may mean that it is not viable to deliver specific housing for older people also. However, the delivery of the two affordable units could be beneficial in meeting a local need.</p>
H4 Affordable	<p>There is no need to specify that developments must accord to local plan and</p>

N Plan Policy	Comment
housing	<p>neighbourhood plan policies.</p> <p>The local connection element of this policy and policy H5 duplicate each other.</p> <p>Part b) of the policy appears to relate to low cost market housing as oppose to affordable housing in social housing terms: affordable housing in planning terms refers to a type of tenure (see definition in NPPF glossary). In any event, the wording of this point is not suitable- it is impossible to design a property that is incapable of extension.</p> <p>You should avoid direct references to the use of S106 and conditions as mechanisms. Instead, the policy should simply state that the dwelling remain affordable in perpetuity.</p>
H5 Retention of affordable housing	<p>Whilst there is sympathy with the intent of this policy, affordable housing need and priority is set out in a housing register policy rather than a planning policy document. West Lindsey's policy is available in the Lincs Homefinder Policy and Guide on the West Lindsey website. It is recommended that this policy be deleted and the goals be pursued through other means.</p>
B1 Local business	<p>This policy is not necessary as it does not add anything further to the provisions of the local plan.</p>
C1 Community facilities	<p>This policy should be worded more positively, for example, 'Development which supports the continued operation of or enhances existing services and facilities will be supported.'</p>
CIL	<p>Some elements of this paragraph are factually incorrect. Namely:</p> <p>The parish council cannot collect funds from developers- this is done by the local planning authority only.</p> <p>How has the rough estimate of £85k been arrived at? It is impossible to estimate this at this point in time as WLDC does not have an adopted CIL charging schedule in place.</p> <p>This section reads more as a consultation document rather than a plan to be adopted for use in planning applications. It should be reviewed or removed – see below comments.</p> <p>CIL priorities:</p> <p>It is suggested that it is better to include the list of priorities in a separate document (e.g. parish plan, parish newsletter, etc) as you will not be able to actively update the list in the adopted neighbourhood plan. As the neighbourhood plan will span several years, your priorities may change and you may wish to add additional things to the list. It would therefore be more appropriate to have the list separate from the neighbourhood plan so that it can be easily updated. If this list is removed the associated appendices should be removed also.</p>
Section 6 Plan delivery and monitoring	<p>This section is useful to clarify what can be expected throughout the plan period from the parish council. You should ensure that all aspects are deliverable.</p> <p>6.6 – 'Neighbourhood Plan Revue' should be 'Neighbourhood Plan Review'.</p>
Appendices	<p>General comments:</p> <p>All maps should be legible (in terms of text, colour, background, etc)</p> <p>All plans should clearly show your OS licence and copyright</p> <p>To aid interpretation of the mapping, it would be particularly helpful if the elements in the key included the relevant policy number (where appropriate). For example, appendix B could make reference to policy E2.</p> <p>It would be ideal to combine all of the elements that are directly referred to in policies into one key diagram or proposals map. There is free mapping software available to enable this (QGIS) or you could employ a graphic</p>

N Plan Policy	Comment
	<p>designer.</p> <p>Appendix A: As previously mentioned, suggest that the map of the neighbourhood area is moved to the front of the plan.</p> <p>Appendix B: Title misleading- should refer to Local Green Spaces.</p> <p>Appendix C: What is the green space shown on this map? It is confusing and not consistent with the Local Green Spaces in Appendix B and referenced in the Local Green Spaces policy.</p> <p>Appendix D: Map size is very small which makes it very difficult to view.</p> <p>Appendix E: Key missing Map does not show whole neighbourhood area. It could be useful to refer to the Environment Agency website as flood mapping may be revised during the neighbourhood plan period.</p> <p>Appendix F: Map key is not clear Same colour used for 'hazardous site', 'likely expansion area' and 'no additional building zone'. Not clear whether areas shown are as existing or proposed (e.g. recreational/sports use). 'protected space' – does not detail what protection the space has, e.g. conservation area, local green space, etc. Key includes additional criteria in relation to affordable housing which is not stipulated in the policy itself. Furthermore, wording 'of more than one or two' is not acceptable due to ambiguity. If this is incorporated into policy the wording needs careful consideration. Wording on sites is illegible. Difficult to distinguish between mixed residential and buildings due to similarity in colours used. Key includes 'cottage industries' but this term is not used anywhere in the plan so unclear on what this use/ designation is. See comments on policy H1 above also.</p> <p>Appendix G: Difficult to distinguish between 'proposed pavements and cycle ways' and 'proposed new footpath' colour. Not clear if 'one way road system', 'new road' and 'improvements to traffic calming' refers to existing situation, or if these are proposed/ desirable.</p>
Other comments	
Conclusion	
<p>It is felt that the current draft of the Fiskerton Neighbourhood plan needs some further work in order to make it user friendly and effective at delivering the intended outcomes. Specifically, it is recommended that:</p> <p>Policy wording is improved to make the intent of policies clear and remove the scope for misinterpretation.</p>	

N Plan Policy	Comment
	<p>The repetition across policies is removed (so the user does not need to cross check different policies in relation to a single issue). Each policy clearly states the type of development that it applies to (i.e. rather than state 'all development', which is not reasonable nor appropriate in most circumstances).</p> <p>It is not clear in the neighbourhood plan itself how the development sites proposed in Appendix F have been identified and many elements shown on the map are not featured/ explained in any policy (it is the policies which have weight- the purpose of policy maps is to depict what is featured within a policy).</p> <p>WLDC is unable to comment on the sites 'allocated' without a review of the evidence behind these allocations.</p> <p>In terms of the basic conditions against which the plan would be considered when submitted to WLDC and when examined by an independent inspector: Regard to National policy: in general, the policies do not appear to contradict national policy, subject to the above recommendations being taken on-board. General conformity with Local Plan: the policies appear to be in general conformity with the Local Plan policies, however, as noted in the detailed comments above the intention of some policies are not clear and therefore WLDC reserve the right to comment on further policy drafts. Contribution to the achievement of sustainable development: as the evidence behind the proposed site allocations has not been provided, unable to consider whether the sites proposed are the most sustainable solution from the sites available. The other policies in the plan generally contribute to the delivery of sustainable development in the parish, subject to the above recommendations. Compatible with EU obligations: as the plan intends to allocate sites the plan should be subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) screening to determine if the plan is likely to have significant environmental impacts. If it is likely, a full SEA may be necessary. It is recommended that the parish council request a SEA screening on the draft plan: if the screening determines that a full SEA is necessary, the neighbourhood plan should not be formally submitted to WLDC until the assessment has been completed.</p>

20 Appendix H: Response from Natural England to the Initial Draft Plan

Thank you for notifying Natural England of/requesting information in respect of your Neighbourhood Development Plan dated 07/01/2015.

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

Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning. We must be consulted on draft Neighbourhood Development Plans where the Town/Parish Council or Neighbourhood Forum considers our interests would be affected by the proposals. We must be consulted on draft Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders where proposals are likely to affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest or 20 hectares or more of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land. We must also be consulted on Strategic Environmental Assessments, Habitats Regulations Assessment screening and Environmental Impact Assessments, where these are required.

Your local planning authority will be able to advise you further on environmental requirements. The following is offered as general advice which may be of use in the preparation of your plan. Natural England, together with the Environment Agency, English Heritage and Forestry Commission has published joint advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans and development proposals. This is available:http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084648/http://cdn.environment.agency.gov.uk/lit_6524_7da381.pdf

Local environmental record centres hold a range of information on the natural environment. A list of local records centre is available at: <http://www.nbn-nfbr.org.uk/nfbr.php>

Protected landscapes

If your neighbourhood planning area is within or adjacent to a National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), we advise that you take account of the relevant National Park/AONB

Management Plan for the area. For Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, you should seek the views of the AONB Partnership.

National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. Their boundaries follow natural lines in the landscape rather than administrative boundaries, making them a good decision making framework for the natural environment.

<http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/publications/nca/default.aspx>

Protected species

You should consider whether your plan or proposal has any impacts on protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced standing advice to help

understand the impact of particular developments on protected or Biodiversity Action Plan species should they be identified as an issue.

The standing advice also sets out when, following receipt of survey information, you should undertake further consultation with Natural England.

Natural England Standing Advice

Local Wildlife Sites

You should consider whether your plan or proposal has any impacts on local wildlife sites, eg Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) or whether opportunities exist for enhancing such sites. If it appears there could be negative impacts then you should ensure you have sufficient information to fully understand the nature of the impacts of the proposal on the local wildlife site.

Best Most Versatile Agricultural Land

Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services (ecosystem services) for society, for example as a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, as a store for carbon and water, as a reservoir of biodiversity and as a buffer against pollution. It is therefore important that the soil resources are protected and used sustainably. Paragraph 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that:

‘Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality’.

General mapped information on soil types is available as ‘Soilscapes’ on the www.magic.gov.uk and also from the LandIS website; <http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm> which contains more information about obtaining soil data.

Opportunities for enhancing the natural environment

Neighbourhood plans and proposals may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment, use natural resources more sustainably and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature.

Opportunities to incorporate features into new build or retro fitted buildings which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes should also be considered as part of any new development proposal.

Should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and

Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again at consultations@naturalengland.org.uk

We really value your feedback to help us improve the service we offer. We have attached a feedback form to this letter and welcome any comments you might have about our service.

21 Appendix I: Anglian Water Response

Policy D3

Anglian Water is supportive of Policy D3 which highlights the importance of incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs) in new parking areas.

Policy D4 Sustainable Urban Drainage

Anglian Water is supportive of Policy D4 which requires new development within the Parish to incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs).

Policy D5 Drainage Strategy

Anglian Water is supportive of Policy D5 which requires applicants to prepare a drainage strategy to accompany planning applications for the proposed allocation sites. However it is considered that the requirement for the preparation of a drainage strategy should not be limited to those sites which are allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan. For example all sites will require a local connection to the existing sewage network which may include network improvements.

We would wish to see all developments adhering to the surface water hierarchy as outlined in Part H of the Building Regulations with the use of SUDs being the preferred method and the disposal to the surface water sewer seen as the last resort. Under no circumstances will surface water be permitted to discharge to the public foul sewerage network.

It is therefore proposed that the wording of Policy D5 should be amended as follows (new text in bold):

‘Applications for development ~~of all~~ including the allocated sites must be accompanied by a drainage strategy. The strategy....following are satisfactory: the approach to SUDs

The approach to foul drainage

The sufficiency of existing infrastructure to accommodate any surface water and foul water emanating from the proposed new development, any proposed improvements and how these will be delivered. Surface water will not be permitted to discharge to the public foul sewerage network.’

Policy H1 Managed Housing Growth

It is proposed that a maximum of 200 dwellings within or adjacent to the built up area of Fiskerton should be developed over the plan period.

Currently there is limited capacity at Fiskerton Water Recycling Centre (formerly known as a sewage treatment works) to serve this level of housing growth. However Anglian Water has a responsibility to ensure capacity is made available for all sites with the benefit of planning consent and we will take the necessary steps to ensure that this is the case.

22 Appendix J: Coal Authority Response

Dear Mr Roberts

Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan – Draft

Thank you for the notification of the 7 January 2015 consulting The Coal Authority on the above Neighbourhood Plan. I note however that consultation actually commenced on the 15 December 2014.

The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. Our statutory role in the planning system is to provide advice about new development in the coalfield areas and also protect coal resources from unnecessary sterilisation by encouraging their extraction, where practical, prior to the permanent surface development commencing.

As you will be aware the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan area is outside of the defined coalfield and therefore The Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.

In the spirit of ensuring efficiency of resources and proportionality it will not be necessary for you to provide The Coal Authority with any future drafts or updates to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. This letter can be used as evidence for the legal and procedural consultation requirements.

Fiskerton is a village I know well from previously working in the planning arena in the area, therefore on behalf of The Coal Authority I sincerely wish the Neighbourhood Plan Group and Fiskerton Parish Council every success with the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Yours sincerely

23 Appendix K Church Commissioner Response

This representation is made by WYG on behalf of the Church Commissioners for England (“CCfE”) in response to the Draft Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan (“the Plan”) which is the subject of public consultation which commenced on 15th December 2014.

Policy E2 We object to the designation of the site referred to as the “Paddock”, Site E2 (1), as a Local Green Space. We consider there is no justification for the designation of this site as Local Green Space. We consider that the site is not a safe hands Green Space in the context of national policy set out in the NPPF. We also object to this designation on the grounds that we consider this site is the most sequentially sustainable location within Fiskerton to accommodate some of the future housing requirements of the village.

It is essential that all sites proposed as Local Green Space are consistent with all of the criteria in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and not used as a mechanism to prevent development on sustainable sites. NPPF paragraph 77 confirms a local green space designation should only be used where the Local Green Space is: in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including playing fields), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

We consider that Landowners should be contacted at an early stage about proposals to designate any part of their land as Local Green Space. The NPPG confirms that landowners and the development industry should be involved in preparing a draft neighbourhood plan. The NPPG confirms that the use of this approach will ensure the qualifying body preparing the plan “will be better placed to produce plans that provide for sustainable development which benefits the local community whilst avoiding placing unrealistic pressures on the cost and deliverability of that development.” (Paragraph: 048 Reference ID: 41-048-20140306)

We consider that further dialogue is essential before work on the Plan progresses further to ensure a deliverable plan is evolved in line with the strategic principles of the emerging Local Plan.

We do not consider site E2 (1), would meet the tests of the NPPF (para. 77). In particular we do not consider site E2 (1) meets the second criteria of being “demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife.” Site E2 (1) is considered to have limited amenity value and has no public access. We do not consider the village is deficient in public space provision and it does not appear that the designation of site E2 (1) has been based on evidence of need. www.wyg.com creative minds safe hands.

The CCfE have prepared an outline planning application for site E2 (1) following a number of pre-application meetings with planning officers at West Lindsey District

Council who provided positive feedback with regard to the proposals. The associated Illustrative Masterplan is included at Appendix 1 to this submission.

The Illustrative Masterplan for site E2 (1) indicates that the site could deliver up to 38 dwellings, with 30% of the site as public open space and pedestrian links throughout the site. A number of technical assessments have been undertaken including a flood risk assessment, ecology survey, transport statement, heritage assessment, tree survey and environmental risk assessment which demonstrate that the site is in a suitable and sustainable location for housing development. The site is not protected by any environmental or ecological designations.

Site E2 (1) is deliverable for housing as there are no physical constraints to developing this site and no significant infrastructure would be required to bring the site forward in the short term.

The heritage assessment has considered the impact of the proposed housing development at Site E2 (1) on the nearby listed buildings and the assessment concluded that there would be no impact on the heritage significance of these assets. The proposed new public open space, shown on the Illustrative Masterplan to the south and west, enhances the setting of St Clement's Church and retains the significance of the listed buildings, and the character of the village.

We consider that Site E2 (1) is the most sequentially sustainable location within Fiskerton for housing development due to its location in the centre of the village with the best access to existing services and facilities. It is within the existing development limits of the village with existing built development to all sides and therefore its residential development would not necessitate an extension to the village and the proposed residential use is compatible with the surrounding land uses.

In summary, we consider Site E2 (1) would not meet the Local Green Space criteria as set out in the NPPF, as we do not consider that the site has demonstrable beauty, historical significance, recreational value (particularly as the site has no public access), tranquillity or richness of wildlife (as demonstrated by the ecological surveys). Recent appeal decisions www.wyg.com creative minds safe hands (APP/G1630/A/12/2172936) Tewkesbury and (APP/J3015/A/13/2198848) Nottingham have demonstrated that designations for Local Green Space should be in accordance with the criteria in the NPPF. We consider the Local Green Space designation proposed in the Plan is based on the outdated policy (Core 9 of the West Lindsey Local Plan 2006) which does not reflect the provisions of paragraph 77 of the NPPF.

It is important to reiterate that Site E2 (1) is in private ownership and has no public access. The site would better serve the future housing requirements of the village representing the most sustainable location within the development limits, as well as providing a significant proportion of publically accessible open space. Policy D1 (Access)

Policy D1 seeks to restrict access to new development by directing it away from the village centre. This policy is unclear as it does not define what is meant by the village

centre. It is also unclear how this will work in practice as there is only one main route through the village and any traffic originating from the east would have to travel along Ferry Road and through the centre of the village. Policy D6 (Fiskerton North Delph)

We consider it is important that any development coming forward is discussed with the relevant local water body and Environment Agency.

Policy D8 seeks to restrict the location of new development. We do not agree with this level of prescription with regards to the shape and location of future development at this early stage. The village needs and sustainability should be considered before ruling out potential development locations.

Policy D8 has the potential to conflict with the proposed mixed residential site (identified in policy H1) and located to the north of the village. This proposed allocation is beyond the www.wyg.com creative minds safe hands current village boundary and will inhibit the provision of well defined development limits to the settlement. This is explored in greater detail in our comments to Policy H1 below. H1 Managed Housing Growth

As set out in paragraph 3.2 above, we consider that site E2 (1) represents the most sequentially sustainable location within the development limits to accommodate some of the future housing requirements of the village. Site E2 (1) will not cater for the identified need of 200 houses and therefore the next location for growth should be the land to the north of the village. Sequentially if there are no sites available within the village limits, the next preferable option would be locations adjacent to the development limits, with good access to existing services and finally more remote locations if the first two options are not available or do not have the capacity to accommodate the level of housing required.

We note the Plan proposes an area of housing to the north of the village as part of Policy H1. We support the principle of a proposal for up to 200 new homes within or immediately adjacent to the north of Fiskerton as suggested in the Plan under Policy H1. We also consider that 200 new homes is an appropriate housing requirement for Fiskerton taking into account the scale of the village, its location in relation to larger settlements and existing services and facilities. This level of development will support the existing services and facilities within Fiskerton and the neighbouring settlement of Cherry Willingham, and could also facilitate the delivery of some of the key infrastructure requirements that may be necessary within Fiskerton. We agree that land to the north of Fiskerton is well related to the existing services and facilities in Fiskerton such as Fiskerton Primary School, Fiskerton Village Hall, the convenience store on Ferry Road and bus stops on Ferry Road. We also consider that a maximum of 25 dwellings per hectare set out in Policy H1 is an appropriate density for housing development in Fiskerton.

We do not, however, consider that proposed allocation H1 as shown on Appendix F of the Plan represents the most sustainable approach to a potential housing / mixed use allocation. In particular we consider its configuration/orientation will not create a logical extension or rounding off to the settlement and as a result will lead to encroachment into

open countryside. We also consider the configuration will restrict viable access to serve the level of development proposed. It would appear that access would only be possible via the existing cul de sac to the north of Ferry Road. www.wyg.com creative minds safe hands

We have reviewed the potential for an alternative arrangement and prepared an Illustrative Masterplan as included in Appendix 2 of this submission. At this stage the Masterplan is for indicative purposes only and no technical work has been undertaken to date. The Illustrative Masterplan demonstrates how the site has the potential to deliver up to 200 houses at a density of 25 dph, together with recreational open space provision in accordance with the adopted Development Plan policy RES5 requirement. We consider our Masterplan would create a logical extension to the village. The amended orientation of the site from the Plan proposal is justified as the east-west emphasis relates well to the existing settlement form and the proposal will integrate with the existing village facilitating accessibility / permeability to the village and the open countryside beyond. The Illustrative Masterplan identifies Corn Close as a main vehicular access point. A second point of access for pedestrian/cycle/emergency use has been identified at Hall Lane. This second access point has the potential to be widened to create two main points of vehicular access to the site. This would further increase the permeability of the site and would provide an additional point of access when compared with the Plan proposals. Each of the two proposed access points are within the ownership of the CCfE. Policies H2, H3, H4 (housing mix, housing for older people, affordable housing)

It is important that any statement on housing mix and tenure / type is consistent with the Local Plan and any strategic housing market assessments which form part of the evidence base. It will not be appropriate for the Plan to set local thresholds without clear justification.

For example Policy H3 requires housing developments of six units or more to address the local need for older persons housing. There is no clear evidence to support this requirement as the Central Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) is at an interim stage. There is also no requirement in national policy for the inclusion of housing for older people. The NPPF states that the cumulative impact of standards and policies should not put the implementation of the plan at serious risk (paragraph 174). Development needs to be viable in order to be deliverable. Housing mix needs to be dictated by need and hence the requirement for this to be evidenced through the SHMA.

On this basis we consider that Policies H2-H4 inclusive should cross refer to the Local Plan and relevant evidence base documents to ensure that any specific housing requirements are appropriately justified in that context. www.wyg.com creative minds safe hands Spatial Development Plan (Appendix F)

A significant proportion of the land to the north of Fiskerton (within the CCfE's ownership) is proposed as recreational use in the Plan. We consider this aspirational and question how these areas are proposed to be delivered. If policies and proposals are to be implemented as the community intended, a Neighbourhood Plan needs to be deliverable.

The NPPG states that when addressing infrastructure in a Neighbourhood Plan, a qualifying body must consider “how any additional infrastructure requirements might be delivered.” (Paragraph: 045 Reference ID: 41-045-20140306)

Our concerns in this regard are linked to Paragraph 173 of the NPPF which states that “pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in planmaking and decision-taking and that plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that its ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.”

Open space associated with new residential development needs to meet the policy requirements in the Development Plan and the level of provision should be appropriately justified and commensurate with the scale and impact of the proposed development. The relevant policy on the provision of Recreational Open Space is included within the West Lindsey Local Plan 2006 (Policy RES5) which identifies that for sites over 10ha, a minimum of 10% of the total site should be informal recreational land or play space, and/or associated equipment and/or built facilities. At this stage there is no other policy or guidance on the level of open space associated with new developments given the early stages of the emerging Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. It is therefore not considered that the level of public space proposed to the north of the village is justified.

Appendix L: Flyer to Advertise Consultation Events on the 15th & 23rd January

FISKERTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



WE ARE HAVING OPEN CONSULTATION EVENTS FROM 3.00 TO 7.00 PM IN THE VILLAGE HALL
ON THURSDAY 15TH AND FRIDAY 23RD JANUARY

LOOK AT OUR DRAFT PLAN (ISSUE 3) WHICH HAS BEEN SENT TO WLDC FOR EXAMINATION.
YOU WILL BE ABLE TO DISCUSS YOUR PREFERENCES AND CONCERNS INDIVIDUALLY WITH
COMMITTEE MEMBERS.

WE HOPE TO KEEP THE PADDOCK AS A PROTECTED GREEN SPACE. GET AN UPDATE ON OUR
DISCUSSIONS WITH THE CHURCH COMMISSIONERS AND THEIR DEVELOPERS. IF YOU AGREE
WITH THE “KEEP THE PADDOCK GREEN” CAMPAIGN PLEASE SIGN THE PETITION.

25 Appendix M : May's Parish News Letter

THE MANOR FARM Paddock

Regular readers will know that the Church Commissioners, who own the Paddock, presented a pre planning application proposal to the Village on 24th Nov 2014 for building houses on the Paddock. The Church Commissioners were told by some West Lindsey Officers that building houses on the Paddock was a good idea despite a very clear statement to the contrary in the 2013 Fiskerton Parish Plan. On 22nd Jan 2015 the West Lindsey District Council officers and planners supported the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Draft Plan (Issue 3) and told the CCs that WLDC would not support the planned building application. On 30th March 2015 the CCs told the Fiskerton Neighbourhood Plan Group that they would not pursue their building application “for the moment”. This gives the Village time to formulate and act on a plan to secure the Paddock as a Community Asset with open green space and access.

The Neighbourhood Plan Group is working on the 4th draft of the plan which clearly marks the Paddock as an open green space. The Parish Council will be forming a plan to acquire access for the public and to manage the Paddock as a valued asset for the community. For this to happen difficult negotiations will have to take place with the CCs who have said that they do not want to sell the Paddock or allow public access. The Neighbourhood Planning Group and the Parish Council will need as much support from the people of Fiskerton, “people power”, as possible if the vision of the Paddock as a place for children to play, relaxation, informal sports activities and interesting wild plants to thrive. Watch this space.

Robert Wall

Chairman of Neighbourhood Planning Group

Vice Chairman of Fiskerton Parish Council

26 Appendix N: Flyer for the Event on the 24th August 2015
FISKERTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



WE ARE HAVING A CONSULTATION EVENT SPECIFICALLY FOR
PEOPLE WHO OWN BUSINESSES IN FISKERTON ON AUGUST 24th AT 7
TO 9.00 PM IN THE VILLAGE HALL.

SEE THE CURRENT DRAFT OF OUR PLANS AND SUGGESTIONS AND
CONTINUE THE DISCUSSION ON YOUR PREFERRED OPTIONS FOR
OUR VILLAGE WITH THE PLANNING COMMITTEE AND PARISH
COUNCIL MEMBERS.

27 Appendix O: Flyer for the Event on the 9 September 2015
FISKERTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



WE ARE HAVING A CONSULTATION EVENT SPECIFICALLY FOR
RESIDENTS OF SHORT FERRY ON SEPTEMBER 9th AT 7 TO 9.00 PM IN
THE TYRWHITT ARMS.

SEE THE CURRENT DRAFT OF OUR PLANS AND SUGGESTIONS AND
CONTINUE THE DISCUSSION ON YOUR PREFERRED OPTIONS FOR
OUR VILLAGE WITH THE PLANNING COMMITTEE AND PARISH
COUNCIL MEMBERS.

28 Appendix P: September Newsletter

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

Since the last update on the Neighbourhood Planning Group activities in the May Parish News, steady positive progress has been made. We have had five meetings and the main outcomes can be summarised as:

1. Issues concerning the Manor Farm Paddock have been transferred to the Parish Council. The PC has arranged for a meeting in September with the Church Commissioners and West Lindsey to discuss how the PC might acquire the Paddock to be able to manage it as a community asset. The Neighbourhood Plan has the Paddock as an open “Green Space”.
2. Specific consultation events have been organised for owners of businesses in the Village and residents of Short Ferry on Aug 24 and Sept 9 respectively. A larger consultation event is planned for October/November when the current draft of the Plan is completed.
3. The PC has received a grant for funding many of the expected costs of professionally producing the Plan and supporting documents. More grants will be applied for, so the expected net cost to the PC will be zero.
4. The NPG has welcomed two new members to help steer us through the final difficult stages. Luke Brown of West Lindsey and Natalie Cockrell of Bassetlaw District Council are both professional planners with experience of Neighbourhood Plans.

Overall the message is positive and we do intend to produce a plan that the residents of Fiskerton want, so it is most important that you speak to members of the NPG and PC, if you know them, and come to the consultation events to express your views which are needed for this plan to be successful and for Fiskerton to develop into a pleasant sustainable rural village.

Robert Wall

Chairman of Neighbourhood Planning Group

Vice Chairman of Fiskerton Parish Council

29 Appendix Q: Options for Development

The options

Please consider the options in the centre of this leaflet and attend one of the drop in sessions (below) to find out more information and most importantly express your preference.

Your responses will help to inform the next stages of the neighbourhood plan.

The NPG, WLDC and Parish Council have been in discussions with the CCs about the village acquiring the Paddock as part of planning gain for nearly two years. How patient are they going to be? The CCs could end discussions with the community and put a planning application in to build on the Paddock and to the North of Ferry Road. Without a Neighbourhood Plan Fiskerton could have much more than 200 houses.

You have a choice....

Please attend one of the drop in sessions below and express your preference at the Village Hall. If you are unable to attend one of the sessions please send your comments to nplan@fiskerton-lincs.org.uk or to Robert Wall at the address below

14 July 7pm – 9pm	Address: The Old Rectory
19 July 7pm – 9pm	Reepham Road
23 July 3pm – 6pm	Fiskerton
9 August 7pm -9pm	Lincoln
13 August 2pm – 4pm	LN3 4EZ



Neighbourhood Development Plan Options

The Localism Act 2011 gives some planning control to the local communities. Fiskerton Parish Council has formed a Neighbourhood Plan Group (NPG), to produce a neighbourhood plan which if it is approved by West Lindsey District Council (WLDC) and the residents in a referendum, it will become part of the planning law. If this happens residents' views on the shape, size and character of their village will have to be considered by future developers.

This leaflet is to inform you of the progress of the NPG to date and to ask you to consider the options within this leaflet and express your preference on how the NPG should progress in the future at one of the drop in sessions detailed overleaf.



The Plan

Following the advice from experts, WLDC and landowners it was decided that approximately 200 houses should be the maximum development during the twenty year period of the plan and the best location for this development was on the land owned by the Church Commissioners to the North of Ferry Road between the School and Hall Lane.



The Landowners

The Church Commissioners (CCs) want to build in our area, and they prepared a plan to build 38 houses on the Manor Farm Paddock in November 2014. When the CCs presented their plans to build on the Paddock to WLDC they met strong opposition from local residents who wish to protect the Paddock as a 'Protected Open Space'. The CCs have now withdrawn these plans "for the moment". The CCs architects and agents are willing to work with the community to produce a Neighbourhood Plan that the residents want. In discussions with the CCs about the Paddock, the Parish Council could acquire the Paddock for public ownership as part of the planning gain in return for the development of approximately 200 houses.

The Current Situation

The CCs have prepared two options for building approximately 200 houses to the North of Ferry Road with open green space including the Paddock to be used for community use. At the open consultation event on May 19th 2016 it was proposed and accepted that further options should be examined. These discussions have taken place with the CCs, who own the land, to West of the village. Their reply is that their land to the West of the village is not available for development.

The Options

Option 1. Develop approximately 200 houses North of Ferry Road. Running East to West from the school to Hall Lane. This option with the Paddock gives 26% open green space and the development itself has more than the minimum 10% required by the statutory regulations. The Paddock to be acquired as a community asset.

Option 2. Develop approximately 200 houses North of Ferry Road. In an L shaped from the school to Hall Lane. This option with the Paddock gives 29% open green space and the development itself has more than the minimum 10% required by the statutory regulations. The Paddock to be acquired as a community asset.

Option 3. The community asked for the option of 100 houses to be developed North of Ferry Road and 100 houses developed to West of the village to be explored. The land owners say the land is not available for development. This option is therefore not deliverable and cannot be considered.

Option 4. The community asked for the option of 200 houses West of the village to be explored. The land owners say the land is not available for development. This option is therefore not deliverable and cannot be considered.

Option 5. No allocation for housing in the Neighbourhood Plan. This would then mean the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan's option for the indicative 15% (approximately 90 homes) growth of Fiskerton as a minimum without a maximum being indicated, so this could lead to houses on the Manor Farm Paddock, houses to the North of Ferry Road and none, or not as many, of the benefits to the local community that are being proposed as part of the neighbourhood plan.

Option 6. No Neighbourhood Plan. This means the community will have no influence or say on planning matters that effect Fiskerton.