

This is a commentary and response to the leaflet recently published and distributed by the "Fiskerton Open Forum." In the past we have not always responded to material which criticises the NPG, but this one is so inaccurate that we feel that we have to do so to ensure the truth is clarified.

Please Note: Extracts from the Fiskerton Open Forum leaflet have been underlined.

Page 1.

There will be another formal consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan. All previous comments will be carried forward, but we will still welcome **new** submissions.

The "250" homes is an exaggeration. The Draft Neighbourhood Plan actually allows for approximately 200 homes. It is not responsible for the Tanya site or other infill.

Page 2.

"The Neighbourhood Plan. Supports plans for 250 to 300 homes in the short term and permits unlimited growth in the long term."

This is completely untrue.

The Draft Neighbourhood Plan allows for a development of approximately 200 houses.

Nowhere in the plan is there any mention of unlimited growth now or in the future.

If you go to <u>www.fiskerton-lincs.org.uk</u> and follow the link to the Final Draft Neighbourhood Plan you will find what is actually there. The relevant sections are :- Page 20 Community Objectives and page 25 Policy 1: Development to the North of Fiskerton.

<u>"250 NOW which is 55% growth and outstrips growth anywhere else in</u> Lincolnshire."

This is not true.

The Draft Neighbourhood plan allows for a development "of approximately 200 homes".

This represents a growth of 44%. This does not include that Short Ferry is part of Fiskerton. If included the percentage would be smaller.

Cherry Willingham has proposals for 432 houses in their Neighbourhood Plan and a further 155 in the proposals for the Marina. A total of 587. This represents 42%

Welton has proposals for about 385 in their Neighbourhood Plan.

The Greetwell Fields development envisages about 500 houses.

It is unclear which, if any, parish this comes under. Greetwell Fields are outside the City boundary, inside West Lindsey. It is closest to Greetwell and North Greetwell. However we feel that it would be unfair to use those as the comparator. (It would lead to a grow th estimate in excess of 200%)

The Neighbourhood Plans can be found by going to <u>www.west-lindsey.gov.uk</u> and following the links to the Planning and Neighbourhood areas of the site.

Page 3.

"TRAFFIC – The current plan will cause traffic through the village to increase by 50%."

This shows a basic misunderstanding of the current situation.

It is reasonable to expect that if the size of the village is increased by 40%, (roughly the NP proposal) then the amount of traffic generated by the village will probably increase by 40%.

However the majority of traffic along Ferry Road and through the village is not generated by the village, it comes from vehicle movements to and from Lincoln and villages like Bardney to the East of Fiskerton.

If every house in the village produced two movements per day that would be about 1000 journeys, many of them not along Ferry Road.

Ferry Road has at least 2500 journeys per day. They cannot be generated by the village.

"The recent traffic survey shows that 1 vehicle exœeds 37.5 mph every 90 seconds*, this will increase"

At last something we can agree with. Like many villages Fiskerton has a problem with speeding traffic. Unfortunately the 2017 Traffic survey does not support the above statistic. Figures are only given for a seven day period. There is no way that a figure can be extracted for any 12 hour period. Worse still for us the survey shows that while traffic had increased from 2015 to 2017 the degree of speeding had gone down slightly.

Traffic is not in the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. It is covered by Lincolnshire County Council, Highways Department. The survey does not support us.

"The results of the survey together with an analysis of the collision data show that the criteria for either fixed or mobile speed camera enforcement is not met."

Nevertheless traffic calming measures are included in the latest Neighbourhood Plan in section 16, Appendix A. Community Aspirations and Projects.

Hall Lane is approximately 1.5 miles long. It links with other bridal paths. The proposed access to the development affects about 150 yards of Hall Lane. That still leaves over a mile of country road for walkers with or without dogs. Being optimistic, that 150 yards may need to be improved, perhaps including a footpath, making it even safer for pedestrians.

<u>"FLOODING – Many homes already experience flooding, it is expected excessive</u> <u>development to the north of the village will increase the risk of flooding for Ferry Road and</u> <u>the low lying land to the south."</u>

This is simply an assertion with no evidence to back it up.

Before the swale behind the Village Hall was built, the road at the end of School Lane, and the area in front of what was the shop, would regularly flood at times of heavy rain. The swale is a success. The area no longer floods. The outline plans for the development north of Ferry Road include four more swales. In addition the development will have to demonstrate a Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme to ensure that run-off is adequately dealt with. The proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan will help to reduce the possibility of flooding.

There is more on this in the Neighbourhood Plan, Section 9 Flooding, and Policy 7 Flood Risk on pages 44-46.

" ENVIRONMENT....."

Again this is simply an assertion with nothing to back it up.

Taking a map and drawing a circle centred on the church tower with a radius of 6 miles encloses an area of well over 100 square miles. The vast majority of which is open farmland similar to the area north of Ferry Road. Looking at the wider area of Lincolnshire it is obvious that there are many thousands of square miles of similar countryside. The loss of less than half a square mile of land will have no significant effect on the overall wildlife of the area. This view is tacitly confirmed by those who would prefer the development take place to the west of the village. The same amount of countryside would be lost.

It is usually considered that gardens have more flowers than open countryside and so are more attractive for butterflies and other insects.

<u>"AMENITIES</u>....Any monies raised from this huge development would go towards the cost of the bypass."

This is completely untrue.

The regulations governing the Community Infrastructure Levy have not changed.

15% of the CIL will be allocated to the Parish Council. If the village has a Neighbourhood Plan in place then this rises to 25%.

The other 75 to 85 % of the CIL will go to West Lindsey and they have said that they will retain 5% for administration costs and pass the rest onto Lincolnshire CC, who in turn will use it to offset their contribution to the cost of the bypass and towards the cost of secondary education. This can be confirmed at :-

www.west-lindsey.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building/west-lindsey-communityinfrastructure-levy-cil/

Follow the link to "CIL Information for Town and Parish Councils".

<u>"SCHOOL – 250+ new homes will bring 67*** new children aged 3-11 into the village</u> meaning 164children for a school rated for 100***"

The school has already exceeded it's designated capacity, there are 113 on roll. It is still by far the smallest primary school in the area. If the development produced 67 new pupils of primary school age the roll might rise to 180. This would be very good news for the school. But Fiskerton Primary School would still be the smallest in the area.

The Department for Education considers a roll of under 250 indicates a "small" school. Increasing the size of the school gives it more resources and reduces the threat of closure.

<u>"THE PADDOCK – has been allocated protected status and cannot be built on for at least 20</u> years. We no longer need to 'strike a deal' with the land owners."

This again shows misunderstandings.

The Paddock does have Protected Status but this will be reviewed in line with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan most probably every 3 to 5 years. We expect the Church Commissioners to continue to oppose this designation every time there is a review unless the NDP is adopted at referendum in which case the Village will have ownership.

The Church Commissioners have a legal duty to maximise their assets. They will therefore have to maintain their stance that the Paddock is potential building land. We will have to continue to insist on its protection as an open green space.

Alongside this the Church Commissioners have offered to transfer ownership of the Paddock to the Parish Council as part of the planning gain associated with the development north of Ferry Road. In the end the transfer will be part of a 'deal'. The Church Commissioners will not be able to simply give their asset away.

Page 4.

The Neighbourhood Plan Group has consulted, and has listened to all of the views and comments both for and against our proposals. We will continue to do so.

At the end of the process every adult in Fiskerton will have an equal vote in the Referendum.

Yes, your voice will count.