

# NOCTON AND POTTERHANWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

## CONSULTATION STATEMENT NOVEMBER 2016

### CONTENTS

<b>Section</b>		<b>Page</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Legislative requirements</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Development of the Neighbourhood Plan</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>Time line of key actions</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Appendix 2</b>	<b>Questionnaire (September 2015)</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Appendix 3</b>	<b>Proposed policies for consultation (December 2015)</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Appendix 4</b>	<b>NKDC SEA Screening Report</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix 5</b>	<b>Consultation letter to residents and other consultees, and response form (September 2016)</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Appendix 6</b>	<b>Details of public consultation 19 September – 30 October 2016</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Appendix 7</b>	<b>Summary of responses and outcome of comments</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Appendix 8</b>	<b>Response from North Kesteven District Council</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Appendix 9</b>	<b>Response From Lincolnshire County Council</b>	<b>53</b>

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1** This Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal requirement of Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 (set out in Para 3) relating to the development of the Nocton and Potterhanworth Neighbourhood Plan ('the Neighbourhood Plan'). The statement details the community engagement and consultation undertaken; this is summarised in sections 4 and 5.

## **2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1** The parishes of Nocton and Potterhanworth lie some seven miles to the south east of Lincoln and are connected to each other by a short stretch of the B1202. The villages are two of a line of settlements running in a north-south direction along the slope of the Lincoln Heath. Both parishes also have small outlying settlements (Potterhanworth Booths and Wasps Nest) and a number of isolated dwellings, mainly on Nocton Heath. The parishes of Nocton and Potterhanworth had a combined population of 1658 in the 2011 Census, split almost equally between the two (819 residents in Nocton and 839 in Potterhanworth). The parishes are rural in nature and the villages are surrounded by farmland.
- 2.2** In early 2014, Nocton and Potterhanworth Parish Councils agreed to produce a Neighbourhood Plan covering both parishes. North Kesteven District Council (NKDC) formally approved this proposal on 1 May 2014. After some delays, the proposal to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan was launched formally at the respective Annual Parish Meetings held by Nocton and Potterhanworth Parish Councils in May 2015. A Steering Group, with delegated responsibility for drafting the Neighbourhood Plan, was established comprising the Chairs of the two Parish Councils and other interested parishioners. Two Community Groups were also established, one in each parish, ensuring representation from all areas of the parish including outlying settlements. Since then, there has been extensive consultation with residents and others to ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan is community-led.

## **3. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

- 3.1** Section 15(2) of part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations sets out that a consultation statement:
- (a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
  - (b) explains how they were consulted;
  - (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- and
- (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

#### **4. DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

- 4.1** The formal development of the plan began in earnest in May 2015. A timeline of key actions from inception to completion of the 6-week statutory consultation prior to formal submission is at Appendix 1. Throughout the development and consultation period advice has been sought from North Kesteven District Council.
- 4.2** Consultation work commenced during August 2015, with meetings of the two Community Groups to identify the issues which the Steering Group should explore further. From this initial work, a comprehensive questionnaire was developed by the Steering Group to obtain residents' views and this was distributed to all households in the area in October 2015. The high return rate of 43% (267) questionnaires provided a sound basis on which to prepare an outline of policies. This outline aimed to respond to those issues which residents felt to be of most concern/interest and provided a framework for future growth and development. A copy of the questionnaire is at Appendix 2.
- 4.3** The key areas of interest identified from the questionnaire were:
- Housing – residents demonstrated a desire to see, at most, only limited further housing development, of design and materials that blend in with their surroundings.
  - Natural environment – the peace and tranquillity, and the rural nature of the villages, were of great value to residents
  - Built environment – residents wished to preserve the character of the parishes
  - Community – both community facilities (especially the then-recently closed public house, The Chequers, at Potterhanworth) and the sense of a safe and friendly community, were of significant worth to residents.
  - Speed and size of vehicles through the villages were also a major concern but the potential solutions to these problems fall outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 4.4** The questionnaire responses generated the proposed Aims, Objectives and specific Policies to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan, which were circulated in December 2015 to all households inviting further comment. This was supplemented by a public meeting in each village in January 2016 at which further comments were made and collated. The text of this document is at Appendix 3. Very few comments were received at this stage of the Plan development and those that were received indicated support.
- 4.5** This wide-ranging consultation was supplemented by a dedicated and interactive “blog site” (<http://nocpotplan.blogspot.co.uk/>) where progress was mapped at each stage of the process and key documents made available for information and comment. Information was also included at relevant stages on the (privately run) “Nocton Blog” and made available on the Parish Councils' own websites and through regular progress reports to each of their meetings.
- 4.6** Further drafting of the Neighbourhood Plan took place between January and September 2016. This phase included two informal reviews by an independent and experienced Planning Officer appointed by NKDC, and a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening by NKDC. The SEA Screening report is at Appendix 4.

## **5. CONSULTATION ON THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

- 5.1** Following receipt of the SEA Screening Report, indicating that an SEA was not required, the Neighbourhood Plan proceeded to the statutory six-week consultation period. This ran from 19 September to 30 October 2016. A covering letter and a response form containing the Policies were delivered to every household in the two parishes a few days prior to the start of the consultation. These documents are at Appendix 5. The covering letter included details of where to obtain a copy of the Neighbourhood Plan, either electronically or in printed form, and information about the four drop-in sessions. Two of these were in Nocton and two in Potterhanworth; two were on a Saturday, one on a weekday afternoon and one on a weekday evening. Printed copies of the Neighbourhood Plan were available at each session, and at least one member of the Steering Group was present to answer questions.
- 5.2** Local businesses and landowners, together with neighbouring local authorities and parishes, service providers and other interested parties were also invited to comment, either by email or by post where no email address was available. A list of these consultees, with an indication of whether a response was received, is at Appendix 6.
- 5.3** Seven people attended across the four drop-in sessions. 57 responses were received from residents commenting on the plan and / or indicating agreement or otherwise with the Policies, either on the pro-forma or by email. Although three respondents each objected to one of the Policies (two to Policy 3 and one to Policy 9), these were not considered to require modification to the Plan. Details of these objections and the outcome agreed by the Steering Group is at Appendix 7. Other comments were overwhelmingly supportive and did not require more than minor modifications. Seven responses were received from other consultees, with detailed responses from NKDC and Lincolnshire County Council. These responses and the outcome agreed by the Steering Group are at Appendix 8 and Appendix 9 respectively.
- 5.4** Following review of all comments received following the consultation, the Steering Group agreed the Submission Draft of the Neighbourhood Plan and submitted it to North Kesteven District Council for formal inspection.

## APPENDIX 1

### TIMELINE OF KEY ACTIONS

<b>2014</b>	24 Jan	Nocton and Potterhanworth Parish Councils jointly apply to North Kesteven District Council (NKDC) to be designated as Neighbourhood Plan Area.
	1 May	Nocton and Potterhanworth designated as Neighbourhood Plan Area by NKDC.
<b>2015</b>	May	Nocton and Potterhanworth Parish Councils launch Neighbourhood Plan at respective Annual Parish Meetings.
	August	Community Groups meet to identify issues to explore further.
	15 Sept	Steering Group agrees questionnaire.
	15 Sept	'nocpotplan' blog launched ( <a href="http://nocpotplan.blogspot.co.uk/">http://nocpotplan.blogspot.co.uk/</a> ).
	19 Sept	Information stall at Potterhanworth Autumn Festival.
	26-28 Sept	Questionnaires delivered to all households (closing date for return 12 Oct)
	17 Nov	Steering group considers analysis of responses to questionnaire in order to formulate initial draft of policies for inclusion in Neighbourhood Plan
	30 Nov	Community Groups asked to comment on initial draft policies
	18 Dec	Leaflet with initial draft policies delivered to all households
<b>2016</b>	Jan	Nocton and Potterhanworth Parish Councils update residents and invite further comments at public meetings
	3 Feb	Steering Group agrees further draft of Neighbourhood Plan
	16 March	Community groups meet to comment on draft NeighbourhoodPlan.
	8 April	Draft Neighbourhood Plan submitted to NKDC for review.
	1 Aug	Further draft Neighbourhood Plan submitted to NKDC for SEA screening.
	5 Sept	NKDC Screening Report received; SEA not required
	19 Sept - 30 Oct	Six-week public consultation
	9 Nov	Steering group agrees response to comments from consultation

**APPENDIX 2**

**QUESTIONNAIRE (SEPTEMBER 2015)**

(The rest of this page is intentionally blank)

# **NOCTON AND POTTERHANWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

## **Including Wasps Nest, Potterhanworth Booths & Nocton Heath**

This is **your** chance to have **your** say about the future of **your** village! This will be a joint plan for both villages together. Please answer for your own village or both villages as you prefer. If there are any questions you don't want to answer, just leave them blank.

**Please complete this questionnaire on behalf of all members of your household - it is important! Please see the attached slip for details of how to return the questionnaire.**

The questionnaire is also available at <http://parishes.lincolnshire.gov.uk/Nocton/section.asp?catId=36936> for download and return by email to your Parish Clerk.

**Please return questionnaires by Monday 12 October.**

**If you require the questionnaire in large print please contact your Parish Clerk.**

### **DEMOGRAPHICS**

It would be extremely helpful if you could complete the following demographic questions so that we can make sure we have included all parts of the community.

Please give your  
postcode

Please insert the number of people in your household by age group.

Under 18	18-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71+

## **Introduction**

- What attracted you to your village?

.....

- What do you think makes your village special today?

.....

- Is there anything that spoils living in your village for you?

.....

## **THE QUESTIONNAIRE**

### **1. How important are the following to the quality of life in your village?**

Please tick relevant box for each line	Not important 1	2	3	4	Very important 5
Village has open green spaces					
Rural atmosphere					
Sense of community					
Friendly & safe environment					
Local wildlife & habitats					
Access to local services					
Access to transport links					
The quietness					
Other – please state					



**HOUSING / DEVELOPMENT**

Under the emerging Local Plan for Central Lincolnshire our combined villages are expected to accept an additional 24 houses in total.

**2. Do you think 24 new homes across the two villages is:**

Too high  Too Low  About right

However, to secure the future of Nocton Hall & the former RAF Hospital site in accordance with the previously agreed Options Appraisal we would require something in the order of 100-150 houses on the hospital site. For details, please see:

<http://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/residents/planning-and-building/planning-applications/options-appraisal-for-nocton-hall/>

**3. Do you think 100 - 150 new homes on the Nocton Hall hospital site is:**

Too high  Too Low  About right

**4. Do you see a need for any more new houses in addition to 150 at Nocton Hall?**

Yes  No

**If so where else would you like to see more housing?**

.....

**5. Would you want to see development outside the existing village boundaries (the curtilage)?**

Yes  No

**6. For any sites other than Nocton Hall what size development(s) do you think might be suitable for future housing in your village?**

Please tick relevant box for each line	Not Suitable 1	2	3	4	Very Suitable 5
One large development (More than 25+ houses)					
A few medium developments (10-25 houses)					
A few smaller developments (less than 10 houses)					
Individual plots (infill)					
A mixture of small/medium developments					

**7. If additional houses were built, what type of housing do you feel your village needs?**

Please tick all relevant boxes	
Flat	
Bungalow	
House with 1-2 beds	
House with 3-4 beds	
House with 5 or more beds	
Retirement housing	
Low cost housing (eg under £150,000)	
Social housing (this is formally known as 'affordable housing' and it means housing provided by housing associations etc at subsidised rents)	
Eco friendly housing	
Other (please specify below)	

.....

**8. Do you run a business from home or work from home?**

Yes  No

**If yes, what sort of business is it?**

.....

**9. Do you think land in our parishes should be identified for businesses suited to our rural environment, to encourage local employment opportunities?**

Yes  No

**If so where would you like to see this?**

.....

**10. What local factors would encourage you to start a new business in the area?**

.....

**11. Do you think land in the parishes should be identified for renewable energy eg wind turbines, solar panels? If so, should this be:**

	Solar panels	Wind turbines
Large scale		
Domestic only		

**12. Would you support fracking in our local area?**

Yes  No

**13. Would you support oil drilling in our local area?**

Yes  No

**LOCAL ENVIRONMENT**

**14. When considering the local environment, how important to you are the following?**

Please tick relevant box for each line	Not important 1	2	3	4	Very important 5
Conserving the open green areas of the villages					
Maintaining or increasing tree population					
Protecting the local wildlife and habitats					
Preserving the nature of local countryside eg Nocton Fen, Potterhanworth Fen					
Reducing the risk of flood					
Reducing carbon footprint					
Preserving the character of the village					
Maintaining regular bus services					
Improving road safety					
Improving access for all around the village					
Protecting educational provision					
Encouraging appropriate good housing design (in-keeping)					
Protecting/nurturing local services and amenities e.g. Village Hall, play area, sports field etc.					
Preserving the heritage of the village					

Any other comments:

.....

.....

**15. Are you concerned about any of the following in and around the village?**

Please tick relevant box for each line	Not concerned 1	2	3	4	Very concerned 5
Crime					
Anti-social behaviour					
Flooding					
Levels of traffic					
Road access to the villages					
Noise pollution					
Light pollution					
Road lighting					
Parking					
Quality of roads & pavements					
Road safety					

Any other comments:

.....

.....

**COMMUNITY**

**16. How highly do you value the following amenities?**

Please tick relevant box for each line	Not at all 1	2	3	4	Very much 5
Pavilion (Potterhanworth)					
Village Hall / Memorial Hall					
Social club					
Church					
Primary School					
Public House					
Convenience store/community shop					
Post office services					
Playing field					
Children's play equipment					
Pre-school/Nursery provision					
Bus service					
Local train services					
Countryside walks					
Cycle paths / bridleways					
Village businesses					
Gym / swimming facilities at Beeswax					

Any other comments:

.....

.....

**17. What priority would you give to providing the following services and facilities?**

Please tick relevant box for each line	Low Priority 1	2	3	4	High Priority 5
Improve Pavilion facilities					
Improve playing park facilities					
Improve facilities within the Village Hall / Memorial Hall					
Provide all weather sports surfaces					
Provide (more) allotments					
Traffic controls in the village					
Better street lighting					
Improved bus services					
Improved access to train services					
Improved cycle / walking paths between the settlements					
Better quality pavements					
Access to medical services					
Better broadband					
Better mobile phone coverage					
Alternative power supplies eg wind / solar					
Mains gas supply					
Improved skate park					
Improved pub/social club facilities					

Any other comments:

.....

.....

**TRANSPORT AND ACCESS**

**18. How many cars/vans are there in your household?**

Number of vehicles:

**19. How many off street parking spaces do you have?**

Number of spaces:

**20. If you work, what is the location of everyone's place of work in your household (eg Lincoln, Sleaford etc)?**

.....

**21. How do you get to work?**

Please tick all relevant boxes for each household member	
Car	
Walk	
Bicycle	
Motorcycle	
Bus	
Train	
Other please specify below	

.....

**22. If there are school age children in your household, where do they go to school (eg Nocton, Potterhanworth, Lincoln, Sleaford etc) ?**

.....



**23. How do they get to school?**

Please tick all relevant boxes for each household member	
Car	
Walk	
Bicycle	
Motorcycle	
School bus	
Public bus	
Train	
Other please specify below	

.....

**AND FINALLY**

**24. Is there anything not covered above that you think should be addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan?**

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.

## APPENDIX 3

### PROPOSED POLICIES FOR CONSULTATION (DECEMBER 2015)

#### NOCTON AND POTTERHANWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

##### PROPOSED POLICIES FOR CONSULTATION

###### AIMS (vision for the future)

The residents of Nocton and Potterhanworth wish to:

- Maintain the peaceful and rural character of their villages
- Promote a sustainable and friendly community where people feel safe and have a high quality of life
- Maintain and enhance the surrounding countryside with its local wildlife habitats and recreational opportunities

###### OBJECTIVES (how to achieve the vision)

- To preserve and enhance the landscape setting and internal character of the villages and outlying settlements
- To promote the integration of the various neighbourhood areas within the villages, and between all the settlements in the parishes, through new and enhanced pedestrian and cycle links
- To support additional but limited and sustainable high quality housing development in accordance with the developing Central Lincolnshire Plan 2012-2036, in appropriate locations, which promotes the 'semi-rural' character of the villages through the adoption of appropriate building styles, low densities, and green infrastructure
- To facilitate a sustainable solution for the Nocton Hall Hospital site which allows for limited development in order to stabilise the Hall ruin, clear the hospital site of derelict buildings and other infrastructure, and manage the area as a publicly accessible green space

**[Questions for consultation: Is this supported? What is considered an acceptable number of houses on the site? What other possible and realistic uses are there for this site other than/in addition to housing?]**

- To promote improvements to non-motorised and public transport, utility infrastructure and digital connectivity
- To endorse policies that have a positive effect on the environment, including those that remove or minimise flood risk, contribute to mitigating climate change and reduce our carbon footprint

###### SPECIFIC POLICIES

###### Housing and the Built Environment

- To support the provision of limited additional and sustainable housing development in accordance with the provisions of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (*currently quoted as a max of 16 units across the two villages*)
- No further development outside the village curtilages
- (NB: smaller settlements such as Potterhanworth Booths and Wasps Nest would

- be treated as 'countryside' under the Local Plan)
  - Support infill development where this is of an appropriate design and location
  - Encourage a broad mix of property sizes and types in any proposed development other than infill
  - Nocton Hall Hospital site to be treated as an "exception" to the Local Plan housing allocation and the principles of size of development
  - Any development to be sympathetic to the existing buildings within the villages, particularly those within the Conservation Areas
- [Questions for consultation: Are there any sites within the villages which are suitable for small-scale housing development to meet the additional housing required by the Local Plan? Is an additional 16 units over the next 20 years appropriate to meet future needs? If not, what would be considered appropriate?]**
- Support appropriate wind and/or solar installations for domestic use
  - No large-scale wind or solar panel farms
  - No fracking
  - No oil drilling
  - Any future development to actively consider reducing where possible the carbon footprint of the area

#### Transport and Access to Local Services

- Maintain and enhance local bus services with particular reference to evening and weekend services, and the provision of further bus stops to meet future needs
  - Ensure any future development includes provision for non-motorised transport as well as cars and allows such traffic to link safely with existing routes
  - Maintain and enhance road, footpath and pavement quality
  - Improve road safety by ensuring appropriate measures are developed to improve traffic flows in, and leading to, any new development as well as to existing areas of the Parishes
  - Reduce traffic levels, in particular heavy goods traffic
- [Question for consultation: How might this be achieved?]**

#### Local Economy

- Support proposals for business development/light industrial units on the brownfield site at Station Road, Potterhanworth
- Promote tourism opportunities such as the Spires and Steeples Trail, Nocton Village Trail and countryside walks

#### Community Wellbeing

- Support any proposals to provide access to primary care medical services in the villages and to work with any potential provider to identify an appropriate location
- Preserve and enhance facilities of the Nocton Village Hall, Potterhanworth Memorial Hall and Potterhanworth Pavilion
- Preserve and enhance play and recreational provision ensuring that these are taken into account in any future development
- Retain The Chequers as a public house and oppose conversion into residential use
- Support any proposal to open a community shop
- Support local amenities such as Nocton Post Office, St Andrews' Church and All

#### Saints Church

- Improve broadband and mobile phone signals for all residents in the parishes including outlying settlements
- Support local educational provision
- Identify a site for a burial ground in Nocton

#### Quality of Life and Environment

- Encourage the preservation of, or increase in, the number of trees in any development
- Promote wildlife by preserving habitats and including wildlife 'corridors' in agricultural land
- Maintain and enhance countryside walks

## APPENDIX 4

### NKDC SEA SCREENING REPORT

(NPNP = Nocton and Potterhanworth Neighbourhood Plan)

#### Application of the SEA Directive to plans and programmes

Criteria	Response: Yes / No / Not applicable	Details
1. Is the Neighbourhood Plan subject to preparation and/or adoption by a national, regional or local authority OR prepared by an authority for adoption through a legislative procedure by Parliament or Government?	<u>Yes</u>	The preparation and adoption of the NPNP is allowed under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Localism Act 2011. Whilst the NPNP will be prepared on behalf of Nocton and Potterhanworth Parish Councils it will be adopted by North Kesteven District Council as the local authority. <b>GO TO STAGE 2</b>
2. Is the Neighbourhood Plan required by legislative, regulatory or administrative provisions?	<u>Yes</u>	Whilst the production of a Neighbourhood Plan is not a requirement and is optional, it will, if made, form part of the Development Plan for the District. It is therefore important that this screening process considers the potential effects. <b>GO TO STAGE 3</b>
3. Is the Neighbourhood Plan prepared for agriculture, forestry, fisheries, energy, industry, transport, waste management, water management, telecommunications, tourism, town and country planning or land use, AND does it set a framework for future development consent of projects in Annexes I and II to the EIA Directive?	<u>Yes</u>	The NPNP is being prepared for town and country planning and land use but does not set a framework for future development proposals. <b>GO TO STAGE 4</b>
4. Will the Neighbourhood Plan, in view of its likely effect on sites, require an assessment for future development under Article 6 or 7 of the Habitats Directive?	<u>No</u>	The NPNP will not have any effects on sites and as such will not require an assessment under Articles 6 and 7 of the Habitats Directive. <b>GO TO STAGE 6</b>

5. Does the Neighbourhood Plan determine the use of small areas at local level, OR is it a minor modification of a Plan subject to Article 3.2?	<u>N/A</u>	
6. Does the Neighbourhood Plan set the framework for future development consent of projects (not just projects in annexes to the EIA Directive)?	<u>Yes</u>	The NPNP will set the framework for development consents in the neighbourhood area. <b>GO TO STAGE 8</b>
7. Is the Neighbourhood Plan's sole purpose to serve the national defence or civil emergency, OR is it a financial or budget PP, OR is it co-financed by structural funds or EAGGF programmes 2000 to 2006/7?	N/A	
8. Is it likely to have a significant effect on the environment?	<u>No</u>	<p>The scope of the proposed NPNP and the geographical area to which it applies is relatively limited. The NPNP does not seek to allocate any sites for development, but provides guidance to be used to determine applications should they come forward.</p> <p>The proposed policies are mainly seeking to protect character or relating to uses or sites that are unlikely to result in development that will have a significant environmental impact.</p> <p>It is not considered likely to have a significant impact on any Natura 2000 site.</p> <p>Whilst Potterhanworth Wood SSSI is within the neighbourhood area it is more than 1km from Potterhanworth village and almost 2km from Nocton village. Bardney Limewoods SSSI is within 1km of the eastern boundary and Metheringham Heath Quarry is nearly 2km from the southern boundary of the neighbourhood area. The content of the plan is such that it is not considered likely to have any</p>

	significant effect on these sites.
<b>Outcome:</b>	<b>SEA not required</b>

Table 2: Assessment of the likely significant effects on the environment

SEA Directive criteria and Schedule 1 of Environmental Assessment of plans and programmes Regulations 2004	North Kesteven District Council Assessment	Likely significant environmental effect?
1. The characteristics of plans and programmes, having regard, in particular, to—		
(a) the degree to which the plan or programme sets a framework for projects and other activities, either with regard to the location, nature, size and operating conditions or by allocating resources;	The NPNP would, if adopted, form part of the Statutory Development Plan and as such does contribute to the framework for future development projects. However, the NPNP would only apply to a very limited geographical area, where few proposals are anticipated and would have very limited resource implications.	No
(b) the degree to which the plan or programme influences other plans and programmes including those in a hierarchy;	The NPNP will be required to be in general conformity with the Local Plan of the area, in this case the North Kesteven Local Plan (NKLP). There is no requirement for any replacement of the NKLP to conform to the policies of the NPNP, although there may be some limited influence to policies of a future local plan.	No
(c) the relevance of the plan or programme for the integration of environmental considerations in particular with a view to promoting sustainable development;	The proposed NPNP includes a policy which seeks to preserve features of high nature conservation such as trees, hedgerows, watercourses and woodland, and to preserve habitats and enhance the green network. Other policies which seek to manage various elements of development within the villages also seek the protection of wildlife and habitats. It is therefore considered that the Draft Plan does integrate environmental considerations with a view to promoting sustainable development.	No

(d) environmental problems relevant to the plan or programme; and	The eastern parts of the neighbourhood area are at risk of flooding and there are channels of flood risk stretching into small areas near to the villages. However, there are no specific implications for these areas in the draft plan.	No
(e) the relevance of the plan or programme for the implementation of Community legislation on the environment (for example, plans and programmes linked to waste management or water protection).	The NPNP is not directly relevant to the implementation of any European legislation.	No
2. Characteristics of the effects and of the area likely to be affected, having regard, in particular, to—		
(a) the probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the effects;	Whilst effects of the NPNP may not be reversible they are anticipated to be minimal, in terms of probability, duration and frequency.	No
(b) the cumulative nature of the effects;	The cumulative effects of the plan are expected to be limited.	No
(c) the transboundary nature of the effects;	It is not anticipated that any effects will be transboundary.	No
(d) the risks to human health or the environment (for example, due to accidents);	There are no significant risks anticipated, and it is considered that the NPNP will enhance human health and the environment.	No
(e) the magnitude and spatial extent of the effects (geographical area and size of the population likely to be affected);	The NPNP area is very local in extent and the plan will only apply to a population in the region of 1650. Any effects of the plan will only be local.	No
(f) the value and vulnerability of the area likely to be affected due to— (i) special natural characteristics or cultural heritage; (ii) exceeded environmental quality standards or limit values; or (iii) intensive land-use; and	The NPNP is not expected to allocate sites and it promotes the protection of the built and natural environment. One draft policy relates to the development of the Grade II listed Nocton Hall, which is currently in a derelict and dangerous state. This policy seeks to manage the impacts of the site to preserve the listed building and its grounds. Nocton and Potterhanworth villages both contain a conservation area and a number of grade II listed buildings.	No



	<p>In addition to these Nocton contains two grade II* listed buildings. The draft plan contains policies which actively seek to ensure that development responds to surroundings, further limiting schemes in the conservation areas to avoid adverse impacts. Any effects of the plan are expected to be positive on these characteristics.</p>	
<p>(g) the effects on areas or landscapes which have a recognised national, Community or international protection status.</p>	<p>Any effects of the plan are expected to be positive.</p>	<p>No</p>

**APPENDIX 5**

**CONSULTATION LETTER TO RESIDENTS AND OTHER CONSULTEES,  
AND RESPONSE FORM (SEPTEMBER 2016)**

The letter to other (non-resident) consultees was modified slightly to make it relevant to them.

(The rest of this page is intentionally blank)

# Nocton and Potterhanworth Neighbourhood Plan

*An opportunity for all residents of Nocton, Potterhanworth, Potterhanworth Booths & Wasps Nest to influence the future development of our villages.*

19th September, 2016

Dear Resident,

Please do take a moment or two to read this letter as it affects the future development of our villages. Hopefully, you will be aware of the work which has been going on to produce a Neighbourhood Plan for our two villages. We have now reached the point where we need to consult with you on the final draft of the Plan before it is put to an independent planning inspector and then to a vote in a local referendum. Details of the Plan's proposed policies are included in a Consultation Response Form which is attached to this letter. It is very important that the Plan and its policies reflect the views and wishes of as many residents as possible so **PLEASE TELL US WHAT YOU THINK!** We will need all comments by no later than **30<sup>th</sup> October 2016** and these can be submitted to us by:

- Emailing your response to one of our Parish Clerks (this is our preferred way of hearing about what you have to say): Steve Altridge – [noctonparishcouncil@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:noctonparishcouncil@hotmail.co.uk) or Gemma McClue – [potterhanworthparishcouncil@gmail.com](mailto:potterhanworthparishcouncil@gmail.com) OR
- Completing the form attached to this letter and handing it to any parish councillor, your Parish Clerk, leaving them in Nocton Post Office, one of our two Churches, Bluebells Café or the Nocton Social Club

If you would like to find out more about our Neighbourhood Plan before making your comments, then you may also wish to attend one of the following consultation events where someone will be on hand to answer any questions you may have (all events are open to residents of both villages):

Nocton Village Hall	Saturday, 1 <sup>st</sup> October from 10.00 a.m. until 12.00 noon
Potterhanworth Pavilion	Saturday, 8 <sup>th</sup> October from 10.00 a.m. until 12.00 noon
Nocton Parish Church	Friday, 21 <sup>st</sup> October from 2.00 p.m. until 4.00 p.m.
Potterhanworth Pavilion	Wednesday, 26 <sup>th</sup> October from 7.00 p.m. until 8.30 p.m.

If you would like to see a full copy of the Plan, then please visit <http://parishes.lincolnshire.gov.uk/Nocton/> or <http://parishes.lincolnshire.gov.uk/potterhanworth/> Further information is also available on our dedicated Neighbourhood Planning blog: <http://nocpotplan.blogspot.co.uk/>

We have also produced a limited number of hard copies of the Plan and these will be available at the consultation events for you to look at. If you would like a copy because you do not have access to the internet or for some other reason e.g. you are housebound, then please telephone one of the Parish Clerks on 01526 321760 (Nocton) or 01522 875752 (Potterhanworth). Please contact your Parish Clerk if you would like a large print version of the Plan.

We very much look forward to receiving your comments

Yours sincerely,

*Ian Goldsworthy*  
Chair of Nocton Parish Council

*Harold Bourne*  
Chair of Potterhanworth Parish Council

**NOCTON AND POTTERHANWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSE FORM**

A large print version of this form is available from the Parish Clerks.

Name or organisation:

Address (including postcode):

General Comments

Comments (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Policy 1**

Development proposals to provide additional housing should:

- be within the curtilage of each village as defined in Maps 4 and 5 below; and
- not detract from the villages' setting in the wider landscape; and
- be of small scale development to contribute to the natural evolution of the village and in line with the rural character, typically on sites of no more than six dwellings in any locations outside of the conservation area, and typically only on infill\* sites for single dwellings within the conservation area where this is appropriate; and
- for sites of more than a single dwelling, include some housing that is suitable for smaller households (typically one or two bedrooms) or that is available at lower cost to help meet the needs of older people and first time buyers.

\* infill is defined as the space between two existing houses on a linear frontage

Support

Object

Neutral

Policy 1 Comments (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Policy 2**

Proposals for additional housing units should:

- be of a design and materials which reflect the current architectural style and character of the villages; and
- provide sufficient off-street parking appropriate for the amount of development and size of homes proposed; and
- provide safe and suitable vehicular access between the site and an adopted highway; and
- provide safe and suitable pedestrian access between the site and a public footpath or footway; and
- not result in an unacceptable impact on the levels of daylight, privacy, and amenity which occupiers of the units or of neighbouring properties may reasonably expect; and
- provide appropriate internet connectivity compatible with local provision.

Support  Object  Neutral

Policy 2 Comments (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

### Policy 3

Proposals for the sustainable development of the former RAF Hospital Nocton Hall site should:

- deliver an appropriate solution for Nocton Hall, in line with the agreed outcome of the 2011 Options Appraisal (or subsequent updated reports) to restore the main house as a ruin and fully restore the service wing, with an agreed management plan to ensure the proposals for the Hall are sustainable; and
- deliver solutions for the currently empty outbuildings in Nocton Hall grounds that are appropriate to their heritage status and relationship with the heritage assets on the site; and
- appropriately restore the 'pleasure gardens' commensurate with being a local green space as part of the wider scheme and in relationship to the heritage assets on the site, ensuring that appropriate levels of public access is available; and
- include proposals to clear the RAF Hospital site of the derelict buildings; and
- provide for safe and suitable vehicular access, as appropriate to the nature of the development, between the site and an adopted highway; and
- ensure that the increase in traffic generated by the development can be safely accommodated on the local road infrastructure; and
- provide for safe and suitable pedestrian access, as appropriate to the nature of the development, between the site and a public footpath or footway; and
- include an agreed comprehensive masterplan to ensure the holistic planning of the site and to avoid piecemeal development; and
- ensure that any such development is proportional to the character of the surrounding village and does not place an unacceptable burden on the existing infrastructure; and
- be for 'enabling development'\* only

Any proposals will be expected to be subject to substantial discussion with Historic England and the Conservation Officer at NKDC, prior to being submitted as an application. To qualify as enabling development, any scheme must be in accordance with the Historic England Guidance on Enabling Development.

Support  Object  Neutral

Policy 3 Comments (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)



**Policy 4**

In Potterhanworth, the playing field off Queensway and the allotment site (identified in Map 6 below), and in Nocton, the Village Green on School Road; the school playing field on Main Street; most of Nocton Hall grounds; and land to the east of Wegberg Road (Nocton Park playing field and allotments) (identified in green in Map 7 below) are designated as Local Green Spaces.

Support

Object

Neutral

Policy 4 Comments (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Policy 5**

Development proposals should:

- preserve and enhance features of high nature conservation and landscape value, including mature trees, species-rich hedgerows, watercourses and existing areas of woodland; and
- preserve wildlife habitats and enhance connectivity between wildlife areas and green spaces; and maintain and enhance access to green spaces and countryside leisure opportunities.

Support

Object

Neutral

Policy 5 Comments (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Policy 6**

Proposals for the provision of alternative sources of energy generation and improved communications infrastructure to improve broadband and mobile phone signals for all residents in the parishes including outlying settlements and dwellings should not have an adverse impact on the distinctive local character of Nocton and Potterhanworth and have no unacceptable impact on nearby residents or wildlife.

Support

Object

Neutral

Policy 6 Comments (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Policy 7**

Development proposals should promote walking, cycling or public transport use (where these are a reasonable alternative to car use) by:

- improving public transport provision and making it more accessible; and
- improving the safety of pedestrians and cyclists and making the use of those modes of travel more convenient; and
- ensuring connectivity between walking, cycling and public transport routes.

Development proposals should enhance road safety by:

- using appropriate road design to facilitate traffic flow in and to any new development; and providing adequate access and manoeuvring space for delivery and service vehicles.

Support

Object

Neutral

Policy 7 Comments (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Policy 8**

Development proposals for business development, light industrial or agricultural uses on the brownfield sites at the former RAF Hospital Nocton Hall and Station Road, Potterhanworth, identified on Maps 8 and 9 below, are acceptable in principle, providing that they:

- are of an appropriate scale for the site; and
- would not detract from the levels of amenity that occupiers of nearby premises may reasonably expect; and
- would not result in any other unacceptable impact.

Proposals for appropriate development to support or enhance tourism relating to local heritage assets will be supported.

Support

Object

Neutral

Policy 8 Comments (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

**Policy 9**

Proposals for the appropriate development of the social, cultural, economic and physical well-being of the local community will be encouraged and supported.

Proposals that would reduce or result in the loss of any current community facility should:

- provide for a suitable replacement facility that will either maintain or enhance the existing public provision in a location that is at least as accessible to the community residents; or
- provide evidence to demonstrate that there is no longer a demand for its current permitted use, or any other appropriate community use.

The Neighbourhood Plan strongly supports the retention of The Chequers and the retention of its internal floorspace as a Public House because of its value to the local community.

Support                       Object                       Neutral

Policy 9 Comments (please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

## APPENDIX 6

### DETAILS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION 19 SEPTEMBER – 30 OCTOBER 2016

Consultee type	Consultees	Date	How contacted	Response
Nocton and Potterhanworth Parish Councils  Local residents	Nocton and Potterhanworth Parish Councils  Residents of Nocton and Potterhanworth parishes	15 September	Information on consultation with links to plan and response form, and details of drop-in sessions, posted on 'nocpotplan' blog and Parish Council website	729 hits on 'nocpotplan' from its launch to the end of the 6 week consultation period
		15-18 September	Delivery of response form containing policies to every household in both parishes, with details of full plan locations and drop-in sessions	57 responses received from residents; summary of responses at Appendix 7
		16 September – 30 October	Notice in Nocton Parish Council Noticeboard	
		Sat 1 Oct 10 am – 12 noon Nocton Village Hall  Sat 8 Oct 10 am – 12 noon Potterhanworth Pavilion	Drop-in sessions with members of Steering Group and printed copies of Neighbourhood Plan	6 residents and 1 District Councillor attended drop-in sessions

		<p>Fri 21 Oct 2 – 4 pm Nocton Parish Church</p> <p>Wed 26 Oct 7 – 8.30 pm Potterhanworth Pavilion</p>		
The local planning authority	North Kesteven District Council	15 September	Email	Response received 26 October Steering group response to comments at Appendix 8
Local Planning Authorities that adjoin NK District	Boston Borough Council	15 September	Email	No response received
	East Lindsey District Council			No response received
	Lincoln City Council			No response received
	Newark and Sherwood District Council			No response received
	South Holland District Council			No response received
	South Kesteven District Council			No response received
	West Lindsey District Council			No response received
The County Council	Lincolnshire County Council	15 September	Email	Response received 31 October Steering group response to comments at Appendix 9



County Councils adjoining NK District	Nottinghamshire County Council	15 September	Email	No response received
Adjoining Parish / Town councils	Branston and Mere Parish Council	15 September	Email	No response received
	Waddington Parish Council			No response received
	Coleby Parish Council			Response received 26 October, amendment made (see Appendix 7)
	Harmston Parish Council			No response received
	Dunston Parish Council			No response received
	Bardney Group Parish Council			No response received
The Coal Authority		15 September	Email	No response received
The Homes and Communities Agency		15 September	Email	No response received
Natural England		15 September	Email	Response received 23 September; no comments
The Environment Agency		15 September	Email	No response received
Historic England		15 September	Email	Response received 18 October; no comments
Network Rail		15 September	Email	No response received
The Highways Agency		15 September	Email	No response received
The Marine Management Organisation		15 September	Email	Acknowledgement received 16 September No further response

				received
Any body to whom the electronic communication code applies and owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in the North Kesteven area.	Mobile Operators Association	15 September	Email	No response received
	Three			No response received
	T-Mobile/EE			No response received
	Vodafone			No response received
	Orange			No response received
	O2			No response received
Primary Care Trust / Clinical Commissioning Group	Lincolnshire West Clinical Commissioning Group	15 September	Email	No response received
Electricity providers	Western Power Distribution	15 September	Email	No response received
Gas providers	National Grid	15 September	Email	Response received 21 September; no comments
Sewerage provider Water provider	Anglian Water	15 September	Email	Response received 1 November, amendment made (see Appendix 7)
Bodies that represent the interests of different religious groups in the neighbourhood area.	Diocese of Lincoln	15 September	Email	No response received
	All Saints' Nocton Parochial Church Council			Response received 26 October; no comments
	St Andrew's Potterhanworth Parochial Church Council			No response received

Bodies that represent the interests of businesses in the neighbourhood area	National Farmers Union	15 September	Email	No response received
Land owners /Farmers	F G Battle & Sons Ltd Potterhanworth	16 September	Hand delivery	No response received
	S Plumb Potterhanworth			No response received
	J Norcross Ltd Potterhanworth			No response received
	Beeswax Dyson Farming Ltd Nocton	15 September	Email	No response received
	EM Howard Ltd Nocton			Response received; no comments
	LEDA Properties Ltd Abingdon, Oxfordshire			Acknowledgement received 16 September No further response received
Lincolnshire Police	Bracebridge Heath Police Station	19 September	Email	No response received
District Councillors	Cllr Ray Cucksey	15 September	Email	No response received
	Cllr Rob Kendrick			No response received
	Cllr Peter Lundgren			Response received 28 October; no changes required
	Cllr John Money			No response received

Schools	Nocton Community Primary School	15 September	Email	No response received
	Potterhanworth Church of England Primary School			No response received
Care Home	The Cottage Residential Care Home Nocton	15 September	Email	No response received
Landscapes	Riva Construction Ltd Potterhanworth	16 September	Hand delivery	No response received
Engineering	B & C Express Potterhanworth	16 September	Hand delivery	No response received
Post Office	Nocton Post Office	16 September	Hand delivery	No response received
Others	Kathryn Billings Printing & Embroidery Limited Potterhanworth	16 September	Hand delivery	No response received
	Nocton Village Hall Management Committee	15 September	Email	No response received
	Nocton Park Management Ltd			Response received 30 October; no changes required
	Nocton Club			No response received

## APPENDIX 7

### SUMMARY OF RESPONSES AND OUTCOME OF COMMENTS

The Steering Group reviewed all the comments and agreed the proposed amendments.

57 responses from residents

	Support	Neutral	Object	No response
Policy 1	56	0	0	1
Policy 2	55	1	0	1
Policy 3	52	0	2	3
Policy 4	54	0	0	3
Policy 5	56	0	0	1
Policy 6	55	1	0	1
Policy 7	55	1	0	1
Policy 8	49	7	0	1
Policy 9	53	1	1	2

8 responses from other consultees

	Support	Neutral	Object	No response
Policy 1	6	1	0	1
Policy 2	7	0	0	1
Policy 3	7	0	0	1
Policy 4	7	0	0	1
Policy 5	7	0	0	1
Policy 6	6	1	0	1
Policy 7	7	0	0	1
Policy 8	7	0	0	1
Policy 9	6	0	1	1

Those 'neutral' and 'object' responses from residents which had comments attached, and the comments from statutory consultees leading to an amendment to the Neighbourhood Plan, are given below, with the agreed response by the Steering Group. The responses from NKDC and Lincolnshire County Council and are discussed at Appendix 8 and Appendix 9 respectively.

**'Neutral' and 'object' comments from residents and Steering Group response**

Policy No	Neutral / object	Comment	Agreed response from Steering Group
2	N	With reference to point one: We feel that a more innovative approach to design and construction can echo & harmonise with the existing style of homes while not being a slavish copy.	Not inconsistent with Policy 2 which states that “proposals for additional housing units should “be of a design and materials which reflect [not necessarily copy] the current architectural style and character of the villages”.  Outcome – no change
3	O	Nocton Hall is beyond saving and would be far too costly to restore. Derelict buildings need clearing and mixed housing or a 'retirement village' put in their place.  Safeguard some of the trees but provide green open spaces / walking routes to join with established areas.	Point 1 – future of Nocton Hall would be agreed with NKDC and Historic England. Clearance of derelict buildings included in Policy 3.  Point 2 – consistent with Policies 3, 5 and 7.  Outcome – no change
3	O	Purely selfish reasons, we just love it as it is. Nuthatches, tree creepers, lots of wonderful wild life, brambles to pick, apples to collect, a haven of peace. So few wild spaces in England and to have one right on our doorstep is sheer heaven. I just stand in there with my sketch book on a still summer's day and wouldn't wish to be anywhere else.  But – we are aware that most people long to 'tidy it up'?	Policies 3 and 5 relate to maintaining Nocton Hall grounds as Local Green Space with public access. This requires management to avoid the area becoming overgrown and inaccessible.  Outcome – no change
6	N	“No unacceptable impact” - Woolly and subjective. We should be more positively supporting 'alternative energy'.	Not possible to be overly prescriptive in Neighbourhood Plan.  Outcome – no change

7	N	The roads need to be able to carry cars and lorries safely first. Too much emphasis is put on cyclists at the expense of paying motorists.	Comment only. Outcome – no change
8	N	I am concerned about the impact on traffic which would result from these types of development. As a result I feel any such scheme would need to have details of improvements to the road.	Covered by Policy 7. Outcome – no change
8	N	Local businesses: dependent on type of vehicles. Potterhanworth & Nocton already have an unaccessible [sic] amount of HGVs passing through. Those with agricultural vehicles too are more than enough so any more industrial in Nocton & Potterhanworth would only exasperate [sic] an existing problem.	Covered by Policy 7. Outcome – no change
8	N	I am nor clear on what might be considered 'appropriate scale for the site' or other 'unacceptable impact'. These phrases are subjective and I would prefer us to be clear about the size and scale of industry these villages can accommodate. The RAF Hospital site appears to me to be at least one third of the overall space Nocton occupies. Development for business that would dominate the landscape or devalue the reputation and nature of a rural village should be rejected.	Not possible to be overly prescriptive in Neighbourhood Plan. Latter point is covered by Policy 3. Outcome – no change
9	O	It would be beneficial to the community to retain facilities such as Chequers but any such scheme must be financially sound and able to support itself without imposing excessive charges via the parish precept on local residents.	Supporting a private venture such as a public house does not come within the powers of the Parish Council. Outcome – no change

### Comments from other consultees and Steering Group response

Policy No	Comment	Agreed response from Steering Group
<b>Coleby Parish Council</b>		
4	Would prefer maps in "full page". Also a list of all of the designated areas for clarity in this policy item.	Maps are as large as resolution allows. Map annotated to clarify areas.
<b>Anglian Water</b>		
3	Policies 3 and 8 outline criteria which will be used to determine planning applications for development on the Former RAF Nocton site. However at this stage the precise mix of use(s) which is likely to come forward is currently unknown. Therefore Anglian Water would wish to comment further as part of the planning application process on any proposals which may come forward on this site.	Noted.
4	Policy 4 states identifies land adjacent to RAF Nocton Water Recycling Centre (formerly sewage treatment works) as designated local open space.  It would be helpful if the Neighbourhood Plan explained in what circumstances development in the vicinity of designated local open space would be acceptable. As part of which it would be helpful to include reference to utility infrastructure provided by Anglian Water.	Plan amended to give indication of location of Anglian Water plant.  Insert in para 5.1.13 'It should be noted that the shared use drive also gives access to the RAF Nocton Water Recycling Centre operated by Anglian Water.'  There is no restriction on development adjacent to a Local Green Space, only within it.
8	Policies 3 and 8 outline criteria which will be used to determine planning applications for development on the Former RAF Nocton site. However at this stage the precise mix of use(s) which is likely to come forward is currently unknown. Therefore Anglian Water would wish to comment further as part of the planning application process on any proposals which may come forward on this site.	Noted.



## APPENDIX 8

### RESPONSE FROM NORTH KESTEVEN DISTRICT COUNCIL

The following detailed comments and recommendations were received from North Kesteven District Council. These were reviewed by the Steering Group which agreed a number of changes to the Neighbourhood Plan as shown in the table below.

Section/Policy	Comments
General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NPNP is very well presented and is well set out and organised. The use of tables, maps and images are good and help to emphasise points. It looks very professional and this is commended.</li> </ul>
Contents Page	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This page is well presented and enables quick navigation.</li> </ul>
1 Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This section reads well and is straight to the point. It provides a useful context for the reader.</li> <li>In paragraph 1.2.1 it is recommended that “as amended” is added to the end of the paragraph.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Outcome – amended as recommended</b></p>
2 Brief Description of the Parishes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This sections provides a useful context for the area. It is concise and all appears to be accurate. The use of tables to present data is helpful.</li> <li>In paragraph 2.6.1 it states that the employment levels compare favourably with county and national averages. It would be helpful to have the economically active percentages for these wider areas to provide a comparison.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Outcome – relevant data included</b></p>
3 Development of the Neighbourhood Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This sections provides a clear, yet brief snapshot of the work undertaken to get the plan to where it is today. It may benefit from being updated after this pre-submission consultation has been completed with a quick summary of number of comments and any key issues being raised, although the detail of the comments received will be within the Consultation Statement which will accompany your plan.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Outcome – updated as suggested</b></p>
4.1 The Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The vision is a key part of the plan, setting the overview for what will happen in your area in the plan period. As such it would benefit from being drawn out from surrounding text in a box or through other means.</li> </ul>

Section/Policy	Comments
	<p><b>Outcome – amended as suggested</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The content of the vision is supported.</li> </ul>
4.2 Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The objectives are supported.</li> </ul>
5 Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended that the policy boxes be made slightly more contrasting to the rest of the document to enable them to stand out more. An alternative to this would be to apply borders to the boxes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome – amended as recommended</b></p>
Policy 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The overall policy and its individual components are supported.</li> </ul>
Paragraph 5.1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recommended that an addition is made at the end of this paragraph to read: “Furthermore, this departure does not affect the general conformity of the neighbourhood plan with the strategic policies of the Draft Local Plan.”</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome – amended as recommended</b></p>
Policy 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The overall policy and its individual components are supported.</li> </ul>
Policy 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy has been the subject of substantial discussion between NKDC and the Steering Group. The general wording of the policy and its aspirations are supported, however, the definition of areas of the site being referred to in this policy is a little unclear. As such it is recommended that this policy is joined with a map demonstrating the areas being referred to, e.g. RAF Hospital Site in the fourth bullet point. This will make it clear for decision makers which area is being referred to and what element of the policy should apply. It is noted that a map showing the RAF Hospital site is included on page 28.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome – map added as recommended</b></p>
Policy 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This policy reflects the proposed designation of Local Green Spaces in the Draft Local Plan.</li> <li>Paragraph 5.2.3 refers to the justification for the designations, however, the wording could be improved to make it clearer. For example:</li> <li>“These sites were proposed as Local Green Spaces to the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team in November 2014. The designation of these sites is accompanied by clear justification in LP23: Local Green Space and Other Important Open Space Evidence Report, available on the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Policy Library at: <a href="https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/_resources/assets/attachment/full/0/17910.pdf">https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/_resources/assets/attachment/full/0/17910.pdf</a>.”</li> </ul> <p><b>Outcome – amended as suggested</b></p>

Section/Policy	Comments
Policy 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall policy and its individual components are supported.</li> <li>• At the end of the policy it would be beneficial to add some wording to make it clear how this policy has been taken into account in planning applications. This wording could read: “Design and Access Statements should demonstrate how these have been considered and incorporated through the design process, and justify any criteria that have not been satisfied.”</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Outcome – amended as suggested</b></p>
Policy 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The direction of this policy is supported, but it could benefit from a minor rewording to make it tighter, as follows:</li> <li>• “Proposals for the provision of alternative sources of energy generation and improved communications infrastructure <del>to improve broadband and mobile phone signals for all residents in the parishes including outlying settlements and dwellings</del> should not have an adverse impact on the distinctive local character of Nocton and Potterhanworth and have no unacceptable impact on nearby residents or wildlife.”</li> <li>• This rewording will help to avoid the potential applicants to circumnavigate the policy.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Outcome – amended as suggested</b></p>
Policy 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This policy is generally supported, but it would be beneficial to amend the wording slightly to ensure that it is only considered in relevant applicants. This is because as worded it would apply to all development proposals including householder extensions. The start of the policy should be reworded to “Development proposals involving the development of new dwellings or commercial uses should...”</li> <li>• At the end of the policy it would be beneficial to add some wording to make it clear how this policy has been taken into account. This wording could read: “Design and Access Statements should demonstrate how these have been considered and incorporated through the design process, and justify any criteria that have not been satisfied.”</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Outcome – amended as suggested</b></p>
Policy 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall policy and its individual components are supported.</li> </ul>
Policy 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall policy and its individual components are supported.</li> <li>• It is suggested that the part of the policy relating to the Chequers could go further than it currently does, for example:</li> <li>• “Development proposals that would result in the loss of The</li> </ul>

Section/Policy	Comments
	<p data-bbox="533 197 1398 309">Chequers as a public house will not be supported. Development proposals that are necessary to reinstate or strengthen the role of the pub will be supported.”</p> <ul data-bbox="488 318 1343 389" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="488 318 1343 389">• This will give decision makers a clear steer of how to treat any applications.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="501 434 960 465"><b>Outcome – amended as suggested</b></p>

## APPENDIX 9

### RESPONSE FROM LINCOLNSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

The following detailed comments and recommendations were received from Lincolnshire County Council. These were reviewed by the Steering Group which agreed a number of changes to the Neighbourhood Plan as shown in the table below.

Section/Policy	Comments
General Comments	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your Neighbourhood Plan. The following response comprises the combined comments received from all Lincolnshire County Council services. Those on Strategic Planning and Public Health are under each Policy below. In addition the following points have been raised:</p> <p><u>Historic Environment</u></p> <p>Although heritage assets are referred to in Policy 3, the justification for Policy 2 and para. 5.8.2 under Policy 8 there is no specific policy covering all historic assets. There is no mention of archaeological remains and the potential impact of any new development on underlying remains. As a minimum please consult the Historic Environment Record (HER) held by Lincolnshire County Council. On this visit we can advise on how the information in the HER can be used to enhance this aspect of the Neighbourhood Plan. Appointments can be made with Mark Bennet: phone 01522 552363 or email <a href="mailto:Mark.Bennet@lincolnshire.gov.uk">Mark.Bennet@lincolnshire.gov.uk</a></p> <p><b>Steering Group response:</b></p> <p><b>Insert “not detract from the character, extent, setting and use of any heritage asset or aspect of the natural or built environment which is subject to a special designation offering it protection” as bullet point 3 of Policy 1.</b></p> <p><b>It is noted that Historic England has made no specific comments on the Neighbourhood Plan and in particular has not commented on the lack of reference to the matters raised by Lincolnshire County Council.</b></p> <p><b>Outcome – amended as requested</b></p> <p><u>Minerals and Waste</u></p> <p>It is noted that such matters are specifically excluded from the Neighbourhood Plan. The following standard response is to ensure that any implications for minerals and waste of other proposals are taken into account.</p> <p>The County Council, as Mineral and Waste Planning Authority, is responsible for producing the Minerals and Waste Local Plan for the County. The first part</p>

Section/Policy	Comments
	<p>of this document, the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (CSDMP), has been completed and was formally adopted by the Council on 1 June 2016. This document therefore forms part of the "development plan" for the county.</p> <p>As you may be aware, it is a statutory requirement that Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan, including the minerals and waste policies. I would therefore ask that you have particular regard to the proposals and policies in the CSDMP that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safeguard existing minerals and waste sites from incompatible development;</li> <li>• Safeguard Mineral Resources to prevent unnecessary sterilisation by development; and</li> <li>• Identify the locational criteria and Areas of Search for future minerals and waste development.</li> </ul> <p>The Second part of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, the Site Locations Document (SLD), is still in preparation, but a Draft document identifying the preferred sites and areas for future mineral working/waste management was published in December 2015. Any policies and proposals in your Neighbourhood Plan should not conflict with the proposed allocations set out in the draft SLD.</p> <p>I would therefore ask that you assess your proposals against the adopted CSDMP and draft SLD. These documents can be found at <a href="http://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste">www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/mineralsandwaste</a>. If there are any conflicts, the County Council should be contacted at <a href="mailto:mineralsandwaste@lincolnshire.gov.uk">mineralsandwaste@lincolnshire.gov.uk</a>.</p> <p><b>Steering group response:</b></p> <p><b>As noted above, such matters are specifically excluded from the Neighbourhood Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan has now been assessed against the adopted CSDMP and draft SLD. None of the Policies in the Neighbourhood Plan conflict with the CSDMP. None of the sites in the draft SLD are in the Neighbourhood Plan area.</b></p> <p><b>Outcome – no change required</b></p>
<p>Policy 1</p> <p>(supported)</p>	<p>It is noted that in the Central Lincolnshire Submission Local Plan Appendix B shows that in Nocton the number of dwellings built or permitted since April 2012 exceeds the 10% growth level, and that in Potterhanworth there is a remaining requirement of 16 dwellings. This level of growth can be met under Policy 1 without the need for new specific allocations.</p>

Section/Policy	Comments
	<p>Building within current villages rather than on the outskirts would improve and maintain a feeling of community and lesson isolation for new residents. Meeting the needs of older people and first-time buyers is welcomed.</p> <p><b>Steering group response:</b></p> <p><b>Comment only.</b></p> <p><b>Outcome – no change required</b></p>
<p>Policy 2 (supported)</p>	<p>Meeting the needs of older people and first-time buyers could also be referenced in terms of design (e.g. higher accessibility standards and dementia friendly design to enable older people who suffer to remain independent in their own home for as long as possible).</p> <p><b>Steering group response:</b></p> <p><b>Such measures, while they would be welcomed, are outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, from which building control measures such as detailed internal design of buildings are excluded.</b></p> <p><b>Outcome – no change required</b></p> <p>Efforts to encourage walking in a safe environment and improve Internet connectivity are welcomed.</p>
<p>Policy 3 (supported)</p>	<p>From the strategic policy viewpoint development at former RAF Hospital Nocton Hall is not required to meet strategic housing needs. It could, however, contribute to meeting the wider housing needs of Central Lincolnshire provided that it can be justified as enabling development under Policy 3 of the Neighbourhood Plan and meets the access requirements of the County Council as Highway Authority. Any planning application including provision of dwellings will also need to address any implications for other County Council services (e.g. school places) at that stage.</p> <p>From the Public Health viewpoint restoring Nocton Hall’s pleasure gardens, securing additional recreational green open space, would be good for community cohesion and enabling physical activity.</p> <p><b>Steering group response:</b></p> <p><b>Comment only.</b></p> <p><b>Outcome – no change required</b></p>

Section/Policy	Comments
Policy 4 (supported)	<p>Open space is important for the whole communities' health and wellbeing. Maintaining and enhancing allotment sites is good for the benefits access to healthy food bring. The Plan might wish to consider the creation of community growing spaces and or a community orchard as part of its policies.</p> <p><b>Steering group response:</b></p> <p><b>While such proposals would be welcomed, they are outside the scope of Policy 4 which relates specifically to the creation of Local Green Spaces rather than the uses to which they might be put.</b></p> <p><b>Outcome – no change required</b></p>
Policy 5 (supported)	<p>No comment made.</p>
Policy 6 (neutral)	<p>Local green energy generation is supported to help reduce climate change, being a big threat to public health. The Neighbourhood Plan could also mention provision for ultra-low emission vehicles (e.g. provision of electric vehicle charging points with new dwellings). Improved communication infrastructure has a positive impact on communities' health and wellbeing, lessening isolation and increasing interaction and also improving employment opportunities of those wishing to work from home.</p> <p><b>Steering group response:</b></p> <p><b>Such measures, while they would be welcomed, are outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, from which building control measures such as detailed internal design of buildings are excluded.</b></p> <p><b>Outcome – no change required</b></p>
Policy 7 (supported)	<p>Making active travel as easy as possible for community will encourage people to be active, and Public Health endorses the importance of safe road and path networks.</p> <p><b>Steering group response:</b></p> <p><b>Comment only.</b></p> <p><b>Outcome – no change required</b></p>
Policy 8	<p>It is also worth noting the potential for increasing local employment opportunities.</p>



Section/Policy	Comments
(supported)	<p>Steering group response:</p> <p>Insert 'and provide local employment opportunities' after 'support the local economy' in paragraph 5.8.1.</p> <p><b>Outcome – amended as suggested</b></p>
Policy 9  (object)	<p>The first sentence refers to physical wellbeing whereas ensuring mental wellbeing is equally important.</p> <p><b>Steering group response:</b></p> <p><b>Insert 'and mental' between 'physical' and 'wellbeing'.</b></p> <p><b>Outcome – amended as requested</b></p> <p>Public Health is supportive of the concept of at least maintaining the current level of community facilities if not increasing it (e.g. a community shop, with potential for a café or luncheon club venue too). This is important for community development, community cohesion and reducing isolation. Should the Policy itself, therefore, make more of supporting development that increases provision as outlined in the justification?</p> <p><b>Steering group response:</b></p> <p><b>Add 'particularly those which enhance or increase existing provision' at end of first paragraph.</b></p> <p><b>Outcome – amended as suggested</b></p> <p>Meeting the desire for local primary care services would require the engagement of the Lincolnshire West Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). There is no mention of securing the future of Post Office services here, which is mentioned earlier in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Steering group response:</b></p> <p><b>Comment only.</b></p> <p><b>Outcome – no change required</b></p>