

| Policy/Para/Table/Map | Comment/Recommendation | Review outcome/action | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|---------|---------------|------|----|---------|--------------------------|-------|-----|------------------|
| Paragraph – 8.6 – 8.14 Policy 2 Map 2 | The Council would like to discuss the matter of the Deepings “development limits” when we meet with the Neighbourhood Plan Group on the 11th of December. The Council have the following questions regarding the highlighted paragraphs including Map 2 and Policy 2 of the Plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the core evidence behind the “Deepings development limit”? • How is this in strategic conformity with SKDC emerging Local Plan policies SP2 and SP4? • What is the advantage of creating the “development limit”? • How is the “development limit” in conformity with the NPPF para 71 entry level exception sites. • Could this create a false potential about what development could come forward within the Deepings? • Do the proposed SKDC LP Allocations for the Deepings need to be included within the limits to development? | Group feel Luke needs to review this point and advise. The section would probably benefit from tightening the wording. 8.12 – Brown Field sites? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Paragraph 9.5 | The SKDC LP now only identifies two proposed allocations within the Deepings totalling 753 units. This is due to the site “west of Linchfield Road” being removed through the examination as it already has planning permission. | Group agree remove DEP2 – H2 row from table 2 on pg 21 Query should we have something in to protect Towngate West if existing planning application is resubmitted for more housing for phase as yet unbuilt | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Table 2 | Table 2 will therefore need updating to show the following changes to density and allocation codes; <table border="1" data-bbox="562 962 1417 1125" style="margin-left: 20px;"> <thead> <tr> <th>SKLP Site Reference</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Site Area (Ha) Indicative</th> <th>Number of Dwellings</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>DEP1-H1</td> <td>Towngate West</td> <td>5.08</td> <td>73</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DEP1-H2</td> <td>Land off Linchfield Road</td> <td>32.89</td> <td>680</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | SKLP Site Reference | Location | Site Area (Ha) Indicative | Number of Dwellings | DEP1-H1 | Towngate West | 5.08 | 73 | DEP1-H2 | Land off Linchfield Road | 32.89 | 680 | As comment above |
| SKLP Site Reference | Location | Site Area (Ha) Indicative | Number of Dwellings | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DEP1-H1 | Towngate West | 5.08 | 73 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DEP1-H2 | Land off Linchfield Road | 32.89 | 680 | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Policy/Para/Table/Map | Comment/Recommendation | Review outcome/action |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Map 3 | A new map will be required to show the updated Deepings allocations in line with what is in the SKDC Local Plan to avoid confusion. The Council can provide this. | Agree |
| Paragraph 9.10 | Will need updating to reflect the changes in site allocations within the Deepings | Agree |
| Paragraph 9.12 | Will need updating to reflect the changes to site allocations within the Deepings, noting that site “west of Linchfield Road” has now been deleted | Agree |
| Paragraph 9.13 | <p>The council suggests the following wording changes to the paragraph;</p> <p>Our aim is to create functional, well-integrated new neighbourhoods by designing places that everyone can visit are suitable for all. These new places will connect people through new routes and strong visual links. Residents will live among and enjoy abundant green space and large trees. A range of homes will ensure that living here appeals to as wider an audience as possible, so that a new community is formed. These new neighbourhoods will be calm, connected and have good access that will encourage people to move around sustainably through walking and cycling</p> | Group is happy with wording changing |
| Policy 1 | <p>The Council suggests the following changes to Policy 1; Policy DNP1: The Allocation of Residential Sites DEP1- H1/H2/H3</p> <p>The following sites are allocated within the SKDC local Plan for residential development:</p> <p>DEP1-H1 Towngate West (SKLP254) - 9.441ha Indicative number: 73 dwellings</p> <p>DEP1-H2 Land West of Linchfield Road (SKLP39) Indicative number: 145 dwellings</p> <p>DEP1-H2 Linchfield Road (SKLP253) 32.862ha Indicative number: 590 dwellings 680</p> <p>2. In addition to the more general principles identified in SKLP Policy DNP1, all development proposals for sites in part 1 of this Policy should demonstrate, in their masterplan, how they have considered the following detailed design principles for the comprehensive development of the proposed site allocations. These detailed design principles follow.</p> <p>a) Streets as Places. Streets must be considered as a ‘social space’ to be used by all, not just vehicles. It is essential that the design of new development should include streets that incorporate needs of pedestrians, cyclists and if applicable public transport users to help</p> | <p>Agree with proposed wording changes with exception of :</p> <p>point b, Group feel using Where possible will only serve to water down</p> <p>point e, keep all existing wording with the exception of At Land west of Linchfield, retain and replace with Retention of</p> |

minimise the use of the private car.

b) Integrated pedestrian paths or linkages. Where possible, new routes should integrate into existing pedestrian routes and networks that surround the site

c) Routes should be laid out in a permeable pattern. This will allow for multiple connections and choice of routes, particularly on foot. Any cul-de-sacs should be relatively short and include wide and overlooked provision for onward pedestrian links. Shared central green spaces in cul-de-sacs are encouraged.

d) Strong frontages on to existing streets. They should be aligned to existing buildings. Where set back, they should replicate to create a feeling of openness and connection with appropriate hard or soft landscape treatment.

e) At Land west of Linchfield, retain existing perimeter maturing plants and trees. The present planted landscape strip is an asset to be protected and enhanced into a "walking corridor" and contribute towards the implementation of the Green Walk Project. Not needed as allocation has been deleted.

f) Development adjoining public open spaces. These should enhance the character of these spaces by either providing a positive interface (properties facing onto them to improve natural surveillance) and a soft landscaped edge. Substantial landscaped areas should buffer the edge of the development and prevent development sprawling into the countryside;

g) Primary and secondary streets. These should differentiate from one another in scale, level of enclosure, use of materials and landscaping features to help provide a clear and distinctive highway network.

h) Gateway and significant built elements. Highlight Access or arrival to newly developed sites should be highlighted. Buildings up to two and a half storeys should be used to increase legibility (meaning ease of recognition with notable features). Where houses front onto landscape areas, they should increase passive surveillance and give a sense of enclosure to these open areas.

i) Variable densities. These should ideally increase towards the existing built up area. Densities should reduce towards the periphery of developments where they neighbour agricultural fields. This will ensure diversity within plots and a landscape setting that reflects the transition from

| | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>urban to rural;</p> <p>j) Height of housing. The majority of the housing should be two storeys to reflect existing residential areas. Where the new development is adjacent to existing residential development housing should be similar in height to the existing to avoid any negative privacy issues. The exception is where gateway and entrance features form part of the design.</p> <p>Policy letters should also be updated as a general formatting change.</p> | |
| Paragraph 10.10 onwards | There appears to be a formatting issue (spacing) with some of the paragraphs here. | Agree – refer to Luke when producing final draft |
| Policy 3 | <p>The Council Suggest the following changes to Policy 3; Policy DNP3: Housing Type and Mix</p> <p>1.Type and Proposals for 10 or more dwellings will provide an appropriate mix of housing types and sizes, including 1, 2- and 3-bedroom dwellings to help meet the need for smaller accommodation in the community – particularly for younger families and older people. Where possible, these dwellings should also include space for adaptability taking inspiration from the Lifetime homes guidance. Number of bedrooms does not need to be stated within the policy, as it would be subject to need on a case by case basis. The final sentence doesn't add anything to the policy and could add confusion for decision makers.</p> <p>2. The subdivision of an existing dwelling or the provision of an onsite annex to accommodate a family member will be supported where it does not cause a detriment to the private amenity of existing occupants or any adjoining occupants. The Council thinks that making this policy specifically for a family member will be difficult to enforce.</p> <p>3. Developers will be required to supply high quality affordable housing in line with the requirements identified in the South Kesteven Local Plan + subsequent development plan documents. The provision of affordable housing through Starter Homes or Shared Ownership schemes will be particularly supported as there is an under provision of owner-occupied affordable housing in the Parish. The Council suggests that this policy also states about meeting future need as the demand for Starter Homes/Shared ownership may change to a different affordable type in the future.</p> <p>4. The affordable housing stock should be made available as an integral part of the development,</p> | <p>Point 1 – Group disagree wording should remain Happy with proposed wording changes to all other groups Group to review the link suggested for Horncastle at point 5</p> |

| | <p>should be visually indistinguishable from the equivalent market housing on the site and dispersed throughout the development.</p> <p>5. Where possible, affordable rental housing within the Neighbourhood Plan area shall be allocated to eligible households with a connection to the area. The council questions where the line is drawn about the connection to the Deepings as the Market Town does also serve a much wider area incorporating many smaller villages. A good example of a step-based connection policy can be found in the Horncastle Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Horncastle Neighbourhood Plan Affordable housing section; pages 36-43</p> <p>https://www.e-lindsey.gov.uk/media/6110/Horncastle-NeighbourhoodDevelopment-Plan-2014-2029-Including-Appendix-A-to-H-and-S/pdf/Horncastle_Neighbourhood_Development_Plan_20142029_(Including_Appendix_A_to_H_and_S).pdf?m=636782181780270000</p> <p>6. Proposals for new care or specialised facilities (public or private) accommodation for the older people and those with additional needs, including dementia housing, should be within a reasonable walking distance, to existing public transport services, walking and cycling routes and be easily accessible to nearby shops and health facilities. Proposals which use opportunities for the multiuse and co-location of care facilities and accommodation for older people with other services and facilities, and thus co-ordinate local care and provide convenience for users, will be supported.</p> <p>7. Proposals for self and custom build will be supported if they comply with other relevant policies of this Plan.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|----------|----------------|--------|---|------|---------|--|------|--|--|--|-------|
| Table 3 | <p>The following labels on the table will need changing to reflect the employment allocation changes through the SKDC LP.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="360 1145 1207 1257"> <thead> <tr> <th>SKLP Site Reference</th> <th>Location</th> <th>Site Area (Ha)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>DEP-E1</td> <td>Land fronting Peterborough Road, Market Deeping</td> <td>4.20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DEP-SE1</td> <td>Extension to Northfields Industrial Estate</td> <td>21.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | SKLP Site Reference | Location | Site Area (Ha) | DEP-E1 | Land fronting Peterborough Road, Market Deeping | 4.20 | DEP-SE1 | Extension to Northfields Industrial Estate | 21.1 | | | | Agree |
| SKLP Site Reference | Location | Site Area (Ha) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DEP-E1 | Land fronting Peterborough Road, Market Deeping | 4.20 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DEP-SE1 | Extension to Northfields Industrial Estate | 21.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Policy 4 | <p>Policy DNP4: Employment Opportunities</p> <p>1. The following sites, as identified on Map 3, are allocated in the SKLP for employment uses under SKLP Policy E1 E2 & E3:</p> | <p>Clarity required from Roger, Group agree point 3 should be an additional Policy – AP has provided suggested wording for review Point 4b remove word valuable</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>DEP-E1 (SKLP 281) 4.20ha – E3 DEP-SE1 (SKLP177) 14.00ha – E2</p> <p>2. Northfields Industrial Estate is protected for employment use under SKLP Policy E2 and Policy E6.</p> <p>3. Hard’s Lane* at Frognall is protected for employment use under SKLP Policy E3 and E5. The Council notes that the NP group have allocated this site themselves. Therefore, the site would require a separate policy as it cannot be added to the SKLP policies due to its advanced stage (the separate policy for “Hards Lane” can however copy the wording of emerging SKLP policies E3/E6. The Council also would like to see evidence of why “Hards Lane” needs protecting over other possible employment clusters within the Deepings.</p> <p>4. Existing areas of employment are protected under SKLP Policy E6. -not needed This does not add anything to the policy.</p> <p>Any additional employment development will be encouraged subject to the following criteria: -</p> <p>a) development should be visually attractive, compatible with the character of the surrounding area and include necessary screening and be of a scale, design and appearance appropriate to the locality, particularly where development can be viewed from the highway, public spaces or residential areas;</p> <p>b) development must not cause detriment to valuable areas or features of nature conservation or heritage assets; - The Council questions what is a valuable area and how would it best be defined?</p> <p>c) development must include appropriate access, parking, areas for loading and unloading, servicing and manoeuvring;</p> <p>d) any outside storage areas and air conditioning should be appropriately sited and screened from public view, including from and neighbouring residential properties;</p> <p>e) development should have no unduly adverse effect on residential amenity from its proposed height, scale, noise, smell, vibrations, glare, dust, emissions, vehicle movements or its operating hours;</p> | <p>Point 4f group disagree with suggested wording change Point 4g Group agree with removing this point</p> |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--------------------|---|--|
| | <p>f) where possible, utilise roof and wall space for the use of renewable energy generation and living wall opportunities; - The council questions how enforceable this policy is, in addition to how this could be difficult for a decision maker to implement or base a refusal off.</p> <p>g) it does not have a detrimental impact on the capacity or safety of the existing highway network. The Council would argue that this part of the policy is not in conformity with NPPF para 109 which states that</p> <p>“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.”</p> <p>*This site is not identified as an existing employment site in the SKLP and therefore it has been added as an existing employment site under this policy. – Please see comments under section 3 of this policy.</p> <p>Policy letters should also be updated as a general formatting change</p> | |
| Map 6 | Suggest moving this map to coincide with the new policy for “Hards Lane” once it has been established. | Agree |
| Map 5 and Policy 5 | The Council would like to discuss why the area has been extended when we meet with the group on the 11th of December. | Andy and Gordon to lead discussion with Roger here |
| Policy 6 | The Principle of the policy is sound – however the council would question why certain churches have been included over others such as – • Deeping Methodist Church • Deeping open Door Baptist Church | Group agree with comments this needs review and amendment |
| Policy 7 | <p>The Council Suggest the following changes to Policy 7; Policy DNP7: Local Centres</p> <p>1. Proposals involving the change of use, at ground floor level, of these retail facilities, to non-retail uses, within the Local Centres, as identified on Maps 7-11, will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, that there is no longer a need for the facility or the premises are unsuitable or not economically viable for the continued provision of a retail facility. The council questions whether other use classes (such as A2, A3, A4, A5) are also not acceptable in these locations?</p> | <p>Clarity re class changes required from Roger Group agree with proposed wording changes re point 3</p> |

| | | |
|----------|---|--|
| | <p>It is also worth noting that many use class changes may not be exempt from needing permission under permitted development rights – the following webpage highlights what these are; https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200130/common_projects/9/change_of_use/2</p> <p>2. Development for the provision, alteration or replacement of shop fronts and signs in the Local Centres will be supported provided the design, colour, materials and details of the alterations to and replacements of shop fronts and signage sustain or enhance the character of the building and surrounding shop frontages and are in keeping with the relevant character area.</p> <p>3. Proposals that seek to improve the structures and public realm of the Local Centres will be supported where the materials design and materials contribute towards the improvement of the character and the amenity value of the area.</p> | |
| Policy 8 | <p>The Council Suggest the following changes to Policy 8; (further comment on this policy will be provided separately by our Urban Design Officer.) Policy DNP8: General Design Principles</p> <p>1. All new development must be of a high-quality design that both physically and visually enhances and reflects the positive features that make up the character of the local area and both physically and visually enhances and compliments the local area. The Council has suggested a slight rewording here.</p> <p>2. Proposals will only be supported where they are designed to meet the key design principles for delivering high quality development set out below and, more specifically, in including the incorporation of the Character Walk descriptions and the Urban Character Assessment.</p> <p>Site characteristics</p> <p>3. New development should consider the retention of any important historic or natural features, buildings and structures on site. Any retention should be appropriately incorporated into the design of the development, whilst not leading to these features being compromised by the construction of the scheme or by the future occupants of the site.</p> <p>Local Character and settlement structure</p> | <p>Group agree with suggested wording changes for Point 1 Point 2</p> <p>With regards to Point 7 group would prefer high to reasonable as suggested Clarity required from Roger re amenity space calculation comment Point 8 Group disagree</p> |

4. New development should respect the historic character of the local area in terms of the form, density, style, height, scale, orientation, plot sizes and position to existing buildings. Developments should not be designed as 'standalone' additions with no clear relationship to the existing settlement in terms of its character and connectivity.

Architectural quality and materials

5. New development should respect its context and improve the quality of local architecture in terms of its sustainability, use of materials and durability. Developments should take inspiration from the positive local architectural features and materials in their designs and not simply produce a development with no reference to local architectural or material merit or distinctiveness. Proposals for new innovative buildings should reflect the highest standards in architecture, utilising modern construction methods and environmentally sustainable materials whilst minimising its impact on the surrounding built and natural character of the area.

Landscaping

6. New development should provide a positive hard and natural landscaping scheme, including boundary treatments that complement the development and respect the surrounding context, particularly where a development site is adjoin surrounding countryside. Where trees or hedgerows are being used, they must be appropriate to the size of the site and consider their proximity to the new buildings. Surfacing must be appropriate for its intended use.

Private Amenity

7. New development should ensure that it provides a decent reasonable standard of private amenity space, allowing adequate spaces for waste, recycling, parking, servicing and cycle storage. The amount of land that should be provided for amenity space will be determined by the size of the development proposed and by the character of surrounding development – Amenity areas should not be compromised by shading from buildings or shading from trees, leaf litter and anxiety of established significant trees and hedges that would lead to future pressure to prune or remove these landscape features. The Council questions how the amenity space will be calculated – what happens if there is a block of flats proposed?

Accessibility

| | | |
|-----------------|--|---|
| | <p>8. New development where appropriate should ensure that all people, including those with disabilities, can easily and comfortably move through and into around it. Developments should prioritise safe, easy and direct pedestrian movement and the creation of a network of attractive, wellconnected public spaces; establish both visual and functional relationships between different parts of a the development and between the development and its wider setting.</p> <p>9. Where neighbouring or functionally linked sites come forward together, applicants will be expected to work together and with the Council to ensure that proposals are, or can be, properly integrated</p> | |
| Paragraph 11.98 | The council feels that having Photographs of these “important gateways” would be helpful in establishing more context. | Agree |
| Policy 9 | <p>The Council Suggest the following changes to Policy 9; (further comment on this policy will be provided separately by our urban design officer.) Policy DNP9: Important Gateways</p> <p>1.Development which impacts on important gateways 50m of the areas, identified on the Map 13, will only be supported provided that the proposed built form, massing, scale and density of the development will create a strong and visually attractive gateway into the Deepings and avoids any unnecessary ‘hard edges’ towards the countryside. The Council is overall supportive of the policy however would question what justifies a 50m area around the gateway? (i.e. what if a development was 51 meters away).</p> | Agree |
| 11.99 | There appears to be some formatting issues with this paragraph. | Agree refer to Luke |
| Policy 10 | <p>The Council Suggest the following changes to Policy 10; Policy DNP10: Area of Separation An Area of Separation is designated, as identified on Map 14: a) Between Deeping St James and Frognall.</p> <p>1. The Area of Separation has been identified to fulfil the following roles and function of preventing the physical merging between Deeping St James and Frognall, preserving their separate identity and local character. Proposals for development, within the identified Area of Separation, will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that the proposed development is not contrary or detrimental to Part 2 of this Policy preserving their separate identity and</p> | Agree in general with suggested wording changes Group feel Point 2 should be removed as it sits better in Policy 9 |

| | | |
|--------|--|-------|
| | <p>local character.</p> <p>2. development within the All gateways to have well designed highly visible signage to set the scene and portray the character of the Deepings.</p> <p>4. Proposals for development, within the identified Area of Separation, will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that the proposed development is not contrary or detrimental to Part 2 of this Policy.</p> <p>The Council has suggested merging both criteria 2 and 4 in this policy. The Council would also like to discuss why the extent of the area of separation has been chosen when we meet with the group on the 11th of December. Map</p> | |
| Map 14 | <p>Needs the following copyright statement</p> <p>Ordnance survey © Crown copyright and database rights 2019 Ordnance survey 100054750 you are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to or interact with the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub- licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.</p> | Agree |
| 12.11 | <p>The Council questions where the information that an LGS has to be between 0.2ha and 20ha in size has come from? – it should follow the criteria set out in paragraph 100 of the NPPF</p> | Agree |
| Map 15 | <p>Needs the following copyright statement</p> <p>Ordnance survey © Crown copyright and database rights 2019 Ordnance survey 100054750 you are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to or interact with the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub- licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.</p> | Agree |
| Map 16 | <p>Needs the following copyright statement</p> <p>Ordnance survey © Crown copyright and database rights 2019 Ordnance survey 100054750 you are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to or interact with the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub- licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form.</p> | Agree |

| | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| | Additionally the key to the map appears to be missing. | |
| Map 17 | Needs the following copyright statement Ordnance survey © Crown copyright and database rights 2019 Ordnance survey 100054750 you are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to or interact with the organisation that provided you with the data. You are not permitted to copy, sub- licence, distribute or sell any of this data to third parties in any form. Additionally, the key to the map appears to be missing. | Key is on map |
| Policy 11 | The Council Suggest the following changes to Policy 11; Policy DNP11: Green Infrastructure 1.Where appropriate, new proposals should preserve, and where possible, enhance the existing local green infrastructure network, including the River Welland Green Corridor, the Green Walk, Green Lanes and existing public rights of way. Green Walk 2. Where appropriate, development proposals will be expected to contribute towards the implementation of the Deepings Green Walk, as identified on Map 15, by: a) enhancing the attractiveness of walking and non-motorised transport in and around the town; b) contributing to the connectivity between other existing footpaths, roadways and cycleways in and around the built-up area, to the town centre, and within the adjacent countryside; c) accommodating the requirements of people with limited mobility to access existing and new Green Infrastructure provision; and d) enhancing the use of existing open spaces, promoting biodiversity, and adding to the connectivity between existing green spaces. New Public Green Spaces on new Developments 3.The provision of new on-site public open space should be well designed, safe, overlooked, | Group to provide additional evidence to support |

| | | |
|------------------|--|---|
| | <p>located within an easily accessible part of the development and well defined in terms of the typology of open space proposed. Pockets of plain grassland or space with no identified clear intended use will not be supported as a green space.</p> <p>Green Lanes –</p> <p>4. The Green Lanes, as identified on Map 17, shall be protected from unsympathetic development which would have an adverse impact on the character area concerned. New development in the identified Green Lanes should preserve and, where possible, enhance their rural appearance. The Council would also like to see the evidence and process of how these “Green Lanes” have been identified when we meet with the group on the 11th of December.</p> | |
| <p>Policy 12</p> | <p>The Council Suggest the following changes to Policy 12; Policy DNP12: Open Space</p> <p>The sites, as shown on Maps in Appendix A, are identified as Important Open Spaces and are protected through SKLP Policy OS1:</p> <p>a) OS6: Towpath by the Riverbank (0.11ha); b) OS10: Cedar Close (0.87ha); c) OS11: The Woodlands (0.72ha); d) OS12: St Guthlac Avenue (0.16ha); e) OS13: Meadway (0.13ha); f) OS14: Osborne Way (0.15ha); g) OS15: Burnside (0.12ha); h) OS21: Centre off Godsey Crescent (A) (0.04ha); i) OS22: Godsey Crescent (B) (0.03ha); j) OS23: Godsey Crescent (c) (0.04ha); k) OS26: Windsor Gardens (0.18ha); l) OS27: Frontage of Tesco (0.02ha); m) OS28: The Green at Churchgate (0.005ha); Area is far too small to warrant Open space designation n) OS29: Lady Margaret Ave (0.019ha); p) OS34 Fraser Close (0.19ha); p) OS35 Boundary Bowling Green (0.15ha); q) OS36 Hereward Way (0.018ha); r) OS37 Campion Drive A B & C (0.07 +0.05 + 0.06); s) OS38 Marigolds/Foxgloves A B & C (0.07 + 0.04 + 0.01); Only A is identified as OS by SKDC t) OS39 Towing Close (0.19); u) OS40 The Brambles (0.03); v) OS41 Swift Close by Nursery (0.07); w) OS42 Wade Park Avenue by school (0.15); x) OS43 Kesteven Close (0.17); y) OS44 Elm Close (0.09); z) OS45 Wade Park Avenue (0.01); aa) OS46a A-K Heron lea Pocket Parks (0.05).</p> <p>Those sites that have been highlighted Green have already been identified as Open space by SKDC, and therefore do not require any further protection from the same policy. Labels on the Open Space map say “LGS” – The Council assumes they need to say “OS” instead.</p> | <p>Group would like to see the evidence of protection of these sites</p> <p>General note for Luke – Group think an explanation should be given to ensure the difference between an Open Space and a Green Space is understood</p> |

| | | |
|------------------|--|---|
| <p>Policy 13</p> | <p>The Council Suggest the following changes to Policy 13; Policy DNP13: Local Green Spaces 1. The sites, as shown on Maps in Appendix B, are designated as Local Green Spaces:</p> <p>a) LGS1: John Eve Field (1.79ha); b) LGS2: Glebe Field (2.47ha); c) LGS3: Rectory Paddock and cemetery (1.47ha); d) LGS4: Riverside Park (0.25ha); e) LGS5: Welland Gardens (0.1ha);</p> <p>f) LGS7: Tattershall Drive, Towngate (1.55ha); g) LGS8: Sandringhm Way (1.54ha); h) LGS9: Tattershall Drive (South) (0.45ha); i) LGS16: Cherry Tree Park (0.22ha); j) LGS17: Greenlands (0.73ha); k) LGS18: Mill Field (10.80ha); l) LGS19: Scout Hut Area (0.74ha); m) LGS24: Charter Avenue (0.24ha); n) LGS30: Jubilee Park (2.29ha); o) LGS31: Woody’s Heights (0.44ha); p) LGS33: Millennium Wood (0.22ha); and q) LGS34: Riverside Park DSJ (0.22ha);</p> <p>1. Development on these sites will only be supported in very special circumstances. – The Council has been through and assessed each of the LGS and determined which ones they agree and disagree with as found below. The Council has been through and assessed each of the LGS and determined which ones they agree and disagree with as found below. LGS justification.</p> <p>LGS1 –Already identified as OS by SKDC and gifted to the people of MD does not need further LGS protection – Disagree</p> <p>LGS2 – Already identified as OS by SKDC and owned by the Town Council. Does not need further protection - Disagree LGS3 – Already identified as OS by SKDC and owned by the Town Council. Does not need further protection - Disagree</p> <p>LGS4 – Already identified as open space but demonstrably meets all criteria and given location LGS would be sufficient– agree</p> <p>LGS5 – Already identified as OS by SKDC and owned by the Town Council. Does not need further protection - Disagree</p> <p>LGS7 = Already identified as OS by SKDC also appears to be quite and extensive tract of land, no</p> | <p>Whilst Group appreciate that SKDC feel further protection is not required as the sites are designated an Open Space they feel these particular areas merit a higher level of protection.</p> <p>Group intend to revisit this section and rework the individual justifications to further explain why they have been identified</p> |
|------------------|--|---|

| | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| | <p>real historical value no further protection needed- Disagree</p> <p>LGS8 – Already identified as OS by SKDC, no real historical value, no further protection needed – Disagree</p> <p>LGS9 – Already identified as OS by SKDC, no real historical value, no further protection needed – Disagree</p> <p>LGS16 - Already identified as open space but demonstrably meets all criteria and given location LGS would be sufficient– agree</p> <p>LGS17 - Already identified as OS by SKDC, no real historical value, no further protection needed – Disagree</p> <p>LGS 18– Site meets the special and historical requirements, however is a far to much of an extensive tract of land to be considered an LGS. Disagree</p> <p>LGS 24 –Not protected, Site has no historical value as it is part of a new housing estate. Disagree</p> <p>LGS30 (incorrectly labelled as 29 on map) - Already identified as OS by SKDC, site has social value and has been around for over 100 years – Disagree</p> <p>LGS31 - Already identified as OS by SKDC, no real historical value, no further protection needed – Disagree</p> <p>LGS32 – appears not to have been assessed in the table? – N/A</p> <p>LGS33 (needs label on map) - no district protection, but owned by the Parish Council is deemed special and has some historical merit– agree</p> <p>LGS34 – Appears not to be in the policy? – N/A</p> | |
| Policy 14 | <p>The Council Suggest the following changes to Policy 14; Policy DNP14: Biodiversity, Nature Conservation and the River Welland Green Corridor</p> <p>1. Where appropriate, development proposals should promote preservation, restoration and recreation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority</p> | <p>Further clarity required from Roger re point 2 Group to provide additional detail to support point 3 Group agree point 4a and 4b should be removed 4c needs rewording</p> |

| | | |
|-----------|---|---|
| | <p>species populations where applicable. This could include, for instance, the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes and swift boxes as part of any new development proposal.</p> <p>2. Development proposals that cannot avoid (through locating an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigate, or, as a last resort, compensate for the loss of a locally or nationally identified site of biodiversity value will not be supported. This will need to be backed up in cases where an EIA is required.</p> <p>3. Where appropriate, development proposals must demonstrate that there is no unacceptable loss of or damage to existing trees, woodlands or hedgerows. – The Council questions this policy as there is no definition of what is deemed an “unacceptable loss” as replacement / compensation can always be made.</p> <p>4. Development proposals for riverside sites on of the River Welland should incorporate and/ or safeguard land for the construction of a pathway next to the river, wide enough for shared use by pedestrians and cyclists. a) Where appropriate, links should be provided to the river corridor from new developments alongside the river. Existing links should be protected that lead to the wider residential areas, the surrounding countryside; b) Development proposals immediately adjacent to the river should include design features that will help animate public space, such as cafes, pubs or other social activities that will enhance enjoyment of the riverside; Therefore, if a wholly residential scheme can come forward would this be enough grounds for refusal? c) Where appropriate, development proposals should open new views to the river and access to the riverside; d) New developments adjacent to the river must demonstrate that they will not impact on the river’s ability to function naturally and should enhance green infrastructure and wildlife corridors.</p> | |
| Policy 15 | <p>The Council Suggest the following changes to Policy 14; Policy DNP15: Sustainable Travel and Transport Infrastructure</p> <p>1. Development proposals will be supported where they:</p> | <p>Group disagree with proposed wording change for point 1c point 1d could be merged into a reworded f and e also should we add a point to support disabled access here</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>a) give the highest priority to pedestrians, cyclists and other ‘active travel’ modes when developing or maintaining streets and roads;</p> <p>b) where possible connect to the Deepings Green Walk, as identified on Map 15;</p> <p>c) Where possible plan and provide a comprehensive network of accessible routes for walking and cycling which offer convenient, safe and attractive access to employment, homes, schools and other public facilities;</p> <p>d) ensure Encourage the integration of transport and active travel networks (i.e. walking, cycling and buses);</p> <p>e) promote ‘active travel’ for example ensuring new developments have adequate bicycle provision, including safe storage, or that new workplaces contain showers and clothes drying areas which will facilitate walking and cycling to work;</p> <p>f) ensure there is easy, clear and safe access to transport nodes, such as bus stops;</p> <p>g) identify and implement measures to reduce transport severance, noise levels and air pollution;</p> <p>h) recognise the needs and responses of different social groups, particularly those experiencing health inequalities; and- The Council questions how this criterion would be measured and how a decision maker would utilise it effectively?</p> <p>i) Where appropriate, provide off-street car parking provision that does not rely upon garages as parking spaces, particularly on developments where there is a mix of housing types and tenures and where there is a reliance on the car for commuting;</p> <p>j) Garages with doors will be classed as storage not parking spaces – The council does not believe this criterion can be effectively implemented. The Council believes that this idea is covered through the “appropriate off-street car parking” section of criteria i)</p> | <p>Point h requires clarity Group disagrees with proposed wording change for point i Point J requires further discussion with Roger</p> |
|--|---|---|

