**CLLP CONSULTATION – 2021**

* Consultation closed 5pm 24 August
* CLLP at <https://central-lincs.inconsult.uk/CLLP.Draft.Local.Plan/consultationHomebe>
* Comments can be made by emailing talkplanning@central-lincs.org.uk
* Major emphasis on further urbanisation of existing towns

**Key housing data:**

* Draft June 2021 to run to 2040
* Housing growth between 23,320 to 29,150 from 2018-40, = 1060 to 1325 per year
* Metheringham Ward within Lincoln Strategic Area
* Neighbourhood plans superseded by higher level plans; revision of NP likely to be required
* Policy S4 development in or adjacent to villages (p20)
* Existing village allocations (Metheringham p171; 276 dwellings (rather than the 329 approved!); p167-179)(Dunston p176; 25) (Nocton – nil)
* Preferred housing site allocations Appendix 3.2
* Residential allocations NKDC Part 1 (HOU002c) (Evidence reports)
	+ Dunston NK/DUNS/001 – Indicative 25 off Fen Lane (existing allocation)
	+ NK/DUNS/002 - 14 south of The Terrace – rejected
	+ /003 – 19 rear of The Orchards – rejected (9 dwellings already approved)
	+ /004 – 8 land at Meadows Lincoln Road, rejected
	+ /005 – 35 south Back Lane, rejected
	+ /006 – 12 south Back Lane, rejected
	+ / 007 – 30 east Willow Lane, rejected
	+ /008 – 31 north Back Lane, rejected
	+ /009 – 34 north of school, rejected
	+ Metheringham NK/MET/001 – 42 west B1188, rejected
	+ /002 - 343 adjacent to Moorlands, rejected
	+ /003 -‘276’ west Dunston Rd, allocate (329 approved, 20% above indicative figure)
	+ /004 – 13 former Transport cafe on A15, rejected
* Residential allocations NKDC Part 2 (HOUS002d)
	+ Nocton NK/NOC/001 – 24 off Main Street, rejected
	+ /002 – 15 between Potterhanworth Rd and Nocton Park Rd, rejected
	+ /003 – 342 Nocton Hospital site and Hall, rejected
	+ /004 – 92 north Rostrop Road, rejected
	+ /005 – 13 on Wellhead Lane, rejected
	+ /006 – 17 west of Kelkherd House, rejected
* Builds in medium villages in groups up to 10; in small villages groups of up to 5 but no cap on number of repeat batch developments.
* No ability to over-ride maximum development with local consultation (what level of development would be needed to successfully challenge and win that the character of the area has been changed?)
* Community support removed

CLLP includes all identified development locations. Evidence report reviews sites for acceptance or rejection. Any previous remaining growth limit and potential protection (eg from 10% growth in medium villages from 2017 to 2036) has now been removed. In Metheringham Ward most of growth allocations and permissions have already been snapped up. However, rejection of sites, in eg Nocton of 503 dwellings, is welcomed but will not prevent windfall allocations.

**Energy, climate change, flooding**

* Reducing energy consumption Policy S6, includes eg no connection to gas network or use of fossil fuel energy on site, dwellings should ‘wash their face’ on carbon emissions
* Able to generate at least same amount of renewable energy preferably on-plot (some clear viability issues for many developments)
	+ Is offsite get-out clause right? S6 p28
	+ Applicant should take reasonable steps to use building materials with low emissions and not wait for regulation in 2025 – S10 p33
	+ Water efficiency and green roves encouraged if flat - S11 p34
	+ Retrofitting on change of use or extensions encouraged – S12 p35
	+ Carbon sinks (eg peat soils) protected – S16 p43
	+ Electric vehicle charging – S17 p44
	+ No fossil fuel exploitation – S18 p45
	+ Flood risk drainage to be in place before occupation – S20 p49

**Policy S13 – renewable energy**

* “Half the renewable energy should come from wind” but are solar panels a better option? Local ideas on development of wave power or photovoltaic imitation slates/tiles etc beyond our ability to directly influence?
* Individual or small groups of 40m wind turbines supported in principle anywhere subject to detailed assessment
* Turbines above 40m (some now 150m tall) not within 2Km of a settlement and be within an area identified as ‘Broad area suitable for large scale wind energy turbines’ , ie much of Nocton, Dunston and Metheringham fen, local community support required but the level of that support would be judged by the local planning authority .
* No medium to large scale turbine within 700m of a residential property

**Housing**

* Affordable housing Policy S21 p54. Limited by viability calculation 25% in expensive zones and 10% in poorer areas p52
* Meeting accommodation needs S22 p57. Homes for older people only in bigger villages
* No isolated dwellings
* Self-build encouraged – S23 p59
* Caravan pitches or park homes supported if acceptable for permanent dwellings S25 p61
* Employment areas- large - S27 p65. Small (1/2Ha) S33 p71
* Shop and pub protected – village centres S39 p85
* Local tourism encouraged – S42 p90
* Infrastructure S44 to transport cycling etc S47 p100

**Design and amenity**

* Car parking in rural areas = 1 per bedroom up to max of 3
* Community facilities S49 p103
* Incorporation of natural features and biodiversity support where possible
* S50 Open spaces for our health and natural spaces and sports **But** only linked to developments of 10 or more – is this enough?
* Health & well being S53 p112

**Natural Heritage**

* Aim to protect trees or mitigate S56 p117 and S65 p130
* Links between green areas called green infrastructure S58 p124
* Local green spaces protected S63 p134
* Expanding woodland supported S65 p139 But a 1m wide tree could be replaced by 11 whips which will take decades to replace the same carbon absorption. Greater requirement is needed to ensure no net decline intervening years otherwise we are worse off in the short term.
* Land for agriculture S66

**Some thoughts:**

* Are we building for communities and to match local needs or?:
	+ “homes .... to support economic ambitions... delivering economic growth within the region.”
	+ “Direct the growth in both employment and housing supply to the locations best suited and most attractive to the market”
* Where is the provision of the essential matching infrastructure?
* Indicative figures prove to be anything but that
* Does the scale of development encourage large homes and inward migration and bring greater car travel? It definitely impacts the infrastructure which just isn’t keeping pace with current builds.
* Why set higher than needed target number of houses which could impact 5-year land supply?
* Previous village growth allocations have been snapped up – the plan needs growth to be phased throughout the period rather than allowing front loading. Scrabbling to build right away will adversely impact achievement of climate goals.
* Affordable home need to be just that, not just cheap – so built to high energy rating
* Lincolnshire has masses of off-shore wind turbines

You are all encouraged to consider the CLLP draft and make appropriate comment for yourself and your community.