

Post_title: Policies Map

ID1: 1021

comment_author: Pedals - Spalding's Cycle Action Gr

comment_content:

Policies Map and Inset Map 2 A single notation has been used for "Cycle Routes". This is an oversimplification because it covers a multitude of circumstances eg: o cycling provision which exists eg dual use and shared use cycle routes and other signed routes, to be protected under Policy 31 C1 proposed routes included in Policy 32 (see our comments about that policy and some omissions from the map) routes in need of improvement (eg the Daffodil Route, see our comment about paragraph 8.0.2) "routes" which have been identified by others but for which there is no evidence on the ground of specific cycling provision or signing (eg London Road, Spalding) We suggest that two notations should be used, 0 one for existing routes, to be protected and maintained in accordance with Policy 31 C1. This notation would cover routes which have specific cycling provision on the ground (e.g. shared and dual use paths) and those roads which have no specific cycling provision but which have official signs identifying them as cycling routes; and ~ another notation for those proposed routes listed in Policy 31 C2 (including our suggested additions). We have identified some errors and omissions on Inset Map 2. We hope that our meeting with members of the Local Plan Team will enable them to be corrected without the need to raise them formally in the consultation process.

Officer Comment:

The Policies Map will be amended to differentiate between existing and proposed routes. The Policies Map will be amended to address concerns raised.

Officer Recommendation:

Make changes to the Policies Map accordingly.

ID1:

1023

comment_author: Pygott & Crone

comment content:

The Draft Local Plan incorporates settlement curtilages to define the extent of potential future developments. Objection: In our opinion, the incorporation of arbitrary settlement curtilages prevents logical future extensions to existing settlements and is in conflict with the objectives of Paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework which supports appropriate sustainable development. Development requirements will be subject to change during the Local Plan period, which will require a degree of flexibility prevented by arbitrary and inflexible settlement curtilages. In our opinion, the proposed settlement curtilages should be removed to allow applications on the edge of existing settlements to be considered on their individual merits at the time of application.

Minutes of the SELJSPC Meeting: 11th September 2015: The Minutes record sites which are considered potentially suitable for allocation within the emerging Local Plan for residential development. Only sites which would provide for 10 or more dwellings have been identified. Objection: In our opinion, the omission of sites for less than 10 dwellings does not enable the Councils to account for windfall sites of less than 10 dwellings (which may contribute a substantial proportion of new housing during the plan period) and restricts the ability to provide smaller developments which enhance the diversity of smaller rural settlements.

Officer Comment:

The settlement boundaries have been drawn to define where particular Local Plan policies apply. In effect, they are defining where the Countryside policy (which covers the majority of the Local Plan area) ends and where other policies relating to Sub-Regional Centres, Main Service Centres, Minor Service Centres and Other Service Centres and Settlements start. They have not been arbitrarily drawn.

A Settlement Boundaries Background Paper was issued as part of this consultation.

The Local Plan seeks to allocate sufficient sites to meet the objectively Assessed Housing Needs for the plan area and the number allocated to the individual settlement. Therefore, any site that comes forward that holds less than 10 is a windfall site and a bonus to the development requirements and do not need to be shown. In addition owing to their size and number they are not always clearly defined on a map, depending on its scale, and would also make it very busy, which undermines its clarity, for other policy purposes.

Officer Recommendation:

No change to the approach is required.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 1024 comment_author: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

comment_content:

Moulton Marsh nature reserve has been identified on this map as recreational open space in addition to its designation as a Local Wildlife Site. As a Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust nature reserve we do not feel it is appropriate to categorise the site as recreational open space and we would therefore request that this site is shown only as a LWS.

Officer Comment:

The open space will be removed from Moulton Marsh. It will be shown as a LWS.

Officer Recommendation:

A small change is required to the mapping.

ID1: 1025 comment_author: Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partn

comment_content:

Moulton marsh Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust reserve and LWS is identified as recreational open space. This is private land and it would be appropriate to check this designation with the land owner before confirming this designation.

Officer Comment:

The open space will be removed from Moulton Marsh. It will be shown as a LWS.

Officer Recommendation:

A small change is required to the mapping.
