

Mr Chris Collison
Independent Examiner
Planning and Management Ltd
c/o East Lindsey District Council

By email to simon.milson@e-lindsey.gov.uk

Dear Mr Collison

Re: Skegness Town Council Comments on Regulation 16 Responses

Further to your letter dated 30th June 2022, we write on behalf of Skegness Town Council who have asked us to comment, where necessary, on responses that were received to the Skegness Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 consultation.

As per your instructions, the comments set out in the attached table do not include new evidence but seek to provide clarification, particularly on matters that have not previously been raised earlier in the plan preparation process.

Should you have any queries regarding the attached comments or require any further clarifications, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely



Kirsten Ward BSc (Hons) MA PhD MRTPI
Associate Director
DLP Planning
kirsten.ward@dlpconsultants.co.uk

Enc. Table of Skegness Town Council comments on Regulation 16 responses

Representations to Skegness Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 16) Consultation – Skegness Town Council Comments

Representor	Section of Neighbourhood Plan / Policy Reference	Representations Summary	Skegness Town Council Comments
Lichfields on behalf of Bourne Leisure Ltd.	Policy V1	Clarification required on whether criteria (a) to (h) in Draft Policy V1 refer to applications for new or existing caravan parks. Emerging policy should either be amended to make it clear that either criteria (a) to (h) do not apply to applications for new or existing caravans, or alternatively the draft policy should include, “ <u>where applicable / relevant</u> ” to the second sentence of Draft Policy V1, with the ‘and’ clause at the end of each criteria subsequently deleted.	The intention of this policy is that criteria (a) to (h) would also be applicable to new caravan parks or extensions. It is recognised that some of these criteria may not be applicable depending upon the location of the development proposed. For clarity, we therefore agree that the second sentence of Policy V1 could be amended to state “Applications for tourism-related development will be supported where it can be demonstrated, <u>where applicable</u> , that:...”
		Criterion (f) should be reworded to “ <u>Taking into account any mitigation, they do not have any unacceptable</u> affect on existing open spaces...”	The purpose of criterion (f) is to ensure that existing open spaces are not adversely affected by any new tourism-related development proposed. The current proposed wording of criterion (f) is therefore considered to be appropriate and effective.
		Criterion (g) should be reworded to state that “ <u>Taking into account any mitigation, they do not have any unacceptable</u> adverse effects on existing heritage assets, environmental designations or existing flood defences.”	The purpose of criterion (g) is to ensure that any existing heritage assets, environmental designations or flood defences are not adversely affected by any new tourism-related development proposed. The current proposed wording of criterion (g) is therefore considered to be appropriate and effective.
		Criterion (h) should be reworded to state that transport assessment should only be provided “ <u>in accordance with NPPF requirements</u> ”.	The inclusion of the word “appropriate” in criterion (h) provides clarity that a transport assessment may not be required in all instances. The inclusion of the words “where

Representor	Section of Neighbourhood Plan / Policy Reference	Representations Summary	Skegness Town Council Comments
			applicable" in the second sentence of Policy V1 (as suggested above) would provide further clarity on this matter. No changes to criterion (h) are therefore considered to be required.
	Policy V3	Policy supported	Comment noted.
	Policy D1	Depending on the nature of the proposal, it may not be possible to meet all criteria listed. Second sentence should therefore be amended to " <u>Where appropriate, proposed developments should</u> " and the final sentence of the policy should be deleted.	The criteria in Policy D1 already specify in what instances each criterion might be applicable. No changes to Policy D1 is therefore considered to be required.
	Policy D3	Policy supported	Comment noted.
	Policy INF11	Policy wording should be amended so that for existing non-residential development "1 charge point is provided for every <u>new</u> 20 parking spaces".	The current policy wording for INF11 in respect of existing non-residential developments makes clear that it relates to "increases in provision in existing developments". In order to provide clarity we therefore agree that the wording of the final sentence of Policy INF11 could be amended to state "1 charge point is provided for every <u>new</u> 20 parking spaces".
John Chappell, Chappell & Co Surveyors Ltd	Site allocations	Confirm that three of the sites identified in the Site Identification & Assessment Report are available for development for open market housing.	A workshop was held with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group in December 2019 at which it was decided that these three sites would not be taken forwards as allocations in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, as recorded in the Further Sites Evidence Report (June 2020). No changes required.
Lincolnshire County Council (LCC)	Policies INF2 to INF4	Requirements for minimum standards do not offer flexibility for developments which seek to promote sustainable transport as set out in Policy INF1. These parking ratios should be provided as	Lincolnshire County Council's (LCC's) comments appear to refer to the Pre-Submission Draft version of the Neighbourhood Plan. Following pre-

Representor	Section of Neighbourhood Plan / Policy Reference	Representations Summary	Skegness Town Council Comments
		guidance and each application should be considered on its own merits as to whether it meets Policy INF1 in promoting sustainable modes.	submission consultation, in response to comments received, a further paragraph was added beneath the table in Policy INF2 and INF4 to clarify that the policies apply unless it can be demonstrated through a Transport Assessment and agreed by the Highways Authority that these minimum parking standards are not required and that levels of parking will be "judged on a case by case basis". No further changes are considered to be required.
	Policy INF5	Policy is inappropriate. For example, Policy INF 5 would require a new pub in Skegness of 300 sq m to have 42 car parking spaces, and if these could not be provided on site, then undertake surveys and demonstrate available space on street. Pubs should not be required to cater for large numbers of visitors by car in town centre location, these Policies seem flawed in terms of transport safety and sustainable targets. The use of the Lambeth Parking Survey methodology is not considered appropriate to a Lincolnshire tourist seaside town.	LCC's comments appear to refer to the Pre-Submission Draft version of the Neighbourhood Plan. Following pre-submission consultation, in response to comments received, a further paragraph was added beneath the table in Policy INF5 to clarify that "Where parking provision is being proposed below the minimum standards, and the site is in a highly accessible location (such as within the Town Centre, as defined on the Policies Map), the applicant should submit evidence to demonstrate that the level of parking is adequate and will not have a detrimental impact upon the local highway network. Such instances will be judged on a case by case basis". Reference to the Lambeth Survey Methodology was also deleted in response to comments received on the Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan. No further changes are considered to be required.
	Policy INF6	Policy is inappropriate.	LCC's comments appear to refer to the Pre-Submission Draft version of the

Representor	Section of Neighbourhood Plan / Policy Reference	Representations Summary	Skegness Town Council Comments
			Neighbourhood Plan. It is unclear from the Regulation 16 comments how Policy INF6 is considered to be inappropriate. Reference to the Lambeth Survey Methodology was deleted in response to comments received on the Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan. No further changes are considered to be required.
	Site Allocation NDP3	It is our understanding that this site is being separately promoted for the Skegness Gateway development, supported by ELDC, for housing. There would appear to be a conflict here.	LCC's comments appear to refer to the Pre-Submission Draft version of the Neighbourhood Plan. Policy NDP3 (Land North of Wainfleet Road) was removed from the Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan and is no longer a proposed allocation.
	General Comment	Whilst there is a brief mention for ensuring that there are access links to the wider countryside and the protection of specific assets such as Vine Walk, Coronation Walk, Croft Walk and King George V walk) there is no mention of the need to protect the existing recorded rights of way should there be development proposals affecting them, nor any mention of the opportunity of new routes linking potential gateway development sites to the wider countryside or to the town centre and Foreshore. It is also slightly disappointing to note that there is no mention at all of the opportunities the National Trail (England Coast Path) may bring in terms of visitors to the town. Links to the Wolds and Gibraltar Point are discussed but there is no mention of the Coastal Country Park and future National Trust Facility within reasonable distance at Sandilands (Sutton on Sea) / Chapel St Leonards.	LCC's comments appear to refer to the Pre-Submission Draft version of the Neighbourhood Plan. In response to comments submitted at Regulation 14 consultation stage, reference was added to the wording of Policy D3 to encourage enhanced walking routes linking gateway sites with wider countryside and town centre / foreshore / coastal path. No further changes are considered to be required.

Representor	Section of Neighbourhood Plan / Policy Reference	Representations Summary	Skegness Town Council Comments
	General Comment	There is also no mention of the potential for Biodiversity Net Gain as part of development proposals at Gateway sites to ensure that this is enhanced in the area.	Biodiversity Net Gain is a national legislative requirement that will be a requirement of all relevant planning applications – no change to the Neighbourhood Plan is therefore required.
Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	General Comment	No further comment is required from the MMO regarding the Skegness Neighbourhood Plan - Regulation 16, as there is no comment required from us at this stage of the plan development and relevant representation has been made during the Regulation 14 consultation stage in October 2021. We advise that you consider any relevant policies within the East Marine Plan Documents in regard to areas within the plan that may impact the marine environment. We recommend the inclusion of the East Marine Plans when discussing any themes with coastal or marine elements.	Comments noted – no change to Neighbourhood Plan required.
Ministry of Defence (MOD)	General Comment	MOD request to be consulted on any potential development within the Statutory Range Safeguarding Zone that surrounds RAF Holbeach that includes schemes that might result in the creation of attractant environments for large and flocking bird species hazardous to aviation or any development with capacity for micro-light / leisure flying activities.	The Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) are a statutory consultee and would be consulted on relevant planning applications for development by ELDC as part of the planning process. No change to Neighbourhood Plan required.
Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	General Comment	No record of high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines within the Neighbourhood Plan area.	Comments noted.
National Highways	General Comment	On review of the Neighbourhood Plan we understand there is some limited growth proposed and given the distance of the Plan area from the SRN we do not consider there will be any impacts on its operation. We will continue to engage with East Lindsey District Council to understand future	Comments noted.

Representor	Section of Neighbourhood Plan / Policy Reference	Representations Summary	Skegness Town Council Comments
		growth plans in the area.	
Natural England	Site Allocations	Confirms that following amendments made to wording of Policy E2 at Pre-Submission stage, Appropriate Assessment of the Neighbourhood Plan will not be required.	Comments noted.
NHS Lincolnshire CCG	General Comment	The wider determinants of health and wellbeing have a significant impact on local residents and these challenges are significant in Skegness. We are working alongside ELDC and other partners to support a wide range of initiatives including those within the Town Investment Plan.	Comments noted.
NHS Property Services	Policy C3	Objects to Policy C3 which currently states that existing health facilities should be retained and enhanced wherever possible. Wording of Policy C3 should be amended to include additional wording as follows: “Applications involving the loss of community health facilities for which there continues to be an established need will be resisted unless adequate alternative provision is or will be made available in a location supported by the local community within an appropriate and agreed timescale. <u>Development (including change of use) that involves the loss or replacement of existing community facilities/services will be permitted where the loss or partial loss of a facility or site arises from a wider public service transformation plan which requires investment in modern, fit for purpose infrastructure and facilities.</u> Applications for new community health facilities or improvements to existing community health facilities will be supported subject to the following criteria...”	These comments were previously submitted to the Town Council by NHS Property Services at the Regulation 14 consultation stage. As the Town Council previously responded in the Regulation 14 Consultation Statement (January 2022), the existing policy wording states that “Applications involving the loss of community health facilities for which there continues to be an established need will be resisted unless adequate alternative provision is or will be made available in a location supported by the local community within an appropriate and agreed timescale”. In this context, ‘adequate alternative provision’ may include that provided through a wider public service transformation plan. It is therefore not necessary to specify this explicitly in the policy wording and no change to the Neighbourhood Plan is therefore required.
Sport England	General Comment	It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects	Relevant published evidence related to sport

Representor	Section of Neighbourhood Plan / Policy Reference	Representations Summary	Skegness Town Council Comments
		<p>the recommendations and actions set out in the Playing Pitch Strategy or other strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities.</p>	<p>and leisure requirements were assessed at the early stages of Neighbourhood Plan preparation as part of the baseline assessment (see Section 2(f) of the Skegness Neighbourhood Plan) that informed the vision, objectives and scope of policies contained within the Neighbourhood Plan. Applications for provision of new sport or leisure facilities are supported under Policy C2 of the Neighbourhood Plan. No change to the Neighbourhood Plan is therefore required.</p>
Theatres Trust	Policy TC2	Policy supported. Consider the plan meets the basic conditions.	Comment noted.
	Policy C1	Policy supported. Consider the plan meets the basic conditions.	Comment noted.
West Lindsey District Council	General Comment	The Plan is well presented and wide-ranging.	Comment noted.