

# Saxilby with Ingleby Neighbourhood Development Plan Review

## Response to the NDP Independent Examination Clarification Note - 19 November 2025

Saxilby with Ingleby NDP response to the areas where further clarification was requested by the Independent Examiner:

<b>Policy No.</b>	<b>Policy Name</b>	<b>Independent Examiner Point for Clarification</b>	<b>NDP Response</b>
<b>Policy 1:</b>	Residential Development within the developed footprint of Saxilby	This is a very comprehensive which sets the scene for the wider Plan. Should its final element cross-relate to the Policy 2 of the Plan?	Yes, this should cross-reference to the Local Plan.
<b>Policy 2</b>	Comprehensive development of land at WL/SAXI/004, land off Sykes Lane Saxilby	I looked carefully at the land off Sykes Lane during the visit. Is the policy wording about the 'allocation' of the site correct given that it is already allocated in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (Policy WL/SAXI/004)? This is acknowledged in paragraph 38 of the Plan. Is the purpose of the policy to consolidate the approach already taken in the Local Plan?	Yes, this should be consolidated to the same approach that is in the adopted Local Plan. Some of the criterion (I, J, L) in the policy go a bit further to provide more local context. There is a concern from nearby local residents of on the impact(s) this development could have on the existing community.
<b>Policy 3</b>	<i>Design of new development</i>	This is a very good policy which will help to ensure high-quality design in the parish. In the round it is an excellent local response to Section 12 NPPF. Should the third part of the policy be supporting text (describing what details should accompany planning applications) rather than in the policy itself? Similarly, should the wording relate only to proposals which require the submission of a design and access statement?	Agreed that the third part of the policy could be within the supporting text and is not necessary to be within policy.
<b>Policy 6</b>	Protecting community facilities	I saw the importance of the community facilities in the village during the visit. Is the primary purpose of the policy to identify local community facilities to which Local Plan policies would apply? If so, I am minded to recommend that it is recast to achieve this purpose. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?	The Parish Council would support this proposition.

<b>Policy 7</b>	<i>Saxilby business and enterprise parks</i>	I saw the importance of the employment sites in the parish during the visit. The third part of the policy is very commendable. However, is it capable of being implemented through the development management process given that any applicant is unlikely to own any of the land concerned as shown on Figure 7 (in red)? Otherwise, is it intended that development proposals would contribute towards an overall scheme? If this is the case, how would that scheme be managed and delivered)?	Maybe a modification to the wording from 'must' to 'should'? this would encourage developers to consider this as part of their scheme to identify whether it is practicable or not.
-----------------	--	---	---

<b>Representation</b>	<b>Independent Examiner</b>	<b>NDP Response</b>	
<b>1. Anglian Water</b>	I would find it helpful if the Parish Council commented on the representations made to the plan	The comments raised by Anglian Water are noted. However, these matters relate to strategic infrastructure provision and are therefore addressed through the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP) rather than the Neighbourhood Plan. No amendments to the Neighbourhood Plan are proposed in response to this representation	The Parish Council do not wish to provide any further points beyond its initial response.
<b>2. Canal and River Trust</b>	I would find it helpful if the Parish Council commented on the representations made to the plan	The council recognises the footbridges referred to in the representation. These assets are acknowledged as having local historic interest and can be taken forward for further consideration by the local History Group. No policy changes to the Neighbourhood Plan are proposed at this stage.	The Parish Council do not wish to provide any further points beyond its initial response.
<b>3. West Lindsey District Council</b>	The District Council makes a series of comments on the Plan. I would find it helpful if the Parish Council responded to the various comments and the suggested revisions	The Parish Council has incorporated as many of the comments from WLDC into the submitted Plan. This is detailed within the Consultation Statement on pp64-71.	The Parish Council do not wish to provide any further points beyond its initial response.

#### 4. Truelove Property and Construction:

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Developer Comment</b>	<b>NDP Response</b>	
<b>Policy I: Residential Development within the Developed Footprint of Saxilby</b>	the SINP should consider being more flexible for edge of settlement sites.	Policy I should reflect the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan	No change
<b>Policy I: Criterion 1 g)</b>	CLLP include prescriptive parking standards. The parish council should set their own standards as opposed to generic policy wording	Parking standards are already reflected reference to the CLLP and no further amendment is considered necessary.	No change
<b>Policy I Criterion 3</b>	Criterion 3 does not also appear to be up to date with the Government's changes in relation to 'First Homes'. No longer a requirement to deliver 25% of all affordable housing as first homes, this should be determined by local need.	The Housing Need Assessment (2024) is not considered out of date and continues to reflect the identified needs of the local community. No change is proposed.	No change
<b>Policy 6 Protecting Community Facilities Criterion 2 a-c)</b>	These add no local influence over and above the CLLP	Not applicable	No change
<b>Policy 7 Saxilby Business and Enterprise Parks. Criterion 1-</b>	Comment suggesting amendment or clarification.	The NDP Working Group agrees with the comment.	Minor modification
<b>Policy 8: Climate Change</b>	It appears that there word 'include' is missing after 'location development proposals should.'	The representation is noted and the NDP Working Group agrees with the comment. A minor modification is proposed to Policy 8 to address the matter raised.	Minor Modification

**Policy 12: Protecting Local Biodiversity**

Reference to CLLP should be removed and should be replaced with 'Figure 9'

This should be removed if SNCC are removed from the Plan

Figure 9 SNCCs have been de-selected. Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) pending for assessment in the parish. Remove Figure 9. **Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC)**

The NDP WG has reviewed and agreed actions relating to Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC):

- SINC sites are referenced on page 57, paragraph 94, and page 59, Figure 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- The Working Group raised the status of these sites with the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (GLNP), which oversees such designations.
- GLNP's response confirms that the sites previously referred to no longer meet the criteria for SINC designation.
- The WG therefore confirms that these sites are not Local Wildlife Sites as referred to in part (b) of Policy 12
- It is recommended that Ingleby Clay, Community Woods, and the Breeding Ponds be put forward for consideration as LWS