

# Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Addendum Consultation Report



## Introduction

This document is an extract of all responses received to the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum Consultation, which was held between 22 August 2022 and 4 October 2022, and includes a summary of the main issues raised.

During the consultation there were 27 representations from 24 individual respondents. The table below presents all the representations received by individuals and organisations in alphabetical order.

Respondents were able to send their responses, either by email or post, to the Local Plan Team who input their comments on their behalf. The link for viewing the responses received in full is provided below:

View questionnaire responses at: [https://central-lincs.inconsult.uk/SA\\_Addendum/questionnaireVotes?qid=8479971](https://central-lincs.inconsult.uk/SA_Addendum/questionnaireVotes?qid=8479971)

Some representations had to be summarised due to their length and some also included the submission of maps, documents, or other evidence to support the comments being made. These are all stored and can be viewed in the consultation database at the above link.

Where additional files have been submitted or where comments have been summarised a link has also been provided in the final column to go direct to the full response.

The table of representations is followed by a summary of the “main” issues raised, which provides a brief and preliminary response from the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee. The Committee reserves the right to provide more comprehensive responses to any future questions from the Local Plan Inspectors as the examination proceeds. It is important to note that the summary provided does not necessarily cover every single issue that has been raised.

## Contents

Introduction .....	1
Individual Respondents .....	3
Tim Croydon.....	3
John and Judith Green .....	4
Mrs Anthea Jepson.....	7
Vincent King .....	8
Organisations.....	9
Anglian Water Services Ltd .....	9
Blankney Estates Limited .....	9
Canal and River Trust.....	11
Cemex UK Properties Limited .....	11
Environment Agency .....	14
Furrowland Holdings.....	14
Gin Property Limited.....	15
Glenthams Parish Council.....	16
Grainfield Developments Ltd .....	18
Great Limber Parish Council.....	19
Lockwood Estates .....	20
Marine Management Organisation.....	21
Natural England.....	21
North Lincolnshire Council.....	21
Sport England.....	22
The Coal Authority.....	22
Timberland Parish Council.....	23
Upper Witham, Witham First, Witham Third and North East Lindsey Internal Drainage Boards.....	23
Main Issues Raised.....	24

## Individual Respondents

Tim Croydon

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120733	WL/SC/003	Don't know	No	No	No	No	Don't know	Don't know	<p>"I wish to formally register the following observations and seek detailed answers to address vague assertions in your Central Plan.</p> <p>From previous correspondence the developer (Deer's Leap/Truelove Property &amp; Construction) have stated that planning proposals would be submitted in 2022/23. If approved they would progress to develop between 2024/28. A period of some 4 years of building.</p> <p>Section 2.1. Access to healthcare: will add a further burden to stretched resource in Nettleham Health Clinic. Is there resiliency to cope with another 116 patients (53x 2.2 persons per household).</p> <p>Sections 8.1 Air Pollution and 8.2 Noise Pollution: with a prevailing south-westerly wind, any dust and noise generated from construction activity will blow/travel towards existing housing at Cathedral View. Please explain how this will be mitigated/minimised when you [NKDC] state: 'careful design and construction methods' would be employed. What would this look like in reality? What measures will be taken to protect adjacent properties and residents? Site traffic with one entrance will add to congestion around Cathedral View together with mud being dragged from the field.</p> <p>Section 13.1 Access to Services and Facilities: please provide greater details to your statement 'where possible provide new linkages for walking, cycling between the new development and facilities outside the site.' There are no footpaths to Langworth, Dunholme or Nettleham where the only Post Office and Co-op shops exist. How will this be achieved to walk safely to and from these amenities?</p> <p>Section 13.2 Sustainable Travel Modes: There is a bus stop for a CallConnect service. The timetable is very limited and inflexible. This would encourage more traffic on the roads.</p> <p>Section 14.2 Education, Training and Learning: As at 26 Sep 22 there is a waiting list of some 16 placements at the local primary school in Scothern. The increase in houses will add to that burden. Your proposal opines: 'the new development should seek to provide improved cycle, pedestrian and bus routes to facilitate sustainable access to education.' How will this be achieved and what specific plans are in place to facilitate this assertion?</p> <p>Finally, I wish to discover whether financial commitments have been paid to the local council by Deer's Leap properties for the development at</p>		Yes	No

									Cathedral View - as I understand this is a prerequisite to help support healthcare and the local community which results from additional housing in the area. If it has not been paid then this sets a questionable precedent for further development at WL/SC/003."			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

John and Judith Green

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EIP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120753	WL/GLH/002 Land off Bishop Norton Road, Glenthams	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	<p>"[Representation summarised due to length. Please see attached for full representations.]</p> <p><b>Health and Wellbeing</b> The landowner agrees the nearest GP surgery is 3.6km and there is not one nearest GP surgery for the allocated site is also a similar distance and this site "access to health facilities" perspective compared to the allocated site.</p> <p>Furthermore, the SA Addendum states, "the site is not of a scale that is likely to provide new open space on-site". This assessment is incorrect as the landowner has undertaken masterplan work for the site, which was submitted as part of the site's representations during the two previous consultations, that clearly shows there will be a large open space area along the entire northern section of the site.</p> <p><b>Environmental – Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</b> The assessment correctly states that the site is not within 500m of a designated wildlife site; a BOM area; nor Local Green Space. Given this, the landowner considers that this should be considered a positive for the site, rather than seen as a neutral "likely effect". Masterplan work has been undertaken which clearly shows the proposed development of the site would include a wildlife area in the northern half of the site.</p> <p><b>Built and Historic Environment</b> A geophysical survey, instructed by the landowner, has concluded there are archaeological remains in the south eastern section of the field (area immediately to the north of Highfield House). Therefore, the landowner is proposing to retain and preserve these remains and this section of the land will not be developed. Furthermore, it is also noted that the site is outside but immediately adjacent the village's Conservation Area. The master-planning work completed by the landowner has given this careful consideration.</p> <p>Therefore, it is considered by the landowner that the potential impact on the built and historic environment would be minimal and the associated "likely effects" to be neutral rather than negative.</p>	"Health and Well-being: add the community benefit of the communal landscape area in the northern section of the site within the "commentary" section and the "likely effect" being positive; Environmental - Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure: add the inclusion of wildlife area in the northern section of the site together with a second wildlife area in the site's south eastern section within the "commentary" section and the "likely effects" being positive; Built and Historic Environment: amend the "likely effect" section to neutral, given the masterplan shows the area where there is known archaeological remains will remain undeveloped and the inclusion of the communal	No	<a href="#">Yes</a>

								<p><b>Pollution – Air and Noise</b> Landowner considers the impact will be neutral as any noise pollution generated during the construction phases can be dealt with by careful design and construction management methods.</p> <p><b>Natural Resources – Land Uses and Soils</b> The landowner agrees with the assessment of the natural resources relating to the site being Grade 3 agricultural land and the site not being within a Minerals Safeguarding Area. However, it is considered that the fact the land is Grade 3 should be considered a neutral or positive effect under the “likely effect” section, given it would involve developing land which is not the most fertile agricultural land for growing crops.</p> <p><b>Climate Change Adaption and Flood Risk</b> As shown on the site’s masterplan, locating the housing to the site’s south western corner means the housing is situated outside the flood zone area. This means the housing element on the site is situated in flood zone 1 and within a sequentially preferred location and meets the requirements of the CLLP and NPPF (July 2021) in terms of flood risk.</p> <p>Potential flood risk in the northern half of the site is not a constraint for the future development of the site. It is, in fact, an opportunity to help reduce potential future flooding in the village and pass the Exception Test. Therefore, it is considered that this should be included in the “commentary” section and the “likely effects” should be positive.</p> <p><b>Transport and Accessibility</b> The landowner agrees that Glenthams village does not have a designed Centre. However, it does have existing services and facilities in the village. Therefore, it is stressed that the site is considered to have good levels of sustainability and, given the site’s location immediately adjacent to the north west of the village “core”, all the services and facilities can be easily accessed by non-car modes. The landowner considers this should be included within the “commentary” section of the SA Addendum and the “likely effects” should be positive.</p> <p><b>Economic</b> The landowner agrees with the assessment in relation to employment, education, training and learning but notes this is the same as the allocated site.</p> <p><b>Local Economy</b> The landowner agrees with the assessment of local economy, but notes this is the same as the allocated site."</p>	<p>recreational area along the site's northern section will not have a significant impact on the setting of the village's Conservation Area; and Climate Change Adaption and Flood Risk: add the benefit of the northern area of the site will not be built upon and can be designed to take the opportunity to help reduce potential future flooding in the village, in the event of high rainfall and if any flooding does occur. This means the potential development of the site would pass the Exception Test as set out in paragraph 164 of the NPPF. In light of this, amend the “commentary” section with this information and the “likely effect” being positive. Transport and Accessibility: add to the “commentary” section that the site is considered to have good levels of sustainability and immediately adjacent the north west of the village’s “core” with all the services and facilities can be</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--	--

										<p>easily accessed by non-car modes. In light of this, amend the "likely effect" section to positive.</p> <p>Furthermore, the landowner also considers the site should be allocated as an additional site for potential residential allocation in Glenthams. Therefore, the landowner proposes the site is included as an allocation in the village of Glenthams and the following information for the site's allocation should be included in policy S82:-</p> <p>Site Name Land to the west of Bishop Norton Road, Glenthams</p> <p>Site Area 2.23ha</p> <p>Planning Status None</p> <p>Indicative dwellings during plan period (2018-2040) 15 dwellings</p> <p>Site Specific Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design to be low-density and in-keeping with the vernacular of the area</li> <li>• Development to be sensitive to the setting of the conservation area</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

										<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No development should occur along its eastern side to retain and preserve archaeological remains</li> <li>• No development should occur within flood zone 3 (along the northern side of the field)</li> </ul> <p>Finally, given the considerable time the landowner has spent on producing a master-plan for the site and undertaken geophysical survey work on the land shows this is not a speculative development. The landowner would like the site to be developed in the future and is very keen for any development on the site to include aspects, as outlined in this document, which will have a significant benefit to the local community."</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Mrs Anthea Jepson

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120731	NK/AUB/016	Don't know	Don't know	No	No	Don't know	Don't know	Don't know	"Being a predominately rural area, we support the inclusion of Policy S5 within the Local Plan as it promotes the protection of the countryside, whilst allowing for diversification. However, we strongly feel that this policy has not been fairly applied to the proposed sites in and around South Hykeham village. NK/AUB/006 and NK/AUB/007 have been included as reasonable alternatives despite being in the hamlet of South Hykeham, part of the green	We ask for this parcel of land to be considered as part of the SWQ SUE. We do not believe the site has been assessed fully and	No	No

									<p>wedge and close to heritage assets. Both sites are currently used for grade 3 agriculture. NK/AUB/016 has been rejected due to it being in the countryside. This site is currently surrounded by open fields but will not be in the near future. The land is immediately adjacent the south western corner of the area already identified for allocation - the land immediately to the north and west of the land is within the SWQ. The site would extend no further eastwards than the area already identified to the north and no further southwards than the current southern boundary of the identified area to the west. In addition, the North Hykeham Relief Road will be in near proximity to the site.</p>	<p>consider it to have the same merits as the western half that is included, and also the land to the north of this site. It is an ideal and an appropriate area of land to be included in the SWQ SUE. Furthermore, it is considered that housing on this land would allow the Central Lincolnshire authorities to meet housing need as part of a larger, well-planned urban extension with all the necessary supporting infrastructure, rather than by smaller developments.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Vincent King

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120714									<p>I hope this finds you, I'm sending this email regarding ALL planning in Ruskington, as you say this is already a large village and on my calculation your planning to add another 1561 new properties, which in my opinion we do not need. I live in Leasingham lane and the junction onto the B1188 is considered dangerous already as tractors and articulated lorries need to cross the central white lines to get round, and the properties on that corner are always needing their fences replaced. So please consider this as a NO from me.</p>		No	No



## Organisations

### Anglian Water Services Ltd

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120705	Anglian Water Services Ltd								<p>Anglian Water does not wish to make any substantive comments on the addendum.</p> <p>We note that water and water recycling infrastructure were not a consideration for these sites. As many are smaller sites the capacity to serve them would depend to a large degree on when the site came forward and the cumulative growth in that water and/or water recycling catchment. That cumulative growth would be a consideration in Anglian Water's five year investment programme within our 25 year Plans. We support the consideration of surface drainage and SuDS in the assessment of most sites.</p>			No

### Blankney Estates Limited

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120742	NK/SCOP/007 and NK/SCOP/008	Don't know	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>"The addendum to the SA concludes the site is not suitable because Scopwick is a small village with limited services and connectivity. The SA identified major negative effects in relation to minerals resources and access to education.</p> <p>We will address the conclusions in the SA below, but, before these issues are addressed, it is important to highlight the proposed allocation of the site in the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan for 14 dwellings under policy 13a. The allocation is proposed to meet the growth targets identified in the adopted Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Planning Group consider the allocation accords with policies in the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan is currently subject to the Examination process. The Examiner has provided initial questions and a response was provided by the Neighbourhood Planning Group. The questions did not raise any concerns about the allocations promoted in the Neighbourhood Plan. We anticipate the Examiner's report will support the allocations and the Neighbourhood Plan will move forward to the referendum, which is likely to be resolved during the Local Plan process. We note the draft Local Plan targets</p>	<p>We request the SA Addendum is amended to acknowledge the progress made with the "Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan", including the allocation of this site.</p> <p>The SA should also acknowledge the review of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, which is expected to change the approach to the assessment of</p>	Yes	No

								<p>for communities are set at levels of allocation in the Local Plan and existing commitments, leaving no leeway for the Neighbourhood Planning process, which seems to undermine the principle of Neighbourhood Planning, contrary to paragraph 66 of the NPPF.</p> <p>We note the adopted Local Plan includes allocations that have been included in “Made” Neighbourhood Plans in other settlements.</p> <p>No effort, however, has been made to reference the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan, despite it being at an advanced stage and the failure to acknowledge the proposed allocation appears inconsistent.</p> <p>With regard to the specific analysis in the Sustainability Appraisal, we have the following comments:</p> <p>“Scopwick is a small village” – We accept the Local Plan designates the settlement as a small village. The settlement hierarchy has been subject to representations, however, and may be subject to change through the Examination. A growth figure is set and the adopted Local Plan and a Neighbourhood Plan are intended to meet that target. The Neighbourhood Plan is currently undergoing Examination.</p> <p>“Scopwick has limited connectivity” – Scopwick is part of a chain of villages between Lincoln in the north and Sleaford in the south, all of which are joined by the B1188, a locally important road route in the Central Lincolnshire area. Collectively the villages provide primary and secondary schools, shops, pubs, sports clubs and a range of other services that are used by residents of all the settlements, and not just the residents of the settlement in which the facility is located. The number 31 bus route runs along the road, connecting Lincoln to Sleaford, and all the settlements along the B1188. The Sleaford to Lincoln rail line also follows the line of settlements with stations at Ruskington and Metheringham. Scopwick is, therefore, well connected for a rural community, and the services provided by the chain of communities ensure there is a reasonable range of options to support a local community.</p> <p>“Impact on Minerals resources” – the site may be included in a Minerals Safeguarding Area, but the proximity of roads and residential properties ensure it is unsuitable for any mineral working. Furthermore, the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review has also commenced, and one of the key proposals explored in the Regulation 18 consultation, is to reduce the minerals safeguarding areas and to increase the number of exemptions for undertaking Minerals Impact Assessment to acknowledge sites like this where extraction is not a meaningful proposition. This issue should be afforded little weight when considering the development potential of a proposed housing allocation.</p> <p>“Limited Access to education facilities” – in reality, although there are no schools in Scopwick the chain of communities along the B1188 include a number of primary schools at Ruskington,</p>	<p>minerals resources. The SA should also acknowledge that, due to the proximity of roads and other development, in reality, the subject site is unlikely to be ever worked for minerals.</p> <p>The SA should acknowledge the collective role the communities along the B1188 (and the rail link) play in supporting the population of all of these settlements. Collectively these communities provide shops, schools, health care, sports and leisure, pubs, community halls, etc and a connecting bus service.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

									Potterhanworth, Metheringham, Branston and Nocton. There is also a secondary school at Ruskington and another at Branston. For a rural area, there are a number of school opportunities before you consider Sleaford to the south all served by school transport provided by the local authority responsible for education."			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

### Canal and River Trust

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120713									<p>We are the charity who look after and bring to life 2000 miles of canals &amp; rivers. Our waterways contribute to the health and wellbeing of local communities and economies, creating attractive and connected places to live, work, volunteer and spend leisure time. These historic, natural, and cultural assets form part of the strategic and local green-blue infrastructure network, linking urban and rural communities as well as habitats. By caring for our waterways and promoting their use we believe we can improve the wellbeing of our nation. The Trust is a statutory consultee in the Development Management process.</p> <p>Having reviewed the documentation, the Trust has no comment to make on this consultation.</p>			No

### Cemex UK Properties Limited

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120761	NK/NHYK/003 Land off 437/439 Newark Road, North Hykeham								<p>[Representation summarised due to length. Please see attached for full representations]</p> <p>The addendum to the SA concludes the site is rejected as a potential allocation because it scores negatively against three categories.</p> <p>It is not clear how these conclusions were reached, however, as the circumstances related to the site clearly demonstrate, some of the assessments are not accurate, up to date or particularly relevant to the development in this area of the Lincoln Urban Area.</p> <p>The site has also been subject to an outline planning application (Application No.20/0657/OUT) for 120 homes, which, although</p>	We request that the SA for 20/0657/OUT is updated to:		<a href="#">Yes</a>

								<p>refused, does address the issues identified as concerns in the preparation of the Sustainability Appraisal, but appears to come to very different conclusions. The differences appear to derive from a greater knowledge of the site demonstrated through the planning application process. We have provided the Committee Report for the Planning Application to support the points we make."</p>	<p>Lake site, to assess whether all the component parts of the site fulfil the role and function of Green Wedge.</p> <p>b) Take into consideration the Ecological Survey submitted with application 20/0657/OUT which provides a more detailed and up to date assessment of the Ecological Value of the site, and the capacity to accommodate development, than the 2009 survey underpinning the designation of the Local Wildlife Site.</p> <p>c) Reflect the working of all minerals on site and to remove the importance of the Minerals Safeguarding Area, the minerals have in fact been worked out – no minerals remain to prejudice other forms of development.</p> <p>d) Show the site is not Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land.</p> <p>e) More accurately reflect the role of the A1434 as the main thoroughfare through North Hykeham and the fact the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

										<p>site is screened from noise by the established housing occupying the area between the site and the road.</p> <p>f) Acknowledge the greater proximity of the site to medical facilities and secondary schools when compared to allocations made in the Local Plan.</p> <p>We anticipate that such a review would remove most, if not all, of the negative factors included in the Sustainability Assessment, especially for a development reflecting the proposal.</p> <p>Failure to accurately reflect the facts relating to sites undermines the rigour of the local plan process, potentially leading to an “unsound” plan. Especially when many of the factors, some of which predated the local plan process by many years, and have already been drawn to attention the Local Planning Authority at early stages in the plan and through the Development</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

										Management process. We note the status of other sites has been changed in light of Development Management processes, and consistency dictates the same approach should be applied to all sites.		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Environment Agency

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120701									Thank you for consulting us on the Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal to address the identified omission to include all reasonable alternative sites. We have reviewed the content of the abovementioned document and we do not have any comments or concerns to raise.			No

Furrowland Holdings

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120754	WL/NOT/001	No							The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 provides at para 32 that "Local plans and spatial development strategies should be informed throughout their preparation by a sustainability appraisal that meets the relevant legal requirements. This should demonstrate how the plan has addressed relevant economic, social and environmental objectives (including opportunities for net gains). Significant adverse impacts on these objectives should be avoided and, wherever possible, alternative options which reduce or eliminate such impacts should be pursued. Where significant adverse impacts are unavoidable, suitable mitigation measures should be proposed (or, where this is not possible, compensatory measures should be considered)."	The SA ought to be revised to reflect the detailed SA undertaken of my clients site as part of the BREEAM communities assessment, and appraised as a reasonable alternative strategy to provide a sustainable settlement	Yes	<a href="#">Yes</a>

									<p>The SA addendum report does not appear to have been informed by the potential need to address cross boundary issues such as the clear disparity between approaches between the emerging Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP) Review and the neighbouring Bassetlaw Local in terms of spatial approach to the A57 corridor, including opportunities presented by the regeneration of the Trentside power station sites in Bassetlaw, and making good the housing deficit in Bassetlaw created by the abandonment of the Apleyhead Garden Village proposal.</p> <p>In terms of reasonable alternatives to address the above, no site in the CLLP is likely to have undergone such extensive Sustainability Appraisal (SA) as my clients site, WL/NOT/001, I attach the BREEAM communities assessment with this representation. Surely the SA should have reflected the significant background work undertaken on this site, particularly as a potential reasonable alternative to Apleyhead as an expanded settlement on the A57, especially due to the fact that my clients site is also likely to be highly accessible to the new community infrastructure provided as part of the regeneration of the Trentside Power Stations site, a proposal that has emerged since the BREEAM communities assessment of my clients site was undertaken.</p>	<p>extension on the A57 corridor, with particular reference to the need to provide an alternative to the abandoned Apleyhead Garden Village proposal in neighbouring Bassetlaw District.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

#### Gin Property Limited

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120740	WL/MIDR/008	Don't know	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>The addendum to the SA concludes incorrectly that the site is not suitable because it is detached from the main footprint of the settlement, is at risk of Surface Water Flooding, is at risk of flood risk and there is limited access to education.</p> <p>In reality, the site frontage is contained by existing development within the settlement footprint to the south and east. Development, in the form of holiday accommodation and permanent housing, also occupies land to the east and development of the proposed site would consolidate the existing development together into the main settlement. Furthermore, land to the west of the railway line is being developed out for residential development for over 300 dwellings. The developed footprint will extend to the northern boundary of the site, extending a significant distance to the west. The allocation site is no more remote from the settlement footprint than the allocated site to the west.</p> <p>Our client's land is only 900m away from the heart of the Town Centre, a lesser distance than the allocation to the other side of the railway line, which is preferred as an allocation. Our client's site will have better access to other services in the town, including De Aston High School, Tesco's and the Railway Station, than sites</p>	<p>We request the SA Addendum is amended to reflect the ongoing development happening on allocations to the west, which will serve to reinforce the relationship of the proposed site to the footprint of the settlement.</p> <p>Similarly, the analysis regarding Flood Risk and Surface Water Flooding should be updated to reflect the small part of the area actually at</p>	Yes	No

									<p>allocated in the adopted local plan and proposed for allocation in the current draft.</p> <p>The area affected by Flood Zones 2 and 3 is the northern corner of the site, a smaller proportion of the site than is similarly affected on the allocated land to the west of the railway line. The area of the site at risk from Surface Water flooding is also restricted to the top west corner and represents a smaller proportion of the site than is affected by surface water flooding on the allocated site to the west of the railway line.</p> <p>The SA should reflect a more accurate representation of the site than it does currently, and the negative attributes should be removed from the entry. The site assessment is more positive than for some allocated sites.</p>	<p>risk of flooding. The area at risk of flooding could be excluded from a potential allocation with a minimal impact on the development capacity of the site, or, alternatively, the design of the site could integrate the areas at risk as part of a wider drainage and flood risk management strategy. In either case, flood risk will not prejudice the development of most of the proposed site.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

#### Glentham Parish Council

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EIP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120718	WL/GLH/006	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Glentham Parish Council does not wish this site to be included as a reasonable alternative due to its size which would radically change the character of the village. It is a greenfield site.</p> <p>The nearest primary school is located in Normanby by Spital which is 3.05 miles away not 2500m as stated in the document and is at capacity. There is no bus service from Glentham to Normanby and it is inadvisable for children to walk on narrow country lanes with no walkway.</p> <p>Likewise the nearest secondary school at Kirton in Lindsey does not have a scheduled bus service.</p> <p>The GP surgery in Waddingham referred to in the document was an outreach surgery operated by Hibaldstow surgery but has been closed for some time. The nearest GP surgery is in fact Kirton Lindsey or Ingham. For which neither has a scheduled bus service. There is a bus stop in the village but there is only one scheduled bus service which operates once a week on Wednesdays arriving in Lincoln at 10.30am and departing at 1.30pm.</p> <p>5% of the site is within Flood zone 3.</p>		No	No
1120724	WL/GLH/001	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Glentham Parish Council does not wish this site to be included as a reasonable alternative due to its size which would radically change the character of the village. It is a greenfield site.</p>		No	No



									<p>The nearest primary school is located in Normanby by Spital which is 3.05 miles away not 2500m as stated in the document and is at capacity. There is no bus service from Glentham to Normanby and it is inadvisable for children to walk on narrow country lanes with no walkway.</p> <p>Likewise the nearest secondary school at Kirton in Lindsey does not have a scheduled bus service.</p> <p>The GP surgery in Waddingham referred to in the document was an outreach surgery operated by Hibaldstow surgery but has been closed for some time. The nearest GP surgery is in fact Kirton Lindsey or Ingham. For which neither has a scheduled bus service. There is a bus stop in the village but there is only one scheduled bus service which operates once a week on Wednesdays arriving in Lincoln at 10.30am and departing at 1.30pm.</p>			
1120726	WL/GLH/005	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Glentham Parish Council does not wish this site to be included as a reasonable alternative due to its size which would radically change the character of the village. It is a greenfield site.</p> <p>The nearest primary school is located in Normanby by Spital which is 3.05 miles away not 2500m as stated in the document and is at capacity. There is no bus service from Glentham to Normanby and it is inadvisable for children to walk on narrow country lanes with no walkway.</p> <p>Likewise the nearest secondary school at Kirton in Lindsey does not have a scheduled bus service.</p> <p>The GP surgery in Waddingham referred to in the document was an outreach surgery operated by Hibaldstow surgery but has been closed for some time. The nearest GP surgery is in fact Kirton Lindsey or Ingham. For which neither has a scheduled bus service. There is a bus stop in the village but there is only one scheduled bus service which operates once a week on Wednesdays arriving in Lincoln at 10.30am and departing at 1.30pm</p> <p>Access to the site to and from the A631 would cause a serious traffic hazard</p> <p>20% of the site is within Flood Zone 3.</p>		No	No
1120728	WL/GLH/007	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Glentham Parish Council does not wish this site to be included as a reasonable alternative due to its size which would radically change the character of the village. It is a greenfield site.</p> <p>The nearest primary school is located in Normanby by Spital which is 3.05 miles away not 2500m as stated in the document and is at capacity. There is no bus service from Glentham to Normanby and it is inadvisable for children to walk on narrow country lanes with no walkway.</p> <p>Likewise the nearest secondary school at Kirton in Lindsey does not have a scheduled bus service.</p> <p>The GP surgery in Waddingham referred to in the document was an outreach surgery operated by Hibaldstow surgery but has been closed for some time. The nearest GP surgery is in fact Kirton Lindsey or Ingham. For which neither has a scheduled bus service. There is a bus stop in the village but there is only one scheduled bus service which operates once a week on Wednesdays arriving in Lincoln at 10.30am and departing at 1.30pm.</p>		No	No
1120730	WL/GLH/002	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Glentham Parish Council does not wish this site to be included as a reasonable alternative due to its size which would radically change the character of the village. It is a greenfield site.</p>		No	No

									<p>The nearest primary school is located in Normanby by Spital which is 3.05 miles away not 2500m as stated in the document and is at capacity. There is no bus service from Glenham to Normanby and it is inadvisable for children to walk on narrow country lanes with no walkway.</p> <p>Likewise the nearest secondary school at Kirton in Lindsey does not have a scheduled bus service.</p> <p>The GP surgery in Waddingham referred to in the document was an outreach surgery operated by Hibaldstow surgery but has been closed for some time. The nearest GP surgery is in fact Kirton Lindsey or Ingham. For which neither has a scheduled bus service. There is a bus stop in the village but there is only one scheduled bus service which operates once a week on Wednesdays arriving in Lincoln at 10.30am and departing at 1.30pm.</p> <p>This site also has the potential for adverse impact on listed buildings and the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Also 50% of the site is in Flood Zone 3.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

#### Grainfield Developments Ltd

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120745	NK/DIG/001 - Land North of Station Road, Digby	Don't know	No	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Support is given to Allocation NK/DIG/001 - Land North of Station Road, Digby.</p> <p>The addendum, however, is not entirely accurate in its statements regarding the site.</p> <p>Part of the site has been built out for 17 dwellings under consent 19/1607/FUL.</p> <p>The remaining land has an indicative capacity for 30 dwellings, using the assumptions adopted by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>The developer is keen to promote development of the rest of the land and has received Pre-Application Advice subsequent to the inclusion of the land as an allocation in the draft Local Plan. The advice recommended delaying submission of an application until the adoption of the Local Plan, so no application has, as yet, been submitted. The statement in the SA that planning application has been submitted for the wider allocation is, therefore, incorrect.</p> <p>The landowner has had informal discussions with the local community and is now considering bringing forward a new application as part of the strategy to deliver the whole proposed allocation site.</p>	<p>We request the SA Addendum is amended to reflect the current planning history and the remaining capacity of the site. The proposal map should also be amended to exclude the completed phase of development.</p> <p>We request the wording of Policy S81 is updated to reflect the remaining expected capacity of the site. The site-specific requirements section should also be updated to acknowledge the</p>	Yes	No

									<p>We note the policy requirements set out in the draft local plan regarding drainage, pedestrian access and the diversion of the power lines. These have already been met by the approved and implemented development and as such are now superfluous.</p> <p>We request the assessment, and the policy wording are updated to reflect the capacity of the allocation, and the current planning application status.</p>	<p>measures already undertaken by the existing development to address concerns regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surface Water flooding and drainage</li> <li>• On site electricity cables</li> <li>• Off site pedestrian footway improvements.</li> </ul> <p>These have already been met as part of the development of 17 dwellings and no longer need to be included in the Local Plan.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

#### Great Limber Parish Council

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120716	WL/GLIM/002	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Great Limber Parish Council supports the inclusion of this site in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan on the grounds that the village needs growth to remain sustainable. There are no other sites that have been put forward that council is aware of in order to achieve the housing quota of 19 by 2036.</p> <p>If the site is included in the revised plan the parish council intends to include the site in its revised Neighbourhood Plan which is under review at the present time.</p>		No	No

Lockwood Estates

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120736	WL/ING/005	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	<p>Lockwood Estates welcomes the inclusion of site WL/ING/005 in the appraisal of reasonable alternatives, however there are two key areas where the assessment is not justified. These will be detailed below under headings relating to the assessment criteria.</p> <p>9.1 Agricultural Land - The site is greenfield located in Grade 3 Agricultural land.</p> <p>The following representations were made in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal at Regulation 19 consultation stage:</p> <p>“Following correspondence between my client and Juliette Thomas-Cousins of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team, clarifying the specific conditions of the site as a former sheep wash and low quality pasture, it was understood that the site’s classification was changed to Grade 5 (very poor quality). This was further confirmed in the attached email from Charlotte Robinson dated 19/10/20 and an updated version of the HELAA was published online in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Planning Policy Library with the updated classification. However, the HELAA published in the Local Plan consultation still records the site as Grade 3. Again, this may have influenced the assessment of the site and we would request that it is corrected and reviewed”.</p> <p>These representations do not appear to have been taken into account and the assessment still identifies the site as Grade 3 Agricultural land. This should be changed to Grade 5.</p> <p>2.2 Opportunities for healthy lifestyles - The site is not of a scale that is likely to provide new open space on-site. Lockwood Estates submitted Proposed Sketch Layout J2015 SK10 in support of representations made in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal at Regulation 19 consultation stage. This shows that a large area of the site would be given over to a community garden including a wildlife pond. Therefore it is incorrect to say that it is unlikely new open space would be provided on site and this should be corrected.</p>	As above, the site should be changed to Grade 5 agricultural land and it should be noted that open space would be provided on site.	Yes	No

## Marine Management Organisation

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EIP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120706									<p>No further comment is required from the MMO regarding the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum, as there is no comment required from us at this stage of the plan development.</p> <p>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, including the tidal extent of any rivers. We recommend the inclusion of the East Marine Plans when discussing any themes with coastal or marine elements.</p> <p>When reviewing the East Marine Plans to inform decisions that may affect the marine environment, please take a whole-plan approach by considering all marine plan policies together, rather than in isolation.</p>			<a href="#">Yes</a>

## Natural England

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EIP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120698									<p>Thank you for consulting Natural England on the addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. I can confirm that we do not wish to make any representations to this consultation.</p>			No

## North Lincolnshire Council

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EIP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120699									<p>We have no comment to make on the updates to the plan documentation.</p>			No

## Ryland Design Services Ltd

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120732	WL/CW/005								<p>Just to let you know, site WL/CW/005 is still available for development for both small- and large-scale development.</p> <p>The applicant is looking to apply for a small group of house on the site.</p> <p>The site is just an overgrown area of land not used for any other purchase.</p>			No

## Sport England

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120711									Thank you for consulting Sport England on an addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal for the Local Plan. I can confirm that we have no comments to make on this addendum			No

## The Coal Authority

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120702									Further to your email below, I can confirm that the Coal Authority has no specific comments or observations to make on your Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal.			No

Timberland Parish Council

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120696	NK/TIM/001 NK/TIM/002 NK/TIM/003 NK/TIM/004 NK/TIM/005 NK/TIM/007 NK/TIM/008								<p>With regard to the Sustainability Appraisal, this would appear to be academic in the case of this parish, as the allocation of any of the seven sites has been deemed inappropriate. Nevertheless, as the Addendum will form part of the Local Plan, we ask that the following comments stand alongside the appraisals of the seven Timberland sites.</p> <p>1. Each appraisal is made on a site by site basis: were two or more sites to be considered for development, the impact of each factor on local community could be considerably different. We would stress the need to take a holistic view.</p> <p>2. Under Transport and Accessibility the specific distance to the nearest bus stop is given for each site. There is no mention of the number of buses which stop there, and in fact there is no regular bus service to Timberland. Without a plan to improve the public transport network, we cannot see how any site could meet this sustainability criteria.</p> <p>3. The mitigation proposed in respect of travel modes is: "New development should seek to maximise use of suitable modes of transport and reduce reliance on private vehicles." Without specific proposals for mitigation, we find this a meaningless statement. At present Timberland has one hospitality facility and no retail outlet; the development of any site will only increase private car use.</p>			No

Upper Witham, Witham First, Witham Third and North East Lindsey Internal Drainage Boards

Rep ID	Comment on	Q2. Legal Compliance		Q3. Tests of Soundness					Q4. Please give details	Q5. What change(s) do you consider are necessary	Q6. Take part in the EiP?	Additional files
		Local Plan	SA	Positively Prepared	Justified	Effective	Consistent with national policy	Complies with Duty to Co-Operate				
1120704									<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above consultation. In general, the four Boards administered from this office support the policies which relate to Flood Risk and Drainage. Through the planning process the individual Boards will continue to comment on the individual planning applications, as and when they are submitted.</p>			No

## Main Issues Raised

Issue	Response
<p>Misunderstanding that the sites in the SA Addendum for a particular settlement will be allocated in the Local Plan for housing  (Rep ID 1120714 and 1120716).</p>	<p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a tool to help assess the potential social, economic and environmental impacts of the Local Plan. It is a requirement of preparing a Local Plan. As part of the SA process, the Committee must include a consideration of the choices (the alternatives) for meeting the objectives of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The sites included in the SA Addendum (EX005) are the reasonable alternatives for housing sites in medium and small villages. These sites were put forward for consideration during various rounds of public consultation on the Local Plan. These sites are not the Committee's preferred site allocations for housing and therefore have not been taken forward and allocated in the Local Plan.</p>
<p>NK/TIM/001, NK/TIM/002, NK/TIM/003, NK/TIM/004, NK/TIM/005, NK/TIM/007, NK/TIM/008</p> <p>Concern cumulative impacts of development have not been considered.</p> <p>Concern SA doesn't acknowledge number of buses that stop at bus stops, and mitigation is meaningless without specific proposals.</p>	<p>The SA Addendum did not consider the cumulative impact of these sites as they are reasonable alternative sites, and not preferred sites selected to be allocated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Where the SA identifies negative effects, it makes possible suggestions for how such effects could potentially be prevented, reduced or offset. These are the mitigation measures and are a requirement of the regulations under which the Local Plan is prepared. Mitigation can take a wide range of forms but for this particular objective, the SA was identifying an issue to be addressed at the project level, i.e. at planning application stage, should development come forward on these sites.</p>
<p>NK/SCOP/007 and NK/SCOP/008</p> <p>The SA should acknowledge the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan, including the allocation of this site.</p> <p>SA not taken into account the landowner's proposals for the site, i.e. additional work such as a masterplan, survey work etc.</p>	<p>NK/SCOP/007 and NK/SCOP/008 were subject to appraisal in the SA Addendum (EX005).</p> <p>The SA includes an assessment of all sites submitted consistently against the sustainability objectives and does not take into account other plans which have undertaken their own assessment. Consideration of position within neighbourhood plans was included in the</p>



	<p>more general site allocations work and sites for 10 or more dwellings allocated in 'made' neighbourhood plans have been included as proposed allocations in the submitted Local Plan.</p> <p>All sites were assessed against the same SA Framework (STA004.1ei) using the same methodology. There has been no deviation from the assessment criteria to take into account supplementary information, such as ecological assessments or masterplans.</p> <p>This was to ensure fairness and consistency across all sites, so that each site was assessed on the same basis and to the same level of detail.</p> <p>Information submitted in support of sites was considered as part of the wider site allocations process and not within the SA.</p>
<p>WL/GLH/001, WL/GLH/002, WL/GLH/005, WL/GLH/006, WL/GLH/007</p> <p>The Parish Council disagree that the above sites are reasonable alternatives due to their size which would radically change the character of the village.</p>	<p>WL/GLH/001, WL/GLH/002, WL/GLH/005, WL/GLH/006, WL/GLH/007 were subject to appraisal in the SA Addendum (EX005).</p> <p>Appendix 7.2 (EX006) sets out the criteria used to determine those sites sifted out of the site allocation process and therefore which were not considered to be reasonable alternatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Policy – The site would be in conflict with national planning policy (for example, Flood Zone 3)</li> <li>• Threshold - The site has capacity for less than 10 dwellings</li> <li>• Location - The site: is not within or adjacent the built-up area of settlements identified in the settlement hierarchy as being identified for allocations, or, has the potential to harm the character of the open countryside</li> </ul> <p>The above sites did not meet the criteria and so were progressed to the appraisal stage and considered to be reasonable alternatives.</p>
<p>WL/GLH/002</p>	<p>WL/GLH/002 was subject to appraisal in the SA Addendum (EX005).</p>

<p>Respondent disagrees with a number of the effects identified and makes suggestions for alternatives scores.</p> <p>SA not taken into account the landowner's proposals for the site, i.e. additional work such as a masterplan, survey work etc.</p> <p>The site should be allocated as an additional site for residential allocation in Glentham.</p>	<p>All sites were assessed against the same SA Framework (STA004.1ei) using the same methodology. There has been no deviation from the assessment criteria to take into account supplementary information, such as ecological assessments or masterplans.</p> <p>This was to ensure fairness and consistency across all sites, so that each site was assessed on the same basis and to the same level of detail.</p> <p>Information submitted in support of sites was considered as part of the wider site allocations process and not within the SA.</p>
<p>WL/ING/005 – Welcome inclusion in SA.</p> <p>Respondent disagrees the effects identified against two of the SA objectives (9.1 Agricultural Land and 2.2 Opportunities for healthy lifestyles).</p> <p>SA not taken into account the landowner's proposals for the site, i.e. additional work such as a masterplan, survey work etc.</p>	<p>WL/ING/005 was subject to appraisal in the SA Addendum (EX005).</p> <p>The SA used GIS mapping to assess the sites. The data used aligned with the Site Assessment Criteria. For objective 9.1, all of the sites were assessed in relation to Natural England's Agricultural Land Classification data (see SA Framework). According to this Natural England GIS layer, this site is shown in Grade 3.</p> <p>All sites were assessed against the same SA Framework (STA004.1ei) using the same methodology. There has been no deviation from the assessment criteria to take into account supplementary information, such as ecological assessments or masterplans.</p> <p>This was to ensure fairness and consistency across all sites, so that each site was assessed on the same basis and to the same level of detail.</p> <p>Information submitted in support of sites was considered as part of the wider site allocations process and not within the SA.</p>
<p>WL/NOT/001</p> <p>SA not taken into account cross boundary issues between Central Lincolnshire and Bassetlaw in terms of spatial approach to the A57 corridor, including opportunities presented by the regeneration of the Trentside power station sites in Bassetlaw,</p>	<p>Site WL/NOT/001 was subject to appraisal in the SA Addendum (EX005).</p> <p>This latest consultation was focused on an addendum to the SA and included an update to Appendix 7 to reflect those sites in small and medium villages which were subject to SA. The Local Plan policies and supporting evidence, including the Final SA</p>

<p>and making good the housing deficit in Bassetlaw.</p> <p>SA not taken into account the landowner's proposals for the site, i.e. additional work such as a masterplan, survey work etc.</p>	<p>Report and Appendices (March 2022) were not subject to further consultation.</p> <p>All sites were assessed against the same SA Framework (STA004.1ei) using the same methodology. There has been no deviation from the assessment criteria to take into account supplementary information, such as ecological assessments or masterplans.</p> <p>This was to ensure fairness and consistency across all sites, so that each site was assessed on the same basis and to the same level of detail.</p> <p>Information submitted in support of sites was considered as part of the wider site allocations process and not within the SA.</p>
<p>WL/CW/005</p> <p>Site is still available for development for both small- and large-scale development.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This latest consultation was focused on an addendum to the SA and included an update to Appendix 7 to reflect those sites in small and medium villages which were subject to SA. The Local Plan policies and supporting evidence, including the Final SA Report and Appendices (March 2022) were not subject to further consultation.</p> <p>The SA Addendum Consultation consisted of two documents. An appraisal of alternative residential sites in medium and small villages (EX005) and an updated version of Appendix 7 to the Main SA Report (EX006).</p> <p>WL/CW/005 was not subject to appraisal in Ex005 as it had already been SA'd in the Final SA Report Appendices (March 2022) (STA004.1hiii).</p> <p>The information presented in Appendix 7 has not changed for this site between the March 2022 and August 2022 versions.</p>
<p>WL/MIDR/008</p> <p>Disagree with the conclusions in Appendix 7.3 under final column 'Brief Justification'</p>	<p>The SA Addendum Consultation consisted of two documents. An appraisal of alternative residential sites in medium and small villages (EX005) and an updated version of Appendix 7 to the Main SA Report (EX006).</p>

	<p>WL/MIDR/008 was not subject to appraisal in EX005 as it had already been SA'd in the Final SA Report Appendices (March 2022) (STA004.1hiii).</p> <p>The information presented in Appendix 7.3 has not changed for this site between the March 2022 and August 2022 versions.</p> <p>No concerns have been raised by the respondent in relation to the SA during the Reg 19 consultation.</p>
<p>WL/SC/003</p> <p>Comments and concerns raised regarding the appraisal of the site and proposed mitigation measures.</p>	<p>This latest consultation was focused on an addendum to the SA and included an update to Appendix 7 to reflect those sites in small and medium villages which were subject to SA. The Local Plan policies and supporting evidence, including the Final SA Report and Appendices (March 2022) were not subject to further consultation.</p> <p>The SA Addendum Consultation consisted of two documents. An appraisal of alternative residential sites in medium and small villages (EX005) and an updated version of Appendix 7 to the Main SA Report (EX006).</p> <p>WL/SC/003 was not subject to appraisal in EX005 as it had already been SA'd in the Final SA Report Appendices (March 2022) (STA004.1hiii).</p> <p>The information presented in Appendix 7 has not changed for this site between the March 2022 and August 2022 versions.</p> <p>No concerns have been raised by the respondent in relation to the SA during the Reg 19 consultation.</p>
<p>NK/AUB/016</p> <p>Policy S5 has not been fairly applied to the proposed sites in and around South Hykeham village.</p> <p>NK/AUB/016 has been rejected due to it being in the countryside but will not be in the near future. Land immediately to the north and west is within the SWQ SUE. North Hykeham Relief Road will be in near proximity to the site.</p>	<p>This latest consultation was focused on an addendum to the SA and included an update to Appendix 7 to reflect those sites in small and medium villages which were subject to SA. The Local Plan policies and supporting evidence, including the Final SA Report and Appendices (March 2022) were not subject to further consultation.</p> <p>The SA Addendum Consultation consisted of two documents. An appraisal of alternative residential sites in medium and</p>

<p>We ask for this parcel of land to be considered as part of the SWQ SUE.</p>	<p>small villages (EX005) and an updated version of Appendix 7 to the Main SA Report (EX006).</p> <p>NK/AUB/016 was not subject to appraisal in EX005, nor in the Final SA Report Appendices (March 2022) as it is located in the countryside and therefore was not considered to be a reasonable alternative site for residential.</p> <p>The information presented in Appendix 7 has not changed for this site between the March 2022 and August 2022 versions.</p>
<p>NK/DIG/001</p> <p>Support allocation of site.</p> <p>Appendix 7, Policy S81 and Policies Map inaccurate with regards to planning history and capacity of the site.</p>	<p>This latest consultation was focused on an addendum to the SA and included an update to Appendix 7 to reflect those sites in small and medium villages which were subject to SA. The Local Plan policies and supporting evidence, including the Final SA Report and Appendices (March 2022) were not subject to further consultation.</p> <p>The SA Addendum Consultation consisted of two documents. An appraisal of alternative residential sites in medium and small villages (EX005) and an updated version of Appendix 7 to the Main SA Report (EX006).</p> <p>NK/DIG/001 was not subject to appraisal in EX005 as it had already been SA'd in the Final SA Report Appendices (March 2022) (STA004.1hii).</p> <p>The information presented in Appendix 7 has not changed for this site between the March 2022 and August 2022 versions.</p> <p>No representations were made by the respondent in relation to the Local Plan nor the SA during the Reg 19 consultation.</p> <p>The Policies Map does not form part of this consultation. A number of allocations include sites where part of the site has been developed and as such this is not a unique case. In these cases, the allocation covers the entire site to reflect that it is a singular site with common characteristics across it. The policies containing site allocations will be updated to take account of the latest monitoring at 31 March 2022.</p>

<p>NK/NHYK/003</p> <p>Disagree with the conclusions in Appendix 7.3 under final column 'Brief Justification'</p> <p>SA not taken into account the landowner's proposals for the site, i.e. additional work such as a masterplan, survey work etc.</p>	<p>This latest consultation was focused on an addendum to the SA and included an update to Appendix 7 to reflect those sites in small and medium villages which were subject to SA. The Local Plan policies and supporting evidence, including the Final SA Report and Appendices (March 2022) were not subject to further consultation.</p> <p>The SA Addendum Consultation consisted of two documents. An appraisal of alternative residential sites in medium and small villages (EX005) and an updated version of Appendix 7 to the Main SA Report (EX006).</p> <p>NK/NHYK/003 was not subject to appraisal in EX005 as it had already been SA'd in the Final SA Report Appendices (March 2022) (STA004.1hii).</p> <p>The information presented in Appendix 7 has not changed for this site between the March 2022 and August 2022 versions.</p> <p>No representations were made by the respondent in relation to the Local Plan nor the SA during the Reg 19 consultation.</p>
---	---