



Further Draft Consultation: Report on Key Issues Raised

January 2016

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Summary of key issues raised during the Further Draft consultation.....	2

Further Draft Consultation: Report on Key Issues Raised

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Consultation on the Further Draft version of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan took place between 15 October and 25 November 2015. The timeframe for the production and adoption of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan is as follows:

First Draft of Local Plan for consultation (the October 2014 'Preliminary Draft Local Plan')	October 2014	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Second Draft of Local Plan for consultation (the October 2015 'Further Draft Local Plan')	October 2015	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Final Draft Local Plan for consultation (the April 2016 'Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan')	April 2016	
Examination of Local Plan	June – November 2016	
Adoption of Local Plan	December 2016	

- 1.2 The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team wishes to thank all those who took the time to comment during the consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan.
- 1.3 All responses received during the consultation period have been read and will be given due consideration as we prepare the next, and final, draft of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.
- 1.4 This report identifies the key issues raised during the October - November 2015 consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan. All comments received during the consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan, including those submitted via post or email, are available to view in full on Objective (our online consultation portal): <http://central-lincs.objective.co.uk/portal/>. All of the comments received in relation to the earlier Preliminary Draft Local Plan are also available on Objective.
- 1.5 A Key Issues Report similar to this one was produced following the 2014 consultation on the Preliminary Draft version Local Plan: this report is available here: <http://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/central-lincolnshire/planning-policy-library/126952.article> (see document LP01A).
- 1.6 The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Team's response to each of the key issues highlighted is not included in this report: all issues raised are still being carefully considered together with other relevant considerations, such as changes to national planning policy. In due course we will publish an Evidence Report for each of the Final Draft 'Proposed Submission' Local Plan policies, which will be available on our website. These Evidence Reports will include detailed commentary on how we have considered your representations in finalising the proposed Local Plan.

2. Summary of key issues raised during the Further Draft consultation

Note: all references to section, paragraph and policy numbers are to those in the Further Draft (October 2015) version of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

Foreword and General Comments Made
Summary of issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various general comments, support and objections made against the Foreword and the Local Plan, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plan is well presented; • collaborative working of City of Lincoln, North Kesteven and West Lindsey District Councils commended by some, whilst others feel that the individual authorities should prepare their own, separate Local Plans; • support for the draft policies at a strategic level, but consider that making certain changes would support sustainable growth and the overarching objectives of the Local Plan; • there are many contradictions in the Plan which need to be addressed; • many serious concerns that the proposed level of growth will not be met by sufficient infrastructure improvements; • the proposed numbers of houses in the period will make it nearly impossible to achieve anything approximating to sustainability; • comments made previously during the Preliminary Draft consultation have not been taken into account; • suggestions that some of the current West Lindsey Local Plan policies should be included in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan; • there is not a section on monitoring, which is expected for the Local Plan to be considered sound at Examination; • concern that the importance of Lincoln University is not afforded sufficient weight in the draft Local Plan policies: a supportive framework requires more than an endorsement of the University's plans for growth in principle; • Comments regarding the policies map: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ objection to the omission of Local Sites, which include Local Wildlife Sites, Local Geological Sites, Sites of Nature Conservation Interest and Regionally Important Geological Sites. Local Sites are non-statutory designated sites which have no statutory protection: the only form of protection that they have is through the planning system and it is therefore vital that Local Sites are included so that the locations of such sites is clear to planning officers and developers.

Chapter 1: The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan
Summary of issues raised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various general comments, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lack of thought given to the elderly and disabled; ○ Much of the Further Draft remains aspirational in content; ○ Reduction in housing growth figure from potentially 47,500 to 36,960 is welcomed, but this figure is still significantly above that which the majority of local people consider realistic, achievable or necessary; ○ Concerned that the Local Plan does not contain any specific provision for places of worship; ○ The Local Plan is insufficient in detail with regard to attracting employment opportunities and providing suitable infrastructure and amenities.

Chapter 2 - Our Vision: A prosperous, stronger and sustainable Central Lincolnshire

Summary of issues raised

- General support for this Chapter, though mixed views on the housing growth figure of 36,960 and comments on the detailed wording.
- Comments on 36,960 housing figure include that this should be a minimum level, and that this number is too high
- Support for the 'positive growth ambition'.
- Comment that the important role of the minerals industry should be given greater prominence.
- Concern that by concentrating jobs in the three main towns rather than spread across the county the need for residents to travel by car is increased.
- Opinion that the vision lacks ambition in relation to cutting carbon emissions and combatting climate change.
- Support for principle that villages should not be left behind and an appropriate amount of residential development should be permitted in villages: it is suggested that the vision should be amended to reflect this principle.

Chapter 3: A Growing Central Lincolnshire

Summary of issues raised

- Various general comments made in relation to Chapter 3, including:
 - Logical chapter;
 - The Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership has almost completed a study into Nature Tourism and its contribution to the Great Lincolnshire economy which shows that £58 million can be attributed to this segment of tourism activities: recommended that reference to this is added to the Local Plan.
 - Projection of business opportunities may be wildly optimistic in current austere climate.
 - Concern over impact of population increase on NHS.
 - The Local Plan recognition of the key issues of flood risk and water supply, as well as the wider array of water services and associated blue infrastructure is welcomed.
 - Recommendation that paragraph 3.4.6 is amended to align with the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of flood risk Sequential Test.
 - Water recourses are a potential constraint to the development of the Food Enterprise Zone.

Policy LP1: A Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Summary of issues raised

- Generally speaking, most representations on this policy were supportive.
- Sustainability needs defining clearer.
- Growth needs infrastructure, and infrastructure needs to come first.
- Concern we can't afford infrastructure.
- Policy will need sensitive interpretation in the future.
- What does 'material considerations' mean?
- Don't support sustainable development if this links Navenby with Lincoln.
- The policy is a political statement, not a strategic planning policy.
- Support the policy, but the policy is not followed through for all other policies.



Policy LP2: The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments supporting the settlement hierarchy and elements of the policy, including:
 - Focusing growth in larger, more sustainable settlements;
 - Limiting growth in smaller settlements but delivering some appropriate growth.
- Various comments objecting to the policy on the grounds of:
 - Not as well-informed or detailed as the previous Sustainable Futures Work;
 - Too much focus in large settlements;
 - Does not take account of how settlements function / relationships;
 - Too inflexible and restricts growth / opportunities;
 - Too flexible and removes control;
 - Does not detail how infrastructure will be delivered to accompany growth;
 - New village/s needed with infrastructure properly planned;
 - Village curtilages should be defined;
 - Does not protect the countryside;
 - Sites should be allocated farther down the hierarchy.
- Various comments on the clarity of the policy and what it means for some settlements.
- Concern that the policy is not in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.
- Comments supporting the position and/or amount of growth at the following settlements:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bardney ○ Bassingham ○ Billinghay ○ Blyton ○ Branston ○ Caistor ○ Carlton Le Moorland ○ Cherry Willingham ○ Coleby ○ Cranwell ○ Digby ○ Dunholme ○ Fiskerton ○ Hemswell Cliff ○ Gainsborough ○ Grayingham ○ Lea ○ Leasingham 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Lincoln ○ Market Rasen ○ Marton ○ Metheringham ○ Navenby ○ Nettleham ○ North Hykeham ○ Potterhanworth ○ Ruskington ○ Saxilby ○ Scothern ○ Scotter ○ Skellingthorpe ○ Sleaford ○ Thurlby ○ Waddington ○ Waddington Low Fields ○ Welbourn
---	--
- Comments objecting to the position and/or amount of growth at the following settlements:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Aubourn ○ Bardney ○ Bassingham ○ Brookenby ○ Burton Waters ○ Canwick ○ Cherry Willingham ○ Coleby 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Market Rasen ○ Martin ○ Middle Rasen ○ Navenby ○ Nettleham ○ Potterhanwoth Booths ○ Riseholme ○ Scothern
--	---



- | | |
|----------------|----------------------|
| ○ Corringham | ○ Scotter |
| ○ Dunholme | ○ Sleaford |
| ○ Eagle | ○ Sturton By Stow |
| ○ Fiskerton | ○ Sudbrooke |
| ○ Gainsborough | ○ Swinderby |
| ○ Heckington | ○ Thorpe on the Hill |
| ○ Langworth | ○ Torksey |
| ○ Leadenham | ○ Waddington |
| ○ Lincoln | ○ Welton |
| ○ Linwood | |

Policy LP3: Level and Distribution of Growth

Summary of issues raised

Level of growth:

- Large number of representations on this part of the policy, with most commenting on the growth target, of which broadly half think the target should be lower, and half think it should be higher.
- Some support for the actual proposed target set out in the plan (1,540pa), though some suggest this should be regarded as a 'minimum'.
- Growth (36,960 homes) should be lower: it is over optimistic, lacks evidence, lacks local evidence, relies on exaggerated employment growth forecasts, is unsustainable, is not supported by infrastructure.
- The evidence given in the SHMA does not appear cohesive or well justified in concluding that the housing needs for the Central Lincolnshire plan area should be 60% above the DCLG 2012 projections.
- Forecasting is too prone to error – leading to too high a growth target
- Assuming we will deliver double the rate of recent house building is unrealistic
- To deliver 36,960 new homes into an area of low employment is 'very stupid'.
- Housing target should be aspirational (higher)
- Housing target should be top of identified range – 1,780pa or 42,710 across plan period (to reflect the high growth economic scenario)
- Housing target reduced from previous plan target of 42,800 – object.
- The negative aspects of a higher growth rate are not outweighed by the positive benefits.
- Forecasts upon which numbers are based will be out of date by 2017 – update now
- Duty to Cooperate has not been fully explored – CL might need to take growth from its neighbours.
- Housing target should be based on the principle of reducing the housing waiting list – not forecasts

Distribution of growth:

- Many comments supporting the broad distribution of growth
- Concern that 12% (4,435) is not deliverable / desirable at Gainsborough. Should be lower (eg 10%)
- Gainsborough / North West Lindsey should have more growth
- Lincoln area should grow greater than pro-rata
- Not clear if villages within the Lincoln Area count towards the 64%
- Lincoln Strategy Area too large – it shouldn't include Navenby / Leadenham
- 12% to 'elsewhere' (rural areas) too low. Should be higher (eg 16% or 20%)
- Sleaford should be lower – eg 10%

- Sleaford should be higher – eg 20%
- Growth should be more dispersed / less reliance on SUEs
- General concerns about too much growth in rural areas

Other issues:

- Growth needs phasing across plan period
- Infrastructure is needed if growth is to happen
- LP3 should set the employment target – too vague at present
- Objection to the housing supply paper / 5 year land supply report

Policy LP4 and Appendix B: Growth Levels in Villages

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments supporting the policy or specific parts of the policy, including:
 - The sequential approach for site selection including brownfield first;
 - Limiting the growth in villages to ensure they remain ‘villages’;
 - Potential to exceed growth levels with local community support.
- Various comments objecting to the policy or specific parts of the policy, including:
 - Policy too inflexible and does not allow for local circumstances;
 - Policy too flexible and will not allow control/management of development;
 - Village curtilages should be retained to retain character and avoid sprawl;
 - No clarity of the delivery of infrastructure to support growth;
 - No breakdown of housing types needed to ensure a mix is delivered;
 - No consideration over relationship between settlements;
 - Growth level should be a minimum;
 - The sequential approach will stifle sustainable development;
 - Community support is desirable but should not be the deciding factor;
 - Does not account for recent growth in villages;
 - Should give protection to Large Villages too.
- Support given for growth level in the following villages:

○ Coleby	○ Harmston
○ Cranwell	○ Hemswell Cliff
○ Bassingham	○ Leasingham
○ Corringham	○ Riseholme
○ Fiskerton	○ South Kyme
○ Grayingham	○ Willoughton
- Concerns were raised about growth levels / seeking a change in the following villages:

○ All villages in the Lincoln area	○ Lea
○ Aubourn	○ Marton
○ Bassingham	○ Morton
○ Blyton	○ Navenby
○ Brant Broughton	○ North Greetwell
○ Brookenby	○ Northorpe
○ Canwick	○ Osgodby
○ Chapel Hill	○ Owmbly
○ Coleby	○ Pilham
○ Corringham	○ Potterhanworth
○ Cranwell	○ Potterhanworth Booths
○ Digby	○ Reepham
○ East Stockwith	○ Riseholme

- | | |
|---------------|----------------------|
| ○ Gate Burton | ○ Scothern |
| ○ Glentworth | ○ Springthorpe |
| ○ Grayingham | ○ Sturgate |
| ○ Eagle | ○ Sturton By Stow |
| ○ Hapswell | ○ Sudbrooke |
| ○ Heapham | ○ Swinderby |
| ○ Hemswell | ○ Tattershall Bridge |
| ○ Kexby | ○ Thonock |
| ○ Kingerby | ○ Torksey |
| ○ Kirkby | ○ Upton |
| ○ Knaith | ○ Usselby |
| ○ Knaith Park | ○ Welbourn |
| ○ Langworth | ○ Willoughton |
| ○ Laughton | |

- Various comments about the possible impact of the policy in specific villages.
- Various comments questioning the evidence and querying how the growth levels were ascertained and what constraints/opportunities were used including suggested changes.
- Comments about the clarity of the policy and how specific cases will be considered.
- Concern about some elements of the detailed policy wording.
- Concern that the policy is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
- Concern that the policy contradicts the Employment Needs Assessment.

Policy LP5: Delivering Prosperity and Jobs

Summary of issues raised

General:

- Various comments broadly supporting elements of the policy.
- The plan lacks clarity on job creation / link between homes and jobs.
- The Water Cycle Study needs updating to assess impact of allocations.
- Infrastructure is needed to cope with heavy goods traffic.
- Concern that the policy is not in conformity with the NPPF.
- Policy needs to control better the loss of employment sites to other uses.
- Policy needs more flexibility/clarity to allow the loss of employment sites to other uses.
- Should be more control on new agricultural buildings eg roof colour.
- Undue reliance on forecasts.
- Policy needs to support expansion of businesses even more than it does.
- Lincolnshire transport infrastructure needs improving if business growth is to happen.
- Water resources needs reflecting in this policy.
- More homes - low job growth: will put more pressure on public services.
- Various detailed suggestions, to improve clarity of policy wording.

Sites:

- Need new employment allocations – not just rolled forward consents / allocations.
- Lack of choice / flexibility for the market.
- Lack of Strategic Employment Sites in north Lincoln.
- Object to employment growth in rural areas.
- Object to a lack of employment growth in rural area / villages.
- New sites suggested: Eg. LN6 and A46 corridor; Enterprise Green; Swinderby Airfield; western side of CL1335; Market Rasen; Navenby; Branston; NE of A15/A17 roundabout (Sleaford).

- Previous allocations in existing Local Plans should be included. Eg: Brookenby; Heighington.
- The delivery of employment in the SUEs is uncertain / likely to be delayed / poor track record – need sites which can deliver early.
- Object to some sites suggested (whole or part). Eg Outer Circle Road EEA; Moorland Industrial Estate EEA; Ruston Works (Pelham Street).
- Concern about three of the EES – they all include a Local Wildlife Site. As a minimum, this issue needs recognising / policy wording to protect LWS.

Policy LP6: Retail and Town Centres in Central Lincolnshire

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments supporting or broadly supporting the policy.
- Various detailed suggestions, to improve clarity of policy wording and meaning including linking the maintenance of thriving retail and town centres to reducing social isolation, health inequalities and improving community resilience; the need to reference smaller/ independent shops and locally distinctive shopping areas; identifying the need for new centres in mixed use development; and the need to strengthen the restriction of development in the countryside/ green areas.
- Concern that the policy is too restrictive for retail/ commercial development for larger villages in rural areas.
- Concern that the policy is not in conformity with the NPPF with evidence to support the thresholds set and providing an alternative suggestion.
- Question evidence to say whether additional retail floor space is required given the number of vacant units and charity shops.

Policy LP7: A Sustainable Visitor Economy

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments broadly supporting the policy.
- Various comments that other Local Plan policies and planning principles should be cross referenced in the policy.
- Comment suggesting that the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership Nature Tourism Study should be referred to in the policy.
- Suggestion that the delivery of sports facilities should be informed by robust and up to date assessment of needs.
- Concern that policy does not explicitly reference key tourist facilities such as racecourse.
- Specific objections to wording of last paragraph: alternative text suggested to overcome objection.

Policy LP8: Lincolnshire Showground

Summary of issues raised

- Some general support for policy, though also various detailed objections.
- Plans to include a business park within the Lincolnshire Showground are welcomed.
- Objection to classification of the Showground as a visitor attraction given the plans for partial redevelopment as an agricultural college and housing redevelopment.
- Road network to access the Showground site needs improving.
- Recognition of the importance of the Showground to the future growth of the Lincolnshire agrifood, wider business and visitor sector economy is welcomed, though it is suggested that the policy justification and plan vision place added emphasis on the Local Development Order objectives and the development of the agri-food economy. Suggestion that the area to

the west of Gate 6 at the Showground within the current curtilage of the site is included within the allocation area to allow for the complete relocation of the Bishop Burton College from the Riseholme campus if necessary and for the redevelopment of the dated exhibition halls.

- Other general points raised include:
 - facility should be improved to make it a national facility;
 - the showground needs a hotel;
 - the showground could be used in a more productive way for outdoor events.
- Objection to the fact that the current Local Plan makes no reference to the Market Rasen Racecourse given that the Showground benefits from a site specific policy. Requested that the Racecourse is recognised in the Local Plan: policy wording suggested by respondent.

Chapter 4: A Caring Central Lincolnshire: meeting needs and the provision of infrastructure

Summary of issues raised

- Very few comments received in relation to this chapter. The general points raised include:
 - Consideration needs to be given to the re-instatement of rail stations at numerous locations so as to reduce the number of car journeys into and out of the larger towns.
 - Concern over impact of development on health facilities.
 - In relation to paragraph 4.2.4: it would be helpful if this paragraph included the title of all policies that affect public health and wellbeing rather than examples only.

Policy LP9: Health and Wellbeing

Summary of issues raised

- Some support for policy, though many detailed comments on how policy wording and requirements could be improved and clarified and some strong objection to the current wording of criteria C which requires Health Impact Assessment.
- Policy proposals need to be viability tested.
- Detailed comments on criteria A, B, C and D regarding the weakness and ambiguity of these requirements, and concern that the requirements should not be placed on other bodies rather than developers.
- Requirement in respect of Health Impact Assessment needs more clarity. HIA should be commensurate with the size of the development and should be integrated into the Development Management process rather than separate: Bristol City Council's policy given as a good example.
- Supported previous requirement in Preliminary Draft for development proposals to make a positive contribution to green spaces: this requirement should be reinstated.
- Need a robust process for identifying health impact that takes account of cumulative effect of housing growth: suggestion that health impact tool is developed.
- Co-location of health services with other services is generally supported.
- Not clear how policy will be implemented.
- Support for inclusion of matters such as allotments etc. alongside 'formal' health care provision.
- Support for referencing other policies in LP9 (criteria e) rather than duplication.

Policy LP10: Meeting Accommodation Needs

Summary of issues raised

- Concern expressed over scale of policy obligations:
 - Policy burdens should not threaten ability to develop viably;
 - Unrealistic to negotiate every site on a one by one basis because aspirations of a policy or combination of policies are set too high;

- Need for viability testing.
- Mixed comments in relation to M4(2):
 - M4(2) requirements could apply to developments of less than 6 dwellings to ensure delivery in small villages;
 - Requirement for 30% of dwellings to M4(2) standard supported;
 - Policy should include requirement for higher accessibility homes to be located in accessible locations within sites;
 - Policy allows exception for inappropriate site characteristics but does not allow for other circumstances which may render the requirement unviable;
 - SHMA does not recommend a proportion of M4(2) dwellings.
- Various comments in relation to self-build:
 - Policy wording could be read as supporting proposals for self-build which would otherwise be inappropriate development;
 - Do not agree that self-build should be dealt with as an 'exception';
 - Self-build should be considered as an integral part of large scale allocations.
- Para 4.4.3 refers to bungalows but there is no mention of single story dwellings in the policy.
- Paragraph 4.4.6 suggests there is a need to consider development of specialist facilities for older persons, but this is not reflected in policy.
- Further Draft version of policy is more flexible than the previous Preliminary Draft version: this flexibility is supported.
- Welcome acknowledgement that minimum space standards and water efficiency requirement will not be pursued.

Policy LP11: Meeting Housing Needs

Summary of issues raised

- Various detailed comments, with particular concerns in relation to viability and the proposed threshold and required level of affordable housing.
- Support for flexibility provided by the policy in terms of ability to provide affordable housing on an alternative site or pay a fee in lieu of site provision where appropriate.
- The Local Plan acknowledges that new affordable housing is not the only solution to respond to this housing need, however there is concern that the other solutions will not be able to respond to the significant shortfall in provision that will be delivered through policy LP11.
- Concerns expressed over assumptions made in the Peter Brett Associates Viability Study and over viability testing in combination with the other requirements set out in the Local Plan.
- Development should not be subject to such a scale of obligations that viability is threatened: whilst developers can negotiate lower affordable housing provision on the grounds of viability such negotiations incur additional costs (financial and time) which impairs housing delivery.
- Comments in relation to affordable housing threshold:
 - 3 is too low;
 - Threshold of 3 does not tie in with the proportions of affordable housing being sought, as 15 / 20 / 25% of 3 dwellings does not generate a single dwelling given the requirement to round up to the nearest whole dwelling: threshold of 5 suggested, with the requirement to round down to the nearest whole dwelling;
 - Should be increased to 10;
 - Should seek affordable housing contribution on all sites, but the contribution on sites of less than 3 units should be in the form of a commuted sum.
- Mixed opinion on level of affordable housing required:
 - Support for requirement of 15% / 20%;
 - Should be higher: 47% suggested;
 - Percentages stated should read 'upto';
 - Concerns over the blanket requirement of 25% across the Lincoln strategy area: there are a range of sites across this area with very different circumstances, e.g. complex previously developed sites;

- The Peter Brett Associates study that supports this policy explored the options of 15% and 20%: it is unclear why the 25% has been proposed.
- Concern about requirement in criteria A regarding subsequent linked developments: issues such as different ownership, different applicants and time lag between applications will prove a minefield. Also concern that sites owned by the same landowner may come forward at different times due to site constraints, financial issues and agreements with different developers.
- Rural affordable housing section only refers to rural exception sites: concern that these are going to be in limited supply given Government proposals, so there is a need for a plan led approach for rural communities.
- Revision of Preliminary Draft version of policy to exempt MOD development for service personnel from the requirement to provide affordable housing is welcomed. However, the MOD has concerns over the explicit requirement that homes subsequently sold or rented should be transferred to a Registered Provider: the homes could be sold beyond the plan period, potentially in a very different housing and planning policy context. A more appropriate approach would be to enable case by case discussion at application stage, through Section 106 agreement.
- Support expressed for seamless integration of affordable housing.

Policy LP12: Infrastructure to Support Growth

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments strongly supporting or broadly supporting the policy or broadly supporting elements of the policy in order to ensure strong, sustainable and cohesive communities and to provide for new and existing residents.
- Comments particularly supporting Green Infrastructure for people and wildlife, increased education and medical services, the need for an eastern and southern bypass for Lincoln and other road improvements and support for para 4.6.9.
- It was suggested that more roads and parking were not the answer and suggestion of a parking levy to fund public transport and cycling infrastructure improvements and a park and ride and bus lanes for Lincoln following a Cambridge or Dutch model and suggestion that more development should be focused close to existing rail links.
- There was a suggestion that land should be specifically safeguarded or allocated for future key infrastructure, suggestions regarding CIL charging levels, that infrastructure provision needs to be coordinated consistently beyond authority boundaries and noting the importance of monitoring.
- There were various detailed suggestions made to improve clarity of policy wording including:
 - adding 'locally' to the policy text and providing an explanation of what is meant by 'local';
 - A suggestion by many that policy wording needed to be strengthened in requiring no development before infrastructure was provided as promises of later delivery had proved unreliable in the past;
 - or to specify a clearer phasing of infrastructure development, and
 - to include para 4.6.9 in the policy wording;
- It was considered 'outrageous' to suggest infrastructure should 'follow on from development' and some felt that no more houses should be built as the existing infrastructure could not cope.
- Many listed existing infrastructure constraints and listed existing as well as proposed infrastructure needs including better roads, public transport, broadband, employment, medical facilities and sewage capacity.
- Concern that there was insufficient clarity on how and when infrastructure would be provided or whether provision would be enough to meet needs and fear that Govt cuts/ 'austerity measures' would exacerbate the problem.
- It was felt that the evidence base for sports facilities was not sufficiently up to date or robust.

- There was some concern that the policy could add cost burdens on developers which could make development unviable, particularly if there was any double counting, and that to comply with the NPPF requirements it should meet legal and policy tests - should be necessary, directly relate to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale.
- It was felt that the soundness of the plan may be brought into question if a clear indication of how the funding gap will be overcome is not included or if the shortfall were to be placed on developers.
- It was felt that developers should not provide public facilities such as schools and surgeries and that biodiversity requirements were onerous for a small developer.

Policy LP13: Transport

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments strongly supporting or broadly supporting the policy or various elements of it, particularly:
 - the need for travel plans;
 - improvements to the Lincoln/ Gainsborough/ Sheffield train service;
 - improved road connectivity across the River Trent;
 - bullet points complimenting the aims of the Central Lincolnshire Green Infrastructure Study;
 - recognitions of the rural nature of the area;
 - improvement of rural roads;
 - flexible approach to parking and transport issues;
 - requirement for safe public rights of way and cycle paths as part of development;
 - improved parking;
 - that development should not be granted if it has adverse transport implications; and
 - that allowance be made for low and ultra-low emission vehicles, in accordance NPPF para 35.
- Noted that development proposed may have an adverse impact on the A46 between Lincoln and Newark and that further work is needed to assess implications and possible improvements.
- Noted that development or road infrastructure should not give rise to the need for an Air Quality Zone or make an existing one worse.
- Several commented on existing transport infrastructure inadequacies and various detailed suggestions were made about specific improvements to:
 - the road network (particularly for HGV's);
 - parking;
 - rail (services and stations);
 - public transport (especially in the evenings and to and from strategic employment sites);
 - footpaths; and
 - cycle way infrastructure,
 including the dualling of some roads, several park and ride sites, a link between Gainsborough Central and Lea Road stations and a 2nd River Trent road bridge.
- There was felt to be insufficient reference to Lincoln's Eastern and Southern Bypasses, specific park and ride sites and East-West Link, the A159, A631 and their importance.
- There was concern that the policy did not reference viability and that the policy as written could add a further cost burden to developers particularly when asking for design and access statements for all developments, in seeking that allowance be made for low and ultra-low emission vehicles and in stating that planning permission will not be granted for development that has adverse transport implications unless it can be mitigated, stating that planning obligations need to meet legal and policy tests and suggesting that this may be contrary to the NPPF or other guidance.
- There was concern that whilst the aims of the policy was 'laudable' without specific details, clear strategies and indications of how proposals may be funded, they may not be realised.

- It was felt that aspirational road improvements should be referenced and proposals to alleviate the issues at the Lincoln Station Road/ Doddington Road/ Skellingthorpe Road level crossing should be put forward.
- There was felt to be a need for a LTP4, more up to date transport reviews and detailed studies to support the policy or detailed proposals.

Policy LP14: Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments supported the policy or partially supported elements of the policy particularly the requirement for SuDS and acknowledgement of their multi-functional role improving the water environment, ecology, amenity and biodiversity. It was felt that this met the requirements of the NPPF and recent government guidance.
- Some detailed suggestions to improve clarity/ strengthen policy wording were made including:
 - that policy wording that restricts connection to the foul sewage network be strengthened;
 - that reference be made to the Level 2 SFRA work being undertaken and reference to Groundwater Protection Zones;
 - that reference to the Water Framework Directive be strengthened;
 - greater emphasis be given to viability when considering SuDS; and
 - that Management Companies and Registered Social Landlords be added to the list of SuDS management companies.
- It was felt that the policy was too vague/ unclear particularly with regard to:
 - further advice needed on what is meant by “impractical”;
 - use of the work “unacceptable” and whether this makes it non NPPF compliant; and
 - Clearer guidance needs to be given on SuDS.
- Some sought confirmation that evidence showed existing or planned drainage infrastructure was sufficient to meet the needs of proposed development and listing existing problems including some villages being affected by development in other, adjacent villages.
- Some expressed concerns that development was being permitted or allocated in flood risk areas and suggesting a new settlement east of Horncastle or elsewhere as an alternative.

Policy LP15: Community Facilities

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments were received supporting the policy or elements of it including reference to open spaces whilst others specifically requested the removal of reference to open spaces and libraries.
- There were various detailed suggestions to improve clarity of policy wording including:
 - adding public houses and places of worship as potential multi use community facilities and the need to reference crematoriums;
 - the need to require the future proofing of buildings and for them to cater for all ages; and
 - the need to find alternative locations for any proposal if it has a detrimental effect on local residents.
- Various comments suggesting that the policy needed substantial or significant rewording, particularly in relation to:
 - the need to strengthen the protection of existing facilities although others felt it was vague and lacked detail;
 - the need to strengthen the requirement for early delivery and stress the importance of securing long term funding and maintenance plans whilst others felt that this was unreasonable and onerous, may affect viability and should be removed altogether;
 - the approach between the policy, Developer Contributions SPD and infrastructure Delivery Plan were inconsistent; and

- that the lack of and need for large scale leisure facilities should be included.
- Some felt that the offer of facilities should give development proposals more weight whilst others felt that this indicated that planning permission could be bought.
- The evidence behind the policy is either lacking, particularly in terms of locally specific need or weak, where draft evidence needs to be updated and completed.
- Some felt that the policy was not NPPF compliant whilst others felt that it directly met the requirements of the NPPF.
- It was suggested that community facility sites should be allocated within the plan and that it should be made clear that the importance of such uses should be included in any Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy LP16: Development on Land Affected by Contamination

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments broadly supporting the policy including recognition of significant health and wellbeing benefits potential environmental impacts on biodiversity.
- Some suggestions made to strengthen and clarify policy wording including the protection of existing 'bad neighbour' users/ businesses such as livestock buildings and grain driers from proposed new development.
- A comment expressed concern about the role of agricultural uses and recognition of other regulation/ controls.

Chapter 5: A Quality Central Lincolnshire

Summary of issues raised

- Overall support for chapter. Detailed comments include:
 - 5.5: mixed support and objection to removal of this section.
 - 5.6: inclusion of Green Infrastructure Network section is welcomed.
 - 5.9: the recognition for the hierarchy of designated sites as well as the importance of sites that are not designated yet still hold value is welcomed.
 - 5.9.2: need to highlight that there are currently no Nature Improvement Areas within Central Lincolnshire.
 - 5.9.4: the clear statement on the importance of survey evidence in the development process is welcomed and will help avoid doubt.

Policy LP17: Landscape, Townscape and Views

Summary of issues raised

- Mixed views on policy. In some instances the policy was generally supported, but detailed comments and suggestions were made as to how the policy wording could be improved.
- Concerns raised that the policy does not provide sufficiently robust protection for the landscape: many respondents suggested that existing West Lindsey District Council policies should be updated.
- Concern that the policy is not fully consistent with the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development: specifically, that the policy does not explain that some harm can be acceptable where the identified harm is outweighed by the benefits of the development.
- Comment that the policy should be more explicit in requiring development proposals to enhance setting.
- Support for how the policy has been expanded from the Preliminary Draft version.

Policies Map:

- Legend shows policy LP17 is applicable for Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Areas of Great Landscape Value. It should be made clear that this policy also applies to the whole of the Policies map and not just designate landscape areas.

Policy LP18: Climate Change and Low Carbon Living

Summary of issues raised

- Mixed support and objection to the policy.
- Neither the Local Plan nor Integrated Impact Assessment indicates that a baseline survey of renewable energy developments in Central Lincolnshire has been conducted: this is essential information to gauge progress.
- Support for amendments made to Preliminary Draft version of policy in relation to carbon offsetting and to the changed emphasis from prescriptive requirements to incentives.
- Some concern expressed about the potential loss of high grade agricultural land.
- Policy too vague on how aspirations will be achieved.
- Policy needs to incorporate flexibility to allow applications to be considered on their merits, balanced against the other benefits the proposal may be delivering.
- Positive stance of policy LP18 is undermined by policy LP19.
- Need to reduce car ownership and commuting.

Policy LP19: Renewable Energy Proposals

Summary of issues raised

- The policy is too vague and needs more detail to stand up to scrutiny. Wording suggested to strengthen policy.
- Concern that Ministerial Statement (HCWS42) could be revoked which would have implications for policy: policy should include adequate protection to prevent inappropriate and speculative proposals.
- Limiting renewable energy development to poorer quality agricultural land is in line with national policy but lower grade land is more limited in Central Lincolnshire than in other areas so the policy may prove overly restrictive.
- Mixed support and objection to approach to wind energy development (i.e. not identifying sites for wind energy). Several objections suggest that the policy should identify suitable areas for wind energy development and that the policy is currently unsound. Comments that neighbourhood plans are not an appropriate tool for managing such development pressure and will lead to an inconsistent approach to wind energy across Central Lincolnshire.
- Concern that policy omits reference to transitional arrangements for wind energy proposals already submitted.
- Suggestion that policy should identify suitable areas for all forms of renewable energy.
- Suggestion that baseline survey into how many commercial renewable energy developments have been built or granted planning permission be conducted.
- Concern over impact of wind turbine development on Ministry of Defence Operations: policy wording suggested.

Policy LP20: Green Infrastructure Network

Summary of issues raised

- Various Comments broadly supporting elements of the policy.
- Various detailed suggestions, to improve clarity of policy wording/strengthen policy wording.
- Concern that the policy as written would add a further cost burden on developers, which could make development unviable.

- Various comments suggesting the policy needs substantial or significant rewording, especially in relation to how development will be expected to contribute towards the establishment, enhancement and on-going management of green infrastructure and the development of a strategic green infrastructure network.
- Concern development of green infrastructure will be limited to new development and areas not allocated any growth will miss out on green infrastructure improvements.

Policy LP21: Green Wedges

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments broadly supporting the policy or elements of the policy.
- Various detailed suggestions, to improve clarity of policy wording/strengthen policy wording.
- Concern the policy is not in conformity with the NPPF. Concern policy is more restrictive than the Green Belt test set out in the NPPF.
- The evidence behind the policy is lacking/weak.
- New Green wedges/extensions to Green Wedges were suggested at/near:
 - Between route of the Lincoln Eastern Bypass, Heighington and Branston;
 - Between the A158 and Fiskerton Road;
 - West of Cherry Willingham between the village and Greetwell;
 - East of Cherry Willingham towards Fiskerton;
 - Between Heighington and Washingborough, and Heighington and Branston;
 - North Greetwell;
 - Between Heighington and Canwick;
 - Between Metheringham and Dunston;
 - Between Welton and Dunston;
 - Between every settlement.
- Current proposed Green Wedges/extensions to current proposed Green Wedges were supported to in part or whole at the following:
 - Between Welton and Dunholme;
 - Riseholme;
 - South Hykeham;
 - Skellingthorpe.
- Current proposed Green Wedges/extensions to current proposed Green Wedges were objected to in part or whole at the following:
 - Witham Valley (various locations);
 - Waddington to Bracebridge Heath (various locations);
 - Burton to Nettleham (various locations);
 - Dunholme to Welton;
 - Canwick to Washingborough(various locations);
 - Hykeham Pits (various locations).

Policy LP22: Local Green Spaces

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments broadly supporting the policy or elements of the policy.
- The evidence is lacking/weak.
- Concern policy is not in conformity with National Planning Practice Guidance.
- Various comments suggesting the policy needs substantial or significant rewording, especially in relation to “only proposals which protect and enhance Local Green Space, and are demonstrably supported by the local community...”
- Various detailed suggestions, to improve clarity of policy wording.
- Current proposed Local Green Spaces were supported in part or whole at the following:
 - Nocton



- Heighington
- Potterhanworth
- Hemswell Cliff
- Cherry Willingham
- Skellingthorpe
- Branston
- Canwick
- Saxilby
- Fiskerton

- Current proposed Local Green Spaces were objected to in part or whole at the following:
 - Cherry Willingham
 - Skellingthorpe
 - Nettleham
 - South Hykeham
 - Market Rasen
 - Fiskerton

- New Local Green Spaces were suggested at/near:
 - Brattleby
 - Keelby
 - Ruskington
 - Heighington
 - Scotter
 - Caistor
 - Lincoln
 - Fiskerton
 - Riseholme
 - Hemswell Cliff
 - Scothern
 - Saxilby
 - Metheringham

- Objections were received to sites that did not meet the Local Green Space criteria at/near:
 - Grayingham

Policy LP23: Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments broadly supporting elements of the policy.
- Various detailed suggestions, to improve clarity of policy wording.
- Concern that the policy is not in conformity with the NPPF.
- The evidence behind the policy needs checking for accuracy and presenting in a different way, especially in relation to how sites are shown on the interactive map.
- Various comments suggesting the policy needs substantial or significant rewording, especially in relation to mitigation.
- Objection to the omission of Local Sites from the Policies Map.

Policy LP24: The Historic Environment

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments broadly supporting the policy.
- Policy wording considered too complicated in places: simplified policy wording suggested.

- Other minor policy wording amendments suggested.
- Policy too broad and imprecise.
- No need to refer to chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework in the policy: in referencing the whole chapter it is unclear which tests are being referred to. Alternative wording to supporting text suggested to overcome this.
- Policy does not accurately reflect the requirements of the NPPF (specifically paras 133 and 134).
- New policy structure in respect of conservation areas and archaeology particularly supported, but reference to registered parks and gardens and to listed buildings is needed.
- Policy is not consistent with presumption in favour of sustainable development (NPPF para 14): policy wording should be revised to explain that harm should be balanced against benefits.
- Pity that this policy speaks of conservation in rather urban terms.

Policy LP25: Design and Amenity

Summary of issues raised

- Policy is generally supported, though many comments and concerns relating to the detailed wording.
- Diverse comments on the content of the policy, ranging from “policy is overly generic” to concern that the policy too detailed and would be hard to apply in practice, especially given that there is no indication of the number of tests a scheme has to meet to be deemed acceptable.
- There is a degree of conflict between competing design issues.
- Amenity considerations are too stringent.
- Requirement to demonstrate that matters “have been considered” is vague and inadequate.
- Objections to the use of ‘where applicable’ throughout the policy which is not defined and results in uncertainty.
- Comments that some of the criteria should include reference to ‘enhancement’.
- Policy should include a criteria on energy and renewables.
- “Places and buildings are accessible to all” may be narrowly interpreted as physical accessibility: policy needs to be clearer that issues such as dementia and sight impairment need to be catered for.

Policy LP26: Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments broadly supporting elements of the policy.
- Concern the policy is not in conformity with the NPPF.
- Various detailed suggestions to improve the clarity of policy wording/strengthen policy wording.
- The policy is too vague/unclear.
- Concern the policy as written would add a further cost burden on developers, which could make development unviable.
- The evidence behind the policy is lacking/weak.
- Various comments suggesting the policy needs substantial or significant rewording, especially in relation to protection of existing facilities, developer contributions and the standards set out in Appendix C.
- Support for reasonable alternative option 2, i.e. “Business as usual, continuation of open space standards in saved local Plans with emphasis on quantity of provision”.
- Objection to standards set out in Appendix C, especially in relation to different standards in rural and urban settlements.

Policy LP27: Town Centre Frontages and Advertisements

Summary of issues raised

- General support for policy.
- Comment that policy would be better placed after policy LP6, Retail and Town Centres in Central Lincolnshire.
- Reference to heritage assets welcomed.

Chapter 6: Delivering Locally

Summary of issues raised

- Concerns raised in relation to the principles established in Paragraph 6.1. Respondent was not opposed to the principle of only sites of 25 or more being formally allocated for housing and the removal of settlement boundaries, and recognises that this could provide considerable flexibility. However, they do not believe that this policy approach sits well with the threshold elements of LP2, which could severely hinder such flexibility.

Policy LP28: Sustainable Urban Extensions

Summary of issues raised

- Mixed support and objection to the policy.
- Concern that the master planning required under the provisions of policies LP28 and LP30 is only a realistic option for the largest property developers as the process will be very time consuming and complex.
- Concern that the policy may unintentionally reduce the rate of delivery of housing as 'front loading' of infrastructure will impact on cash flow.
- Various objections to the proposed requirement for urban extensions to set aside land for Gypsy and Traveller pitch provision.
- Concern that policy lacks flexibility, specifically in regard to the need for the support of all landowners.
- Suggestion that a 'phased masterplan' is required instead of a 'broad concept plan'.
- Support for wording in respect of 'cherry picking' of profitable elements.
- Support for requirement to prepare a Broad Concept Plan for each SUE in its entirety.
- Support for criteria h (avoidance of sterilisation of minerals).
- Suggestions for additional criteria include:
 - Reference to the implementation of the Central Lincolnshire Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping Study opportunities
 - Reinstatement of criterion u from Preliminary Draft version (biodiversity)
- One respondent suggested the concept of 'sustainable village extensions' as the appropriate vehicle to ensure future growth outside the urban area and large towns.

Chapter 7: Lincoln

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments are made broadly supporting elements of the policy including support for 64% of Central Lincolnshire's growth to be accommodated within the Lincoln Policy Area and for the use of SUEs as a policy approach to meet identified need.
- Some detailed text corrections are suggested.
- It was felt there was a lack of emphasis on protecting the Brayford area.

- The need for improved public transport to support the proposed population growth is identified.
- Concern is expressed about the scale of development proposed in the SEQ area with detailed comments on specific aspects.
- Insufficient identification of the importance of retail to the Lincoln economy on a par with/ more important than education and tourism.
- Greater emphasis should be made of the sequential approach and the need to develop in the centre of the town first, then edge of centre.
- It was felt that there was insufficient evidence to justify rejecting the allocation of extensive new development in the Lincoln Strategy area villages.

Policy LP29: Protecting Lincoln's setting and character

Summary of issues raised

- Most comments broadly or strongly supporting the policy.
- Various detailed suggestions, to improve clarity of policy wording including more detail regarding character and public realm and reference to the Lincoln Urban Opportunity Study.
- Concern that policy is not in conformity with the NPPF in that landscape, biodiversity and historic environment are not fully consistent with presumption in favour of sustainable development or that it is not made clear that some harm may be acceptable where it is outweighed by the benefits of the development.

Policy LP30: Major Development Sites

Summary of issues raised

- Comments supporting the policy for all 4 Lincoln SUE's from respective landowners/ developers with additional detailed comments on site specific issues.
- Objections to the policy in respect of variety of issues including: Western Growth Corridor SUE on flood risk grounds; and connection onto A46; reference needs to be made to technical flood risk work undertaken by RAB Consultants in WGC Policy itself; that a regional leisure centre should not be located at WGC; concern about possible development of the Riseholme Campus and impact on green wedge; NEQ SUE on impact on SSSI; traffic generated by all SUE's; green wedge designation North of Lincoln; proposed low CIL rate for SUE's; SEQ and impact on RAF airfields and urban sprawl towards Branston; and over reliance on SUE's for housing supply and their likely delivery rates.
- Various comments suggesting the policy needs substantial or significant rewording, especially in relation to: specific reference to Bomber Command Centre at SEQ, phasing, requirement for detailed odour assessment for development close to water recycling centres and additional wording in respect of consideration of biodiversity and impact on local wildlife sites for all the SUE's.
- Clarity sought over policy wording in respect of SEQ and 'high quality landscape setting' and where this is located.
- General comments on SUE's in respect of traffic, infrastructure provision e.g. impact on schools, health facilities, utility provision including water and wastewater infrastructure and no mention of providing GTA sites in SUE's.

Policy LP31: Lincoln's Economy

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments expressing support for or broadly supporting the policy.
- The City's role as a major regional shopping centre should be recognised and acknowledged as a growth sector alongside tourism and education.

- Feel that Lincoln university should be afforded greater status as a key economic driver.
- Identification of the importance of improved transport choice and locating development that is not reliant on the private car.
- Suggest a formal and rigorous sequential test.
- Evidence of limited suitable employment land in the City is questioned.
- Suggest referencing the Lincoln Signage and Visitor Management Strategy and using similar terminology for quarters.
- Question evidence supporting reference to the Bailgate area.
- Suggest that reference is made to the latest Lincoln Growth Strategy.

Policy LP32: Lincoln's Universities and colleges

Summary of issues raised

- Significant number of comments objecting to the policy based on views that it will allow the University of Lincoln to be given too much flexibility and favouritism and "beyond the reach of district and neighbourhood plans".
- University should be treated the same as other potential sites.
- Concerns over allowing housing development on the Riseholme Campus and impact on the green wedge.
- Various comments suggesting the policy needs substantial or significant rewording, especially in relation to providing more detail on the University of Lincoln future growth plans.
- Concern that the policy is not in conformity with the NPPF in respect of financial advantage for a particular landowner (for their existing land bank and future land acquisition) and could potentially be subject to legal challenge.

Policy LP33: Lincoln City Centre-Primary Shopping Area and Central Mixed Use Area

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments broadly supporting the policy or elements of it, including the principal of identifying Primary and Secondary Shopping Areas and Central Mixed Use Area.
- Various detailed suggestions, to improve clarity of policy wording. The need for the use of consistent terminology and clarity on retail areas/ zones suggested.
- Concern that the policy is not in conformity with the NPPF retail tests. Suggested that not enough retail space has been allocated to meet the needs evidenced in the Retail Study 2015.
- Concern that the policy as written would add a further cost burden on developers, which could make development unviable, particularly in respect of planned retail redevelopment to the east of the City.
- Various comments suggesting the policy needs substantial or significant rewording, especially in relation to:
 - No reference to the historic environment and local distinctiveness including niche and independent retailing and historic retail premises;
 - Specific reference to the need to accommodate the operations of nearby businesses within the Mixed Use Area;
 - The need to redefine the Central Mixed Use Area to a more tightly constrained boundary;
 - Policy should explicitly state the need for any retail proposals outside the Primary Shopping Area not to impact on existing or proposed retail investment within the City Centre/ Primary Shopping Area, and any such proposals should be subject to sequential testing;
 - Further reference to the City Centre Masterplan should be made in the definition of the City Centre and Primary Shopping Area; and

- Concern that designation of St Marks as Secondary Shopping Area is not correct and needs reconsidering as a part of the Primary Shopping Area.

Policy LP34: District and Local Shopping Centres

Summary of issues raised

- Comments supported the policy and the aim to maintain and support the district and local centres and their contribution to reducing carbon footprint.
- Reference to new district and local centres in the proposed SUEs is welcomed but an error was noted in reference to another policy. Reference to policy LP27 should read policy LP30.

Policy LP35: Regeneration and Opportunity Areas

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments broadly supporting elements of the policy, particularly regenerating the existing urban area and the allocation of the Firth Road Regeneration and Opportunity area.
- Comment that the policy is too vague/ unclear and suggestion that it needs to include leisure as an appropriate use in a mixed use development, particularly in the Firth Road Regeneration and Opportunity Area.
- Various detailed suggestions, to improve clarity of policy wording, including the need for further clarity around flood risk exception testing.
- Various comments suggesting the policy needs substantial or significant rewording, especially in relation to;
 - Suggested inclusion of Rushton Works Site within the neighbouring area; and
 - Protection of existing uses, particularly those such as the Royal Mail delivery service, which could affect residential amenity.

Policy LP36: Transport Priorities / Movement Strategy

Summary of issues raised

- Some comments broadly supporting elements of the policy.
- Various detailed suggestions, to improve clarity of policy wording.
- General comments reflecting a lack of confidence in the evidence behind the policy and proposals to mitigate traffic implications for Lincoln’s road infrastructure. Particular concerns about the LEB and Canwick Hill.
- Concern that further impact assessment on the implications for the A46 network should be undertaken and Policy implications addressed prior to submission.

Policy LP37: Sub-division and Multi-occupation of Dwellings Within Lincoln

Summary of issues raised

- Support for the policy, including comment that policy provides a ‘hook’ for any future policy initiatives in respect of houses in multiple occupation.
- Concern that impacts of sub-division and multi-occupation could be socially detrimental.

Chapter 8: Gainsborough

Summary of issues raised

- Various general comments, suggestions and observations, including:

- a matter of consistency, the Lincoln and Sleaford chapters both have sections on Protecting Setting and Character, but there is not a comparable section for Gainsborough;
- would welcome acknowledgement of Gainsborough's role as a service centre for villages in eastern parts of Bassetlaw;
- concerns raised in relation to Gainsborough's ability to deliver the suggested level of housing over the plan period (section 8.2). The current lack of progress with the two sustainable urban extensions in the town is of concern as these will be vital to achieve the numbers identified;
- should consider the impacts of proposed development on landscape character both within Lincolnshire and the adjacent areas of Nottinghamshire. In the wider rural landscape tall structures (e.g. those associated with renewable energy developments) have the potential to have adverse impacts on the landscape from extended view points. These impacts should be considered, as well as cumulative impacts;
- Gainsborough Town Council has resolved to prepare Neighbourhood Plan's for Gainsborough and ask that reference is made in the Gainsborough Chapter to these so as to ensure awareness.

Policy LP38: Gainsborough Southern Neighbourhood SUE

Summary of issues raised

- Mixed support and objection to policy.
- Support for ambition to deliver new secondary school provision as part of urban extensions.
- Concerns that development could impact on the nature conservation interest of Local Wildlife Sites adjacent to the site, through the development of new pathways and increased visitor pressure, and from light, noise and visual disturbance. Recommended that policy should require protection and enhancement of existing natural environmental assets and 'design in' wildlife.
- Objection raised to the various conditions attached to each of the SUEs: concern that these conditions create uncertainty and could delay the delivery of SUEs. It is suggested that the Local Plan should allocate a greater range of non-SUE sites to ensure a rolling five-year land supply.
- General comment regarding status of site: permission was granted July 2011 and delivery of the SUE has been slower than anticipated (largely due to market conditions) but the Estate remains committed to the delivery of the SUE, therefore it should provide 1,200 – 1,500 units over the plan period.

Policy LP39: Gainsborough Northern Neighbourhood SUE

Summary of issues raised

- Mixed support and objection to policy.
- Support for ambition to deliver new secondary school provision as part of urban extensions.
- Suggestion that the Sustainable Urban Extension boundary be extended to include adjacent land to the south west and north west.
- Concerns raised by the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust that development could impact on the nature conservation interest of woodlands adjacent to the site, through the development of new pathways and increased visitor pressure, and from light, noise and visual disturbance. Importance of protecting, enhancing and buffering areas of nature conservation emphasised.
- Objection raised to the various conditions attached to each of the SUEs: concern that these conditions create uncertainty and could delay the delivery of SUEs. It is suggested that the Local Plan should allocate a greater range of non-SUE sites to ensure a rolling five-year land supply.

Policy LP40: Gainsborough Riverside

Summary of issues raised

- Mixed support and objection to policy.
- Comment that it is essential for policy to include reference to the Gainsborough Riverside conservation area.
- Various detailed objections, including:
 - Policy is very prescriptive and inflexible: it is unclear what is meant by “all relevant development proposals”.
 - Last paragraph in relation to public open space is inflexible and disproportionate.
 - Policy fails to demonstrate ambition for the regeneration of the riverside area.
- Additional wording suggested relating to the Water Framework Directive and meeting the Exception Test where applicable.

Policy LP41: Regeneration of Gainsborough

Summary of issues raised

- General support for policy, though very few detailed supportive comments.
- Support for recognition of heritage and inclusion of former Castlehills School site as part of the Greater Gainsborough Housing Zone.
- Comment that the plan should be more critical of the transport connections in and around Gainsborough: transport connections have to be dramatically improved.

Policy LP42: Gainsborough Town Centre and Primary Shopping

Summary of issues raised

- Support for policy.
- No detailed comments made.

Chapter 9: Sleaford

Summary of issues raised

No comments made against the chapter itself.

Policy LP43: A Growing Sleaford

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments broadly supporting elements of the policy.
- Various detailed suggestions to improve clarity of policy wording.
- The evidence behind the policy is outdated.
- Concern that the policy as written would add a further cost burden on developers which could lead to uncertainty and delay delivery.
- Concern growth levels for Sleaford are too high.
- Objection growth levels are not high enough.
- Concern around provision of infrastructure to support proposed growth.
- Various comments suggesting the policy needs significant rewording, especially in relation to reference to development in towns and villages located within the Sleaford area not just Sustainable Urban Extensions, and various changes in relation to policy criteria, including f)

and g) of Sleaford West Quadrant, additional wording around accessible natural greenspace within green infrastructure and a requirement for odour assessment.

- Proposed Sustainable Urban Extensions were supported at:
 - Sleaford West Quadrant
- Proposed Sustainable Urban Extensions were objected to at:
 - Sleaford West Quadrant
- Alternative Sustainable Urban Extensions were proposed at:
 - Land at Quarrington

Policy LP44: Protecting Sleaford's Setting and Character

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments broadly supporting elements of the policy.
- Various detailed suggestions to improve the clarity/accuracy of policy wording.

Policy LP45: Regeneration and Opportunity Areas

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments broadly supporting elements of the policy.
- Regeneration opportunities from relocation of Carre's Grammar School/ Kesteven and Sleaford High School is missing from the policy.
- Sleaford Town Centre needs to become pedestrianised and traffic free before objectives of policy can be achieved.
- Text is missing from supporting text.

Policy LP46: Sleaford Town Centre

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments broadly supporting the policy.
- Comments suggesting an additional policy objective around enhancement of the Conservation Area and listed buildings.

Policy LP47: Access and Movement

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments broadly supporting elements of the policy.
- Concern and objection that the Sleaford link road will not alleviate traffic congestion.

Chapter 10: Development Sites

Summary of issues raised

Key issues raised against Chapter 10 have been incorporated into the policy summaries (LP48 to LP54).

Policy LP48: Sustainable Urban Extensions - Allocations

Summary of issues raised

- Support was received for the approach of using SUEs.



- A number of general comments and objections were made about the allocation and assessment of SUEs, including:
 - The importance of taking account of local evidence in assessments such as that being developed for neighbourhood plans;
 - A proper plan needs to be included to ensure that the necessary infrastructure will be available to support development;
 - Too much reliance on SUEs and taking account of development on them in the early stage of the plan is not robust;
 - The specific policies on the SUEs create uncertainty and could lead to delays;
 - Some SUEs should be considered as separate settlements with their own parishes being established to assist in their saleability; and
 - Viability will be essential in delivering the SUEs.
- Support was given in representations about the following SUEs:
 - Grange Farm
 - North East Quadrant (Greetwell Quarry)
 - South East Quadrant
 - Western Growth Corridor
 - Land South of Foxby Lane, Gainsborough
 - Land East of Belt Farm, Gainsborough
 - Sleaford West Quadrant
- Objections and concerns were raised about the allocation of the following SUEs for a variety of reasons:
 - Grange Farm
 - North East Quadrant (Greetwell Quarry)
 - South East Quadrant
 - Western Growth Corridor
 - Sleaford West Quadrant
- Suggestions for amendments to the boundaries at Grange Farm SUE.
- Suggestions for alternative SUEs were made for the following sites:
 - Land to the West of Lincoln Road, Nettleham
 - Land South of Lea, Gainsborough
 - Land to the North East of Sleaford
 - Land at Boston Road, Sleaford
 - Land East of Mareham Lane and South of the Maltings, Sleaford
 - Land at Quarrington, Sleaford (currently a Broad Location)

Policy LP49: Residential Allocations – Lincoln

Summary of issues raised

- Some general support was submitted for the allocation of sites in Lincoln as sustainable locations for development.
- A number of objections to the approach to allocating sites in and around Lincoln, including:
 - The only suitable places to develop around Lincoln are outside of Lincoln;
 - Sprawl to the south west of the city is not appropriate;
 - Green wedges are artificially restricting the city's growth;
 - The allocated sites for housing wrongly include student accommodation;
 - Should not be building on green spaces within the urban area;
 - Infrastructure is needed alongside the housing; and
 - Too much focus on urban extensions and more smaller sites need allocating.

- Support was received for proposed allocation of the following sites:
 - CL532 – Land North of Ermine West, Lincoln
 - CL698 – Land to the rear of the Birchwood Centre, Lincoln
 - CL705 – Site of Moorland Infant and Nursery School, Westwick Drive, Lincoln
 - CL706 – Site at Ermine Community Infants School, Thoresway Drive, Lincoln
 - CL4615 – Land West of Lincoln Road, Romangate, Lincoln
 - CL4652 – Land at [and to] the North of Usher Junior School, Lincoln

- Comments suggested changes to the capacity or boundaries of the following sites:
 - CL532 – Land North of Ermine West, Lincoln
 - CL698 – Land to the rear of the Birchwood Centre, Lincoln
 - CL4379 – Land at the Junction of Brant Road and Station Road, Waddington
 - CL4652 – Land at [and to] the North of Usher Junior School, Lincoln

- Objections were made about the proposed allocation of the following sites:
 - CL525 – Former Cegb Power Station, Spa Road, Lincoln
 - CL703 – Land adjacent to Yarborough School, Riseholme Road, Lincoln
 - CL704 – Land to the rear of 283-335 Newark Road, Lincoln
 - CL705 – Site of Moorland Infant and Nursery School, Westwick Drive, Lincoln
 - CL706 – Site at Ermine Community Infants School, Thoresway Drive, Lincoln
 - CL1068 – Land to the North of Station Road, Waddington Low Field
 - CL1963 – Former Bacon Factory, St Marks Street, Lincoln
 - CL4466 – Land adjacent to the Holiday Inn
 - CL4652 – Land at and North of Usher Junior School. Skellingthorpe Rd, Lincoln

- Objections were made about the following sites not being allocated, some with information to support their reconsideration:
 - CL813 and CL416 – Land at Urban Street, Lincoln
 - CL817 – Farmland South of Long Leys Lane, Lincoln (part of/adjacent to)
 - CL917 – Land off 437/439 Newark Road, Lincoln
 - CL929 – Former Lincoln Castings Site, North Hykeham
 - CL930 – Land at Richmond Lakes, North Hykeham
 - CL2178 – Land at Thorpe Lane, South Hykeham
 - CL3073 - Land off Thorpe Lane, South Hykeham
 - CL4431 – Land off Lee Road, Lincoln
 - CL4432 – Land off Wolsey Way, Lincoln
 - CL4685 – Four Acres, and to the West of 67 Station Road, Waddington
 - Land off Conway Drive, North Hykeham
 - Land North of Waddington Brick Pits, Waddington

Policy LP50: Residential Allocations – Main Towns

Summary of issues raised

- The policy should make it clear that sites are dependent on infrastructure being delivered through SUEs, particularly in Sleaford, and should not be allowed to saturate the market.

- Support was received for proposed allocation of the following sites:
 - CL1007 – The Hoplands Depot, Sleaford
 - CL1013 – Land at Poplar Farm, South of the A17, Sleaford
 - CL1014 – Land off Grantham Road, Sleaford
 - CL1248 – Middlefield School of Technology, Middlefield Lane, Gainsborough

- Comments suggested changes to the capacity or boundaries of the following sites:

- CL1242 – Castle Hills Community Arts College, The Avenue, Gainsborough
- Objections were made about the proposed allocation of the following sites:
 - CL1013 – Land at Poplar Farm, South of A17, Sleaford
 - CL3044 – Land south of Willingham Road, Lea, Gainsborough
 - CL4436 – White’s Wood Lane, Gainsborough
- Comments or objections were made about the following sites not being allocated, some with information to support their reconsideration:
 - CL1001 – Land at Quarrington, Sleaford
 - CL1003 – County Council Offices, Eastgate, Sleaford
 - CL1021 – Land off Mareham Lane, Sleaford
 - CL1025 – Land to the north east of Sleaford
 - CL2107 – Lea Estate Farm, Gainsborough
 - CL4391 – Land on Boston Road, Sleaford
 - CL4399 – Land South of the Maltings, Sleaford
 - Land at Belt Road, Gainsborough
 - Land at Horsley Road, Gainsborough
 - Land at Nelson Street, Gainsborough
 - Land at Highfields Roundabout, Gainsborough
 - Land Opposite Somerby Park, Gainsborough
 - Land off the Avenue/old school site, Gainsborough
 - Land at Japan Road, Gainsborough
 - Former Beckett School, Gainsborough

Policy LP51: Residential Allocations – Market Towns

Summary of issues raised

- Comments received notifying that flood maps have been updated in Market Rasen and this may affect the situation on some sites.
- Comments received about the lack of clarity in the policy about what is in Market Rasen and what is in Middle Rasen.
- Comments suggesting the Market Rasen is well placed to accommodate growth if any SUEs fail to be delivered and therefore more should be allocated there.
- Comments received stating that there are numerous brownfield sites in Caistor that should be built on instead of proposed allocations.
- Comment objecting to allocations given that the emerging Caistor Neighbourhood Plan limiting housing development to infill plots within 800m of the market centre.
- Comments received stating that Caistor and Market Rasen (and Middle Rasen) should not receive additional housing because:
 - Infrastructure, including services roads and sewerage cannot cope; and
 - Levels of growth in recent years.
- Support was received for the following proposed allocations:
 - CL1170 – Land at Sunnyside, west of Tennyson Close, Caistor
 - CL1358 – Land off Gallamore Lane, Market Rasen
 - CL1359 – Land off Linwood Road and The Ridings, Market Rasen
 - CL1547 – C16 Caistor Hospital Site, North Kelsey Road, Caistor
 - CL3086 – Land to the South of North Kelsey Road, Caistor
 - CL4028 – Land between Mayfield and Wodelyn Cottage, Market Rasen
- Some comments or objections were made against the following proposed allocations:
 - CL1164 – Land North of Navigation Lane, Caistor
 - CL1170 – Land at Sunnyside, west of Tennyson Close, Caistor

- CL1358 – Land off Gallamore Lane, Market Rasen
 - CL1364 – Caistor Road, Market Rasen
 - CL1547 – C16 Caistor Hospital Site, North Kelsey Road
 - CL1888 – Land Adjacent to and Rear of Roman Ridge on Brigg Road, Caistor
 - CL2093 – Land North of North Street, Caistor
 - CL3086 – Land to the South of North Kelsey Road, Caistor
- Comments or objections were made about the following sites not being allocated, some with information to support their reconsideration:
 - CL1369 – Land to the Rear of Walesby Road, Market Rasen
 - CL2092 – South of A46 and South of Whitegate Hill, Caistor
 - CL3089 – Land to the West and rear of the Meadows, North Kelsey Road, Caistor
 - CL4113 – Land at Glebe Farm, Willingham Road, Market Rasen
 - CL4189 – Land West of Market Rasen Station
 - CL4498 – Land South of Gainsborough Road, Market Rasen (and land south)
 - Land East of Brigg Road, South of Canada Lane, Caistor
 - Land West of Brigg Road, Caistor

Policy LP52: Residential Allocations – Large Villages

Summary of issues raised

- Suggestions received that the policy should provide greater certainty for Large Villages in that the allocated development will be all that is built and that there should be a percentage cap as per medium and small villages.
- Suggestions received that Large Villages near to Lincoln should accommodate more growth to support Lincoln's role.
- Objections and/or comments received on the overall approach taken to specific elements of the site scoring for site allocations and a number of specific queries/comments/objections received for its application in regard to specific sites.
- Some support was given for growth levels proposed in some large villages, although this was dependent on infrastructure provision.
- Comments and/or objections were received regarding the level of growth in the following Large Villages:
 - Bardney – capable of delivering more;
 - Billinghay – infrastructure and services; drainage and sewerage; public transport links; impact on character
 - Branston – infrastructure and services; lack of employment;
 - Cherry Willingham – past growth; traffic and road safety; infrastructure and services;
 - Dunholme – infrastructure and services; traffic and road safety; drainage and sewerage; public transport links;
 - Heckington – capable of delivering more;
 - Keelby – drainage and sewerage; shortage of properties in area;
 - Middle Rasen – requires some growth to support its infrastructure and services
 - Navenby – infrastructure and services; traffic and road safety; drainage and sewerage; impact on character; loss of agricultural land
 - Ruskington – traffic and road safety; drainage and sewerage; flood risk; infrastructure and services; public transport links; loss of agricultural land
 - Saxilby – capable of delivering more;
 - Scotter – past growth; infrastructure and services; lack of jobs; loss of agricultural land; flood risk; public transport links; traffic and road safety; impact on character
 - Waddington – infrastructure and services; traffic and road safety; impact on character



- Welton – infrastructure and services; traffic and road safety; drainage and sewerage; public transport links; capable of delivering more
- Support was received for proposed allocation of the following sites:
 - CL415 – Land South of Bracebridge Heath
 - CL875 – Land Opposite the Cemetery, Boston Road, Heckington
 - CL904 – Land Northwest of Village, Metheringham
 - CL906 – Top Farm, Navenby
 - CL957 – Land off Lincoln Road, Ruskington
 - CL958 – Land North of Ruskington
 - CL960 – Land South of Poplar Close, Ruskington
 - CL965 – Land at Whitehouse Road, Ruskington
 - CL986 – Land South of Ferry Lane, Skellingthorpe
 - CL1086 – Land at Pitts Road, Washingborough
 - CL1100 – Land to the North of Witham St Hughs
 - CL1179 – Land North of Rudgard Avenue, Cherry Willingham
 - CL1181 – Land East of Thornton Way, Cherry Willingham
 - CL1892 – South of Winchelsea Road, Ruskington
 - CL1305 – Land at Church Lane, Keelby
 - CL2091 – Land off West Street, Billingham
 - CL3018 – Billingham Field, Mill Lane, Billingham
 - CL4433 – Land East of Rudgard Avenue, Cherry Willingham
 - CL4660 – Land off Deepdale Lane, Nettleham
 - CL4661 – Land off High Leas, Nettleham
 - CL4662 – Neighbourhood Plan Allocation C Part of Site CL1376 East of Brookfield Avenue, Nettleham
 - CL4663 – Old Linelands Site, All Saints Lane Nettleham
- Objections and/or comments were made about the proposed allocation of the following sites:
 - CL415 – Land South of Bracebridge Heath
 - CL417 – Land off Moor Lane, Branston
 - CL418 – Land at Silver Street, Branston
 - CL875 – Land Opposite the Cemetery, Boston Road, Heckington
 - CL904 – Land Northwest of the Village, Metheringham
 - CL906 – Top Farm, Navenby
 - CL957 – Land off Lincoln Road, Ruskington
 - CL958 – Land North of Ruskington
 - CL986 – Land South of Ferry Lane, Skellingthorpe
 - CL994 – Land East of Lincoln Road, Skellingthorpe
 - CL1061 – Land at Grantham Road / High Dyke, Waddington
 - CL1086 – Land at Pitts Road, Washingborough
 - CL1101 – Land at Mill Lane, Billingham
 - CL1110 – Land off Park Lane, Billingham
 - CL1179 – Land North of Rudgard Avenue, Cherry Willingham
 - CL1181 – Land East of Thornton Way, Cherry Willingham
 - CL1190 – Land South of Honeyholes Lane, Dunholme
 - CL1208 – Off Lincoln Road, Skellingthorpe
 - CL1305 – Land at Church Lane, Keelby
 - CL1456 – Land to East of North Moor Road, Scotter
 - CL1488 – Hackthorn Road, Welton
 - CL1490 – Land at The Hardings, Welton
 - CL1491 – Land at Prebend Lane, Welton
 - CL3018 – Billingham Field, Mill Lane, Billingham
 - CL3031 – Land South of the Whyche, Billingham
 - CL4084 – Land North of Honeyholes Lane, Dunholme



- CL4433 – Land East of Rudgard Avenue, Cherry Willingham
 - CL4469 – Land East of Canterbury Drive, Washingborough
 - CL4496 – Grantham Road, Waddington
 - CL4660 – Land off Deepdale Lane, Nettleham
 - CL4661 – Land off High Leas, Nettleham
 - CL4662 – Neighbourhood Plan Allocation C Part of Site CL1376 East of Brookfield Avenue, Nettleham
 - CL4663 – Old Linelands Site, All Saints Lane, Nettleham
 - CL4671 – Land off Grantham Road, Waddington
 - CL4674 – North [Moor] Road, Scotter
- Comments or objections were made about sites not being allocated in the following Large Villages, with alternative sites being proposed as suitable allocations:
 - Bardney
 - Billinghay
 - Branston
 - Cherry Willingham
 - Dunholme
 - Heighington
 - Heckington
 - Keelby
 - Middle Rasen
 - Nettleham
 - Ruskington
 - Saxilby
 - Scotter
 - Skellingthorpe
 - Waddington
 - Washingborough
 - Welton

Policy LP53 – Residential Allocations in Medium and Small Villages

Summary of issues raised

- Suggestions received that medium and small villages should be given allocations in general for reasons including:
 - Too much reliance placed on SUEs;
 - Need to spread development pressures more;
 - Need to take account of significant opportunities that present themselves;
 - To help provide certainty; and
 - To help support services and halt rural decline.
- Suggestions were received that the following villages should specifically receive allocations, many also including suggested sites:
 - Bassingham
 - Brookenby
 - Eagle
 - Fiskerton
 - Glentham
 - Hemswell Cliff (different sites to the one proposed for allocation)
 - Langworth
 - Marton
 - Morton
 - Newton on Trent

- North Greetwell
 - Potterhanworth
 - RAF Digby
 - Scampton
 - Scothorn
 - Sturton by Stow
 - Swinderby
 - Thorpe on the Hill
 - Torksey
- Objection received regarding allocating sites without planning permission in any villages in these tiers of settlement hierarchy as inconsistent and against policy.
 - Objections and/or general comments were made about the following proposed allocations:
 - CL22 – Nocton Park, Nocton
 - CL1200 – FA2 Lincoln Road, Faldingworth
 - CL4673 – Hemswell Cliff

Policy LP54 – Broad Locations for Future Growth

Summary of issues raised

- Comments that the status of these sites were unclear.
- Objections received stating that work undertaken on them, as SUE-size sites, is insufficient to date.
- Objections and/or general comments received about the Broad Location for Future Growth at Land at Quarrington, Sleaford
- Support was received for the allocation of Land East of White’s Wood Farm, Gainsborough (Gainsborough Eastern SUE) as a Broad Location for Future Growth:
- Comments received suggesting that the Broad Location for Future Growth at Land at Quarrington, Sleaford should be allocated fully in the Local Plan:
- Comments received suggesting that a change to the boundary should be considered for the Broad Location for Future Growth at Land South of Waddington Low Fields.
- Suggestions for additional and/or alternative Broad Locations for Future Growth were received for the following sites:
 - CL1021 – Land off Mareham Lane, Sleaford
 - CL4391 – Land off Boston Road, Sleaford

Policy LP55: Development in Rural Areas and the Countryside

Summary of issues raised

- Various comments made in support of and objection to the policy.
- Particular support expressed for Part B, replacement of a dwelling in open countryside.
- Part G, protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land, is also particularly supported.
- However there was also objection to Part G, namely that it goes beyond requirements set out in paragraph 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- Objections raised against Part D, non-residential development in rural areas: comments that the policy creates a ‘presumption against development’ that restricts development outside settlement boundaries and that it risks stifling much needed growth in some areas. Alternative wording suggested.
- Suggestion made that a clause should be inserted into Part F, agricultural diversification, that large scale renewable energy developments are not classed as diversification.

- Concerns raised against Part A, re-use and conversion of non-residential buildings for residential use in open countryside: misgivings about what constitutes 'comprehensive' evidence to justify a building is no longer being used for its original purpose.
- Concerns raised against criteria c of Part E, non-residential development in rural areas: criteria needs clarification so that it does not become a tool to prevent a farming business from diversifying because of existing agricultural uses, or to stop a farm business embarking on a scheme just because there is a similar scheme nearby.
- Concern that the policy does not accord with paragraphs 54 and 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Policy LP56: Gypsy and Traveller Allocations

Summary of issues raised

- Objections to all proposed site allocations
- Very small number of supporting representations, mostly giving high level support
- Mixed views on whether Sustainable Urban Extensions should provide Gypsy and Traveller provision
- Common objections to all the proposed site allocations included:
 - Lack of facilities nearby
 - Impact on landscape character
 - Road safety and access
 - Flooding
 - Integration to the community
 - Limited school places
 - Privacy and amenity of existing and future residents
 - Questions over site capacity
 - Imbalanced distribution of sites across the Central Lincolnshire area
 - Objection on the grounds that the proposed site allocations do not meet the criteria set out in the policy
 - No existing infrastructure on site

Policy LP57: Ministry of Defence Establishments

Summary of issues raised

- Some support for policy.
- Various suggestions for improvement of policy wording and requirements.
- Support for development of housing on redundant sites.
- Concern that policy does not recognise importance of and opportunities presented by heritage assets on military sites.
- Ministry of Defence supports first part of policy and principle that redevelopment or change of use of redundant sites will be supported, but has concerns over criteria (a) to (e) and the three bullet points.

Chapter 11: Previous 'Saved Policies', Implementation and Monitoring

Summary of issues raised

- Numerous comments stated that reference to the Nettleham village Design Guide should be included at 11.1.5.
- Detailed policies for ongoing implementation and monitoring are missing from the current Further Draft Local Plan. Monitoring, review and implementation are key aspects of the Government's 'plan, monitor and manage' approach to the planning system.



Appendix A: Neighbourhood Planning

Summary of issues raised

- Very few comments received in relation to this appendix.
- One general statement on the importance of neighbourhood plans.
- Support for the list of 'strategic' policies to assist with the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans.
- Comment that the Local Plan should be more specific on how local communities can enhance existing facilities and provide protection from over development.

Appendix B: Growth Levels in Villages (Levels 5-6 of the settlement hierarchy)

Summary of issues raised

Please see combined summary of Policy 4 and Appendix B above.

Appendix C: Open Space Standards

Summary of issues raised

- General observations received: no explicit support expressed, or objections raised.
- Open spaces, green spaces and Public Rights of Way considered a very important part of the development of Central Lincolnshire.
- Comment that Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards should be used to ensure that there is sufficient natural greenspace accessible to residents and available for wildlife.