



Policy LP2 The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy Evidence Report

Proposed Submission
April 2016

Contents

1. Introduction and Policy Context.....	1
2. Central Lincolnshire Context in Relation to Policy LP2.....	2
3. Local Plan Policy: Preliminary Draft.....	3
4. Local Plan Policy: Further Draft	5
5. Local Plan Policy: Proposed Submission.....	6
6. Alternative Reasonable Options.....	7
7. Conclusion	7
Appendix A1: Settlement Hierarchy in the Preliminary Draft Local Plan.....	8
Appendix A2: Settlement-specific comments	10
Appendix B: Settlement Hierarchy at Further Draft stage	17

1. Introduction and Policy Context

Introduction

- 1.1 A joint Local Plan for the Central Lincolnshire area is being produced which will set the framework for how development will be considered across the districts of the City of Lincoln, North Kesteven and West Lindsey to 2036.
- 1.2 This evidence report (which is one of a collection) provides background information and justification for policy LP2, which relates to the Spatial Distribution and Settlement Hierarchy for Central Lincolnshire.

National policy

- 1.3 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012 and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) was introduced in 2014 which offers ‘live’ government guidance.
- 1.4 One of the Core Planning Principles identified in paragraph 17 of the NPPF is that planning should:
- “actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable”*
- 1.5 Section 3 of the NPPF concerns “Supporting a prosperous rural economy”. The following points are particularly relevant:

Paragraph 28 –

“Planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development. To promote a strong rural economy, local and neighbourhood plans should:

- *support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well designed new buildings;*
- *promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses;*
- *support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside. This should include supporting the provision and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations where identified needs are not met by existing facilities in rural service centres; and*
- *promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.”*

This clearly shows how the Local Plan must ensure that it takes proper account of the opportunities for developing the rural economy, providing flexibility for local needs.

- 1.6 Section 4 of the NPPF concerns “Promoting sustainable transport”. The following points are particularly relevant:

Paragraph 30 –

“Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.”

This demonstrates a clear justification for the settlement hierarchy approach, taking account of sustainable modes of transport and reducing the distance needed to travel to services and employment for example.

- 1.7 Paragraph 55 of the NPPF concerns the promotion of sustainable development in rural areas. It states that:

“To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances...”

This suggests that account of rural networks is an important consideration in distributing growth, but isolated developments should be avoided unless specific circumstances suggest otherwise.

- 1.8 The NPPG contains guidance on how local authorities can support sustainable rural communities [Reference ID: 50-001-20140306]. This states that:

“It is important to recognise the particular issues facing rural areas in terms of housing supply and affordability, and the role of housing in supporting the broader sustainability of villages and smaller settlements...”

“Assessing housing need and allocating sites should be considered at a strategic level and through the Local Plan and/or neighbourhood plan process. However, all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas – and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.”

This suggests that a policy should not unduly restrict housing development in rural settlements with a blanket restriction, but directing development to certain settlements at a strategic level whilst providing flexibility to allow appropriate growth where needed, is appropriate.

2. Central Lincolnshire Context in Relation to Policy LP2

- 2.1 There are more than 400 settlements and small collections of dwellings in the Central Lincolnshire area. The principal settlement is the city of Lincoln which, together with the neighbouring area of North Hykeham and other connected urban areas, has by far the largest population (110,000) and provides a regional role. In addition to Lincoln the towns of Gainsborough (population 18,500) and

Sleaford (population 15,600) are important centres for the surrounding rural areas, providing employment opportunities, retail and other services.

- 2.2 These three settlements have clearly defined roles within Central Lincolnshire. Outside of these the roles of the area's towns and villages are less well-defined. Many settlements perform a number of roles with complex interrelationships with both smaller and larger settlements.

3. Local Plan Policy: Preliminary Draft

- 3.1 The Preliminary Draft version of the Local Plan (published for consultation in October – November 2014) included a policy on The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy. The policy sought to identify the proposed approach to distributing growth and the main elements of the policy were as follows:

- Focusing growth in Lincoln and adjoining urban areas and possibly in some of the larger villages near to Lincoln;
- Additional growth in the main towns of Gainsborough and Sleaford;
- Some growth in Small Towns and Growth Villages;
- Limited growth in smaller villages referred to as Limited Growth Villages and Small Villages; and
- Development limited to that needed to support rural operations in all other areas referred to as Countryside.

- 3.2 The classification of these settlements was based primarily on population but took into account the presence of some facilities and services. The position of settlements in the Preliminary Draft is included at Appendix A1.

Preliminary Draft Consultation

- 3.3 There were a number of comments and objections made on the draft policy, varying from factual details about the presence of facilities in specific villages, comments about the wording and language used, opinions on the level of growth in specific settlements and comments about the overall approach to the policy. In addition to this, many comments included support for the policy approach or for specific parts of the policy.
- 3.4 The below summarises the main issues raised on the overall approach of the policy and the response to comments where necessary:
- The wording is not in plain English and is not clear for non-professionals.
 - Unclear what is meant in the wording relating to growth in smaller settlements. This is a loop hole that could allow developers to circumnavigate the policy.
 - Negative physical or visual impact of development on rural areas, harming village character, loss of separation.
 - Negative impact of development on services and facilities in rural areas.
 - Should be a greater focus on urban areas in Lincoln.
 - There is too much emphasis on the main towns and more should be delivered in and near to Lincoln.
 - Policy should not artificially constrain growth in rural areas, this will have an impact on the vitality of these areas. These are sustainable due to modern technology and lifestyles, e.g. internet. A greater level of flexibility should be allowed in rural locations to address settlement and site specific issues.

- More development should be built in villages to improve their sustainability through new facilities.
- Policy should deliver new villages rather than cramming houses into existing.
- The focus for growth in the Lincoln Area should be spread more around other villages in the area.
- Villages should not be included in tier 1 but should at most be in tier 3, due to the urbanising effect of scale of development.
- Better understanding is needed of villages at the edge of the Central Lincolnshire area, to take into account nearby settlements.
- Impact of no affordable housing coming forward in rural villages.
- Policy does not take account of rural networks where groups of villages support one another, in terms of opportunities and potential risks.
- Policy should take account of the Humber Bank growth area.
- The policy should utilise a criteria-based policy test for decisions on proposals in rural areas.
- Policy is contrary to the requirements of NPPF and NPPG which encourages growth in rural areas which supports vitality. The blanket approach used is not appropriate and is contrary to guidance.
- Small towns and growth villages should be separated out into two categories.
- Small towns and growth villages are capable of accommodating developments of more than 50 dwellings.
- The Limited Growth Villages category should be split into two with villages over 1000 homes where 100-150 homes would be acceptable; and villages less than 1000 homes where 25 homes could be delivered on non-allocated sites.
- Limited Growth Villages will require allocations in order to meet the Objectively Assessed Need and to provide certainty.
- The wording for Limited Growth Villages should include a clear preference for sites within the village itself before sites on the edge of the village.
- The small villages category is too wide with settlements of 55-1725 population.
- The wording should be changed to allow for development at the edge of small villages.
- Policy should deliver houses where need arises rather than arbitrary distribution.
- Distance to secondary schools is not a helpful figure as buses are run to secondary schools in rural areas.
- Growth is not good as it will add to unemployment.
- Policy should be amended to add renewable energy generation to the list of acceptable uses in rural areas.
- No justification given for the maximum numbers for rural settlements. This will not be appropriate given the variety of size of villages.
- Should be a greater focus on locations with failing services.
- Policy does not take account of the sustainable futures work undertaken to underpin the previous core strategy.
- Levels of growth in settlements should be determined by the ability to accommodate growth in services and facilities, or the accessibility of jobs.
- Policy should let neighbourhood plans decide what level of growth should occur.
- The wording of the policy does not take account of neighbourhood plans being undertaken in villages in the Lincoln Area.
- The approach to settlements in category 6 would preclude the provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites.
- No justification for why Scotter has been downgraded.

- Some of the scoring is unclear and it downplays some attributes, such as open space.
- The policy should include a function to manage the phasing of development in villages.
- Site criteria for rural areas should be set out to enable the GLLEP to deliver its target of doubling the GVA and output from the food and farming industry.
- Affordable housing should be included as a reason in the public interest for development in category 5.
- Housing affordability issues resulting from restricting growth in small settlements.
- The hierarchy should be refocused to deliver development where it is wanted, based on consultation feedback.
- Policy should allow small developments in small hamlets.
- Policy does not deliver on the Local Plan vision.
- Policy does not take account of redundant farmsteads, the development of which, with enabling development, could avoid their demolition.
- Development at the edge of category 6 settlements should also be allowed where overriding reasons in the public interest exist or if they are delivered through a neighbourhood plan.
- Development in countryside areas should not automatically be subject to an occupancy condition.
- Villages should remain compact so that people can walk into the village centre, parking is often limited in village centres.
- Presence of heritage assets should be used in the policy-on approach.
- There is no planning reason why development could be allowed at the edge of a limited growth village, but not a small village.
- Growth levels should be expressed in percentages not in dwelling numbers.

3.5 In addition to the above table, many comments were made on individual settlements. These comments have been taken into account in the revision of the category for each settlement. The summary of these comments can be seen in Appendix A2.

4. Local Plan Policy: Further Draft

4.1 The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy was amended from the Preliminary Draft version in response to comments received during the consultation, and in response to information about the level of growth needed in the plan.

4.2 The titles of some of the tiers of the settlement hierarchy were amended following the consultation. These changes are as follows:

Preliminary Draft Stage	Further Draft Stage
1. Lincoln Area	1. Lincoln Urban Area
2. Main Towns	2. Main Towns
3. Small Towns and Growth Villages	3. Market Towns
4. Limited Growth Villages	4. Large Villages
5. Small Villages	5. Medium Villages
6. Countryside	6. Small Villages
	7. Countryside

These changes were made to reduce the wide range of settlements in some of the middle tiers and to make it clearer about what distinguished between the tiers.

- 4.3 The basis for categorising smaller villages was also revised following the consultation due to the availability of accurate information and as it was considered that use of dwelling numbers as a means to consider the size of settlement to be more appropriate than the population when considering the size of an individual development that could occur. Furthermore, a closer connection was established with policy LP4 which set the overall levels of growth for villages.
- 4.4 The position of settlements in the settlement hierarchy at the Further Draft stage is provided in Appendix B.

Further Draft Consultation

- 4.5 There was a fair level of support for the revised approach in the Further Draft Local Plan, and also for the positioning of many settlements in the hierarchy. However, a number of key issues and comments were also received, as follows:

- Growth should be more focused in larger, more sustainable settlements.
- Growth in smaller settlements should be more limited whilst delivering some appropriate growth.
- 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 received 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.
- Suggestions that settlements lower down in the hierarchy should be allocated sites.
- Suggestions for some amendments to the position of some villages in the hierarchy.

5. Local Plan Policy: Proposed Submission

- 5.1 Following the Further Draft Consultation comments made were considered and some minor amendments to the policy were undertaken. Comments about the positioning of settlements were reviewed and some settlements were relocated within the hierarchy accordingly. The following changes were made to the positioning of sites in the hierarchy:
- The Elms and Torksey Lock – these were listed as separate settlements in the previous stages of consultation but have now been merged into Torksey Lock in the medium villages tier
 - Osgodby – this was relocated to small villages from medium villages
 - Brattleby – this was added to the small villages tier from countryside
 - Canwick – this was added to the small villages tier from countryside
 - Grayingham – this was removed from the small villages tier into countryside
 - Springthorpe – this was added to the small villages tier from countryside
- 5.2 The revised approach to the final settlement hierarchy, and some other related policies, has been amended, partly as a result of the comments received. This revised approach provides more flexibility in smaller settlements to account for local circumstances, whilst clearly steering growth to

the more sustainable settlements. The revised approach is detailed in the *Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Distribution Study April 2016* which is available on the Central Lincolnshire website in the planning policy library.

6. Alternative Reasonable Options

- 6.1 The following alternative options have been considered for this policy (Option 1 is the preferred policy approach which has been included in the Further Draft Local Plan).
- 6.2 **Option 2:** Inclusion of a policy that details the spatial strategy, but that does not include a settlement hierarchy. Whilst a spatial strategy would include some broad distribution and an overall approach to delivering growth this would result in uncertainty in villages and towns about what growth would come forward. Many villages have similar sustainability levels and without a hierarchy, this could result in villages becoming overwhelmed by growth. It would also be very difficult to plan for infrastructure to support the growth.
- 6.3 **Option 3:** Inclusion of a policy that details the spatial strategy and would include a settlement hierarchy that is less flexible. This would provide greater certainty for developers and residents and would allow for infrastructure to be delivered with a clear knowledge of where growth would occur. However, a rigid approach to growth in smaller settlements would place an overly restrictive cap on growth in settlements and may restrict sustainable opportunities from being realised.
- 6.4 **Option 4:** Do not include a policy for the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy. National policy clearly seeks for local plans to address spatial implications and as such this approach would be inconsistent with national policy. It would also provide very little certainty for residents, developers and infrastructure providers and could result in unsustainable distribution of growth.

7. Conclusion

- 7.1 This evidence report sets out the evolution of policy LP2 including the main issues raised through two stages of consultation. The detailed rationale for the amended hierarchy as contained in the Proposed Submission Local Plan is in a separate document called the *Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Distribution Study* (Ref E018 in the planning policy library).

Appendix A1: Settlement Hierarchy in the Preliminary Draft Local Plan

1. **Lincoln Area:**

Lincoln Urban Area: City of Lincoln, North Hykeham, South Hykeham Fosseway, Waddington Low Fields

Possibly some of the Lincoln Area Villages: Bracebridge Heath; Branston; Cherry Willingham; Dunholm; Heightonton; Nettleham; Saxilby; Skellingthorpe; Waddington (village); Washingborough; Welton; and Witham St Hughs.

2. **Main Towns:**

Gainsborough and Sleaford

3. **Small Towns and Growth Villages:**

Bardney; Billingham; Caistor; Heckington; Keelby; Market Rasen; Middle Rasen; Metherringham; Navenby; and Ruskington.

4. **Limited Growth Villages:**

Bassingham; Blyton; Fiskerton; Helpingham; Hemswell Cliff; Ingham; Leasingham; Martin; Morton; Quarrington; RAF Scampton; Reepham; Scothern; Scotter* and Sturton by Stow.

5. **Small Villages:**

Aisthorpe	Great Limber	Rowston
Anwick	Greetwell	Scampton
Apley	Greylees	Scopwick
Ashby de la Launde	Hackthorn	Scotter Common
Aubourn	Harmston	Scotterthorpe
Aunsby	Harpwell	Scotton
Beckingham	Heapham	Scredington
Bigby	Heckington Fen	Searby
Bishop Norton	Hemswell	Silk Willoughby
Blankney	Holdingham	Snarford
Blankney Fen	Holton cum Beckering	Snelland
Bleasby Moor	Holton le Moor	Snitterby
Blyborough	Ingleby	Somerby
Blyton Carr	Kettlethorpe	South Carlton
Boothby Graffoe	Kexby	South Hykeham
Brampton	Kirkby	South Kelsey
Branston Booths	Kirkby Green	South Kyme
Brant Broughton	Kirkby La Thorpe	South Rauceby
Brattleby	Knaith	Southrey
Broadholme	Knaith Park	Spridlington
Brocklesby	Langworth	Springthorpe
Brookenby	Laughterton	Stainfield
Broxholme	Laughton	Stainton By Langworth
Burton	Lea	Stapleford
Burton Pedwardine	Leadenham	Stow
Burton Waters	Legsby	Stragglethorpe

Cabourne	Linwood	Sudbrooke
Caenby	Lissington	Susworth
Cammeringham	Little Hale	Swallow
Canwick	Martin Dales	Swarby
Carlton le Moorland	Marton	Swaton
Chapel Hill	Moortown	Swinderby
Claxby	Nettleton	Swinhope
Coleby	New Toft	Tattershall Bridge
Corringham	Newton	Tealby
Cranwell	Newton On Trent	The Elms
Culverthorpe	Nocton	Thoresway
Digby	Normanby By Spital	Thorpe On The Hill
Doddington	Normanby Le Wold	Threekingham
Dorrington	North Carlton	Thurlby
Dunston	North Greetwell	Timberland
Eagle	North Kelsey	Torksey
Eagle Moor	North Kelsey Moor	Torksey Lock
East Ferry	North Kyme	Upton
East Heckington	North Owersby	Waddingham
East Stockwith	North Rauceby	Walcot
Evedon	North Scarle	Walcott
Ewerby	North Willingham	Walesby
Faldingworth	Northorpe	Walkerwith
Fenton	Norton Disney	Welbourn
Fillingham	Osournby	Wellingore
Friesthorpe	Osgodby	West Rasen
Glentham	Owmbly	Whisby
Glentworth	Owmbly By Spital	Wickenby
Goltho	Potterhanworth	Wildsworth
Grasby	Riby	Willingham By Stow
Grayingham	Risesholme	Willoughton
Great Hale	Rothwell	Wilsford
		Wrawby

6. Countryside.

* Scotter was treated as an exception in the Preliminary Draft version of the plan, where the basic criteria would place it in the Small Towns and Growth villages category.

Appendix A2: Settlement-specific comments

Settlement	Comment made
Aubourn	Object to Aubourn being classified in tier 5 as the policy is not clear. These villages would benefit from allocations to give certainty to residents.
Bardney	Bardney can accommodate a higher level of growth on brownfield employment land.
	Bardney can accommodate housing on sites greater than 50 dwellings.
	Bardney children have a long way to travel to a secondary school.
Bassingham	Bassingham should be designated as a small town and growth village. It was previously identified as a tertiary attractor and it has been reduced without any apparent justification. It has the facilities to support development including, recreational facilities, retail facilities, 2 pubs, 2 food stores, primary school, post office, medical surgery, bus routes to major towns, places of worship and employment facilities.
	Bassingham should be identified for significant growth as being within the Lincoln Area due to its level of services and position and relationship with Lincoln.
	Support for Limited Growth categorisation but expect the plan to provide guidance on how people can get to employment without adding to vehicle movements.
Billingham	Billingham is very remote.
Bracebridge Heath	Support for Bracebridge Heath being identified as a location for growth within the Lincoln Area as it is a sustainable with good access to existing facilities and new ones likely to come forward in nearby SUEs.
	Bracebridge Heath should be included in the Lincoln Area due to its close geographic and functional relationship with Lincoln.
Branston	Object to Branston being within tier 1 and should be a limited growth village.
	Branston should not be joined with Lincoln. The bypass should form a natural barrier to Lincoln's growth.
	Branston Post Office is currently for sale for a 4 bed dwelling.
	Capacity issues in health facilities, schools and roads.
	Branston should be included in the Lincoln Area due to its close geographic and functional relationship with Lincoln.
Brattleby	Concerned about the impact of any development as access is unsuitable, it would result in the loss of the rural character, impact on property prices, and lack of infrastructure.
Brookenby (inc. Binbrook College, Orford & Swinhope)	Brookenby should really include the other areas of Binbrook College and Orford as one settlement. Should also include Swinhope located within 50m of village. This will alter the sustainability picture.
	Brookenby does have a pub / social club.
	Brookenby should be identified as a growth village.
	Brookenby has a large amount of brownfield land suitable for economic or housing development and is close in terms of travel to work patterns to Grimsby.
Burton Waters	Should be higher up in the hierarchy to ensure that an appropriate level of growth can be delivered, taking account of its distance to Lincoln and the facilities available.
	The background document does not correctly identify the facilities in Burton Waters, it has a parade of shops and businesses, a food store, a café, restaurants, a pub, and there is permission for an extra care centre and a hotel.
	Burton Waters' facilities are developing and improving, this should be reflected.
Caistor	Support position of Caistor as a small town and growth village.
	Caistor is likely to be influenced by what is happening in the neighbouring areas such as Humber Bank. This needs to be taken into account.

	More should be made of the Humber Bank opportunity in Caistor.
Cherry Willingham	Concern about focusing growth at Cherry Willingham without investment in health, school places.
	Important to protect the village character
	Villages like Cherry Willingham need the creation of jobs and facilities to survive as viable communities.
	The amount of housing development in the last 50 years is threatening to end Cherry Willingham's character as a village.
	Cherry Willingham should be moved to tier 4 Limited Growth Villages.
	The Cherry 2020 plan should be given more weight.
	Cherry should not be joined with Lincoln and there should be green space retained all around Cherry including to Fiskerton.
	One of the two main roads is due to be cut off by the eastern bypass.
	Cherry Willingham is scored positively for employment but there is none.
	Cherry Willingham should be included in the Lincoln Area due to its close geographic and functional relationship with Lincoln.
Cranwell	The classification as small village is incorrect as its sustainability credentials have been underestimated. It should be moved up to Limited Growth Village in recognition that it is a vibrant and growing village. It has nearly 3000 residents, a convenience store and nearby facilities.
Digby	Digby has suffered several incidences of flooding recent years. The drainage and sewerage systems require an overhaul.
	Issues with highways safety and development would result in additional vehicle movements due to lack of local facilities.
Dunholme	Dunholme and Welton should be relocated from tier 1 to tier 4 as they are already over-developed and not able to sustain more large developments.
	Dunholme should be included in the Lincoln Area due to its close geographic and functional relationship with Lincoln.
Dunholme Field	Dunholme Field should be a new settlement.
Dunston	The rural character of the village should be retained.
Ewerby	Should be considered for growth due to its proximity to Sleaford. Logical infill site between main street and the clay pits. This could deliver 30 homes to help the continuing sustainability. This could be delivered in the short term.
Fiskerton	Fiskerton should not be restricted by classification as a limited growth village.
	Fiskerton has a village hall, a regular bus service, a convenience store, two pubs, mobile library, church, primary school, and a nearby secondary school (Cherry Willingham).
Gainsborough	There is not demand for houses in Gainsborough. Access and movement is an issue with only one bridge over the Trent. Improved access to the M18/M180 would be beneficial.
	Question the need for growth in Gainsborough.
	Gainsborough is the key driver in West Lindsey and should be a focus for growth.
Glentworth	There are local issues with the sewage works creating foul odours. This should be considered with any development in Glentworth or in neighbouring villages also served by the works, Hemswell, Harpswell and Fillingham.
Grayingham	Objection to submission to develop land around Grayingham as unsustainable.
	Object to building in Grayingham as there is no infrastructure, reliant on over-subscribed services in Kirton-in-Lindsey.
	Concerns about sewerage infrastructure in Grayingham which is often overwhelmed in high rain fall.
	Concerns about impact of development on local wildlife – hares, rabbits, foxes, owls and bats.

	Suggestion of under 5% growth in Grayingham due to recent levels of growth.
Greetwell	Wish to remain within category 5 and to maintain a settlement break on the eastern side of the bypass to ensure that North Greetwell maintains its separate identity.
Greylees	This is already part of Sleaford and is not a separate settlement. There is far more opportunity for growth here than in other locations.
Heckington	Heckington is one of the most sustainable settlements in tier 3 due to the services available (list given).
Heighington	Object to significant growth at Heighington due to impact on village feel, congestion on high street, and loss of distinction with neighbouring areas merging. Heighington should be included in the Lincoln Area due to its close geographic and functional relationship with Lincoln.
Hemswell Cliff	Hemswell Cliff is ideally placed for more growth (250-300) with good road connections, business park, school and community facilities.
	Hemswell Cliff should be moved up from a limited growth village to a small town and growth village.
	Policy STRAT3 of the WLLP identified Hemswell Cliff as a primary rural settlement. It has a good range of services and a good amount of employment.
	A masterplan is being developed for Hemswell Cliff in conjunction with the LEP and LCC for an urban extension and industrial expansion as an alternative to over-burdening the Lincoln Fringe.
Holdingham	Should be removed from the list of small villages as it is part of Sleaford.
Keelby	Keelby does not have a pharmacy
	More should be made of the Humber Bank opportunity in Keelby.
Langworth	There is no school, no shop, no post office, no doctors surgery, and only one footpath in the entire village. Access issues to the village at Barlings Lane.
Lea	Lea is classed as a small village yet it is stated that it is linked to Gainsborough.
	Lea has no facilities and the only way to deliver meaningful amenities through the development process.
	Development in Lea will not result in its loss of separate identity.
	Suggestion that the reason for classifying Lea in this way is to protect preferred SUEs.
Leadenham	Can accommodate more growth as it has good road links, a primary and secondary school within walking distance, two pubs, retail and therefore should be moved to limited growth villages.
Market Rasen	Market Rasen's Town centre is of a larger scale than would be expected for its size. As such there is potential for additional growth that is appropriate and in the right place.
	With an increased focus on the visitor and tourism economy Market Rasen's economic potential should be reflected in the plan through employment and housing allocations.
	Market Rasen is one of the most sustainable settlements in tier 3 due to the services available (list given).
	More should be made of the Humber Bank opportunity in Market Rasen.
Martin	Any future development should be to the south of the village, away from public rights of way and should be small scale (2-3 dwellings). Any development should enhance the width of the village from north to south as opposed to west to east.
Metheringham	Concerns about Metheringham being considered for growth on the grounds of congestion, including from the anaerobic digester and other planning applications. Impact on local health and education services. Loss of agricultural land in combination with other renewable energy projects. Potential loss of separation between Metheringham and Dunston.

	<p>The site adjoining Dunston Road has access and drainage issues and will reduce the separation with Dunston.</p> <p>Support Metheringham being classified as a growth village if development is in the right locations. CL900 may be suitable for light industry / employment and CL904 for mixed housing and amenities such as doctors surgery, dentist, community building. These sites must include infrastructure needed.</p> <p>Development in nearby villages of Dunston and Nocton need to be taken into account as they use facilities in Metheringham.</p> <p>Metheringham is a sustainable settlement, but does not have the level of services available in other settlements in tier 3.</p>
Middle Rasen	<p>Question the position of Middle Rasen in the hierarchy.</p> <p>Middle Rasen is too small to be included in category 3.</p>
Morton	<p>Do not agree that Morton and other limited growth villages are not of a scale to warrant an allocation in the Local Plan.</p> <p>As part of Gainsborough, support Morton as a location for growth in order to support its function and sustainability.</p> <p>Should be moved to Category 5 Small Villages</p>
Navenby	<p>Navenby has had a lot of development in past years without attention to infrastructure. Insufficient medical facilities and school places to accommodate growth.</p> <p>Navenby now feels like a town, not a village.</p> <p>Navenby should be included in the category small villages or limited growth villages as it has had a lot of development over recent years.</p> <p>Traffic congestion and safety issues with development in Navenby.</p> <p>Concerns about Navenby joining Wellingore and Boothby Graffoe if more development comes forward.</p> <p>The sewerage infrastructure cannot cope with additional dwellings and there is already flooding at the High Street at the bottom of Chapel Lane.</p> <p>Navenby does not have a post office.</p>
Nettleham	<p>Development here will have a negative impact on the historic character and will have an impact on the setting of Lincoln.</p> <p>Services and facilities in the village are stretched and cannot accommodate more development.</p> <p>Development to the south of Nettleham will impact on the green wedge.</p> <p>Nettleham should be identified as within a sub set of tier 4 suitable for 100-150 homes, or failing that, within category 3.</p> <p>Support identification of Nettleham as one of the main villages key to servicing the Lincoln Area.</p> <p>Nettleham should be included in the Lincoln Area due to its close geographic and functional relationship with Lincoln.</p>
Newtoft	<p>Has large areas of brownfield land suitable for housing or employment development. It has current designations that have restricted development and it should be considered to remove these restrictions.</p>
Newton on Trent	<p>Concern over the very limited amount of development to come forward in Newton. How much growth is needed to maintain and improve existing services such as the school and bus service? Will flooding limit future growth and how can this be tackled?</p>
Nocton	<p>Nocton does not need or want development as already have a thriving close-knit community. Whilst some development is recognised as being inevitable. Support the approach for small villages with very limited development.</p>
North Greetwell	<p>Support small village category for village but concerned about the ability of developments to occur if they include a village hall for example.</p>

	A new village incorporating North Greetwell should be considered as this will reduce pressure for building more in Lincoln fringe villages.
North Hykeham	North Hykeham should not have any additional housing until such time as the traffic issues are resolved. Newark Road is at a standstill for many hours of each day with accidents or roadworks exacerbating it.
	It needs to be clarified what is meant as North Hyekham and what is south Hykeham as sites promoted are between the two.
Owmby	Object to classification as small village which imposes a restriction on development. Owmby should be given allocations to give comfort about where development will come forward in the plan period.
Quarrington	This is already part of Sleaford and is not a separate settlement.
Riseholme	Support Riseholme as a small village in the hierarchy.
	Concern about university proposals to develop a large amount of housing in Riseholme as inappropriate in planning terms.
	Expect the LPA to limit any development in Riseholme to single dwellings in otherwise built up frontage. There should also be no allocations here.
Ruskington	Support classification as small town and growth village.
Saxilby	Services and facilities cannot cope with additional development. Saxilby should be moved to the small towns and growth villages category.
	Focusing Growth at Saxilby will result in loss of rural character and setting.
	Saxilby should be classified as a Limited Growth Village as the amount of growth experienced in recent years has the facilities and services at capacity.
	There are some facilities that could be improved in Saxilby, but other infrastructure can never be improved and is inadequate for new housing growth.
	Saxilby should be moved to category 2 or 3 as it only has 2 shops, 1 post office, 2 doctors surgeries, 1 primary school, 1 train station, 1 nursery, 1 vet, 1 sports centre, 1 pharmacy, 2 take aways, 1 and ½ pubs, poor road network, and in an area at risk of flooding.
	Support for inclusion of Saxilby as one of the main villages in the Lincoln Area at which to consider growth.
	Saxilby has a train station and a population of approximately 3000 with a range of facilities. It should deliver in the region of 400-600 homes.
	Saxilby should be included in the Lincoln Area due to its close geographic and functional relationship with Lincoln.
RAF Scampton	MOD are concerned about the inclusion of RAF Scampton as the planning authority is not in a position to determine the level of growth to occur here. This should be considered in a specific policy on MOD sites in the plan.
	Should be moved up to Small towns and growth villages as it has good road links and extra population would help with balancing social mix.
	Site is 1/3 unoccupied and whilst there is uncertainty over the MOD's future use of the site it should be allocated for economic uses such as tourism and heritage. Along with the showground and Hemswell Cliff, Scampton forms part of a strategic cluster on the A15.
	The land between the showground and RAF Scampton should be developed in a joint venture with a hotel and deliver a new large village or small town with a vibrant community delivering 2-3 thousand homes with all new facilities.
Scothern	Scothern is wrongly categorised as a limited growth village as it does not have a convenience store, post office and no library service. The population of Scothern is also more aligned to small villages.
	Development in Scothern is not sustainable in terms of water supply, drainage, roads and amenity.

	Current applications in Scothern for 38 homes likely to increase the population by 10%.
Scotter	There is no evidence of housing need in Scotter and houses have struggled to be sold in recent years.
	Object to any developments greater than 9 dwellings occurring in Scotter.
	Cannot understand why Scotter has been singled out in the policy as no information given.
	Support Scotter being identified as Limited Growth Village due to its extensive development over the past decade.
	Scotter suffers sewage overflows, surface water drainage is not able to accommodate recent developments. The primary school is full with no scope for expansion. It is difficult to get an appointment at the doctors surgery. Jobs are not available locally and rely on local towns where jobs are in fairly short supply.
	Scotter should be moved down to tier 4 small villages. Reasons include previous growth resulting in services and facilities being stretched, car parking in the village causing problems with traffic and inadequate sewerage.
	Scotter should not be moved up to Small Towns and Growth Villages due to issues mentioned above.
	Scotter was identified in the Sustainable Futures work as having a number of sustainable attributes. Scotter performs well at the moment and can consolidate its role as a tertiary attractor.
Skellingthorpe	Object to anything that would result in Skellingthorpe merging with Lincoln. Villages should retain their separate identity.
	Skellingthorpe already has permission for 300+ houses which will increase the village size by 25%.
	Issues in Skellingthorpe from additional houses include traffic and road safety and drainage. Loss of village character.
	Skellingthorpe should be included in the Lincoln Area due to its close geographic and functional relationship with Lincoln.
Sleaford	Sleaford cannot sustain continued building and further growth would require a southern bypass to the town.
	Sleaford's road network is not suited to growth.
	Sleaford has yet to recover from the significant growth of the last 20 years. Retail and employment provision will not meet the levels of growth. There is finite space in Sleaford to accommodate facilities.
	Sleaford should have a separate classification as a significant town to enhance its role in providing employment, retail, and key services and facilities to the wider area.
	Sleaford is the key driver in North Kesteven and should be a focus for growth.
Snitterby	Support Snitterby being identified as a small village and the limited nature of development accepted.
South Hykeham	With South Hykeham South Hykeham Fosseway identified as a location of growth is clearly unwilling to offer protection to South Hykeham Village.
Stow Park	Should be included as a small village so that a small scale development can occur. It is comparable to a number of other small villages in terms of size and facilities.
Sturton By Stow	Should be relocated to Category 3 Small Towns and Growth Villages
	Support classification as limited growth village.
Sudbrooke	Wishes to remain within category 5.
	Should be relocated to category 4.
Swallow	Agree that Small Villages is the appropriate category for Swallow.

Swinderby	Object to classification of Swinderby as a small village as it provides employment, primary school, pub, and has a population of 773. It should be a Limited Growth Village.
Thurlby	Support classification of Thurlby as a small village.
The Elms	The Elms is listed as a separate settlement but it is part of Torksey.
	The Elms and Torksey have a post office, convenience store, 3 mobile shops, hairdresser, chiropodist, 1 café, 1 restaurant, 2 pubs, 1 pharmacy, 1 doctors surgery, 1 mobile library, church, a village hall, free bus to Lincoln and Gainsborough provided by supermarkets, and estimated employment of 120.
Timberland	The Parish Council are concerned that there are no sites for housing in the village.
Waddington	Question the growth in Waddington with no jobs in the settlement and no new ones forthcoming. Suggest development would exacerbate the situation.
	Waddington is one location and should be treated as such. The village as a whole should be under tier 3.
	Waddington should be included in the Lincoln Area due to its close geographic and functional relationship with Lincoln.
Walesby	Object to classification as small village which imposes a restriction on development. Walesby should be given allocations to give comfort about where development will come forward in the plan period.
Washingborough	Washingborough should be included in the Lincoln Area due to its close geographic and functional relationship with Lincoln.
Welbourn	Does not fit in the category for small villages given its size and range of services. If the tier approach is retained it should be moved up to limited growth villages.
Wellingore	Wellingore is joined with Navenby but there is a desire to retain individual character and distinction. With Navenby classed as a Small town and growth village this could result in an unbalanced settlement.
	Should be classified as a low growth village involving sites of up to 5 dwellings and only within the village.
Welton	Dunholme and Welton should be relocated from tier 1 to tier 4 as they are already over-developed and not able to sustain more large developments.
	Welton should be included in the Lincoln Area due to its close geographic and functional relationship with Lincoln.
Witham St Hughs	Any development outside of the bypasses in the Lincoln Area should be focused at Witham St Hughs in preference to older villages as it has better road links and a population that will be more receptive to growth.
	Witham St Hughs should be included in the Lincoln Area due to its close geographic and functional relationship with Lincoln.

Appendix B: Settlement Hierarchy at Further Draft stage

1. Lincoln Urban Area:

City of Lincoln; North Hykeham; South Hykeham Fosseway; Waddington Low Fields.

2. Main Towns:

Gainsborough and Sleaford

3. Market Towns:

Caistor and Market Rasen

4. Large Villages:

Bardney	Heighington	Saxilby
Billinghay	Keelby	Scotter
Bracebridge Heath	Metheringham	Skellingthorpe
Branston	Middle Rasen	Waddington
Cherry Willingham	Navenby	Washingborough
Dunholme	Nettleham	Welton
Heckington	Ruskington	Witham St Hughs

5. Medium Villages:

Bassingham	Helpringham	Potterhanworth
Blyton	Hemswell Cliff	Reepham
Brant Broughton	Ingham	Scothern
Brookenby	Lea	Scotton
Burton Waters	Leasingham	Sturton By Stow
Cranwell	Martin	Sudbrooke
Digby	Marton	Swinderby
Dunston	Morton	Tealby
Eagle	Nettleton	The Elms
Fiskerton	Nocton	Waddingham
Great Hale	North Kelsey	Welbourn
Greylees	North Scarle	Wellingore
Harmston	Osgodby	

6. Small Villages:

Anwick	Holton cum Beckering	Rowston
Ashby de la Launde	Holton le Moor	Scampton
Aubourn	Kexby	Scopwick
Beckingham	Kirkby	Scredington
Bigby	Kirkby Green	Searby
Bishop Norton	Kirkby La Thorpe	Silk Willoughby
Blankney	Knaith Park	Snitterby
Boothby Graffoe	Langworth	South Hykeham Village
Branston Booths	Laughterton	South Kelsey
Burton	Laughton	South Kyme
Cammeringham	Leadenham	South Rauceby
Carlton le Moorland	Legsby	Southrey
Chapel Hill	Lissington	Spridlington
Claxby	Little Hale	Springthorpe
Coleby	Martin Dales	Stow
Corringham	Moortown	Swallow
Doddington	New Toft	Swaton
Dorrington	Newton On Trent	Swinhope
East Ferry	Normanby By Spital	Tattershall Bridge

East Heckington
East Stockwith
Ewerby
Faldingworth
Fenton
Fillingham
Glentham
Glentworth
Grasby
Grayingham
Great Limber
Hackthorn
Hemswell

North Carlton
North Greetwell
North Kyme
North Owersby
North Rauceby
North Willingham
Northorpe
Norton Disney
Osbournby
Owmbly By Spital
Riby
Riseholme
Rothwell

Thoresway
Thorpe On The Hill
Threekingham
Timberland
Torksey
Upton
Walcott
Walesby
Whisby
Wickenby
Willingham By Stow
Willoughton
Wilsford

7. Countryside