

## Central Lincolnshire Local Plan

### Initial questions from the Inspectors (26 July 2016) and the Committee's Response to those Questions (15 August 2016)

Note: references to 'the Committee' are to the *Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee*.

#### **Summary of main issues**

1. The *Report on Key Issues Raised* appears to summarise all (or most) of the issues raised in representations. However, Regulation 22 seeks a summary of the *main* issues. Can the Committee prepare a summary of what are considered to be the *main* issues arising from the representations. It would also be helpful if a focused response could be provided to each of the identified main issues.

#### **CLJSPC Response:**

The Committee is aware that regulation seeks a summary of 'main issues' only, but is conscious that this is undefined, and that representors will, on the whole, consider their representations to be 'main', hence the Committee's approach to providing a comprehensive summary of issues raised. However, in response to the Inspector request, Appendix 1 of this document aims to draw out the more 'headline' main issues raised during the proposed submission consultation for the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. The summaries have been prepared by officers and represent their best efforts to accurately and clearly identify these 'headline' main issues raised. However, this summary is intended to act as a guide only and should not be used as a substitute for the more comprehensive summary of key issues raised in the Planning Policy library or the full submitted set of representations. The Inspector examining the Local Plan has been provided with a full and comprehensive set of all duly made representations. A full set of all representations made is publicly available in the Programme Officer's library and all are available to view on the Central Lincolnshire web site:

[http://central-lincs.objective.co.uk/portal/central\\_lincolnshire/pslp/pslp](http://central-lincs.objective.co.uk/portal/central_lincolnshire/pslp/pslp)

The representations received expressing support for the Local Plan policies have not been listed in Appendix 1.

A response to the 'main' issues is also set out in Appendix 1, as appropriate.

#### **Suggested modifications**

2. The Committee's letter of 29 June states that a schedule of suggested main and additional modifications has been prepared. Could this now be made available. It would be helpful if a column could be provided explaining why the Committee consider each of the suggested main modifications are necessary.

#### **CLJSPC Response:**

'Version 1' of the *Schedule of Suggested Modifications by CLJSPC* (Document Ref LP05) has now been finalised and will be added to the library as soon as possible (web library and hard copy libraries). It is attached to this reply for ease of reference.

## Consultation

3. *The Report on Key Issues Raised* (on pages 2 and 3) explains that some representors had concerns about consultation on the plan. This includes the availability of submission documents, procedures to consider comments, feedback on comments, length of consultation, venues used to view consultation documents and generally about a lack of publicity. Can the Committee provide a response to these concerns.

### **CLJSPC Response:**

The Proposed Submission Local Plan and other Proposed Submission Documents (as defined by regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012)) were available for the duration of the formal consultation period on our website and hard copies were available at the offices of North Kesteven District Council during normal office hours.

The Proposed Submission Local Plan (but not the full set of the other Proposed Submission Documents) were also made available to view at the offices of City of Lincoln Council and West Lindsey District Council and numerous community buildings throughout Central Lincolnshire (such as libraries, parish council offices, and community centres) as detailed in our 'Statement of the Representations Procedure and Arrangements for Inspection of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (Proposed Submission Version – April 2016)' which is available on our website.

The full set of Proposed Submission Documents were not available on Objective (our online consultation portal): the principle purpose of the portal is to enable people to submit comments electronically, therefore the Portal only featured the Local Plan itself. The Committee's website is (and was) the proper place to provide the full set of Proposed Submission Documents, and other wider material (such as the wider evidence base).

Following the consultations (Regulation 18) on the Preliminary Draft version of the Local Plan and the Further Draft version, the Committee published and made available on our website, a 'Key Issues Raised' report (documents LP01A and LP02A respectively) which summarised the comments received. Following the Proposed Submission consultation (Regulation 19), a further 'Key Issues Raised' report was published (LP03A). Prior to the consultation on the Further Draft Local Plan, the Committee also published Evidence Reports for each of the policies which explained how and why each policy had changed between the Preliminary and Further Draft, in light of the comments received and more generally how we responded to representations received. Prior to the consultation on the Proposed Submission version, the Evidence Reports were updated and republished, and explained any further changes, again in light of comments received during the consultation or other evidence. These Reports made it clear how we responded to representations received.

The Preliminary Draft, Further Draft and Proposed Submission Local Plans were each subject to 6 weeks public consultation, in line with the Regulations.

Consultations were publicised by emails to all consultees on our consultation database, through the Central Lincolnshire website and the websites of the constituent authorities, and through social media.

Overall, the Committee is very confident it met all of the consultation obligations as set out by the various Acts, Regulations and our own SCI, and the various material on our website demonstrates this.

### Objective assessment of housing need (OAN)

4. DCLG recently released its 2014-based household projections (2014-2039) for England. These update the household projections that were released in February 2015. The new projections are based on the 2014-based sub-national population projections (SNPP) that were published by ONS in May 2016. The OAN figure in the plan uses the 2012 sub-national household projections released in 2015 as the demographic starting point. Can the Committee provide a comparison between the 2012 and 2014 based projections. Does this have any significant implications for the OAN and the housing requirement in the plan?

#### CLJSPC Response:

The following table compares the 2012 and 2014-based household projections over the Local Plan period of 2012-2036 for the three District Councils and Central Lincolnshire as a whole.

<b>2014-based household projections: Comparison with 2012-based projections for Examination of Central Lincolnshire Local Plan</b>					
<b>All Households</b>	<b>2014-based</b>		<b>2012-based</b>		
<b>Local authority</b>	<b>Change 2012-2036</b>	<b>Average p.a. 2012-2036</b>	<b>Change 2012-2036</b>	<b>Average p.a. 2012-2036</b>	<b>Difference p.a.</b>
<b>Lincoln</b>	6,813	284	6,070	253	31
<b>North Kesteven</b>	9,021	376	9,953	415	-39
<b>West Lindsey</b>	7,210	300	6,996	292	9
<b>Central Lincolnshire</b>	<b>23,044</b>	<b>960</b>	<b>23,019</b>	<b>959</b>	<b>1</b>

It can be seen that there is a difference of just 1 dwelling per annum between the two projections for Central Lincolnshire as a whole. This is a balance of increased rates in Lincoln and West Lindsey being matched by a reduction in North Kesteven. As a basic principle of the Submission Local Plan is to distribute planned growth across Central Lincolnshire, and not burdened by the three district administrative boundaries, the District level figures above are, therefore, not particularly relevant.

DCLG round the published projections to the nearest 1000 and these calculations are based on the unrounded figures. Given this, and the inherent uncertainty in projecting future housing needs, then we can be confident that the projected trends are materially unchanged.

Overall, therefore, the latest projections make no material difference to the 'starting point' for determining the OAN, and the Committee considers that the latest forecasts have no implications for the conclusions reached in the SHMA, or the OAN as set by the Committee, or the subsequent housing targets as set out in the Submitted Local Plan. If anything, the forecasts re-enforce the Committee's position on all these matters.

## Housing supply

5. Policy LP53 allocates 5 sites in medium and small villages (401 dwellings) and Policy LP4 allows 10-15% growth in the many other medium and small villages. Is any housing supply assumed from these '10-15% growth' settlements? If so, does it contribute to the windfall assumptions set out in the table on page 109 of the Plan?

### CLJSPC Response:

The short answer is 'yes' to both questions.

To explain further, the table on page 109 of the Local Plan includes assumed growth from small and medium villages in column (i). The assumptions for growth in column (i) (i.e. 4,133 dwellings) can be broken down as follows:

- a) Growth assumption from small sites in the Lincoln urban area (see document PS.EVR48-54, paragraphs 3.8-3.9 on page 4) – **1,500 dwellings** (75 per annum);
- b) Growth anticipated from the Central Lincoln Mixed Use Area as designated in Local Plan policy LP33 (as referenced in document PS.EVR48-54, paragraph 3.10 on page 4) – **500 dwellings**;
- c) Growth remaining in small and medium villages within the Lincoln Strategy Area – **805 dwellings** across the 44 villages within the Lincoln Strategy Area – this is based on the 10-15% for the villages;
- d) (a) + (b) + (c) above add up to 2,805, the figure shown in the first row of column (i); and
- e) Growth remaining in small and medium villages outside the Lincoln Strategy Area – **1,328 dwellings** across the 91 villages not in the Lincoln Strategy Area – this is based on the 10-15% growth levels for the villages.

For the avoidance of doubt, the numbers included for windfall exclude growth taken up by the completions (since 2012), commitment and allocations in policy LP53 because they are captured in columns (d) and (g).

## Lincoln West Quadrant Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE)

6. The CIL Viability Study (E0111A Appendix D) states that an application will be made for European Social Fund grants in the region of £24 million to support delivery of this SUE. The plan indicates 3,200 dwellings in the plan period and the viability study indicates 750-1000 units in first phase. The second phase is then said to be dependent on ground remediation and grants funding. The Evidence Paper for the Western Growth Corridor states that viability evidence supports delivery but all 'estimated costs' and 'how will it be delivered' in the infrastructure delivery table are marked 'TBC'. Is any firm evidence available on infrastructure costs, funding arrangements and deliverability within the plan period?

### CLJSPC Response:

**Infrastructure Costs:** The updated WGC Topic Paper details the infrastructure requirements and costs for the delivery of the SUE. These costs have been used in the high level viability work that demonstrates the development is viable.

**Funding Arrangements:** The WGC SUE is viable and deliverable without external sources of funding for all phases of the development. A number of funding applications have been and will be submitted for European, National, Regional and Local Funds to assist in permitting earlier supply of both residential and commercial opportunities. Any external sources of funding secured would enable accelerated delivery of the development that will early bring forward housing and employment growth for the City of Lincoln Council. For the

purposes of all the high level detailed viability appraisals a funding/grant rate of nil was adopted.

**Deliverability:** Build rates have been reviewed as part of the updating of the Topic Paper and these remain unchanged as they are achievable in the plan period.

**Viability Assessments:** Several high level detailed viability appraisals have been undertaken for the WGC which all include contributions of Section 106, CIL and provision of affordable housing units. These appraisals demonstrate that the scheme is viable including when the sales value of £1990 sq.m is adopted as identified in Table 6.2a of the Central Lincolnshire Whole Plan Viability Study undertaken by Peter Brett Associates (PBA).

7. In respect of all SUEs, have the Council's proposed CIL rates been factored into viability assessments?

**CLJSPC Response:**

In short, yes.

The various SUEs are at different stages in their preparation, from consent to preliminary stages. In each case, an appropriate level of viability assessment has taken place which factors in CIL rates (as submitted for examination). In some cases, two appraisals have been done, one with CIL and one without, to factor in the fact that consent may occur prior to CIL being in place.

Full details on viability (and wider deliverability) issues are set out for each SUE in the updated set of SUE Topic Papers as published on 15 August 2016 and available in our library. These Papers have been agreed between the applicable district and the site promoter.

CLJSPC is happy to respond to any detailed queries the Inspector(s) may have on viability and deliverability issues of any specific SUE.

### **5 year supply of housing land**

8. Appendix 1 in the *Five Year Land Supply Report* sets out a list of sites which contribute to a five year supply. It would be helpful if this table could be expanded with a column added to indicate which sites are allocations and SUEs within the plan and which are windfalls. It would also be helpful to add columns to cover the period until the end of the plan period to help demonstrate that a rolling 5 year supply can be achieved (or do this in a separate table).

#### **CLJSPC Response:**

Please see the attached Appendix 2, which is an expanded version of Appendix 1 in the *Five Year Land Supply Report* which now shows the sites that are allocated and the policy within which they are allocated (4<sup>th</sup> column). It also shows the longer term trajectory as requested. This is the information that went into the trajectory on page 110 of the Local Plan.

9. Table 5 indicates that a large component of the 5 year supply will be from sites that do not appear to have planning permission (emerging new allocations and windfalls). What evidence is there that each of these sites will be able to contribute to a 5 year supply?

#### **CLJSPC Response:**

The Committee intends to publish an updated Five Year Land Supply Report in early September 2016, incorporating data to 31 March 2016 (rather than 31 March 2015, as in the current published version). However, in the meantime, please see attached Appendix 3 entitled *Five Year Land Supply Interim Update* which provides an up to date position for sites proposed for allocation. This concludes that 60.0% of dwellings in the five year land supply are on sites which now benefit from planning permission, many of which (3,165 dwellings) having received permission since 1 April 2015. In addition, 19.1% are dwellings on proposed allocation sites with no objections, and 4.9% on sites with some objections. Only 6.1% are windfall. Thus, permissions now form the majority (60%) of the supply, with the minority (40%) of supply made up of uncontested proposed allocations, contested allocations and windfall.

The windfall element is 748 dwellings, made up of 2 parts:

- (i) 300 dwellings from small sites in Lincoln (75 dwellings per year, excluding year 1 which is set at 0) in the five year supply is based on the lowest delivery from small sites in the city since 2006/07 as detailed in paragraphs 3.8 and 3.9 of document PS.EVR48-54. The inclusion of only 75 dwellings per year is considered to be conservative and that this is likely to be surpassed in many, if not all, years.
- (ii) 448 dwellings from rural areas, which is also considered to be a conservative estimate. Whilst this is based on the overall remaining growth level for medium and small villages in policy LP4 spread across the remaining years of the plan, permission has been granted for a large number of dwellings since April 2015 and as such we are expecting more front loading in villages as a result of this policy. Figures for permissions in these villages will be provided in the revised Five Year Land Supply Report which includes the 2015/16 data.

10. The *Five Year Land Supply Report* sets out the record on completions since 2012/13 and concludes that *some might argue* that an additional 20% buffer is required due to persistent under-supply. In this context the PPG states that *the assessment of a local delivery record is likely to be more robust if a longer term view is taken, since this is likely to take account of the peaks and troughs of the housing market cycle*. Can the Committee provide an analysis looking back over a longer period, including to before the economic down-turn, comparing annual delivery with the housing requirement before the base date for the submitted plan (2012). What bearing does this have on the application of a 5% or 20% buffer.

**CLJSPC Response:**

For long term completion rates, please refer to figure 5.10 on page 68 of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (July 2015) (document ref E003).

Prior to the Regional Spatial Strategy (see below), housing numbers were set through the Lincolnshire Structure Plan. The last one to be adopted (prior to Structure Plans being abolished) was in September 2006, with a plan period 2001-2021. This set an annual requirement of 405 dwellings for Lincoln, 400 dwellings for North Kesteven, and 350 dwellings for West Lindsey. This total of 1,155 for Central Lincolnshire was significantly exceeded for each of the 8 years from 2001 (base date of the Structure Plan) to the superseding of the Structure Plan in 2009 by the RSS.

The East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) (adopted in March 2009) identified the housing growth requirements for Central Lincolnshire prior to its revocation in March 2013. Policy 13a of the RSS set 2,030 dwellings per year as a target for the combined Central Lincolnshire area (a near doubling of the Structure Plan annual target, and well in excess of anything ever achieved in Central Lincolnshire) with a breakdown for different parts of Central Lincolnshire as follows:

- Lincoln Principal Urban Area (PUA) broadly aligned to the Lincoln Urban Area at the top of the settlement hierarchy in policy LP2 of the Local Plan – 990 dwellings per annum;
- North Kesteven (excluding areas of the district in the Lincoln PUA) – 560 dwellings per annum; and
- West Lindsey (excluding areas of the district in the Lincoln PUA) – 480 dwellings per annum.

It is clearly evident in figure 5.10 that the RSS targets were never met (by a considerable margin) in the short life of the RSS.

If we look solely at the 10 years prior to the downturn, 1998/99-2007/08 there was an average supply of 1,634 dwellings per year, which exceeds the Structure Plan of the time, and exceeds the current OAN for the Submission Local Plan.

Overall, in terms of drawing a conclusion on the buffer, there are clearly periods when Central Lincolnshire has performed well, and delivered in excess of its requirements. But, more recently (last 8 years, which coincides with the national economic down-turn), delivery has steadily declined, and below target.

Overall, and on a precautionary basis, CLJSPC has determined that it is appropriate to use a 20% buffer in its recent five year land supply calculations. However, if the Inspector considers that the over-supply (i.e. exceeding of targets) in the 10 year period up to around 2007/08 should be considered to outweigh the more recent under-supply, then CLJSPC will be happy to explore this matter further.

### **Alternative/additional sites advanced in representations**

11. Can the Committee prepare a list of such sites (ie those where representors are seeking a different use to that proposed in the plan). It would be helpful if the list could include the representor, allocation in the plan, the allocation/use being sought and a plan/map showing the location of each site.

#### **CLJSPC Response:**

Please see attached Appendix 4. In addition to this, the Key Issues Report for the Proposed Submission Draft (reference LP03A) listed and summarised all objections against proposed residential allocation sites on pages 45-55. Furthermore, the Residential Allocations Evidence Report (PS.EVR48-54) details the rationale for selecting sites for allocation or for not selecting them.

### **Employment land**

12. The Plan states that the Economic Needs Forecast results in a requirement for 23 ha of new employment land (3.5.10). The plan allocates significantly more land than this through strategic employment sites (111ha) and land within Sustainable Urban Extensions (42ha) - a total of 153ha of land (Policy LP5). How much of this allocated land:

a) has an extant planning permission for employment use

b) lies within existing established employment area and/or a site/location which is already partially developed for employment use?

#### **CLJSPC Response:**

Evidence Report (Doc Ref PS.EVR5) in defence of Policy LP5 sets out details in respect of the reasoning behind the policy and allocations. This includes commentary on scale of consents (p13-14 in particular), which demonstrates that the vast majority of strategic allocations have consent, or similar (eg enterprise zone status). I can also confirm that, in June 2016 (i.e. post the Evidence Report being published), the site known as E5 Sleaford Enterprise Park has also been granted consent.

However, the majority of the employment allocations forming part of the SUEs do not have consent (see p15-16 of same Report).

None of the strategic allocations or SUEs lie within the defined 'established employment areas' though, as detailed on p13-14 of the Report, some of consented strategic sites have been built out, but anything built out already has not been counted as part of the forward supply (for obvious reasons).



## Appendix 1 - Inspectors Initial Questions (July 2016), Q1

### Summary of main issues

The summaries below aim to draw out the key or main issues raised during the proposed submission consultation for the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. The summaries have been prepared by officers and represent their best efforts to accurately and clearly identify the ‘headline’ main issues raised. However, this summary is intended to act as a guide only and should not be used as a substitute for the more comprehensive summary of key issues raised in the Planning Policy library or the full submitted representation. The Inspector examining the Local Plan has been provided with a full and comprehensive set of all duly made representations. A full set of all representations made is publicly available in the Programme Officer’s library and all are available to view on the Central Lincolnshire web site.

[http://central-lincs.objective.co.uk/portal/central\\_lincolnshire/pslp/pslp](http://central-lincs.objective.co.uk/portal/central_lincolnshire/pslp/pslp)

The representations received expressing support for the Local Plan policies have not been listed in this ‘main issues’ summary.

<b>Policy/ Section</b>	<b>‘Headline’ Main Issues</b>	<b>CLJSPC Initial Response</b>
General	General procedural challenges.	See the response to Q3
Suggested Additional Policies	Additional policies were requested for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residential caravans</li> <li>Tourist accommodation</li> <li>Enabling policy for Nocton Hall, Nocton</li> <li>‘Comprehensive development’ policy preventing ransom strips.</li> </ul> Also see LP7 and LP29.	The specific issues raised are thought to be adequately covered by other policies in the plan.
Forward, Preface & Chapter 1	No main issues.	N/A
Our Vision: A prosperous, stronger and sustainable Central Lincolnshire & Chapter 2.	No main issues	N/A
LP1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	No main issues	N/A
LP2 – The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy	A wide variety of issues raised, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>objection to the placing of some settlements in the hierarchy</li> <li>objection to the thresholds set and</li> </ul>	The hierarchy approach has been developed through the Local Plan process and alternatives tested through the IIA/ SA.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>objection to removal of village curtilage boundaries.</li> </ul>	Various evidence reports support the policy approach.
LP3 – Level and Distribution of Growth	<p>Objections to the housing growth target which some consider too high, not needed and over optimistic or that it is too low and should either be stated as a minimum or set at the higher range of the objectively assessed need.</p> <p>Objections to the distribution of growth and % split and an over reliance on SUEs.</p>	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections.
LP4 – Growth in Villages incl Appendix B	<p>Objection to the sequential test and the requirement to demonstrate local community support.</p> <p>Considered not flexible enough by some or too vague and flexible by others.</p>	<p>A sequential approach seeks to ensure that the most suitable and sustainable sites are developed first, preventing settlement sprawl and encouraging “the effective use of land” as stated in the NPPF (p.111). Community support is only required for settlements within categories 5 and 6 where they exceed the suggested level of growth in policy LP4 and Appendix B.</p> <p>The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections.</p>
LP5 – Delivering Prosperity and Jobs	<p>Object to the need to market a site for 12 months before conversion or redevelopment for non-employment uses.</p> <p>Sites identified are too few, too large and in the wrong locations.</p> <p>Suggestion that housing growth should be higher to stimulate growth or support higher growth.</p>	<p>Marketing a site for 12 months would provide sufficient evidence to adjudge that a site has no reasonable prospect of being used for that purpose and would allow consideration of alternative uses on their merits.</p> <p>The Local Plan is considered suitably flexible to respond to changing circumstances, such as an upturn in the economy.</p> <p>The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections.</p>
LP6 – Retail and Town Centres in Central Lincolnshire	The Retail Impact Assessment thresholds are questioned.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections.

LP7 – A Sustainable Visitor Economy	<p>Urban bias including need to demonstrate that urban areas are unsuitable which fails to recognise potential for facilities that are rural in nature or location specific.</p> <p>Reinstate WLDC policy CRT7 in relation to Market Rasen Racecourse.</p>	<p>The policy acknowledges and allows for rural development if they are location specific or their nature requires a rural location.</p> <p>The policy as worded takes account of uses such as Market Rasen Racecourse.</p> <p>The Local Plan is a strategic and flexible document, eliminating the need for lengthy, detailed or site specific policies.</p>
LP8 – Lincolnshire Showground	No main issues.	N/A
LP9 – Health and Wellbeing	<p>Question how the policy would be implemented</p> <p>Concern that HIA would result in additional cost implication for developers and that the threshold for requiring it is too low.</p>	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections
LP10 – Meeting Accommodation Needs	<p>The policy is too prescriptive in terms of mix and should be based on local characteristics and market demand.</p> <p>Requirement for meeting M4(2) challenged on: viability grounds; why the requirement is set at 30%; and there should be an allowance for exceptions.</p>	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections.
LP11 - Affordable Housing	<p>Questions raised regarding viability (including links to the outcome of CIL and LP12), deliverability, definitions, whether the highest priority need should be met first and recent changes to national policy (including 4 dwelling threshold).</p> <p>To meet identified need, the % of affordable housing required should be higher or the total housing target should be increased. Some consider the evidence suggest developers can afford a higher %, while others feel that the viability assessment justifies a lower %.</p> <p>Assumptions in the Whole Plan Viability assessment are questioned – land values, build costs, profit level.</p>	<p>Recent govt changes have been noted and suggested modifications have been put forward by CLJSPC to the Inspector.</p> <p>Viability has been considered in detail as part of the whole plan viability assessment and is considered robust. The % required has been set at a rate which seeks to meet as much of the identified need as possible whilst taking viability into consideration.</p> <p>Overall, the CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any further modifications, other than</p>

		as currently suggested, to meet these objections.
LP12 - Infrastructure to Support Growth	<p>Some consider the infrastructure ask to be too onerous and wide ranging, whilst others consider the ask not enough to meet what is needed</p> <p>Phasing of delivery crucial and para 4.6.9 should be incorporated into policy wording.</p>	<p>This policy is supported by a Developer Contributions SPD, Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Community Infrastructure Charging Schedules, all of which provide greater information and guidance on what will be required, when and how it will be funded and are referenced in policy and supporting text.</p> <p>The policy refers to 'planning permission will only be granted' and 'infrastructure capacity to support and meet all the necessary requirements arising from the proposed development' and is therefore considered to reference a direct relationship to the development and the importance of meeting infrastructure need.</p> <p>Viability has been considered in detail as part of the whole plan viability assessment and is considered robust and defensible.</p> <p>Overall, the CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections</p>
LP13 - Accessibility and Transport	No main issues (though several detailed issues)	N/A
LP14 - Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk	objection to the inclusion of the higher water efficiency standards.	Central Lincolnshire is in the East of England high water stress area and the EA and Anglian Water support the higher water efficiency standard. The Housing Standards Review puts the costs of the higher standards at between £6 and £9 per dwelling. The plan has been subject to a whole plan viability assessment.

LP15 - Community Facilities	<p>Too wide ranging and insufficiently prescriptive.</p> <p>Insufficient account taken of viability and need for a robust business plan and governance arrangements are onerous.</p>	<p>The policy seeks to meet the NPPF requirement to promote healthy communities (section 8) and the requirement for a business plan and governance arrangements aims to ensure that proposals are deliverable and viable.</p> <p>The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections</p>
LP16 - Development on Land Affected by Contamination	No representations received.	N/A
LP17 - Landscape Townscape and Views	No main issues	N/A
LP18 - Climate Change and Low Carbon Living	No main issues.	N/A
LP19 - Renewable Energy Proposals	Disappointment that suitable sites for wind have not been identified, not positive or proactive, should include criteria, not assessed by the IIA and Neighbourhood Plans are an unrealistic and inappropriate vehicle for identification of locations.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections
LP20 - Green Infrastructure Network	No main issues	N/A
LP21 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity	No main issues.	N/A
LP22 - Green Wedges	Specific Green Wedge areas either supported, suggestions made for extensions or removal.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections.
LP23 - Local Green Space and Other Important Open Space	Specific Local Green Spaces and Important Open Spaces either supported, suggestions made for extensions or their removal.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections
LP24 - Creation of New Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities	No main issues.	N/A

LP25 - The Historic Environment	Needs to be clear that some harm can be acceptable and need to distinguish between substantial and less than substantial harm.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections
LP26 - Design and Amenity	No main issues.	N/A
LP27 – Main Town Centre Uses – Frontages and Advertisements	No main issues.	N/A
LP28 - Sustainable Urban Extensions	Too flexible or not flexible enough.  Overreliance of SUEs and there should be more non SUE sites allocated.  Object to need to provide for gypsies and travellers and unfair treatment compared to those SUEs that already have planning permission and non-SUE sites. Lack of evidence of alternatives considered and should be located where sites are needed. Should be provided for through CIL.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections
Chapter 7 Lincoln	No main issues	N/A
LP29 - Protecting Lincoln's Setting and Character	No main issues.	N/A
LP30 - Lincoln's Sustainable Urban Extensions	No main issues – site specific issues only	N/A
LP31 - Lincoln's Economy	No main issues	N/A
LP32 - Lincoln's Universities and Colleges	Policy needs re-writing to give greater support to university assets and growth.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections
LP33 - Lincoln's City Centre Primary Shopping Area and Central Mixed Use Area	No main issues	N/A
LP34 - Lincoln's District and Local Shopping Centres	No main issues	N/A
LP35 - Lincoln's Regeneration and Opportunity Areas	No main issues	N/A

LP36 - Access and Movement within the Lincoln Area	No main issues	N/A
LP37 - Sub-Division and Multi-occupation of Dwellings within Lincoln	No representations received.	N/A
Chapter 8 Gainsborough	Lea and Morton are separate villages and not part of Gainsborough and identified separately elsewhere.	Some suggested modifications in this respect – see modifications schedule V1
LP38 - Protecting Gainsborough's Setting and Character	No representations received.	N/A
LP39 - Gainsborough's Sustainable Urban Extensions	No main issues	N/A
LP40 - Gainsborough Riverside	No main issues	N/A
LP41 - Regeneration of Gainsborough	No representations received.	N/A
LP42 - Gainsborough Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area	No representations received.	N/A
Chapter 9 Sleaford and Key Diagram	No main issues	N/A
LP43 - Protecting Sleaford's Setting and Character	No main issues	N/A
LP44 - Sleaford Sustainable Urban Extensions	No main issues – site specific issues	N/A
LP45 - Sleaford's Regeneration and Opportunity Areas	No main issues	N/A
LP46 - Sleaford Town Centre	No main issues	N/A
LP47 - Access and Movement within Sleaford	Objection to the Link Road. Not needed, funding not secured, alternatives not investigated, loss of open space and trees and closure of level crossing unnecessary.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections.
Chapter 10 Development Sites	Over reliance on SUEs and unrealistic delivery rates and need for more, smaller sites to help provide flexibility, choice and to make the plan deliverable. Overreliance on allocations in 5 year supply and need to clearly state how shortfall will be met. Why do market towns have less growth than some large villages and large villages should have a % cap and only incremental growth.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence. Some modifications are suggested in relation to specific development sites (mostly relating to recent permissions).

	Site assessment methodology and consistency of application questioned and consider that there are inconsistencies with IIA scoring.	
LP48 - Sustainable Urban Extensions – Allocations	Detailed comments on specific sites.  An additional SUE is proposed at Quarrington, Sleaford.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections
LP49 – Residential Allocations – Lincoln	Detailed comments on specific sites and suggestions made for additional allocations or alternatives.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence. Some modifications are suggested in relation to specific development sites (mostly relating to recent permissions).
LP50 - Residential Allocations – Main Towns	Detailed comments on specific sites and suggestions made for additional allocations or alternatives.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence. Some modifications are suggested in relation to specific development sites (mostly relating to recent permissions).
LP51 - Residential Allocations – Market Towns	Detailed comments on specific sites and suggestions made for additional allocations or alternatives.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence. Some modifications are suggested in relation to specific development sites (mostly relating to recent permissions).
LP52 - Residential Allocations – Large Villages	Detailed comments on specific sites and suggestions made for additional allocations or alternatives.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence. Some modifications are suggested in relation to specific development sites (mostly relating to recent permissions).
LP53 - Residential Allocations – Medium and Small Villages	Detailed comments on specific sites and suggestions made for additional allocations or alternatives.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence. Some modifications are suggested in relation to specific development sites (mostly relating to recent permissions).
LP54 – Remaining Capacity on SUEs and Broad Locations for Future Growth	Suggestion that Land at Quarrington, Sleaford be allocated and additional site suggested at Heckington.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections
LP55 - Development in Hamlets and the Countryside	Part D (new dwellings in hamlets and the countryside) is too restrictive and E(a) (non-residential development in hamlets and the countryside) is inconsistent with LP2. A(c) (re-use and conversion of buildings of notable architectural or historic merit) and part G (protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land) go beyond NPPF requirements.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections



LP56 - Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation	Need is not met, policy criteria f is too restrictive and there is an objection to requiring provision on the SUEs. The proposed allocation site at Marton has many objections for various reasons.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections
LP57 - Ministry of Defence Establishments	No main issues.	N/A
Chapter 11 Previous 'Saved Policies', Implementation and Monitoring	Absence of a monitoring framework.	The monitoring framework is set out in the Sustainability Appraisal based evidence reports.
Appendix A Neighbourhood Planning	No representations received.	N/A
Appendix B Growth Levels in Villages	Comments recorded under LP4.	N/A
Appendix C Open Space Provision Standards	No main issues.	N/A
Appendix D Glossary	No representations received.	N/A
Integrated Impact Assessment	LP4 – only considered the principle of setting a % level for settlements or why 10% is appropriate. A policy identifying areas suitable for wind energy not appraised. Inconsistencies between the IIA and Residential Allocations report and assessment of alternatives to some allocation sites.	The CLJSPC considers the policy is supported by published evidence and is not suggesting any modifications to meet these objections

**Appendix 2 – see separate attachment**

## Appendix 3 Five Year Land Supply Interim Update

### Introduction

This note provides an interim update on the five year land supply position in advance of a full refresh of the report for the 2015-16 monitoring year. It identifies:

1. Which sites have now obtained planning permission (since 1 April 2015);
2. Which sites obtained no objections and support from owners or developers; and
3. Which sites have outstanding objections against them.

This report is intended to provide clarity for the appointed Inspector for the Examination of the Local Plan, but can also be used in applications and appeals where the five year land supply position is a matter of disagreement between parties. It helps to provide greater certainty over the delivery of allocated sites that did not have planning permission at 1 April 2015 and for which the latest status was not updated in the most recent Five Year Land Supply Report (May 2016).

In relation to sites without permission, it is considered that additional weight can be applied to the allocation of sites at this stage of the plan-making process and in accordance with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that:

*From the day of publication, decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:*

- *the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);*
- *the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and*
- *the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).*

Whilst it is down to the decision-taker to consider the precise level of weight that should be attributed to the allocations, it is considered that it is acceptable and appropriate to include some reliance on growth from proposed allocations without objections at this advanced stage, and also on allocations where objections are about details of the site, rather than the in-principle allocation. In addition to this, where land owners or developers with an interest in the site, have confirmed they are actively pursuing development on the site, this provides greater certainty about the likelihood of the site coming forward in the short term.

## Update on Sites

The below tables detail the sites proposed for allocation, with sites with permission at 1 April 2015 in Table 1, and sites with permission since 1 April 2015 in Table 2. Table 3 highlights sites with no outstanding objections against them and Table 4 indicates those sites that do have objections against them. Tables 3 and 4 provide additional information with a summary of the objections and whether the land owner has confirmed that they are pursuing development at this time.

Table 1 – Sites in the Local Plan with permission at 1 April 2015

<b>Table 1 – Sites in the Local Plan with permission at 1 April 2015</b>				
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>Total Capacity</b>	<b>Capacity in 5 years</b>
CL1239	Gainsborough Southern Neighbourhood SUE	Gainsborough	2,500	160
CL1016	Sleaford South Quadrant	Sleaford	1,450	150
CL1068	Land to North of Station Road, Waddington (former Brick Pits site)	Lincoln	163	127
CL1113	Mill Lane/Newark Road, North Hykeham	Lincoln	228	200
CL1328	LF7 Nettleham Road, Lincoln Fringe	Lincoln	95	95
CL1687	LF2/3 Land off Wolsey Way	Lincoln	374	175
CL2098	Former Lincoln Castings Site A, Plot 1, Station Road, North Hykeham	Lincoln	310	180
CL252	Land rear of No 44 and 46 Station Road	Lincoln	33	33
CL452	Former Parade Ground, Nene Road, Lincoln	Lincoln	54	24
CL515	Romangate Development, land at Nettleham Road, Lincoln	Lincoln	80	80
CL516	RMSC Playing Fields, Newark Road	Lincoln	30	20
CL529	Former Grain Silo Site, off Skellingthorpe Rd	Lincoln	54	54
CL920	Land off Mendip Avenue, North Hykeham	Lincoln	52	40
CL1248	Middlefield School of Technology, Middlefield Lane, Gainsborough	Gainsborough	112	110
CL1271	G21 Northholme, Gainsborough	Gainsborough	51	51
CL1277	G3 & G25 combined, Corringham Road	Gainsborough	252	120
CL1617	Land off Vanessa Drive	Gainsborough	31	31
CL1624	G1 The Avenue/The Belt	Gainsborough	41	41
CL1633	G11 Foxby Lane, Park Springs Road	Gainsborough	83	83
CL1984	Land at Spring Gardens	Gainsborough	58	58
CL1013	Land at Poplar Farm, South of A17, Sleaford (Part A)	Sleaford	290	190
CL1023	The Bass Maltings, Mareham Lane	Sleaford	204	80
CL1027	Land at King Edwards Street Sleaford	Sleaford	134	106
CL1547	C16 Caistor Hospital Site, North Kelsey Road	Caistor	128	128
CL1356	Works /W'houses East of Charlotte Cl.	Market Rasen	28	9
CL1144	B4-Field Lane, B5-Wragby Road & B6-Field Lane, Bardney	Bardney	73	48
CL248	St John's former hospital, Bracebridge Heath	Bracebridge Heath	176	170
CL418	Land at Silver Street, Branston	Branston	198	170

<b>Table 1 – Sites in the Local Plan with permission at 1 April 2015</b>				
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>Total Capacity</b>	<b>Capacity in 5 years</b>
CL1307	K2 Stallingborough Road, Keelby	Keelby	90	90
CL66	Manor Farm, Ferry Lane, Church Road	Skellingthorpe	51	51
CL1086	Land at Pitts Road, Washingborough	Washingborough	92	92
CL1488	Hackthorn Road, Welton, Lincolnshire	Welton	63	63
CL1490	Land at The Hardings, Welton	Welton	50	50
CL4664	Cell 19, Witham St Hughs	Witham St Hughs	39	3
CL4736	Land off Hutton Way, Faldingworth	Faldingworth	41	41
CL47	Former Rauceby Hospital, Grantham Road	Greylees	109	94
CL22	Nocton Park, Nocton	Nocton	36	25
<b>Total</b>			<b>7,853</b>	<b>3,242</b>

Table 2 – Sites currently in the Local Plan with permission since 1 April 2015

<b>Table 2 – Sites currently in the Local Plan with permission since 1 April 2015</b>					
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>Total Capacity</b>	<b>Capacity in 5 years</b>	<b>Comments</b>
CL428	South East Quadrant, Lincoln	Lincoln	6,000	400	Permission for 120 on part of site
CL818	North East Quadrant, Lincoln	Lincoln	1,400	275	Permission on part for 500 dwellings.
CL1099	Land at Thorpe Lane, South Hykeham	Lincoln	38	38	
CL572	Home Farm, Boultham Park Road	Lincoln	36	36	
CL704	Land to rear of 283-335 Newark Road	Lincoln	150	150	
CL706	Site at Ermine Community Infant School, Thoresway Dr	Lincoln	32	32	
CL808	Westbrooke Road, off Western Crescent	Lincoln	52	52	
CL1238	East of Allocation G1	Gainsborough	80	80	
CL4691	Former Castle Hills Community College Site, Gainsborough	Gainsborough	130	120	
CL1014	Land off Grantham Road, Sleaford	Sleaford	377	260	Part of the site has received permission for up to 200 dwellings.
CL875	Land opposite the cemetery, Boston Road, Heckington	Heckington	106	100	
CL1101	Land at Mill Lane	Billingham	65	65	Part of the site is under construction for 22 dwellings. There is a live planning application for 65 dwellings .

**Table 2 – Sites currently in the Local Plan with permission since 1 April 2015**

Ref	Site name	Settlement	Total Capacity	Capacity in 5 years	Comments
CL417	Land off Moor Lane, Branston	Branston	73	73	
CL4666	Land to the west of Station Road, Branston	Branston	91	40	
CL1190	Land to the south of Honeyholes Lane, Dunholme	Dunholme	275	125	
CL4084	Land north of Honeyholes Lane, Dunholme	Dunholme	49	49	
CL4667	Land south of Fen Road, Heighington	Heighington	50	50	
CL907	Land off Winton Road, Navenby	Navenby	42	42	
CL908	Land off High Dyke, Navenby	Navenby	36	36	
CL4661	Neighbourhood Plan Allocation B - Land off High Leas	Nettleham	68	60	
CL4726	Land off Lodge Lane, Nettleham LN2 2RS	Nettleham	39	39	
CL960	Land south of Poplar Close, East of Railway, Ruskington	Ruskington	67	67	
CL1432	Land off Church lane, Saxilby	Saxilby	221	105	
CL986	Land south of Ferry Lane, Skellingthorpe	Skellingthorpe	102	102	There are permissions across parts of the site 39 and 52 dwellings.
CL994	Land east of Lincoln Road, Skellingthorpe	Skellingthorpe	280	140	An old permission exists on this site, but there is a live application for a replacement scheme.
CL4496	Grantham Road, Waddington	Waddington	142	142	
CL4469	Land east of Canterbury Drive, Washingborough	Washingborough	185	140	
CL1491	Land to East of Prebend Lane, Welton	Welton	350	140	
CL4089	Cliff Road, Welton, Lincoln	Welton	63	63	
CL4725	Land off Meadowsweet Lane, Witham St Hughs	Witham St Hughs	105	105	
CL2089	Land off Carlton Road and Whites Lane, Bassingham	Bassingham	39	39	
<b>Total</b>			<b>10,743</b>	<b>3,165</b>	

Table 3 – Sites currently in the Local Plan without permission and without objections

Table 3 – Sites currently in the Local Plan without permission and without objections					
Ref	Site name	Settlement	Total Capacity	Capacity in 5 years	Comments
CL4668	South West Quadrant, Lincoln	Lincoln	1,600	0	Suggestion from one land owner that part of the site can come forward in 5 years.
CL526	Former Main Hospital Complex, St Anne's Road	Lincoln	126	20	
CL532	Land North of Ermine West	Lincoln	250	120	No objections received, suggestion from the owner that an application is imminent.
CL698	Land to the rear of Birchwood Centre	Lincoln	62	62	
CL699	Land at Nettleham Road, (Junction with Searby Road)	Lincoln	39	39	
CL705	Site of Moorland Infant and Nursery School, Westwick Drive	Lincoln	60	60	
CL824	Land off Ingleby Crescent, Lincoln	Lincoln	81	81	
CL1882	Land off Millbeck Drive	Lincoln	46	46	No objections received and suggestion from land owner that the site can come forward in 5 years.
CL4379	Land at Junction of Brant Road and Station Road Waddington	Lincoln	46	46	No objections received, suggestion from the owner that an application is imminent.
CL4394	Land North of Hainton Road	Lincoln	39	39	
CL4615	North West of Lincoln Road Romangate, Lincoln	Lincoln	99	20	No objection received but suggestion for allowing some mixed use on the site.
CL4704	Land off Western Avenue	Lincoln	30	30	Support received for the site.
CL1217	Tesco Car Park	Gainsborough	25	10	
CL1244	Site between Wembley/Hickman St	Gainsborough	34	15	
CL1246	West of Primrose Street	Gainsborough	83	0	
CL1247	Land enclosed by Thornton St, Bridge St, King St and Bridge Rd, Gainsborough	Gainsborough	25	0	

**Table 3 – Sites currently in the Local Plan without permission and without objections**

Ref	Site name	Settlement	Total Capacity	Capacity in 5 years	Comments
CL1253	Sinclairs, Ropery Road	Gainsborough	114	20	
CL1610	Land between North Street and Church Street	Gainsborough	48	20	
CL4686	Gateway Riverside Housing Zone, Gainsborough	Gainsborough	245	120	The Local Development Order for the Riverside Gateway site was adopted on 19th July – reducing the capacity from 450 dwellings shown in the Local Plan to a revised capacity of 245 dwellings.
CL4687	Town Centre Riverside Housing Zone a	Gainsborough	73	0	
CL4688	Town Centre Riverside Housing Zone b	Gainsborough	55	40	
CL4689	Riverside North Housing Zone, Gainsborough	Gainsborough	170	40	
CL4690	Amp Rose Housing Zone	Gainsborough	78	20	
CL1002	Land at Stump Cross Hill, Quarrington, Sleaford	Sleaford	204	120	
CL1170	Land at Sunnyside, Caistor, west of Tennyson Close	Caistor	60	40	
CL3086	Land to the South of North Kelsey Road, Caistor	Caistor	135	40	No objections received and suggestion from land owner that development is being actively pursued.
CL1369	Land to the rear of Walesby Road, Market Rasen	Market Rasen	30	30	No objections received and suggestion from land owner that development is being actively pursued.
CL4028	Field between properties known as Mayfield & Wodelyn Cottage, Linwood	Market Rasen	47	30	
CL4189	Land to the east of Gordon Field & south of Chapel Street, adjoining Market Rasen Railway Station	Market Rasen	36	30	
CL1110	Land off Park Lane	Billingham	65	65	



**Table 3 – Sites currently in the Local Plan without permission and without objections**

Ref	Site name	Settlement	Total Capacity	Capacity in 5 years	Comments
CL2091	Land off West Street	Billinghay	132	80	No objections received and planning application live on site.
CL3018	Billinghay Field, Mill Lane	Billinghay	154	120	
CL3031	Land to the south of the Whyche	Billinghay	98	0	
CL4721	Land off Waterside	Billinghay	46	23	No objections received and suggestion from owner that an application is imminent.
CL1179	Land North of Rudgard Ave, Cherry Willingham	Cherry Willingham	40	40	No objections received and comments from owners indicated deliverable within 5 yrs.
CL1181	Land East of Thornton Way, Cherry Willingham	Cherry Willingham	200	60	No objections received and comments from owners indicated deliverable within 5 yrs.
CL4433	Land East of Rudgard Avenue, Cherry Willingham	Cherry Willingham	133	45	No objections received and comments from owners indicated deliverable within 5 yrs.
CL904	Land Northwest of village	Metheringham	276	140	
CL4660	Neighbourhood Plan Allocation A - Land at Deepdale Lane, Nettleham	Nettleham	50	40	No objections received, comments from owners suggest a planning application is being prepared.
CL4662	Neighbourhood Plan Allocation C - East of Brookfield Avenue	Nettleham	50	50	
CL4663	Neighbourhood Plan Allocation D	Nettleham	30	30	
CL1208	Off Lincoln Road, Skellingthorpe	Skellingthorpe	129	0	
CL1061	Land off Grantham Road/High Dike	Waddington	187	100	
CL1100	Land to the north of Witham St. Hughs (Phase 3)	Witham St Hughs	1250	360	No objections received and live application for the site.
CL4673	Land at Hemswell Cliff	Hemswell Cliff	180	50	
<b>Total</b>			<b>6,960</b>	<b>2,341</b>	

Table 4 – Sites currently in the Local Plan without permission and with outstanding objections

Table 4 – Sites currently in the Local Plan without permission and with outstanding objections					
Ref	Site name	Settlement	Total Capacity	Capacity in 5 Years	Comments
CL819	Western Growth Corridor	Lincoln	3,200	150	Objection to building in area of flood risk. Suggestion from one land owner that 150 could be delivered separately of the rest – appears to be capacity outside of flood risk zones for this.
CL1241	Gainsborough Northern Neighbourhood SUE	Gainsborough	2,500	150	Questions about short term deliverability – owner confirmed deliverable.
CL3036	Sleaford West Quadrant	Sleaford	1,400	220	Concerns about flood risk, other concerns from earlier consultations, mainly about delivery – application in and owners confirmed deliverable.
CL525	Former Cegb Power Station, Spa Road, Lincoln, LN2 5TB	Lincoln	300	250	Concerns over deliverability due to flood risk, access, viability and contamination.
CL703	Land adjacent to Yarborough School, Riseholme Road, Lincoln	Lincoln	39	39	Objection to loss of playing field – is not a playing field and open space audit suggests a surplus in Lincoln.
CL4652	Land at and North of Usher Junior School	Lincoln	81	60	Objection to possible loss of playing field – as a former school site there is not public access to this site and open space audit suggests a surplus in Lincoln.
CL3044	Land south of Willingham Road, Lea, Gainsborough	Gainsborough	68	45	Many objections to site being allocated on grounds of traffic, road safety, drainage, capacity in services, impact on landscape and wildlife.
CL1007	The Hoplands Depot, Boston Road, Sleaford	Sleaford	63	63	Suggestion that access may be an issue with this site – highways raised no concerns.
CL1013a	Land to the East of CL1013, Poplar Farm, South of A17, Sleaford (Part A)	Sleaford	200	0	Concerns about landscaping and noise – objection not resolved, but no numbers in 5 year supply.
CL1888	Land adjacent and to the rear of Roman Ridge on Brigg Road, Caistor	Caistor	50	45	Objections as a beautiful area, infrastructure capacity issues and houses not selling.

**Table 4 – Sites currently in the Local Plan without permission and with outstanding objections**

Ref	Site name	Settlement	Total Capacity	Capacity in 5 Years	Comments
CL2093	Land North of North Street, Caistor	Caistor	28	28	Objections as a beautiful area, infrastructure capacity issues and houses not selling.
CL1358	Land off Gallamore Lane, Market Rasen, Lincolnshire	Market Rasen	77	20	Concerns at the site not being well connected to the town centre and relying on cars suggesting the capacity should be reduced – within 800m of town centre – detailed development proposals being worked up and public consulted.
CL1359	Land off Linwood Road & The Ridings, Market Rasen	Market Rasen	133	90	Concerns at site not being well connected with the town centre and relying on cars and lack of capacity in services suggesting the capacity should be reduced – within 800m of town centre.
CL1364	Caistor Road, Market Rasen	Market Rasen	200	90	Concerns at site not being well connected with the town centre and relying on cars and lack of capacity in services suggesting the capacity should be reduced – within 800m of town centre – planning application being prepared for 400 units.
CL415	Land South of Bracebridge Heath	Bracebridge Heath	241	90	Support received and deliverable within 5 years for up to 369 dwellings – application being prepared. Owners of neighbouring SUE keen for it either to be in the SUE boundary or phased for delivery in line with infrastructure on SUE.
CL1305	Land at Church Lane, Keelby, Lincs	Keelby	100	0	Concerns about access and capacity in sewage treatment works and drainage.
CL906	Land at Top Farm, Navenby	Navenby	125	125	Objections only about approach for Navenby and support received regarding its deliverability for in excess of 125. Active owners and agents pursuing applications and appeals.

<b>Table 4 – Sites currently in the Local Plan without permission and with outstanding objections</b>					
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>Total Capacity</b>	<b>Capacity in 5 Years</b>	<b>Comments</b>
CL957	Land off Lincoln Road, Ruskington	Ruskington	78	78	Suggestion that this site will have a greater impact on landscape than another site being promoted in Ruskington.
CL958	Land North of Ruskington	Ruskington	172	60	Suggestion that this site will have a greater impact on landscape than another site being promoted in Ruskington.
CL965	Land at Whitehouse Road, Ruskington	Ruskington	73	60	Suggestion that this site will have a greater impact on landscape than another site being promoted in Ruskington.
CL1892	South of Winchelsea Road, Ruskington	Ruskington	76	60	Suggestion that this site will have a greater impact on landscape than another site being promoted in Ruskington.
CL4710	Field 8 Lincoln Road, Ruskington	Ruskington	83	0	Suggestion that this site will have a greater impact on landscape than another site being promoted in Ruskington.
CL1456	Land to the east of North Moor Road, Scotter	Scotter	42	20	Concerns about drainage, road safety, traffic, access, proximity to services, capacity of services, flood risk, impact on views, and impact on bypass.
CL4674	North Moor Road, Scotter	Scotter	51	0	Concerns about drainage, road safety, traffic, access, proximity to services, capacity of services, flood risk, impact on views, and impact on bypass.
CL4671	Land off Grantham Road, Waddington	Waddington	88	88	Objection as site is within the AGLV and green wedge.
<b>Total</b>			<b>9,468</b>	<b>1,831</b>	

**Table 5 – Sites not currently included as proposed allocations for housing**

In addition to the sites currently proposed for housing allocations in the submitted Local Plan, there are a number of non-allocated sites that have received planning permission for housing since the proposed submission draft was published. These sites are being suggested by CLJSPC as modifications to the plan to ensure that the allocations reflect the latest possible position in relation to large sites to be built in Central Lincolnshire. These are shown in table 5 below:

<b>Table 5 – Sites not currently in the Local Plan with recent permission</b>					
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Site name</b>	<b>Settlement</b>	<b>Total capacity</b>	<b>Capacity in 5 years</b>	<b>Permission ref</b>
CL4007	Phase Three, Manor Farm Development, Horncastle Road	Bardney	170	70	Application ref: 131498 Appeal ref: APP/N2535/W/14/3001767
CL4727	Lancaster Green, Hemswell Court	Hemswell Cliff	40	40	Application ref: 133344 Appeal ref: APP/N2535/W/16/3147051
CL4750	Sudbrooke Farm	Sudbrooke	155	70	Application ref: 133284 Appeal ref: APP/N2535/W/16/3144855
CL4086	The Old Scrapyrd, Stow Lane	Ingham	35	35	Application ref: 130739
CL4751	Site 1, Land south of Wesley Road	Cherry Willingham	26	26	Application ref: 132090
CL4752	Site 2, Land south of Wesley Road	Cherry Willingham	33	33	Application ref: 132089
CL4753	George Hotel, 15 Main Road	Langworth	36	36	Application ref: 130773
CL1437	Heath Road	Scothern	30	30	Application ref: 132027
<b>Total</b>			<b>525</b>	<b>340</b>	

## Conclusion

Given the above information it is clear that whilst in the Five Year Land Supply Report (May 2016) suggested there was a significant reliance on proposed allocations in the Local Plan, many of these sites now benefit from planning permission. Table 6 below shows the updated break-down of supply in the five year period.

Table 6 – Summary of supply for five year period

Row	Category	Capacity in 5 year supply	Percentage
A	Permissions up to 1 April 2015 (Table 1 + small sites not included in this report)	4,202	34.2%
B	Allocations with permission since 1 April 2015 (Table 2)*	3,165	25.8%
C	Allocations without objections (Table 3)	2,341	19.1%
D	Allocations with unresolved objections (Table 4)	1,831	14.9%
E	Windfall allowances from Five Year Land Supply Report	748	6.1%
F	Total	12,287	100%

\* excludes new sites with permission proposed as allocations through modifications to the Local Plan, which total a further 340 dwellings in the five year supply as shown in table 5.

Table 6 shows that a substantial amount of dwellings included in the five year supply have planning permission and as such provides substantial certainty of their delivery in the five year period. This 7,367 dwellings (row A + row B) represents 60% of the supply.

Beyond this, row C shows that a further 2,341 dwellings are anticipated to be delivered from the 45 sites proposed for allocation for which there are no outstanding objections. Table 3 shows that of these 45 sites, 14 sites are either the subject of a live planning application or received representations from landowners or developers supporting the site and stating that development is actively being pursued. This provides a greater level of certainty about their short term delivery. These 14 sites have a combined capacity of 960 dwellings in the five year supply.

Row D shows the proposed allocations with outstanding objections, which total 1,831 dwellings or 14.9% of the supply across 25 sites. Of these objections, many were not substantial, were relating to specific details of the site rather than objections in principle, or were about matters that would not affect deliverability of the site. In addition to this, 6 of these sites are the subject of live planning applications or received supporting representations from land owners and developers confirming the deliverability of their site in the short term. These 6 sites have a combined capacity of 825 dwellings in the five year supply.

Therefore, it can be concluded that a substantial proportion of the five year housing land supply is made up of sites with permission, and sites that are actively being promoted and have few or no objections against them.

## Appendix 4 - Information in response to Q11

The sites in Table 1 below received objections against the designation or allocation and proposed alternative designations from the land owner or developer.

Table 1: Sites allocated/designated in the Local Plan, proposed by land owner/developer for alternative use					
Ref	Address	Representor ID	Representor	Allocation/designation in plan	Summary
CL1001	Land at Quarrington, Sleaford	907553	MC Mountain and Son Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy LP54 – Broad Location for Growth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be allocated as a housing site</li> <li>Delivery of this site would be sustainable</li> <li>More desirable location than Sleaford West Quadrant</li> <li>Will deliver direct link to A15</li> <li>Policy LP44 (points e and f) identifies problems that are yet to be dealt with in relation to Sleaford South SUE, this can be dealt with through allocating this site.</li> </ul>
CL4615	Land north west of Lincoln Rd, Romangate, Lincoln	958535	Taylor Lindsey Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy LP49 – Residential Allocations - Lincoln</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The allocation should allow for some commercial development to be included.</li> <li>The frontage to the site includes a gym and it is adjacent to a district centre so is suitable for some commercial.</li> <li>Whilst policy does not preclude commercial uses it should be specifically clarified that mixed use is acceptable here.</li> </ul>
CL416/CL813	Land South of Urban Street, Lincoln	958535	Taylor Lindsey Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LP17 – Landscape, Townscape and Views / LP22 – Green Wedges</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The designation of this site as an area of great landscape value and green wedge is disputed and site should be allocated for housing.</li> <li>Landscape assessment included – it does not contribute to the purposes of the green wedge and it does not relate to the landscape characteristics of the AGLV.</li> <li>Surrounded on three sides by development and therefore forms part of Lincoln Urban Area – primary focus for growth.</li> <li>There would not be conflict with neighbouring industrial uses.</li> </ul>

**Table 1: Sites allocated/designated in the Local Plan, proposed by land owner/developer for alternative use**

Ref	Address	Representor ID	Representor	Allocation/designation in plan	Summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The gas holder site is being decommissioned and the site has been sold.</li> <li>• There are no major constraints and the site is adjacent to a district centre and well-located for other services.</li> <li>• Site is suitable for allocation of housing.</li> </ul>
CL4431	Land at Lee Road, Lincoln	958535	Taylor Lindsey Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LP23 – Local Green Space and Other Important Open Space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site should not be designated as an important open space and should be allocated for housing.</li> <li>• Site forms part of Lincoln urban area and residential use here is appropriate.</li> <li>• The site offers minimal recreational value, it is in single ownership, it is suitable for housing, there are no major constraints, it is available and deliverable in 5 year period, well located for access, it is flat, it is within flood zone 1.</li> <li>• Formerly Clayton Sports and Social Club, but no longer in use and is redundant/ underutilised, bowling club hut only on short term lease.</li> <li>• Any loss in provision of leisure uses could be provided for through off-site contributions.</li> <li>• Playing field use removed from rating list.</li> <li>• Anti-social behaviour issues.</li> </ul>
CL4432	Land off Wolsey Way, Lincoln	958535	Taylor Lindsey Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LP23 – Local Green Space and Other Important Open Space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site should not be designated as an important open space and should be allocated for housing.</li> <li>• Landscape review provided concluding that the site is of no recreational value other than an informal /trodden link.</li> <li>• The site has development on three sides.</li> <li>• The site is part of the Lincoln urban area – focus for growth, it is well positioned for access to services.</li> </ul>



Table 1: Sites allocated/designated in the Local Plan, proposed by land owner/developer for alternative use					
Ref	Address	Representor ID	Representor	Allocation/designation in plan	Summary
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is suitable for housing and details of credentials are provided.</li> <li>The site is in single ownership and controlled by a housebuilder and can be delivered within 5 years.</li> </ul>
CL1888	Land adjacent and rear of Roman Ridge on Brigg Road, Caistor	865615 / 993045	Caistor Town Council / residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy LP51 – Residential Allocations – Market Towns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site should be designated as a Local green Space.</li> </ul>
CL2093	Land north of North Street, Caistor	865615	Caistor Town Council / residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy LP51 – Residential Allocations – Market Towns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site should be designated as a Local green Space.</li> </ul>
CL415	Land south of Bracebridge Heath	868774	Barratt & David Wilson Homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy LP52 – Residential Allocations – Large Villages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site should be brought within the SUE boundary as it is at least partly reliant on the infrastructure provision of the SUE.</li> </ul>
CL1384	Land at Nettleham off Mill Hill, Nettleham	869007	Church Commissioners for England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy LP23 – Local Green Space and Other Important Open Space</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to part of the site being designated as Local green Space and should be allocated for housing.</li> <li>The site is sustainably located, well related to the built up area, near to amenities, there are no physical constraints and it is suitable, available and deliverable for residential development.</li> </ul>
CL4701	Land at Tinkers Lane and Millers Road, Waddington	956021	Messers Gamble	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy LP22 – Green Wedges</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development could be achieved with landscaping to obscure views preserving the green wedge.</li> <li>More housing needed in Waddington, and justification given for suitability of the site.</li> </ul>
CL4521	Land North of Old Gallamore Road, Middle Rasen	868932	Zodiak Construction Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy LP22 – Green Wedges</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Site should be allocated for housing not in green wedge. The green wedge boundary should be relocated to the River Rase.</li> <li>In an appeal on the site an inspector concluded that whilst development on the site would</li> </ul>

Table 1: Sites allocated/designated in the Local Plan, proposed by land owner/developer for alternative use					
Ref	Address	Representor ID	Representor	Allocation/designation in plan	Summary
					reduce the gap, but the impact on the gap would be minimal and development here would not result in coalescence of the two settlements.
E11	Outer Circle Road Employment Area, Lincoln	868750	Associated British Foods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy LP5 – Delivering Prosperity and Jobs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to site at northern part of employment area being included in designation.</li> <li>Formerly within district centre in previous Local Plan.</li> <li>Site not in use for past 6 years and as such does not meet criteria and description for defined employment areas.</li> <li>Should be within neighbouring district centre for retail use or other appropriate mixed use.</li> </ul>
E14	Waterside South (Ruston Works), Lincoln	958520	Key Property Investments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy LP5 – Delivering Prosperity and Jobs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to allocation as employment site.</li> <li>Site has previously been recognised as an opportunity area as a catalyst for regeneration for mixed use development.</li> <li>Lack of evidence to justify the allocation and the allocation will not be effective in delivering economic regeneration.</li> <li>Is too inflexible for potential future opportunities.</li> </ul>
E15	Moorland Way Industrial Estate, Lincoln	957902	Lincolnshire Cooperative Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy LP5 – Delivering Prosperity and Jobs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to allocation as employment site.</li> <li>The site is predominantly in retail use contrary to the uses proposed in the plan.</li> </ul>

The sites in table 2 below received objections from third parties where they specifically sought a change to an alternative use than that shown in the Local Plan.

Table 2: Sites allocated or designated in the Local Plan, proposed by third party for alternative use					
Ref	Address	Representor ID	Representor	Allocation/designation in plan	Summary
CL818	North East Quadrant, Lincoln	865743 / 864398	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust / Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy LP30 – Lincoln Sustainable Urban Extensions / Policy LP48 –</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Area should exclude Greetwell Hollow and Quarry which should be retained as wildlife site/nature reserve</li> </ul>

<b>Table 2: Sites allocated or designated in the Local Plan, proposed by third party for alternative use</b>					
<b>Ref</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Representor ID</b>	<b>Representor</b>	<b>Allocation/ designation in plan</b>	<b>Summary</b>
				Sustainable Urban Extensions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area should be designated as important open spaces</li> </ul>
CL819	Western Growth Corridor, Lincoln	860966	Cllr Chris Goldson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy LP30 – Lincoln Sustainable Urban Extensions / Policy LP48 – Sustainable Urban Extensions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site should be used predominantly for employment use to deliver a co-ordinated approach to jobs and industry, with housing allowed as an exception or departure and greater focus on housing at other SUEs.</li> </ul>
E28	Heckington Industrial Area	992998	Heckington Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy LP5 – Delivering Prosperity and Jobs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area allocated should be reduced to allow the adjacent cemetery to expand.</li> </ul>