



**CENTRAL LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN  
PROPOSED POST-SUBMISSION MAIN MODIFICATIONS**

**SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL AND  
HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS**

**(JANUARY 2017)**

## **Contents**

Introduction .....	2
Next Steps .....	3
Integrated Impact Assessment – Implications .....	4
Habitats Regulations Assessment - Implications .....	20
Appendix 1. New IIA of LP11 Affordable Housing .....	23
Appendix 2. Revisions to the Submission Version IIA (April 2016) .....	35

## **Introduction**

An Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA), including Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), was undertaken during the preparation of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan as required by environmental and planning legislation<sup>1 2</sup>. A final IIA Report was submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination alongside the Submission Local Plan on 29 June 2016. An Integrated approach has been undertaken to the SA and of the Local Plan. Throughout this Report, the term 'Integrated Impact Assessment or IIA' should be taken to mean incorporating the requirements of both SA and SEA.

As required by the 'Habitats Regulations'<sup>3</sup>, the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee (CLJSPC) prepared a Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Submission Local Plan, to screen the Plan for likely significant effects on European Sites, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects.

The Examination Hearing Sessions were held in November and December 2016. During the course of the Hearing Sessions, a number of suggested Main Modifications arose which, subject to consultation and final consideration by the Inspector, are likely to be necessary to make the Submitted Local Plan 'sound'. These suggested Main Modifications are being consulted upon in public in 23 January 6 March 2017.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2004/5/section/19>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2004/1633/contents/made>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2010/490/contents/made>

This Report considers the implications of the schedule of suggested Main Modifications for the IIA and Habitats Regulations Assessment previously undertaken on the Submission Local Plan, and whether such Modifications would affect the findings of the IIA and/or HRA. It should be read alongside these reports<sup>4</sup> (document references E001C and E050A) as well as the Schedule of Proposed Post-Submission Main Modifications, January 2017.

### **Next Steps**

This Report will be available alongside the consultation on the Schedule of Proposed Post-Submission Main Modifications for a six week period of public consultation. The consultation will run from 23 January to 6 March 2017. Please see the Schedule for details on how to comment.

Following the end of the public consultation, the representations will be considered by the Inspector and will, as appropriate, inform the Inspector's Final Report. On adoption of the Local Plan, an IIA Post Adoption Statement will be prepared and published on the Central Lincolnshire website in accordance with Regulation 16(4) of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/central-lincolnshire/planning-policy-library/>

## Integrated Impact Assessment – Implications

**Table 1. Main Modifications – Implications for IIA**

<b>Policy Number/Plan Reference</b>	<b>Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Justification</b>
LP1	No	No	No modifications made.
LP2	Yes	Yes	<p>The modification to the supporting text commits the Committee to carefully monitoring of policy LP2, especially in relation to the approach to not including settlement boundaries. This is a technical clarification that does not affect the findings of previous IIA work as set out in the IIA Report and Appendices, April 2016.</p> <p>There are a number of modifications to the wording of policy LP2, primarily to ensure greater clarity to applicants and decision makers on how the policy should be interpreted. More detailed criteria around ‘appropriate locations’ are likely to affect the findings of previous IIA work, particularly in relation to IIA objective 5 (Landscape and Townscape). As such, the appraisal has been reviewed and revised. Please see Appendix 2 for updated IIA.</p>
LP3	Yes	No	<p>The changes to the supporting text clarify that the Committee considers the OAN to be a specific single figure rather than a range as expressed in the evidence, and that the 36,960 dwelling figure is not a precise and fixed ceiling for growth.</p> <p>These changes provide procedural clarification on how the policy will be implemented that do not affect the findings of previous IIA work.</p>

Policy Number/Plan Reference	Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)	Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)	Justification
			<p>Changes to the policy wording make the policy clearer and more effective by adding the strategic aim to create 11,894 FTE net new jobs over the plan period. This is considered to be a minor change that does not alter the findings of the IIA Report, where major positive effects were recorded in relation to the employment and economy IIA Objectives.</p> <p>A new paragraph added to the end of LP3 in relation to five year land supply is considered to provide procedural clarification to ensure consistent application of methods to calculate supply.</p>
LP4	Yes	No	<p>The modification to the supporting text provides clarity and certainty to applicants and decision makers and is considered to be a procedural change that helps explain how the policy will be implemented and monitored.</p> <p>Modifications to the policy wording are considered to be relatively minor changes that re-order paragraphs and provide greater clarity. They do not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work.</p>
LP5	Yes	No	<p>The modifications to the supporting text provide procedural clarification as to how the policy should be implemented and therefore do not significantly alter the findings of previous IIA work.</p> <p>A number of changes are proposed to the policy wording of LP5 to provide greater clarity and avoid confusion, especially in relation to allocated and non-allocated sites, and to ensure the policy is effective. These amendments are considered to be relatively minor changes to policy wording to improve</p>

<b>Policy Number/Plan Reference</b>	<b>Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Justification</b>
			readability and remove unclear wording. They do not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work, as they do not alter how the policy is expected to be interpreted or implemented.
LP6	Yes	No	The modifications to the wording of LP6 ensure consistency with national planning policy and make the intention of the policy clearer. They are considered to be relatively minor changes that do not alter the general thrust of the policy and therefore do not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work.
LP7	Yes	No	Additional criteria has been added to the final paragraph of LP7 to clarify that existing facilities seeking redevelopment or expansion would not need to pass the test set out in the policy.  This is considered to be a relatively minor policy wording change that would not alter how the policy is expected to be interpreted/ and or implemented and therefore will not significantly affect the IIA findings.
LP8	No	No	No modifications made.
LP9	Yes	No	Minor change to supporting text to provide procedural clarification to assist applicants and decision makers which does not affect the findings of previous IIA work.
LP10	Yes	No	Minor changes to policy wording that provide clarity/ensure consistency between the policy and the supporting text. They are not considered to affect the findings of previous IIA work.
LP11	Yes	Yes	The modification to LP11 with respect to affordable housing thresholds represents a significant change to the Local Plan (in

<b>Policy Number/Plan Reference</b>	<b>Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Justification</b>
			increasing the threshold from 4 to 11 dwellings) and is a new policy alternative not previously assessed in the IIA.  Please see Appendix 1 for new IIA.
LP12	No	No	No modifications made.
LP13	Yes	No	Minor change to policy wording to clarify that only relevant proposals will be required to make a contribution. This change does not affect the findings of previous IIA work.
LP14	No	No	No modifications made.
LP15	Yes	No	Procedural change to supporting text to ensure policy is effective by clarifying the meaning of 'redevelopment'. This change does not affect the findings of previous IIA work.
LP16	No	No	No modifications made.
LP17	No	No	No modifications made.
LP18	No	No	No modifications made.
LP19	No	No	No modifications made.
LP20	No	No	No modifications made.
LP21	Yes	No	Policy wording amended and a new paragraph added to the supporting text to provide clarity and avoid misinterpretation. The change to the wording of the policy does not affect the likely significant positive effect on IIA Objective 4 (Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure) that was predicted in the 2016 IIA Report.
LP22	Yes	No	Additional supporting text to provide clarity as to how the policy relates to proposals for existing development within a Green Wedge and how the text relates to the policy. This is a procedural clarification and does not affect the findings of previous IIA work, and in particular, the likely significant positive effect on IIA Objective 4 (Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure).

<b>Policy Number/Plan Reference</b>	<b>Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Justification</b>
LP23	Yes	No	<p>Additional supporting text to provide clarity on what is Important Open Space and how it is different to Local Green Space. The change to the supporting text provides procedural clarification and does not affect the likely significant positive effect on IIA Objective 4 (Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure) that was predicted in the 2016 IIA Report.</p> <p>Relatively minor changes to the wording of policy LP23 to provide clarity that part a) of the policy does not apply to non-publicly accessible Important Open Space. These changes provide clarity and are not expected to alter how the policy is expected to be interpreted. No further IIA work is required.</p>
LP24	Yes	No	<p>Relatively minor changes to policy wording, supporting text and Appendix C which clarify that the Open Space Standards apply to residential development. The modifications provide clarity and are no expected to alter how the policy is expected to be interpreted. They therefore do not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work, which predicted major positive effects against IIA Objective 4 (Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure).</p>
LP25	Yes	No	<p>Relatively minor changes to policy wording to ensure consistency with the NPPF and to ensure the Conservation Areas section of the policy is consistent with LP26. The modifications do not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work, which predicted major positive effects against the built IIA objective 6 (Built and Historic Environment).</p>
LP26	Yes	No	<p>Relatively minor changes to policy wording to ensure consistency with the NPPF and ensure consideration is given to</p>

<b>Policy Number/Plan Reference</b>	<b>Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Justification</b>
			'bad neighbour' uses, adjacent to or in the vicinity of development proposals. The modifications do not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work, which predicted major positive effects against IIA objectives 5 and 6 (Landscape and Townscape and Built and Historic Environment).
LP27	No	No	No modifications made.
LP28	Yes	No	Relatively minor change to policy wording to provide clarity in relation to education provision on Sustainable Urban Extensions. This change doesn't introduce a new requirement and is therefore not considered to significantly alter the findings of previous IIA work, which predicted positive effects in relation to IIA objective 14 Employment.
Lincoln Key Diagram	Yes	No	Relatively minor changes to the key diagram to improve clarity. Relatively minor technical change that does not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work.
LP29	Yes	No	Relatively minor change to policy wording to recognise the importance of views of the Lincoln Castle. Not considered to significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work, which predicted major positive impacts in relation to IIA objective 5 and 6 (Landscape and Townscape and Built and Historic Environment).
LP30	Yes	No	Under each SUE in LP30, reference to education provision has been deleted. This is to avoid confusion and conflict with LP28, which seeks education provision for all SUEs. This modification has relatively minor implications for the IIA work set out in the April 2016 IIA Report, as the commentary makes specific reference to the policy requirement for education provision. However, this will result not result in significant changes not

Policy Number/Plan Reference	Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)	Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)	Justification
			<p>previously assessed and therefore no amendments are required to the IIA.</p> <p>The policy and supporting text has been amended to refer to Local Centres to ensure consistency with LP6. This is a relatively minor change to the policy wording and does not affect the findings of the previous IIA work.</p> <p>Insertion of the word ‘approximately’ in relation to employment provision could mean slightly more or slightly less employment land is provided at the NEQ, SEQ and WGC sustainable urban extensions. However the change is relatively minor and does not affect the findings of the IIA Report, which predicted likely significant positive effects for IIA Objectives 14 and 15 (Employment and Local Economy).</p> <p>The policy requirement has been widened to emphasise a wider range of transport infrastructure is needed for each of the SUEs and not just consideration of park and ride. For SEQ, policy wording has been amended to provide greater flexibility as to how bus priority will be provided. Previous IIA work predicted minor positive effects in relation to IIA objective 13 (Transport and Accessibility), however the proposed modifications are not expected to change this effect to a major positive, as it is inevitable some private car use will remain through choice, especially in the short to medium term.</p> <p>Under the SWQ, additional text has been added to make a more specific reference to the Water Recycling Centre. Previous IIA work predicted a minor positive effect in relation to IIA objective 8 (Pollution). This modification is not thought to significantly alter this conclusion, as by requiring proposals to</p>

<b>Policy Number/Plan Reference</b>	<b>Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Justification</b>
			<p>demonstrate that a suitable distance is provided from the WRC, this will help to mitigate any potential negative effects in relation to IIA objective 8.</p> <p>Other changes are considered to provide clarification or amend referencing errors and therefore do not affect previous IIA work.</p>
LP31	Yes	No	Minor amendment to policy wording to remove 'area' after Lincoln to ensure consistency with other parts of the policy and the Plan. This will not result in significant changes not previously assessed and therefore no amendments are required to the IIA.
LP32	Yes	No	<p>The proposed modification adds a new paragraph to the end of LP32 that clarifies how a decision maker should react to any proposals at the University Campus at Riseholme. The paragraph supports, in principle, proposals for education, teaching and research buildings and other associated uses, subject to wider planning policies, including policy requirements for the Campus in any Made Neighbourhood Plan for Riseholme.</p> <p>This will not result in significant changes not previously assessed and therefore no amendments are required to the IIA.</p>
LP33	No	No	No modifications made.
LP34	No	No	No modifications made.
LP35	No	No	No modifications made.
LP36	No	No	No modifications made.
LP37	No	No	No modifications made.

<b>Policy Number/Plan Reference</b>	<b>Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Justification</b>
A Growing Gainsborough 8.2.3	Yes	No	Relatively minor change to wording of the supporting text to ensure consistency with LP2 and LP4 and make clear that Lea and Morton are separate villages. The modification does not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work.
LP38	Yes	No	<p>The proposed modification deletes bullet point a) to avoid repetition with LP25 and the test set out in section 72(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>The modification potentially has implications for the findings of previous IIA work set out in the April 2016 IIA Report, as positive effects were predicted in relation to IIA objective 6 (Built and Historic Environment), where specific reference was made to bullet point a) in the commentary. However, on review, this modification will not result in significant changes not previously assessed and therefore no amendments are required to the IIA.</p>
LP39	Yes	No	<p>Under each SUE in LP39, reference to education provision has been deleted. This is to avoid confusion and conflict with LP28, which seeks education provision for all SUEs. This modification has implications for the IIA work set out in the April 2016 IIA Report, as the commentary makes specific reference to the policy requirement for education provision. However, this will result not result in significant changes not previously assessed and therefore no amendments are required to the IIA.</p> <p>Under the sub-heading for Gainsborough Southern Neighbourhood SUE, the policy wording has been amended to provide greater flexibility in what employment land and retail floorspace should be provided, by adding the word 'approximately', changing the amount of employment land from</p>

<b>Policy Number/Plan Reference</b>	<b>Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Justification</b>
			<p>15,000m<sup>2</sup> to 4 ha and removing the retail floorspace. Insertion of the word 'approximately' in relation to employment provision could mean slightly more or slightly less employment land is provided at SUE. However, the change is relatively minor and does not affect the findings of the IIA Report, which predicted likely significant positive effects for IIA Objectives 14 and 15 (Employment and Local Economy).</p> <p>Under the sub-heading for Gainsborough Northern Neighbourhood SUE, the modifications propose removal of the requirement to deliver employment land phased before or alongside dwelling completions as it could jeopardise the ability to expedite housing delivery on this site. This change doesn't alter the amount of employment land to be delivered and therefore doesn't significantly alter the thrust of the policy. No further IIA work is required.</p>
LP40	No	No	No modifications made.
LP41	No	No	No modifications made.
Gainsborough Key Diagram	Yes	No	Relatively minor changes to the key diagram to improve clarity. Relatively minor technical change that does not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work.
LP42	Yes	No	<p>Relatively minor changes to policy wording to ensure consistency with national policy by adding 'main' in front of town centre uses and to specify development must not result in an over-concentration of uses in the primary shopping area, rather than 'the broad area in which the proposal is set'.</p> <p>The changes are considered to be relatively minor and do not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work, which</p>

Policy Number/Plan Reference	Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)	Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)	Justification
			predicted significant positive effects against IIA objective 15 (Local Economy).
LP43	Yes	No	<p>The proposed modification deletes bullet point a) to avoid repetition with LP25 and the test set out in section 72(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>The modification potentially has implications for the findings of previous IIA work set out in the April 2016 IIA Report, as positive effects were predicted in relation to IIA objective 6 (Built and Historic Environment), where specific reference was made to bullet point a) in the commentary. However, on review, this modification will not result in significant changes not previously assessed and therefore no amendments are required to the IIA.</p>
LP44	Yes	No	<p>Under each SUE in LP44, reference to education provision has been deleted. This is to avoid confusion and conflict with LP28, which seeks education provision for all SUEs. This modification has implications for the IIA work set out in the April 2016 IIA Report, as the commentary makes specific reference to the policy requirement for education provision. However, this will result not result in significant changes not previously assessed and therefore no amendments are required to the IIA.</p> <p>Where the policy refers to 'Sleaford Area', amend to 'Sleaford area' to avoid confusion that 'Area' refers to an area defined somewhere in the Local Plan. This is considered to be a relatively minor policy wording change that does not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work.</p>

Policy Number/Plan Reference	Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)	Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)	Justification
			<p>In relation to Sleaford South SUE, the policy wording has been amended to remove specific site areas/floorspaces to provide greater flexibility. Bullet point e) has also been reworded to make the policy clearer and therefore more effective. These do not alter the findings of previous IIA work.</p> <p>In relation to Sleaford West SUE, the policy wording has also been amended to remove specific site areas/floorspaces to provide greater flexibility, and 'approximately' has been added to bullet c). Insertion of the word 'approximately' in relation to employment provision could mean slightly more or slightly less employment land is provided at SUE. However, the change is relatively minor and does not affect the findings of the IIA Report, which predicted likely significant positive effects for IIA Objectives 14 and 15 (Employment and Local Economy). Revisions to the IIA to remove reference to specific areas/floorspaces will be picked up as for the Sleaford South SUE above.</p> <p>Bullets g) and i) under Sleaford West SUE have been amended to improve to make specific reference to the Sleaford Transport Strategy for clarity, and to ensure consistency with other SUE policies in the Plan. Previous IIA work predicted minor positive effects in relation to IIA objective 13 (Transport and Accessibility), however the proposed modification is not expected to change this effect to a major positive, as it is inevitable some private car use will remain through choice, especially in the short to medium term.</p>
Sleaford Key Diagram	Yes	No	Relatively minor changes to the key diagram to improve clarity. Relatively minor technical change that does not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work.

<b>Policy Number/Plan Reference</b>	<b>Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Justification</b>
LP45	Yes	No	Relatively minor change to the wording of the supporting text to clarify the location and extent of the Former Advanta Seeds site. The modification does not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work.
LP46	Yes	No	Relatively minor change to policy wording to ensure consistency with LP6 and the NPPF, by adding 'main' in front of town centre use. The modification does not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work.
LP47	Yes	No	Additional text added to the final paragraph of LP47 to retain the principle of safeguarding the route of the Sleaford Link Road, whilst allowing discussions on alternative options. This is considered to be a relatively minor change that is not expected to alter how the policy is expected to be interpreted. It does not therefore significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work, which predicted major positive impacts against IIA objective 13 (Transport and Accessibility).
10.2.1, Table on page 109 and trajectory on page 110	Yes	No	Proposed modifications are a factual update to bring the text up to a 1 April 2016 base date and to ensure the table and trajectory takes account of the latest position, including sites proposed through the modification process. This is considered to be a technical clarification and no further IIA work is required.
LP48	No	No	No modifications made.
LP49 – LP53	Yes	No	Modifications to the tables to provide clarity on which sites are under construction and to present the latest information from monitoring on dwellings remaining.

Policy Number/Plan Reference	Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)	Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)	Justification
			These modifications are considered to be technical changes. No further IIA required.
LP49	Yes	No	The modifications to LP49 are considered to be relatively minor, factual changes to provide the latest position as of 1 April 2016. Where the indicative total dwelling figure has been revised, these are predominantly sites with planning permission that were not subject to IIA. There are no sites where this is considered to significantly alter the findings of previous IIA work.
LP50	Yes	Yes	<p>The modifications to LP50 are considered to be relatively minor, factual changes to provide the latest position as of 1 April 2016. Some site names have been amended to be clearer to the reader, and this will result in minor revision to previous IIA work to ensure consistency with the policy. These will be made in the Final IIA Report.</p> <p>Where the indicative total dwelling figure has been revised, these are predominantly sites with planning permission that were not subject to IIA. There are no sites where this is considered to significantly alter the findings of previous IIA work.</p>
LP51	Yes	No	The modifications to LP51 are considered to be relatively minor, factual changes to provide the latest position as of 1 April 2016. Where the indicative total dwelling figure has been revised, these are predominantly sites with planning permission that were not subject to IIA. There are no sites where this is considered to significantly alter the findings of previous IIA work.

<b>Policy Number/Plan Reference</b>	<b>Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Justification</b>
LP52	Yes	No	<p>The modifications to LP52 are considered to be relatively minor, factual changes to provide the latest position as of 1 April 2016. Some site names have been amended to be clearer to the reader, however this will result not result in significant changes not previously assessed and therefore no amendments are required to the IIA.</p> <p>Where the indicative total dwelling figure has been revised, these are predominantly sites with planning permission that were not subject to IIA. There are no sites where this is considered to significantly alter the findings of previous IIA work.</p>
LP53	Yes	Yes	<p>Modifications change the title of LP53 to 'Residential Allocations – medium Villages' and delete sites in medium to small villages, with the exception of Hemswell Cliff, to ensure consistency with LP4. Previous IIA work included an IIA for allocation CL2089. This will need to be removed from the IIA of LP53 – Medium Villages.</p> <p>Please see Appendix 2 for updated IIA.</p>
LP54	No	No	No modifications made.
LP55	Yes	No	Modification is a consequential amendment following modifications to LP2 and is a technical clarification that amends the policy title to delete hamlets. However, this will result not result in significant changes not previously assessed and therefore no amendments are required to the IIA.
LP56	Yes	No	A relatively minor change is proposed to the wording of the requirements in relation to CL4675, which provides clarity as to

<b>Policy Number/Plan Reference</b>	<b>Main Modification Suggested (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Change required to the IIA? (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Justification</b>
			<p>what wildlife impacts need to be considered. This change does not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work.</p> <p>Further modifications to the policy wording of LP56 are to ensure consistency with other policies in the Plan and to provide clarity that pitch numbers are a maximum, and that the policy also applies to travelling showpeople proposals. However, this will result not result in significant changes not previously assessed and therefore no amendments are required to the IIA.</p>
LP57	Yes	No	<p>A number of changes to the wording of LP57 are proposed to clarify that the policy does not apply to all former MOD sites and applies to sites which are currently operational, but known to be surplus to requirements soon. Modifications would ensure that redevelopment proposals for new civilian communities on all redundant MOD land could come forward in appropriate locations, subject to specified criteria. The policy has also been amended to recognise that creating significant new communities may not be appropriate on all surplus MOD land.</p> <p>The proposed modifications are not considered to alter the general thrust of policy LP57, rather they seek to improve the clarity and effectiveness of the policy. The changes therefore do not significantly affect the findings of previous IIA work, which concluded that the effects of the policy on the IIA objectives were uncertain in many cases as they depended on the scale and nature of development coming forward.</p>
Appendix B	Yes	No	Not previously subject to IIA therefore no change required.
Appendix D	Yes	No	Not previously subject to IIA therefore no change required.

## **Habitats Regulations Assessment - Implications**

The Habitats Regulations Assessment Report submitted alongside the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan identified 7 Local Plan policies out of a total of 57 with potential for significant adverse effects on the identified European Sites:

LP3 Level and Distribution of Growth

LP5 Delivering Prosperity and Jobs

LP30 Lincoln Sustainable Urban Extensions

LP39 Gainsborough Sustainable Urban Extensions

LP44 Sleaford Sustainable Urban Extensions

LP48 Sustainable Urban Extensions – Allocations

LP54 Remaining Capacity on SUEs and Broad Locations for Future Growth

The HRA Report concluded that, after taking into account the mitigation measures and considerations of other plans, the Local Plan would not be likely to have to have a significant effect on a European Site, either alone, or in-combination with other plans or projects, and that no further assessment work was required. Natural England were consulted on this screening recommendation and confirmed in writing that they agreed with the HRA Report and its conclusions<sup>5</sup>.

**Table 2** below considers whether the above policies have been modified as a result of the Examination and if so, whether these modifications would alter any of the conclusions previously reached in the HRA Report. Only modifications to policy wording have been considered.

Although the main modifications proposes changes to the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, the majority of the modifications provide further clarification on how a policy will be implemented, are technical changes (for example, update references to other documents) or relate to the supporting text. They do not significantly change the amount, type or location of development that would result from the Plan policies. Therefore, in conclusion, no further HRA work is required.

---

<sup>5</sup> See document reference E050B at <https://www.n-kesteven.gov.uk/central-lincolnshire/planning-policy-library/>

**Table 2. Main Modifications – Implications for HRA**

Policy Number/Plan Reference	Main Modification Made (Yes/No)	Implication for HRA Conclusions
LP3	Yes	Relatively minor changes made to policy wording to replace employment land with a job target of 11,894 FTE. Overall housing target set out in LP3 remains unchanged. No likely significant effects as a result of policy LP3 modifications.
LP5	Yes	A number of changes are proposed to the policy wording of LP5 to provide greater clarity and avoid confusion, especially in relation to allocated and non-allocated sites, and to ensure the policy is effective. These amendments are considered to be relatively minor changes to policy wording to improve readability and remove unclear wording. The overall amount of employment land allocated remains unchanged. No likely significant effects as a result of policy LP5 modifications.
LP30	Yes	<p>A number of relatively minor changes proposed to policy wording. Insertion of the word 'approximately' in relation to employment provision but no change in overall quantum of development.</p> <p>The policy requirement has been widened to emphasise a wider range of transport infrastructure is needed for each of the SUEs and not just consideration of park and ride. In combination with other plans and projects, this modification should help to mitigate adverse impacts that may arise from housing and employment development and increased vehicular traffic by offering alternatives modes of travel to the private car.</p> <p>Other changes are considered to provide clarification or amend referencing errors.</p> <p>No likely significant effects as a result of policy LP30 modifications.</p>
LP39	Yes	<p>A number of relatively minor changes proposed to policy wording. Insertion of the word 'approximately' in relation to employment provision but no change in overall quantum of development.</p> <p>No likely significant effects as a result of policy LP39 modifications.</p>

<b>Policy Number/Plan Reference</b>	<b>Main Modification Made (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Implication for HRA Conclusions</b>
LP44	Yes	<p>Policy wording has been amended to remove specific site areas/floorspaces to provide greater flexibility, however the overall quantum of housing and employment development remains unchanged. Other, relatively minor wording changes are considered to provide greater clarification to make the policy more effective.</p> <p>No likely significant effects as a result of policy LP44 modifications.</p>
LP48	No	None. No modifications made.
LP54	No	None. No modifications made.

## Appendix 1. New IIA of LP11 Affordable Housing

Revisions are shown in **red font** (deleted text as ~~strikethrough~~ and new text underlined)

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP11 – Affordable Housing										
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Further Draft Policy To have a policy setting qualifying affordable housing threshold at 3 dwellings and requiring affordable housing at varying percentages across Central Lincolnshire.		Option 2 - Lower threshold (below 3) at which affordable housing contribution is required.		Option 3 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy: Increase threshold at which affordable housing contribution is required to 4 dwellings.		Option 4 - Introduce a single requirement percentage across Central Lincolnshire (rather than have the varying percentages of 15 – 25% across different locations).		Option 5 – Main Modifications Policy: <u>Set qualifying affordable housing threshold at 11 dwellings or more (or 1,000 sqm or more floorspace).</u>	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
1. Housing	✓✓	This policy approach sets out how development will contribute towards meeting affordable housing need, whilst ensuring that development remains viable.  It will increase the supply of affordable housing, and may consequently reduce homelessness and overcrowding.	? (✓/✓✓)	This policy approach would set out the requirements in respect of affordable housing and establish a threshold below 3 dwellings. This policy approach is likely to have positive effects in relation to this objective as it will increase the supply of affordable housing and in doing so may reduce homelessness	✓✓	This policy approach sets out how development will contribute towards meeting affordable housing need, whilst ensuring that development remains viable.  It will increase the supply of affordable housing, and may consequently reduce homelessness	? (✓/✓✓)	This policy approach would set out the requirements in respect of affordable housing. This policy approach is likely to have positive effects or major positive effects in relation to this objective as it will increase the supply of affordable housing and in doing so may reduce homelessness and overcrowding.	✓	<u>This policy approach sets out how development will contribute towards meeting affordable housing need, whilst ensuring that development remains viable.</u>  <u>It will increase the supply of affordable housing, and may consequently</u>

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP11 – Affordable Housing										
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Further Draft Policy To have a policy setting qualifying affordable housing threshold at 3 dwellings and requiring affordable housing at varying percentages across Central Lincolnshire.		Option 2 - Lower threshold (below 3) at which affordable housing contribution is required.		Option 3 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy: Increase threshold at which affordable housing contribution is required to 4 dwellings.		Option 4 - Introduce a single requirement percentage across Central Lincolnshire (rather than have the varying percentages of 15 – 25% across different locations).		Option 5 – Main Modifications Policy: <u>Set qualifying affordable housing threshold at 11 dwellings or more (or 1,000 sqm or more floorspace).</u>	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
				and overcrowding.  However, the effects are uncertain because a lower threshold may pose viability issues for some developments, which may result in the affordable housing requirement not being deliverable on all qualifying sites.		and overcrowding.		However, the effects are uncertain: it is highly unlikely that a single percentage requirement across the Central Lincolnshire area will adequately reflect the local circumstances in relation to viability. A lower requirement to reflect the less viable areas will mean that in areas where the land values are higher and it would be viable to deliver more affordable dwellings, that		<u>reduce homelessness and overcrowding.</u>  <u>This option is not likely to have significant positive effects like options 1 and 3 because the higher threshold means that no affordable housing will be delivered on smaller sites</u>

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP11 – Affordable Housing										
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Further Draft Policy To have a policy setting qualifying affordable housing threshold at 3 dwellings and requiring affordable housing at varying percentages across Central Lincolnshire.		Option 2 - Lower threshold (below 3) at which affordable housing contribution is required.		Option 3 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy: Increase threshold at which affordable housing contribution is required to 4 dwellings.		Option 4 - Introduce a single requirement percentage across Central Lincolnshire (rather than have the varying percentages of 15 – 25% across different locations).		Option 5 – Main Modifications Policy: <u>Set qualifying affordable housing threshold at 11 dwellings or more (or 1,000 sqm or more floorspace).</u>	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
							<p>this potential is not being realised. And vice versa, if a higher requirement is established, development proposals in less viable areas may not be able to deliver this requirement and consequently negotiations on affordable housing provision will result in unpredictable and inconsistent affordable housing contributions.</p>			
<b>2. Health</b>	✓	Through the provision of affordable housing, there is likely to be some	✓	Through the provision of affordable housing, there is likely to be some	✓	Through the provision of affordable housing, there is likely to be	✓	Through the provision of affordable housing, there is likely to be some	✓	<u>Through the provision of affordable housing, there is likely</u>

<b>Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP11 – Affordable Housing</b>										
<b>IIA Objectives</b>	<b>Option 1 – Further Draft Policy</b> To have a policy setting qualifying affordable housing threshold at 3 dwellings and requiring affordable housing at varying percentages across Central Lincolnshire.		<b>Option 2 -</b> Lower threshold (below 3) at which affordable housing contribution is required.		<b>Option 3 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy:</b> Increase threshold at which affordable housing contribution is required to 4 dwellings.		<b>Option 4 -</b> Introduce a single requirement percentage across Central Lincolnshire (rather than have the varying percentages of 15 – 25% across different locations).		<b>Option 5 – Main Modifications Policy:</b> <u>Set qualifying affordable housing threshold at 11 dwellings or more (or 1,000 sqm or more floorspace).</u>	
	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>
		positive effects on improving mental and emotional health, particularly as a result of housing meeting the needs of homeless and overcrowded households.		positive effects on improving mental and emotional health, particularly as a result of housing meeting the needs of homeless and overcrowded households.		some positive effects on improving mental and emotional health, particularly as a result of housing meeting the needs of homeless and overcrowded households.		positive effects on improving mental and emotional health, particularly as a result of housing meeting the needs of homeless and overcrowded households.		<u>to be some positive effects on improving mental and emotional health, particularly as a result of housing meeting the needs of homeless and overcrowded households.</u>
<b>3. Social Equality and Community</b>	✓✓	The provision of affordable housing through this policy and the requirement for such housing to integrate seamlessly amongst private housing will help create community	✓✓	The provision of affordable housing through this policy and the requirement for such housing to integrate seamlessly amongst private housing will help create community cohesion and	✓✓	The provision of affordable housing through this policy and the requirement for such housing to integrate seamlessly amongst private housing will help create	✓✓	The provision of affordable housing through this policy and the requirement for such housing to integrate seamlessly amongst private housing will help create community cohesion and	✓/✓✓	<u>The provision of affordable housing through this policy and the requirement for such housing to integrate seamlessly amongst private</u>

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP11 – Affordable Housing										
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Further Draft Policy To have a policy setting qualifying affordable housing threshold at 3 dwellings and requiring affordable housing at varying percentages across Central Lincolnshire.		Option 2 - Lower threshold (below 3) at which affordable housing contribution is required.		Option 3 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy: Increase threshold at which affordable housing contribution is required to 4 dwellings.		Option 4 - Introduce a single requirement percentage across Central Lincolnshire (rather than have the varying percentages of 15 – 25% across different locations).		Option 5 – Main Modifications Policy: <u>Set qualifying affordable housing threshold at 11 dwellings or more (or 1,000 sqm or more floorspace).</u>	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
		cohesion and prevent social exclusion by creating mixed, balanced communities. The policy criteria regarding rural affordable housing may also increase the housing mix within a given locality and thus promote more diverse communities.		prevent social exclusion by creating mixed balanced communities. The policy criteria regarding rural affordable housing may also increase the housing mix within a given locality and thus promote more diverse communities.		community cohesion and prevent social exclusion by creating mixed balanced communities. The policy criteria regarding rural affordable housing may also increase the housing mix within a given locality and thus promote more diverse communities.		prevent social exclusion by creating mixed balanced communities. The policy criteria regarding rural affordable housing may also increase the housing mix within a given locality and thus promote more diverse communities.		<u>housing will help create community cohesion and prevent social exclusion by creating mixed balanced communities. The policy criteria regarding rural affordable housing may also increase the housing mix within a given locality and thus promote more diverse communities</u>  <u>While this option is likely</u>

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP11 – Affordable Housing										
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Further Draft Policy To have a policy setting qualifying affordable housing threshold at 3 dwellings and requiring affordable housing at varying percentages across Central Lincolnshire.		Option 2 - Lower threshold (below 3) at which affordable housing contribution is required.		Option 3 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy: Increase threshold at which affordable housing contribution is required to 4 dwellings.		Option 4 - Introduce a single requirement percentage across Central Lincolnshire (rather than have the varying percentages of 15 – 25% across different locations).		Option 5 – Main Modifications Policy: <u>Set qualifying affordable housing threshold at 11 dwellings or more (or 1,000 sqm or more floorspace).</u>	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
										<u>to have positive effects, the effects may not be as significant as the other options because the higher threshold means that no affordable housing will be delivered on smaller sites, thus the housing mix on smaller sites may be more limited, affecting the diversity and balance of communities</u>

<b>Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP11 – Affordable Housing</b>										
<b>IIA Objectives</b>	<b>Option 1 – Further Draft Policy</b> To have a policy setting qualifying affordable housing threshold at 3 dwellings and requiring affordable housing at varying percentages across Central Lincolnshire.		<b>Option 2 -</b> Lower threshold (below 3) at which affordable housing contribution is required.		<b>Option 3 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy:</b> Increase threshold at which affordable housing contribution is required to 4 dwellings.		<b>Option 4 -</b> Introduce a single requirement percentage across Central Lincolnshire (rather than have the varying percentages of 15 – 25% across different locations).		<b>Option 5 – Main Modifications Policy:</b> <u>Set qualifying affordable housing threshold at 11 dwellings or more (or 1,000 sqm or more floorspace).</u>	
	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>
<b>4. Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</b>	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	<u>This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.</u>
<b>5. Landscape and Townscape</b>	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	<u>This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.</u>
<b>6. Built and Historic Environment</b>	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	<u>This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.</u>

<b>Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP11 – Affordable Housing</b>										
<b>IIA Objectives</b>	<b>Option 1 – Further Draft Policy</b> To have a policy setting qualifying affordable housing threshold at 3 dwellings and requiring affordable housing at varying percentages across Central Lincolnshire.		<b>Option 2 -</b> Lower threshold (below 3) at which affordable housing contribution is required.		<b>Option 3 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy:</b> Increase threshold at which affordable housing contribution is required to 4 dwellings.		<b>Option 4 -</b> Introduce a single requirement percentage across Central Lincolnshire (rather than have the varying percentages of 15 – 25% across different locations).		<b>Option 5 – Main Modifications Policy:</b> <u>Set qualifying affordable housing threshold at 11 dwellings or more (or 1,000 sqm or more floorspace).</u>	
	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>
<b>7. Water</b>	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	<u>This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.</u>
<b>8. Pollution</b>	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	<u>This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.</u>
<b>9. Land Use and Soils</b>	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	<u>This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.</u>

<b>Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP11 – Affordable Housing</b>										
<b>IIA Objectives</b>	<b>Option 1 – Further Draft Policy</b> To have a policy setting qualifying affordable housing threshold at 3 dwellings and requiring affordable housing at varying percentages across Central Lincolnshire.		<b>Option 2 -</b> Lower threshold (below 3) at which affordable housing contribution is required.		<b>Option 3 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy:</b> Increase threshold at which affordable housing contribution is required to 4 dwellings.		<b>Option 4 -</b> Introduce a single requirement percentage across Central Lincolnshire (rather than have the varying percentages of 15 – 25% across different locations).		<b>Option 5 – Main Modifications Policy:</b> <u>Set qualifying affordable housing threshold at 11 dwellings or more (or 1,000 sqm or more floorspace).</u>	
	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>
<b>10. Waste</b>	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	<u>This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.</u>
<b>11. Climate Change Effects and Energy</b>	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	<u>This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.</u>
<b>12. Climate Change Adaptation and Flood Risk</b>	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	<u>This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.</u>

<b>Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP11 – Affordable Housing</b>										
<b>IIA Objectives</b>	<b>Option 1 – Further Draft Policy</b> To have a policy setting qualifying affordable housing threshold at 3 dwellings and requiring affordable housing at varying percentages across Central Lincolnshire.		<b>Option 2 -</b> Lower threshold (below 3) at which affordable housing contribution is required.		<b>Option 3 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy:</b> Increase threshold at which affordable housing contribution is required to 4 dwellings.		<b>Option 4 -</b> Introduce a single requirement percentage across Central Lincolnshire (rather than have the varying percentages of 15 – 25% across different locations).		<b>Option 5 – Main Modifications Policy:</b> <u>Set qualifying affordable housing threshold at 11 dwellings or more (or 1,000 sqm or more floorspace).</u>	
	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>
<b>13. Transport and Accessibility</b>	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	<u>This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.</u>
<b>14. Employment</b>	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	<u>This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.</u>
<b>15. Local Economy</b>	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.	<b>0</b>	<u>This policy approach will not have an impact upon the sustainability objective being appraised.</u>

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP11 – Affordable Housing										
IIA Objectives	<b>Option 1 – Further Draft Policy</b> To have a policy setting qualifying affordable housing threshold at 3 dwellings and requiring affordable housing at varying percentages across Central Lincolnshire.		<b>Option 2 -</b> Lower threshold (below 3) at which affordable housing contribution is required.		<b>Option 3 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy:</b> Increase threshold at which affordable housing contribution is required to 4 dwellings.		<b>Option 4 -</b> Introduce a single requirement percentage across Central Lincolnshire (rather than have the varying percentages of 15 – 25% across different locations).		<b>Option 5 – Main Modifications Policy:</b> <u>Set qualifying affordable housing threshold at 11 dwellings or more (or 1,000 sqm or more floorspace).</u>	
	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>
<b>Summary of Significant Effects</b>	Significant positive effects are predicted in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Obj 1. Housing (✓✓)</li> <li>Obj 3. Social equality and community (✓✓)</li> </ul>		Significant positive effects are predicted in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Obj 3. Social equality and community (✓✓)</li> </ul> Mixed significant positive effects are predicted in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Obj 1. Housing (? ✓/ ✓✓)</li> </ul>		Significant positive effects are predicted in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Obj 1. Housing (✓✓)</li> <li>Obj 3. Social equality and community (✓✓)</li> </ul>		Significant positive effects are predicted in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Obj 3. Social equality and community (✓✓)</li> </ul> Mixed significant positive effects are predicted in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Obj 1. Housing (? ✓/ ✓✓)</li> </ul>		<u>Mixed significant positive effects are predicted in relation to:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Obj 3. Social equality and community (✓/✓✓)</u></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Conclusions:</b> Options 1 and 3 are both likely to have significant positive effects in relation to objectives 1 (Housing) and 3 (Social Equality and Community). <u>Option 5 is also expected to have significant positive effects in relation to objective 3.</u></p> <p>Options 2 and 4 score the same in relation to all criteria: the anticipated effects in relation to the Housing objective are uncertain, potentially ranging from positive to major positive effects.</p> <p>Option 2 is to set a lower threshold (below 3) at which an affordable housing contribution is required. This policy approach has been discounted to prevent small scale development being subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that the ability to be developed viably (in combination with other obligations) is threatened.</p> <p>Option 4, to introduce a single requirement percentage across Central Lincolnshire (rather than have the varying percentages of 15 – 25% across different locations) has been discounted because the varying affordable housing requirements in the sustainable urban extensions, Lincoln and other areas reflect the varying viability considerations across these different localities. A universal requirement could render development unviable in some areas if too high, or if the requirement is lower, it may mean that sites in the more viable areas deliver less affordable housing than could viably be delivered, thus making a less significant contribution to meeting the affordable housing need identified in the SHMA.</p> <p><u>Option 5 is the threshold set out in national planning policy and the accompanying ministerial statement. Despite lower scoring against some of the IIA Objectives in comparison with the other options, this option is the preferred policy because it is consistent with the national policy.</u></p>										

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP11 – Affordable Housing										
IIA Objectives	<b>Option 1 – Further Draft Policy</b> To have a policy setting qualifying affordable housing threshold at 3 dwellings and requiring affordable housing at varying percentages across Central Lincolnshire.		<b>Option 2 -</b> Lower threshold (below 3) at which affordable housing contribution is required.		<b>Option 3 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy:</b> Increase threshold at which affordable housing contribution is required to 4 dwellings.		<b>Option 4 -</b> Introduce a single requirement percentage across Central Lincolnshire (rather than have the varying percentages of 15 – 25% across different locations).		<b>Option 5 – Main Modifications Policy:</b> <u>Set qualifying affordable housing threshold at 11 dwellings or more (or 1,000 sqm or more floorspace).</u>	
	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>
<p><del>While options 1 and 3 score the same, Option 3 is taken forward as the preferred policy because a threshold of 4 dwellings will mean that in the Lincoln Strategy Area (excluding SUEs) where a 25% affordable housing contribution is required, developments of 4 dwellings will be required to deliver a whole dwelling onsite (unless exceptional circumstances exist), rather than provide a commuted sum in the case of a threshold of 3 dwellings. This amendment will also help the viability of small developments of 3 dwellings or fewer, thus supporting small scale building firms.</del></p>										

**Appendix 2. Revisions to the Submission Version IIA (April 2016)**

Revisions are shown in **red font** (deleted text as ~~strikethrough~~ and new text underlined)

<b>Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy</b>						
<b>IIA Objectives</b>	<b>Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy</b> setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy		<b>Option 2 –</b> setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		<b>Option 3 –</b> To have no policy and only rely on national policy.	
	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>
<b>1. Housing</b>	✓✓	The policy aims for development to provide the scale and mix of housing types to meet the identified needs of Central Lincolnshire with decisions on the location and scale of development to be taken on the basis of a settlement hierarchy. The settlement hierarchy is devised on factual information, i.e. the number of dwellings in and the role of the settlement. The settlement hierarchy will not set the level of growth for	✓	Whilst the policy without a hierarchy would contribute to the objective, by not providing a clear delivery mechanism for new housing in settlements there could be less certainty for developers which could restrict investment and development in some areas. This may result in a lack of focus for growth in the more sustainable locations of Central Lincolnshire and not meeting needs in a balanced way across.	✓	Whilst the NPPF supports the objective, the local dimension is lost. This could result in not delivering houses where they are most appropriate or needed.

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy						
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy		Option 2 – setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		Option 3 – To have no policy and only rely on national policy.	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
		<p>settlements but will determine the size of individual developments that will be appropriate to help ensure that developments do not overwhelm a settlement and to assist new development in integrating. The hierarchy will deliver new homes in all <del>but the smallest</del> settlements <u>but not in the countryside</u>, where sustainability considerations may be questionable, <u>unless allowed by other policies in the Local Plan.</u></p> <p>Overall, this policy approach is expected to lead to long term positive results across</p>				

<b>Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy</b>						
<b>IIA Objectives</b>	<b>Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy</b> setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy		<b>Option 2 –</b> setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		<b>Option 3 –</b> To have no policy and only rely on national policy.	
	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>
		Central Lincolnshire.				
<b>2. Health</b>	✓✓	The policy aims to locate development in the locations with more services available in proximity to enable a larger number of people to access services, such as health and welfare. Decisions on investment in such services are taken on the basis of growth distribution and by setting out clear expectations for growth through a settlement hierarchy this enables forward planning for this investment. As such, accessibility for all to health and welfare services, specifically, can be improved, in a	✓	Whilst the policy would contribute to the objective, by not including a settlement hierarchy there will be less focus for delivering growth in areas best equipped to maximise health. It is likely that a strategy that promotes growth in the most suitable and sustainable locations would result in long term positive effects for Central Lincolnshire, but it might also lead to long term negative effects if development is delivered in less sustainable settlements.	✓	The NPPF specifically seeks to promote healthy communities and requires good design which helps create safe and accessible environments. However, without the local dimension provided by the preferred policy the extent to which the objective can be met in terms of meeting Central Lincolnshire’s needs in the most sustainable way is likely to be significantly reduced. It is likely that reliance on national policy would result in growth in the most suitable and sustainable

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy						
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy		Option 2 – setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		Option 3 – To have no policy and only rely on national policy.	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
		<p>focussed and sustainable manner, which in turn will contribute to reducing health inequalities.</p> <p>Overall, this policy approach is expected to result in long term, significant positive effects across Central Lincolnshire.</p>				<p>locations, and therefore would result in long term positive effects for Central Lincolnshire, but it might also lead to long term negative effects if development is delivered in less sustainable settlements.</p>
<b>3. Social Equality and Community</b>	✓✓	<p>The policy aims to deliver growth spread across a large number of settlements, with a focus for growth in the larger urban conurbations, which experience a higher level of deprivation. This growth will help to regenerate a number of areas delivering benefits for existing and new population.</p>	✓	<p>Whilst the policy could contribute to the objective, by not including a settlement hierarchy the focussed nature of meeting needs in a balanced way across Central Lincolnshire could be lost. A strategic policy would likely result in growth generally being delivered in urban</p>	✓	<p>National policy recognises the importance of providing opportunities for social interaction and delivering safe and accessible developments and environments. These requirements will help to deliver equality of access and have positive, permanent long</p>

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy						
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy		Option 2 – setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		Option 3 – To have no policy and only rely on national policy.	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
		<p><u>In Medium and Small Villages, criteria provides flexibility for additional growth if development proposals can demonstrate clear local community support. This is likely to lead to positive effects in helping people to feel positive about the area they live in as they will have a say on new development in their settlement.</u></p> <p>It is expected that this policy approach will deliver long term positive effects across deprived areas in Central Lincolnshire.</p>		<p>areas, but may result in a higher proportion of development being delivered in less-deprived areas, potentially resulting in a less positive result than in the preferred policy.</p>		<p>term impacts upon this objective. However, without the local dimension provided by the preferred policy the extent to which the objective can be met in terms of meeting Central Lincolnshire’s needs is likely to be reduced.</p>

<b>Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy</b>						
<b>IIA Objectives</b>	<b>Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy</b> setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy		<b>Option 2 –</b> setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		<b>Option 3 –</b> To have no policy and only rely on national policy.	
	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>
<b>4. Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</b>	✓	Decisions on investment in facilities such as sports facilities are made on known growth and distribution. A settlement hierarchy will assist planned decisions for this investment. The policy also seeks to make the most effective use of previously developed land except where that land is of high environmental value which could include important biodiversity sites. It is expected that this approach will lead to some positive effects in some locations.	✓	A policy strategy would likely seek to make the most effective use of previously developed land except where that land is of high environmental value which could include important biodiversity sites.  Whilst the policy could contribute to the objective, by not including a settlement hierarchy there could be less focus for investment to support growth.	✓	The NPPF supports the provision of services and facilities and identifies the importance of open space and seeks to protect it. The NPPF also identifies the role that planning can play in minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, including the importance of ecological networks. However, without the local dimension provided by the preferred policy the extent to which the objective can be met in terms of meeting Central Lincolnshire's

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy						
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy		Option 2 – setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		Option 3 – To have no policy and only rely on national policy.	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
						needs is likely to be reduced.
5. Landscape and Townscape	0✓	<p><del>This policy would not in itself have any impact on this objective.</del></p> <p><u>The policy requires additional growth not allocated in the Plan to be in appropriate locations, either within the developed footprint or outside of, but immediately adjacent to the developed footprint of a settlement.</u></p> <p><u>The policy sets out criteria to clearly set out how a site would qualify as an 'appropriate location'.</u></p> <p><u>Alongside the implementation of LP26 Design and Amenity, this policy</u></p>	0	This policy would not in itself have any impact on this objective.	0	This policy would not in itself have any impact on this objective.

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy						
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy		Option 2 – setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		Option 3 – To have no policy and only rely on national policy.	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
		<u>is expected to result in minor positive effects on protecting and enhancing the character and appearance of Central Lincolnshire's landscape and townscape, by seeking to retain the core shape and form of settlements and protecting the character and appearance of the settlement, its rural setting and/or the surrounding countryside.</u>				
<b>6. Built and Historic Environment</b>	<b>0</b>	This policy would not in itself have any impact on this objective.	<b>0</b>	This policy would not in itself have any impact on this objective.	<b>0</b>	This policy would not in itself have any impact on this objective.
<b>7. Water</b>	✓	The spatial strategy focuses on delivering	?	For the policy not to include a settlement	?	Whilst the NPPF requires that the planning system

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy						
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy		Option 2 – setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		Option 3 – To have no policy and only rely on national policy.	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
		sustainable growth that supports improvements to infrastructure, which is likely to include new water systems infrastructure. Water consumption will increase because of demand both during the development process and by end users. Taking decisions on the location and scale of development on the basis of the settlement hierarchy will concentrate development at more sustainable locations. This could provide opportunities for improving infrastructure as it allows greater		hierarchy could result in less planned investment in infrastructure as there is less certainty about the location of growth, but this would not necessarily impact on the objective as there is a legal duty on water providers.		should seek to protect and enhance the natural environment through a variety of measures including 'preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at risk from or being adversely affected by...water pollution' this would not necessarily result in any different outcomes than for option 2 as it would result in a less predictable spread of growth.

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy						
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy		Option 2 – setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		Option 3 – To have no policy and only rely on national policy.	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
		clarity over the location of growth.				
<b>8. Pollution</b>	✓/X	It is likely that there will be a mixed effect from this preferred policy on this objective. The settlement hierarchy seeks to focus development in the main urban areas which will reduce the need to travel by private car as a result of facilities and services being located closer to development and as a result of better public transport. However, Lincoln has two AQMAs which could be affected by development in the Lincoln area. The exact extent of any effects is unknown.	?	It is uncertain whether the inclusion of a strategy without a hierarchy would make any difference to how the policy might meet the objective.	?	Whilst the NPPF seeks to minimise greenhouse gas emissions through a variety of means including supporting renewable energy, reducing reliance upon the car and promoting low carbon energy development, this would not impact the spatial distribution of sites or allow for investment of public transport for example. As such it is unclear what the effect of reliance on national policy would be without any local considerations.
<b>9. Land Use and Soils</b>	✓/X	The policy requires the most effective	✓/X	This option would set out the spatial	?	National policy in the NPPF

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy						
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy		Option 2 – setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		Option 3 – To have no policy and only rely on national policy.	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
		<p>use of previously developed land, which would involve the avoidance of development on the best and most versatile agricultural land. <u>However, it also allows development outside of, but immediately adjacent to, the developed footprint of Market Towns and Large Villages.</u> The focus of growth at a number of locations does not specify whether this growth would be on greenfield or brownfield land, but it is doubtful that adequate levels of brownfield land would be available to deliver the needed growth in at least some locations.</p>		<p>strategy, which prioritises the effective use of previously developed land leading to positive effects throughout the plan period. However, without a settlement hierarchy, there would be no prioritisation of development to Central Lincolnshire's main settlements and this could lead to permanent, negative impacts on this objective as it could lead to the loss of Greenfield land throughout the plan period.</p>		<p>encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed provided that it is not of high environmental value. However, exact impacts will be dependent on individual proposals that come forward in the future and therefore it is difficult to assign a conclusive score at this stage.</p>

<b>Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy</b>						
<b>IIA Objectives</b>	<b>Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy</b> setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy		<b>Option 2 –</b> setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		<b>Option 3 –</b> To have no policy and only rely on national policy.	
	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>
<b>10. Waste</b>	<b>0</b>	This policy would not in itself have any impact on this objective.	<b>0</b>	This policy would not in itself have any impact on this objective.	<b>0</b>	This policy would not in itself have any impact on this objective.
<b>11. Climate Change Effects and Energy</b>	✓	Locating development on the basis of the settlement hierarchy could provide opportunities to minimise energy usage by concentrating growth in those places that are most accessible by forms other than the car.	X	The opportunities to minimise energy usage are likely to be reduced by not locating development on the basis of the settlement hierarchy due to a greater reliance on the car for transport as development will not necessarily be focussed on the more sustainable places, in terms of accessibility.	✓/X	National policy supports measures to widen transport choice and reduce the need to travel. However, without a local distribution it is possible that development will not be focused in the most sustainable locations where the need to travel is minimised and where alternative modes of transport are readily available.
<b>12. Climate Change Adaptation and Flood Risk</b>	<b>0</b>	This policy would not in itself have any impact on this objective.	<b>0</b>	This policy would not in itself have any impact on this objective.	<b>0</b>	This policy would not in itself have any impact on this objective.
<b>13. Transport and Accessibility</b>	✓✓	The settlement hierarchy prioritises the largest	✓	The strategy would seek to focus growth in previously	✓	National policy supports measures to widen transport

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy						
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy		Option 2 – setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		Option 3 – To have no policy and only rely on national policy.	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
		settlements with the most services and facilities available. These are also the locations where the best public transport infrastructure exists and so will maximise the opportunity for people to travel through alternative modes of transport. It will likely also result in greater investment in the locations where growth is being focused which is expected to result in significant positive effects for the majority of new growth.		developed sites which would have some positive effect on reducing the need to travel in many cases. However, the absence of the settlement hierarchy from the policy might mean that the relative accessibility of Central Lincolnshire's settlements would not be taken into account in locating development and as such not optimise opportunities for meeting the objective.		choice and reduce the need to travel. This should result in some positive impacts however this approach would not recognise local transport and accessibility issues or opportunities.
<b>14. Employment</b>	✓✓	The policy and hierarchy will result in the majority of growth, both employment and residential being	✓	Whilst a strategy without a hierarchy would seek to deliver homes and jobs as part of the creation of strong	✓	The NPPF recognises that planning has a key role to play in supporting sustainable

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy						
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy		Option 2 – setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		Option 3 – To have no policy and only rely on national policy.	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
		delivered in the largest settlements and the most sustainable locations. This will deliver new employment near to the largest populations and the most new houses near to employment locations, likely resulting in improved access to a range of employment opportunities for a large proportion of the population. It will also likely deliver smaller employment developments in smaller settlements, commensurate with the expected population growth. Overall this policy approach is expected to result		communities, by not including a settlement hierarchy there would be less focus on certain sustainable locations and this would lead to a reduced amount of improvement across Central Lincolnshire.		economic growth and it places a significant emphasis on Local Plan policy to set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area, set criteria or identify sites for local and inward investment and identify priority areas for economic regeneration. However, it does promote the creation of sustainable growth. It is likely that national policy would lead to some growth in jobs in many sustainable locations, but without a local context it could result in the benefits being reduced than in other options.

Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy						
IIA Objectives	Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy		Option 2 – setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		Option 3 – To have no policy and only rely on national policy.	
	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation	Residual Effects Score	Commentary and Mitigation
		in significant permanent positive effects on Central Lincolnshire.				
<b>15. Local Economy</b>	✓✓	The policy seeks to deliver growth that meets the needs for jobs, regenerates places and supports necessary infrastructure. It also aims for development to create strong communities, an element of this being prosperity. Decisions on the location and scale of development are to be based on the settlement hierarchy which distributes growth according to size and role of settlements. Accordingly, the policy supports the objective.	✓	Whilst the policy could contribute to the objective, by not including a settlement hierarchy there will be less focus for where and how growth should be accommodated.	✓	The NPPF recognises that planning has a key role to play in supporting sustainable economic growth and it places a significant emphasis on Local Plans and local policy to set out a clear economic vision and strategy for their area, set criteria or identify sites for local and inward investment and identify priority areas for economic regeneration. It is likely that national policy would lead to positive effects but the effects would likely be less than in the other options.

<b>Proposed Submission Local Plan Policy: LP2 - The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy</b>						
<b>IIA Objectives</b>	<b>Option 1 – Preferred Proposed Submission Policy</b> setting out the spatial strategy and a settlement hierarchy	<b>Option 2 –</b> setting out the spatial strategy but not including a settlement hierarchy		<b>Option 3 –</b> To have no policy and only rely on national policy.		
	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>	<b>Residual Effects Score</b>	<b>Commentary and Mitigation</b>
<b>Summary of Significant Effects</b>	Significant positive effects are predicted in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Obj 1. Housing (✓✓)</li> <li>• Obj. 2. Health (✓✓)</li> <li>• Obj 3. Social equality and community (✓✓)</li> <li>• Obj. 13 Transport and accessibility (✓✓)</li> <li>• Obj. 14 Employment (✓✓)</li> <li>• Obj. 15 Local Economy (✓✓)</li> </ul> No other significant effects are predicted.	No significant effects are predicted.	No significant effects are predicted.			
<b>Conclusions:</b> Option 1 is predicted to have a number of positive and major positive impacts in relation to the IIA Objectives. In addition to setting out the spatial strategy, making decisions based on the settlement hierarchy will allow consideration of local issues to be taken into account and will provide greater certainty for investment. Although Options 2 or 3, would both have positive impacts it is considered that the extent of the effects would be less than in the preferred approach in Option 1.						

LP53 – Medium and Small Villages – Preferred Allocations																	
CL2089	Land off Carlton Road and Whites Lane, Basingham	✓	0	0	0/X	✓	X	X	✓	X	-	-	✓	XX	X	XX	This site is being allocated as it was granted permission for residential development. It is in a smaller village and so has fewer facilities available than in many larger villages. The site is greenfield, but there are no major constraints on the site. It is adjacent to Basingham conservation area and is within 50m of a grade II listed building and a Local Wildlife Site is located within 100m of the site. However, as the site has been granted permission it clearly did not have significant impacts on these designations.
CL4673	Land at Hemswell Cliff	✓✓	✓/X	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	X	✓	XX	-	-	✓	✓/X	✓	XX	This site is fairly well located in Hemswell Cliff with development on three sides, however, it is separated from the main built area by the main road. It is a green field site in an area of grade 2 agricultural land and within agricultural use. It has access to a reasonable level of facilities in Hemswell Cliff, including employment, a shop and post office, and a primary school. There are no major constraints on the site.