



CENTRAL LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON THE CONSULTATION DRAFT SET OF MAIN MODIFICATIONS

Introduction

The following table summarises the representations that were received in respect of the modifications as consulted upon. The consultation took place between Monday 23 January 2017 to Monday 6 March 2017. This summary is provided in order to be helpful to the reader, and aims to capture the key points, but not all points, made. It should not be used as a substitute for the full representations which were received, all of which are available in full on the website.

The third column of the table sets out a brief Committee response to the representation made, where it is considered necessary or helpful to do so. For many representations received, the issues raised were either debated at the hearing sessions or are raising issues which are not related to the modifications, and therefore it is not felt necessary or appropriate to provide a further Committee response. Where a representation is made relating to a modification, but the Committee does not support the representation or feel it necessary to comment, then the Committee similarly makes no further comment.

Where the Committee has provided a response, and where this is supporting or recommending a text change, the Committee's view is that such changes are not of such significance to warrant either any additional consultation or any further amendment to the Sustainability Appraisal reports. Instead, they can be matters simply addressed by the Inspectors in the final set of Main Modifications to be published.

The full set of representations have been sent to the Inspectors examining the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, and the Inspectors will carefully consider the representations prior to issuing an Inspector's Report. This note has been prepared by the Committee, dated 20.3.2017.

Representor Name/ ID	Representation Summary	Committee Response
LP2 – The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy		
Larkfleet Homes Ltd (Robert Doughty Consultancy)/ 868366	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/1: An effective regime of monitoring welcomed, but the proposed wording does not set out the criteria to assess whether the policy is being successful. Without clarification it will not be possible to determine whether the policy is providing an effective framework for decision makers. • MM/2: Proposed wording does not set out a clear definition of “demonstration of clear local support” and it should be set out how the community view would be tested against material planning issues. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Lea Lincs Properties (GraceMachin Planning an Property)/ 866348	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/2: Object to Lea having an exception allocation, unlike comparable village. It is not considered to be justified and should be deleted unless growth is increased from 15% to 35% to reflect a reasonable contribution to Gainsborough’s housing needs. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Barratt Homes & David Wilson Homes/ 868774	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/66, MM/68, MM/69 and MM/70: Greylees should be added as a new medium village in the settlement hierarchy. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Sleaford Town Council/ 868311	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/2: Do not consider that this proposal will enhance the role of Sleaford. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Cllr Mrs Overton/ 868734	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/2: The removal of settlement curtilages is justified in smaller villages by the application of a 10 or 15% cap to protect their character and avoid overwhelming facilities. Larger villages desperately need this too. 	The Committee has no further comments.
The Orchards Park (Residential) Ltd/ 891886	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/2: Modification for large villages refers to ‘within the existing developed footprint’. How have site allocations been reviewed to reflect this? 	The Committee has no further comments.
Andrew Ottewell/ 907689	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/1: ‘Custom/ self-build needs its own policy to run alongside the right to build register.’ 	The Committee has no further comments.
Cyden Homes (Barton Willmore)/ 951241	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/2, Large Villages: ‘exceptional circumstance’ is not clearly explained and the example given would conflict with the NPPF and the legal test for planning 	The Committee has no further comments.

	<p>obligations. Inclusion of an exceptional circumstances test is, in principle, contrary to the Framework and reference should be removed. Consider that a judgement from the court of appeal (due May 2017) should be awaited before the Inspector determines the soundness of LP2 in this respect.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/2, Large Villages: 'appropriate locations' definition broadly supported but object to the first criteria regarding retaining the core shape and form of the settlement. Consider this to be unclear, unnecessary and should be deleted. • MM/2, Large Villages: No evidence or justification for the development/ site size threshold and consider it should be removed. 	
Cllr T Smith/ 951279	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/2: Support allowing appropriate development in hamlets when there is local support. • MM/2: Consider 'on the edge' to be clearer than the proposed rewording of 'outside of, but immediately adjacent to, the developed footprint' 	The Committee has no further comments.
Tom Barton Farms Ltd (JH Walter)/ 951531	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/1: lack of settlement boundaries welcomed. Acknowledge caveat for monitoring but consider 'appropriate locations' criteria in LP2 provides the degree of control necessary 	The Committee has no further comments.
Burton By Lincoln Parish Council/ 952396	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/2: content with the definitions of 'appropriate locations', 'clear community support' and 'developed footprint'. • MM/2: hamlets and countryside have no direct reference to a Neighbourhood Plan or 'clear community support'. Para's 3.4.8, 3.4.11 and 3.4.12 relate to villages only and where proposed development exceeds identified growth, therefore reference should be added for hamlets and countryside development. • MM/2: consider proposed modification 8(b) is not clear, provides uncertainty and should be deleted. Also suggest amendment under countryside to read 'renewable energy generation <i>that is suitable both in terms of size and scale on the surrounding area</i>' reflecting what is specified in LP55. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Gladman/ 958926	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/1: Lack of clarity about how monitoring will be used and need for trigger events. Reference to SPD's should be removed. • MM/2: Lincoln Urban Area and Main Towns – consider reference to developed footprint is unnecessarily restrictive and lack of flexibility in lower order settlements. • Reference to scale of development in settlements is unnecessarily restrictive. 	The Committee has no further comments.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not approve of the exceptional circumstances test and should be deleted. • A 'thorough, but proportionate, pre-application consultation exercise' is not clarified and is not in accordance with the Framework. • Appropriate locations is highly subjective and should be based on a robust and comprehensive evidence base. 	
Thonock and Somerby Estates (Savills)/ 959827	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/1: welcomes the flexibility this policy brings. • MM/2: welcomes the certainty provided within this policy for allocated and non-allocated sites within Main Towns. The Estate supports Medium Villages, Small Villages and Hamlets as concepts given the importance of ensuring that smaller settlements remain viable through increased populations. 	The Committee has no further comments.
National Grid – Viking Link/ 995610	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/2: Suggest additional wording under 8. Countryside. '...• Renewable energy generation <u>and infrastructure necessary to support renewable energy projects.</u>' 	The Committee has no further comments.
Mr R Sykes (Emery Planning)/ 997354	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/2: Support inclusion of housing into the list of uses that large villages can provide. • 'developed footprint' is open to misinterpretation and needs further clarification. • 'outside of, but immediately adjacent to, the developed footprint' is not clear and there should not be the added test of sites being exceptional. Sufficient guidance is provided by the 'appropriate locations' definition, but suggest amending the first point to 'retain <u>not significantly harm</u> the core shape and form...' to make it less restrictive. Consider 'in exceptional circumstances' to be superfluous, but if retained it should be amended to say '...the decision maker to determine, but could be, for example <u>but not exclusively</u>...'. 	The Committee has no further comments.
NG34 Plan/ 1068474	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contacting 'the applicable Council' requires additional clarification – applicable parish, town or district council and would make it consistent with the preceding reference. 	The Committee accepts that this could lead to confusion. Therefore, the Committee recommends to the Inspectors that the word 'Council' is replaced by 'local planning authority'.
LP3 – Level and Distribution of Growth		

Larkfleet Homes Ltd (Robert Doughty Consultancy)/ 868366	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/3 and MM/4: the main modification fails to explain the process undertaken and the derivation of a single target and does not make it clear that housing growth of 1,540 per year should be a minimum. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Cyden Homes (Barton Willmore)/ 951241	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/8: object to reference to the Liverpool Method and consider it should be deleted. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Tom Barton Farms Ltd (JH Walter)/ 951531	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/3: Support acknowledging that the OAN figure should not be seen as a ceiling. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Gladman/ 958926	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/3: welcome recognition that the housing target should not be seen as a ceiling, but consider that the figure should be at the upper end of the OAN range 	The Committee has no further comments.
Thonock and Somerby Estates (Savills)/ 959827	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/3: Welcomes the flexibility this policy brings. 	The Committee has no further comments.
NG34 Plan/ 1068474	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/3: If the figure, as stated, is 'higher than the demographic need', on what basis should the figure not be seen as a ceiling? • MM/4: reference to 'new jobs' rather than 'employment land' should be consistently applied throughout the plan e.g. a, b, c and d also in LP3. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP4 – Growth in Villages		
Lea Lincs Properties (GraceMachin Planning an Property)/ 866348	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/6: Object to Lea having an exception allocation, unlike comparable villages. It is not considered to be justified and should be deleted unless growth is increased from 15% to 35% to reflect a reasonable contribution to Gainsborough's housing needs. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Sleaford Town Council/ 868311	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/10: Why delete support from the Town Council? 	Specific reference to Parish or Town Councils have been incorporated in the modifications made to policy LP2. No further action necessary.

Larkfleet Homes Ltd (Robert Doughty Consultancy)/ 868366	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/7: Growth targets are only included here for tier 5 & 6 settlements and it is not clear how this will feed into the monitoring of LP2 or how it will be used • MM/6: As Lea has an allocation that is equivalent to the growth target, if this means no other growth will be allowed, this must be clarified. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Waterside Builders/ 891855	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy LP4 Para 6: does not establish any identified policy for affordable housing alongside the 4 dwellings or % growth. Some sites could be all affordable. The total of 180 dwellings for villages will not be accepted by Govt. future policy. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Tom Barton Farms Ltd (JH Walter)/ 951531	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/6: Support acknowledgement that some medium villages are subject to allocations. Consider that the plan should allow scope for growth in Lea, particularly in the event that the allocation does not come forward, the council does not deliver against the OAN and/ or growth is required for Gainsborough. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Jack Baird/ 957099	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/6: Lea and Gainsborough are separate entities, Lea's infrastructure is inadequate for the present number of dwellings whilst Gainsborough would welcome more demand. Growth in Lea should be changed from 15% to a 'nominal 3%'. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Gladman/ 958926	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/7: If the housing target is not a ceiling, question whether LP4 should continue to have targets. • MM/8: Question whether each district can demonstrate a robust 5 year housing supply and delivery rates. Consider that Sedgefield rather than the Liverpool method be used. Allocation of further sites is required. • MM/10: Object to the principle of maximising the re-use of brownfield land in the manner proposed and recommend sequential test approach be deleted. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Thonock and Somerby Estates (Savills)/ 959827	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/7: welcomes the increased transparency for developers that this policy provides. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Mrs D Heppenstall/ 995719	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/6: The modification refers to 15% level of growth in LP4 (and therefore also LP2) as the determining policy for growth in Lea. Para 8.3.4. states there is capacity for more growth in Gainsborough and the inclusion of reference to LP50 is therefore unnecessary and the need to justify the allocation of site CL3044 is irrelevant. Reference to Lea should be deleted and CL3044 removed from LP50. 	The Committee has no further comments.

Mr R Sykes (Emery Planning)/ 997354	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/7: support live data every quarter, but why is it restricted to level 5 and 6 settlements only? Given response to housing completions query, question whether this will be supplied quarterly and a clear commitment is required. • MM/8: The backlog should be addressed as soon as possible (within the first five years and recommend new wording) and not delayed till later in the plan period. Applying the Sedgfield method would still provide a 5 year supply and meet the backlog. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP5 – Delivering Prosperity and Jobs		
Sleaford Town Council/ 868311	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/14: Definition and character need clarifying. • MM/15: Unclear why the last sentence has been removed? 	The Committee has no further comments.
Church Commissioners (WYG Group)/ 869007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/12: support the amendment which complements the changes within Policy LP30. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Key Property Investments/ 958520	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/11-15: The amendments to policy LP5 make the policy more stringent and prohibit development to uses outside that of employment and removes any of the stated flexibility in the evidence report and is contrary to the NPPF. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP6 – Retail and Town Centres in Central Lincolnshire		
Standard Life (Montagu Evans)/ 958022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/16: It is considered that the potentially unintentional consequence of the proposed modification is that development within the primary shopping area would need to be supported by an impact assessment, while development outside, but within 1km, would not. Therefore suggest the following amendment: ‘... nearby centres will be required for any <u>edge-of-centre or out-of-centre</u> retail, leisure or office proposals...’ and remove ‘is located’ from bullets b, c and d. 	<p>The Committee predominantly agrees.</p> <p>The representors additional wording could be used, or alternatively the word ‘boundary’ could be added after the words ‘primary shopping area’ in criteria a. This latter option is more consistent with wording of b, c and d and is believed to achieve the same objective as the representors suggested wording.</p>

		The word 'is located' should be deleted from b, c and d (because it is covered by the same wording prior to the criteria).
LP10 – Meeting Accommodation Needs		
NG34 Plan/ 1068474	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MM/19: The modification is supported, but suggest some clarification of 'other appropriate local evidence' e.g. recognising the importance of evidence bases produced during the development of Neighbourhood Plans. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP11 – Affordable Housing		
Cllr Mrs Overton/ 868734	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MM/21: The threshold should be set at 4 otherwise small and medium villages will get nothing. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Waterside Builders/ 891855	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LP11: increasing affordable units from 4 to 11 is supported and may be supported by the housing minister, but again prefabricated units to provide a roof for families will be prioritised. Policy = votes. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Thonock and Somerby Estates (Savills)/ 959827	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MM/21: Welcomes this policy which aligns the emerging Local Plan with National Planning Policy. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP13 – Accessibility and Transport		
Sleaford Town Council/ 868311	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MM/24: Definition and character need clarifying. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Church Commissioners (WYG Group)/ 869007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MM/24 and MM/40: Support this modification as it reflects the comments made at the hearing session. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP14 – Managing Water Resources and Flood Risk		

Marine Management Organisation/ 892029	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 4.8.13 update/ correction: ‘...be guided by the Marine Policy Statement <u>and East Marine Plans</u> or any subsequent replacement. The Marine policy statement provides a shared UK vision...’ 	This paragraph is not subject to any proposed modifications, nor is the representation understood to have been a representation made at the proposed submission stage. It is not, therefore, considered appropriate for a main modification to be made now. It is also not considered to be a matter which can be addressed through an Additional Modification, because the additional text goes beyond a factual update.
LP21 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity		
Natural England/ 865330	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/23 and MM/26: welcomed as they are considered to reflect the advice set out in the NPPF 	The Committee has no further comments.
Gladman/ 958926	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/23 and MM/26: the definition of ‘ecosystems services approach’ has not been provided in the modification to Appendix D. 	The definition will be included as an Additional Modification
LP22 – Green Wedges		
Anglian Water/ 891379	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/27: Concerned about existing WRCs in Green Wedges and constraining their operation. Generally supportive of modifications to para 5.7.3, but propose the following additional text to 5.7.5 to make the modification justified and effective ‘...fulfil their statutory <u>and/ or corporate</u> obligations, or the provision...’ 	The Committee has no further comments.
Burton By Lincoln Parish Council/ 952396	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/27: pleased to note definition of suitable development but consider ‘<u>outdoor</u>’ should be added before ‘sport and recreational use’ for clarity. 	The Committee would support the addition of the word ‘outdoor’ as suggested, as that gives greater clarity as to the

		sort of uses which 'may' be acceptable in a Green Wedge.
NG34 Plan/ 1068474	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/27: for consistency with other sections of the plan, suggested further clarification 'Where development on a Green Wedge is permitted, should such development substantially alter it's appearance, character and amenity, a suitable equivalent area should be made available to replace it'. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP23 – Local Green Space and other Important Open Space		
Sleaford Town Council/ 868311	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/28 and MM/29: Definition and character need clarifying. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Thonock and Somerby Estates (Savills)/ 959827	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/29: welcomes this distinction between publicly accessible open space and important open spaces. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP25 – The Historic Environment		
Barratt Homes & David Wilson Homes/ 868774	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/31: Object to modification under Conservation Areas and consider it to be contrary to NPPF and recommend text in the submitted Local Plan policy be retained. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP26 – Design and Amenity		
Sleaford Town Council/ 868311	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/32 and MM/33: Definition and character need clarifying. No specific reference to Sleaford which should be added. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Chris Taylor/ 1068467	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/32 and MM/33: welcome amendments which support and replace most of the aims and intensions of the Long Leas Road policy in the CoL Local Plan. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP28 – Sustainable Urban Extensions		

Larkfleet Homes Ltd (Robert Doughty Consultancy)/ 868366	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/34: The meaning of the word appropriate is not defined. • MM/34: Is including secondary and post 16 education in conflict with CIL regulations. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP30 – Lincoln SUEs		
Highways England/ 865332	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/40: Noted 20ha of employment land on WGC and need for master planning and transport assessment and new link/ mitigation on A46 but are satisfied that this is covered by policy LP13 and have no further comments. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Anglian Water/ 891379	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/43: Had sought clearer direction as to how an odour assessment would be considered on SWQ from the South Hykeham WRC. Generally supportive of the proposed modification but consider that the phrase ‘relationship with the South Hykeham WRC’ should be clarified to ensure the policy is effective and consider the following be added to the 9th bullet point ‘...arising from the relationship with <u>proximity of the proposed development to</u> the South Hykeham WRC.’ 	The Committee would have no objection to this alternative wording.
Church Commissioners (WYG Group)/ 869007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/40: Object to specifying the type of employment use for the SWQ and recommend changing to ‘...5ha of <u>land for employment generating uses (including those within the B use class)</u> to allow for non-B use classes to be included. • MM/43: consider the wording to be unduly onerous and recommend changing bullet 9 to ‘A detailed odour assessment to demonstrate that there would be no <u>significant</u> adverse impact on potential future occupants of regularly occupied land and buildings, arising from the relationship with the South Hykeham WRC, <u>which could not otherwise be suitably mitigated.</u>’ 	The Committee has no further comments.
Thonock and Somerby Estates (Savills)/ 959827	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/40: welcomes the flexibility this policy provides. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP32 – Lincoln’s Universities and Colleges		
University of Lincoln/ 897429	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/45: The modifications should echo saved WLDC policy CRT6 and consider the proposed modification to be weaker in that support is ‘...subject to wider planning policies, including detailed policy requirements for the Campus in any Made Neighbourhood Plan for Risholme.’ The Neighbourhood Plan should not set strategic planning policy. 	The Committee has no further comments.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is requested that the 3rd paragraph be amended to read <u>'Within the Riseholme Park Campus as defined on the Proposals Map development proposals involving the expansion/ alteration of existing educational uses will be permitted provided that:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The development is of appropriate scale with regard to it's setting and would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the open countryside, the setting of Listed Buildings or the setting of the Historic Park and Garden and Scheduled Ancient Monuments;</u> <u>The development would not have a detrimental effect on highway safety;</u> <u>The development would not have a detrimental effect on residential amenity by reason of noise and traffic.</u> 	
Burton By Lincoln Parish Council/ 952396	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MM/45: pleased to see reference to education, teaching and research and direct link to the Neighbourhood Plan, but consider that lack of clarity is introduced by reference to 'wider planning policies' and consider that this should be deleted. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP39: Gainsborough Sustainable Urban Extensions		
Thonock and Somerby Estates (Savills)/ 959827	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MM/49: welcomes this proposed change. MM/50: welcomes the flexibility this policy provides. MM/51: welcomes the flexibility this policy provides. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP43 – Protecting Sleaford's Setting and Character		
Sleaford Town Council/ 868311	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MM/54: Definition and character need clarifying. What is defined as Conservation Area? 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP44 – Sleaford Sustainable Urban Extensions		
Sleaford Town Council/ 868311	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MM/60: Changes appear retrograde. What does 'secondary access' actually mean? MM/57: appears not to have industrial development. Does this conflict with MM/59? 	The Committee has no further comments.

NG34 Plan/ 1068474	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/57: would removing the areas to be allocated for specific items of infrastructure raise the question of consistency with LP10? • MM/58: as this development forms a significant part of the increase in numbers of houses in Sleaford, it is considered that the bullet point should be strengthened further; 'e. provide appropriate <u>adequate</u> transport mitigation measures <u>for the whole of the wider Sleaford area</u> having particular regard to...' • MM/60: appears to be a conflict between what was specified in the Sleaford Masterplan and more recent proposals for the Sleaford West Quadrant SUE. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP45 – Sleaford’s Regeneration and Opportunity Areas		
NG34 Plan/ 1068474	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/62: for consistency throughout the plan shouldn't the Advanta Seeds site, as a brownfield site, should have been allocated ahead of the Sleaford South Quadrant SUE. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP47 – Access and Movement within Sleaford		
NG34 Plan/ 1068474	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic modelling had shown that the Link Road would not provide any significant improvement and should have been removed from the plan and should not be safeguarded. The Sleaford Southern Bypass is considered to offer greater benefits. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Housing Data Table on page 109 and Trajectory on page 110		
Barratt Homes & David Wilson Homes/ 868774	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/66, MM/68, MM/69 and MM/70 and consider the 109 indicative dwellings at the former Rauceby Hospital should be itemised as 'remaining capacity' to show how they have been accounted for in the revised Appendix 2. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Church Commissioners (WYG Group)/ 869007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/65: support the proposed modifications although note that at the examination session it was stated that para 10.2.1 should be moved in the document to immediately precede the summary site allocation tables in Policy LP48. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Gladman/ 958926	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/67: welcome inclusion of trajectory but disagree with accuracy and reliability of the upgraded version. Should include further allocations and a table in 	The Committee has no further comments.

	appendix 3 detailing the expected delivery of each individual site commitment which would aid monitoring.	
Mr R Sykes (Emery Planning)/ 997354	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/67: Consider a more realistic trajectory should be used. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP50 – Residential Allocations – Main Towns		
Lea Lincs Properties (GraceMachin Planning an Property)/ 866348	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/70: Site CL3044 in Lea remains listed incorrectly under LP50 in Appendix 5 and should be removed. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Mrs J Hedge/ 1068472	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/70: Concerned about the impact that the level of development will have on Lea and consider the proposed allocation site to be unrealistic (traffic, access, drainage, sewage capacity. Further development should be in the form of small-scale developments in those parts of the village where infrastructure can still support it. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP51 – Residential Allocations – Market Towns		
Cllr T Smith/ 951279	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/69: Disappointed with the level of development proposed for Market Rasen and do not believe the infrastructure can cope with the strain of another 640 dwellings 	The Committee has no further comments.
West Rasen Parish Meeting/ 954464	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/69: Question current planning application re CL1364 and whether flood risk has been satisfactorily resolved. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP52 – Residential Allocations – Large Villages		
The Orchard Park (Residential) Ltd/ 891886	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site selection: No factual evidence has been given as to how sites were considered against each other. Indicators have not been applied consistently. No factual justification for % increase applied to each village which does not relate to infrastructure. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP53 – Residential Allocations – Medium Villages		

Lea Lincs Properties (GraceMachin Planning an Property)/ 866348	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/70: Object to specific reference to CL3044 in Lea and do not consider it to be necessary or justified unless further growth, above 15%, is accepted. If further growth is accepted then CL3044 should be replaced with the alternative suggested site. • Question whether the proposed site allocation constitutes a sustainable pattern of development, having the greatest impact on an historical parkland asset and is less suitable than another site which is subject to a current planning application. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Barratt Homes & David Wilson Homes/ 868774	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/66, MM/68, MM/69 and MM/70 and consider the 109 indicative dwellings at the former Rauceby Hospital should be itemised as 'remaining capacity' to show how they have been accounted for in the revised Policy LP53. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Tom Barton Farms Ltd (JH Walter)/ 951531	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/70: Support acknowledgement that some medium villages are subject to allocations. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP55: Development in the Countryside		
Burton By Lincoln Parish Council/ 952396	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/71: Support the separation of hamlets and the countryside, however, the policy refers to 'developed footprint' and it is not clear whether this relates to settlements 1-7 or includes settlement tier 8. The definition in LP2 should be explicitly referenced in this section. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP56 – Gypsy and Traveller Allocations		
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups/ 866041	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/72: Oppose proposed modification as unnecessary, divisive and discriminatory. 	The Committee has no further comments.
LP57 – Ministry of Defence Establishments		
Ministry of Defence/ 866235	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/73 and MM/74: Concerned that proposed modifications could potentially result in large, brownfield, former public sector sites lying vacant. • MM/74: Consider the use of the word 'significant' to be highly subjective requiring further clarification. 	The Committee has no further comments.

Appendices		
Church Commissioners (WYG Group)/ 869007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MM/76, Appendix D: Support the modification that reflects current national policy, but the definition should acknowledge that the national definition of affordable housing continues to evolve, it is therefore suggested that the following be added to the end of the definition ‘...2012. <u>Any subsequent changes in the definition of affordable housing through amendments to the NPPF, will be reflected in the approach taken to relevant planning applications through the life of the Plan</u>’. 	The Committee would have no particular objection to these words being added, though the risk in adding such words could be that it causes as much confusion as it helps, because it is unknown what the new definition will finally be, and whether any transitional arrangements will apply.
NG34 Plan/ 1068474	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MM/76, Appendix D: in the event of future legislative changes, would the definition need to be changed and/ or additional note required? 	See above
Maps		
Barratt Homes & David Wilson Homes/ 868774	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MapMod/21, Inset Map 15: Site CL47 should be retained on the policies map. 	The Committee has no further comments.
University of Lincoln/ 897429	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not consider the policies map as it refers to the University of Riseholme campus to accurately define the extent of the developed campus core and reference to the map is confusing and ambiguous to which part of the campus it refers. This is better identified in the WLDC Policies Map. An amendment is fundamental in offering the decision maker absolute clarity. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Larkfleet Homes Ltd (Robert Doughty Consultancy)/ 868366	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Map modifications are unclear and inconsistent in showing what change is being promoted, compounded by the lack of a key. They should be revised and subject to further consultation. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Mr J Hodson (David Hickinson)/ 906956	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MapMod/22: Important Open Space: Modification put forward for land to the rear of Riby Road, Keelby as it does not meet the requirements (inaccessible and containing existing concrete and timber storage buildings) and would not be detrimental to the overall Important Open Space. 	The Committee has no further comments.

David Ash/ 1068470	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MapMod/22: Site boundary does not reflect the boundary as shown on the accompanying land registry map. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Cllr T Smith/ 951279	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MapMod/28: map should include the entire parish of Middle Rasen. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Middle Rasen Parish Council/ 951290	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MapMod/28: Map should include the entire parish of Middle Rasen 	The Committee has no further comments.
Tom Barton Farms Ltd (JH Walter)/ 951531	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/52: Key diagram for Gainsborough - Amendments considered unnecessary, particularly given other references elsewhere in the plan – LP2, MM/46 and Gainsborough Strategy Area Study. 	The Committee has no further comments.
NG34 Plan/ 1068474	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MM/61: Key diagram for Sleaford – broad locations for future growth should include the number of dwellings proposed, Sleaford Link Road should be removed and spelling correction 'Former Advanta Seeds' rather than 'forma'. 	The Committee will make this amendment as an Additional Modification
Leafbridge Ltd (Globe Consultants)/ 957618	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MapMod/8: Suggested amendments to the boundary for the Green Wedge at Hykeham Pits, North Hykeham to include all filled land, excluding the water bodies. 	<p>The boundary as proposed in the main modifications consultation is based on a combination of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the description in the Inspectors' letter on 16 January 2017 (ref. ED023) and • from looking at historic records the area that best fit the Inspector's description was the EA Waste Management Licence no. 70902 (site name: George Fischer Factory Landfill), as available on the EA website

		The Committee does not support any further amendments.
Taylor Lindsey Ltd (Freeths)/ 958535	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MapMod/3 - CL4615/ CL4430: support the proposed modification. • MapMod/9 – CL4432: support the proposed modification. • Further modifications required as previously stated for: CL4431 – Lee Road, Lincoln CL416 – Urban Street, Lincoln 	The Committee has no further comments.
Thonock and Somerby Estates (Savills)/ 959827	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MapMod/11: Inset Map 3. agree with the removal of this site as a housing allocation as the site is already developed. • MapMod/15: inset Map 3. agree with the removal of this site from the Important Open Space allocation as it is not publicly accessible land. 	The Committee has no further comments.
P & C Kendall/ 1070393	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MapMod/9: Do not consider there to be any valid reason to amend the plan. The site provides an important wildlife habitat. Yielding to developer pressure. 	The Committee has no further comments.
R Crampton/ 1070630	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MapMod/9: The land is important to the local community. Nothing has changed since it was identified as Important Open Space in the City of Lincoln Local Plan and earlier versions of the Central Lincs Local Plan, other than a developer has decided to present a plan to build on it. This is not considered a reason to alter the boundary. 	The Committee has no further comments.
IIA		
Waterside Builders/ 891855	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 1, New IIA: Option 5 it seems govt. policy will require this to satisfy need. Affordable does not mean built at a loss = prefabrication 	The Committee has no further comments.
General		
Internal Drainage Boards/ 865333	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further comments. 	The Committee has no further comments.

Historic England/ 868771	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further comments. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Nottinghamshire County Council/ 891957	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments to make. 	The Committee has no further comments.
North Lincolnshire Council/ 955792	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments to make. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Andrew Ottewell/ 907689	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to specific removal of reference to custom/ self-build. Suggest that the plan should consider allocating specific smaller sites for self/custom build or develop an exception policy in support of land release in certain locations. They have a number of positive impacts on other policy area in the plan 	The Committee has no further comments.
National Grid – Viking Link/ 995610	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LP19: Suggest the additional wording ‘...proposals for non-wind renewable technology <i>(including supporting infrastructure for such development)</i> will be assessed...’ East Lindsey had incorporated a similar policy in their Core Strategy and it is important for large scale, cross boundary projects that there is consistency across boundaries. (Appendix – previously submitted rep.) 	The Committee has no further comments.
Chris Taylor/ 1068467	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Important Established Employment Area for Long Leas Road, with B1, B2 and B8 use classes is out of character with the neighbourhood and contradicts mods to LP26, 1 and 3. It should only be B1. (Accompanied by a residents petition.) 	The Committee has no further comments.
Ben Hill/ 1068468	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The employment area on Long Leas Road should be B1 only and not B1, B2 and B8 use classes. The area is unsuitable for heavy industrial businesses. The residents have not been consulted. (Accompanied by a link to a residents petition.) 	The Committee has no further comments.
Sleaford Town Council/ 868311	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brownfield precedence needs to be addressed. • Manual of Streets best practice. • Concerns over River Slea levels and water supply. • Impacts on other amenities. 	The Committee has no further comments.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about the availability of medical services and adequacy of transport provision. 	
Patrick Jackman/ 868011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that the correct level of infrastructure would not happen and concrete agreements need to be agreed and implemented. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Cllr Mrs Overton/ 868734	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signage is limited in villages to avoid garish competition. • Housing should only be allowed where matching facilities and jobs are allowed. • All large developments (of 11 or more) should demonstrate how they reflect the housing needs of the locality. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Waterside Builders/ 891855	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard copies should have been more widely displayed. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Mrs J Hedge/ 1068472	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the plan to have been poorly advertised and unfortunate that no attempt was made to inform every household in the central Lincolnshire area. 	The Committee has no further comments.
Alan Waddington/ 908441	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questioning access arrangements for a new secondary school in Sleaford; • Raising points regarding non-car transport provision, highways infrastructure other than the Lincoln eastern bypass, health care provision, amount of affordable/ rented housing provision, response to flood risk, the amount of green space that will be built on, implications of devolution and plans for the Lincolnshire coast. 	The Committee has no further comments.