

Examination of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Review

Inspectors' Matters, Issues and Questions

Matthew Birkinshaw BA (Hons) Msc MRTPI and

Clive Coyne BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

Inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State

Date: 3 October 2022

Introduction

The Local Plan Review was submitted for examination on 8 July 2022 by the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee (thereafter referred to as 'the Committee'). The plan area encompasses the City of Lincoln, North Kesteven District and West Lindsey District.

Prior to the forthcoming hearing sessions, responses are invited from participants on the following Matters, Issues and Questions ('MIQs') for Examination. The MIQs are based on the Main Issues identified by the Committee and other relevant issues raised by representors.

Participants should only answer Questions which are directly relevant to their original representations. Further information about the examination, hearings and format of written statements is provided in the accompanying *Examination Guidance Note*, which should be read alongside the MIQs.

In answering the following Questions, participants should have regard to the list of suggested Main Modifications presented by the Committee (referred to as 'MMSC'). These are available on the examination website under Examination Documents – Reference EX011. Participants should also have regard to the Committee's response to the Inspectors' Initial Questions (Examination Document EX004). Both will be discussed during the hearing sessions.

Matter 1 – Legal Compliance

Issue 1 – Duty to Cooperate

- Q1. The Statement of Common Ground (updated September 2022)¹ states that an additional document is in preparation with Bassetlaw District Council regarding the Apleyhead logistics site. What is the latest position regarding the completion of this Statement? How does it demonstrate constructive, active and ongoing engagement on a strategic cross-boundary issue?
- Q2. The Statement of Common Ground confirms that discussions have taken place with the Lincolnshire Clinical Commissioning Group ('CCG') on behalf of the NHS. However, what evidence can the Committee point to which demonstrates that this engagement was constructive? For example, did it lead to any specific policy outcomes?
- Q3. How did the Committee consider potential strategic cross-boundary issues with North Lincolnshire Council, having particular regard to the impacts of growth along the A15?
- Q4. Has the Duty to Cooperate under sections 22(5)(c) and 33A of the 2004 Act and Regulation 4 of the 2012 Regulations been complied with, having regard to advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') and the National Planning Practice Guidance (the 'PPG')?

Issue 2 – Public Consultation

- Q1. Has public consultation been carried out in accordance with the *Central Lincolnshire Statement of Community Involvement* ('SCI')², the Framework, the PPG and the requirements of the 2004 Act and 2012 Regulations?
- Q2. Were adequate opportunities made available for participants to access and make comments on the Local Plan, and other relevant documents, in different locations and in different formats (such as in paper and online)?
- Q3. Was a consistent approach taken to public consultation across the three Council areas?
- Q4. How did the Committee reach different groups within the community to inform people about the Local Plan, such as the elderly or residents in smaller, rural villages?

Issue 3 – Sustainability Appraisal

- Q1. The *Interim Sustainability Appraisal for the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (June 2021) (Appendix 2)*³ assessed three options for housing growth. How were the options defined and what were they based on?
- Q2. Appendix 2 (Interim SA, June 2021) concludes that the outcomes between Options 1 and 3 are very similar. What were the reasons, therefore, for pursuing the preferred outcome (Option 1)?

¹ Examination Document EX008

² Core Document STA003

³ Core Document STA004c

- Q3. The June 2021 SA also assessed different options for the distribution of new development. Option 4 included the provision of one or more new settlements. Was this based on proposed schemes, known to the Committee at that time, or generic proposals for new settlements?
- Q4. Did the SA consider different options for the scale and distribution of employment growth proposed in the Plan?
- Q5. How was the list of 'reasonable alternative' sites defined for the purposes of the SA?
- Q6. Where RAF Scampton is concerned, the June 2021 SA considered three options for its redevelopment. Option 2 included the allocation of the site as a mixed-use development. However, neither the proposed uses nor the scale of development was specified in the SA. What were the reasons for this? In the absence of any specific details at the time, how did the SA enable the Committee to reach an informed decision on the growth strategy for the area?
- Q7. Are the various iterations of the SA based on robust and up-to-date information relating to the likely significant effects of new development, especially where sites are concerned?
- Q8. Are the conclusions in the various iterations of the SA accurate and robust? For example, what are the reasons for the different scores (and outcomes) between sites WL/WELT/008 and WL/WELT/008A?
- Q9. Consultation was carried out by the Committee in August 2022 on a SA Addendum. What were the conclusions from this additional SA work and what implications (if any) does the evidence have on the soundness of the submitted Plan?

Issue 4 – Habitats Regulations

- Q1. When considering the potential for recreational disturbance, what is the justification for using an 8km distance to screen out likely significant effects in the *Habitats Regulations Assessment Main Report* ('HRA')⁴?
- Q2. What are the main reasons for concluding that the likelihood of impacts from residential development on functionally linked will be low? Are the conclusions reasonable and robust?
- Q3. What measures will the Local Plan put in place to ensure that likely significant effects would be avoided from relevant windfall sites, not only for residential development but other uses such as renewable energy projects?

⁴ Core Document STA005.1a

Issue 5 – Strategic Flood Risk Assessment

- Q1. Paragraph 3.4 of the *Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment* ('SFRA')⁵ states that the EA flood zones do not currently include an allowance for climate change. However, "...recent discussions with the EA has concluded that the impact of climate change on the extent of the Flood Zones in this area is likely to be negligible and should not significantly impact on the strategic allocation of land." What are the reasons for this, and, how have the implications of climate change been taken into account in the allocation of land?
- Q2. Is the Plan consistent with paragraph 161 of the Framework which states that all plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development - taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change – so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property.
- Q3. What is the justification for allocating land for development where sites fall (even in part) within Flood Zones 2 or 3? In answering this question, it would assist the examination if the Committee could produce a table identifying each relevant site, the land use proposed and the total area at risk of flooding.

Issue 6 – Public Sector Equality Duty ('PSED')

- Q1. In what way does the plan seek to ensure that due regard is had to the three aims expressed in s149 of the Equality Act 2010 in relation to those who have a relevant protected characteristic?

⁵ Core Document FRI001

Matter 2 – Housing, Employment and Retail Need

Issue 1 – Local Housing Need

To determine the minimum number of homes needed, paragraph 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') states that strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance – unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals.

- Q1. What is the minimum number of new homes needed over the plan period as calculated using the standard method? Are the calculations accurate and do they reflect the methodology and advice in the national Planning Practice Guidance ('the PPG')?

The PPG advises that there will be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than the standard method. Circumstances where this may be appropriate include situations where there are growth strategies for an area, where strategic infrastructure improvements are proposed or where an authority is taking on unmet housing needs from elsewhere. The Committee referred to this guidance in their response⁶ to the Inspectors' Initial Questions⁷.

- Q2. Does the PPG list only those circumstances where it would be appropriate to plan for an alternative level of housing provision than the standard method, or, could other locally specific reasons justify a higher figure?

Policy S2 states that the housing requirement for Central Lincolnshire is between 1,060 and 1,325 dwellings per year. The lower figure is calculated using the Government's standard method described above. It is projected to accommodate enough residents to support around 14,890 new jobs over the plan period, or 677 jobs per year. In contrast, the higher figure is intended to ensure that the Plan provides enough working age population to support a projected increase of around 992 jobs per year equating to around 24,000 new jobs over the plan period.

- Q3. Is that level of job growth realistic? How has it been calculated and how does it compare to other projections for employment in Central Lincolnshire over the plan period?
- Q4. How does it compare to past performance?
- Q5. How has the number of new homes needed to support that level of employment growth been calculated? Are the calculations accurate and robust?
- Q6. How does the projected number of jobs compare to the supply of employment land? Could the projected number of new jobs (and thus homes needed) be higher?

⁶ Examination Document EX004

⁷ Examination Document EX003

- Q7. In the current Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, Policy LP54 identified broad locations for future growth which could come forward if net job growth exceeded 496 jobs per year. Does this Plan include a similar mechanism? If not, why not?
- Q8. What would be the implications if housebuilding did not match projected increases in job growth?

Issue 2 – Housing Requirement – Policy S2

- Q1. Is the higher figure of 1,325 dwellings per year over the plan period justified and consistent with national planning policy and guidance? If not, what should the housing requirement be for the plan period?
- Q2. The Committee’s response to the Inspectors’ Initial Questions includes details of housing completions between 2012 and 2019 (Table 2). Is a housing requirement of 1,325 dwellings per year achievable over the plan period?
- Q3. If the Local Plan seeks to make provision for 1,325 dwellings per year in response to projected employment forecasts, then what is the justification for setting the housing requirement as a range?
- Q4. Is the proposed housing range sufficiently clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities? Is Policy S2 effective in this regard?
- Q5. What is the justification for suggested modification MMSC1? Is it necessary for soundness?

Issue 3 – Affordable Housing Need – Policy S22

- Q1. The *Central Lincolnshire Housing Needs Assessment* (‘HNA’)⁸ states that the overall need for affordable housing is around 592 homes per year. Is this figure accurate and robust? If not, what is the need for affordable housing over the plan period?
- Q2. Do affordable housing needs differ between the City of Lincoln, North Kesteven and West Lindsey? Does the Plan seek to differentiate between needs across the three Councils? If not, why not?
- Q3. Based on the expected rate of housing delivery, will the affordable housing needs of the area be met?
- Q4. Paragraph 7.85 of the HNA states that it is for the Councils to consider whether an increased housing requirement could help to increase the delivery of affordable housing in Central Lincolnshire. Has this been done and what were the reasons for not pursuing higher rates of housing delivery to meet identified needs?
- Q5. Were such options considered as part of the SA process?

⁸ Core Document HOU001

Issue 4 – Viability

The PPG advises that the role for viability assessment is "...at the plan making stage"⁹. It states that Plans should set out the contributions expected from development. This should include the level and type of affordable housing provision required, along with other infrastructure. These policy requirements should be informed by evidence of need and a proportionate assessment of viability, taking into account all relevant policies and standards.

The *Whole Plan Viability Assessment*¹⁰ identified four zones across Central Lincolnshire where different house prices are achieved. Reflecting the viability of new residential development, this is translated into different requirements for affordable housing depending on location. Zone A attracts the greatest affordable housing contribution (25% on qualifying sites). Zone D attracts the lowest (10%).

- Q1. How was the 25% threshold determined for the high value areas? Could residential development in Zone A viably contribute more affordable housing?
- Q2. How were the zones defined and are they accurate and appropriate?
- Q3. Does the Whole Plan Viability Assessment accurately account for all likely development costs, from contributions towards healthcare and education to site specific design costs such as higher optional technical standards?
- Q4. Does the Whole Plan Viability Assessment differentiate between greenfield and brownfield sites, and if so, how is this reflected in the Plan?
- Q5. Does the Whole Plan Viability Assessment differentiate between strategic and non-strategic site allocations, and if so, how is this reflected in the Plan?
- Q6. What are the viability implications of the preference for 25% of all affordable housing to be delivered as first homes in Policy S22?
- Q7. When taking into account the need for and cost of likely development contributions, will the policies in the Local Plan undermine its deliverability?

Issue 5 – Employment Land Requirement – Policy S28

- Q1. What is the need for employment land over the plan period and is this adequately set out in the Plan?
- Q2. The PPG advises that strategic policy making authorities will need to develop an idea of future needs based on a range of data which is current and robust, such as labour demand, labour supply, past take-up of employment land and consultation with relevant organisations.¹¹ How have these factors been taken into account in determining future demand for employment space in Central Lincolnshire?

⁹ Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 10-001-20190509 and Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 10-002-20190509

¹⁰ Core Document INF002a

¹¹ Paragraph: 027 Reference ID: 2a-027-20190220

- Q3. The *Central Lincolnshire Economic Needs Assessment*¹² identifies a need for around 11.6 hectares of land. This is less than the amount previously projected to support the existing Local Plan (around 23 hectares). What are the main reasons for this reduction?
- Q4. The Committee’s response to the Inspectors’ Initial Questions states that there is approximately 100 hectares of land on Strategic Employment Sites yet to be developed, with around 90 hectares benefitting from planning permission. How does the committed supply of employment land relate to the identified need? I.e. – does the scale, type and location of approved employment space match the anticipated requirements for land going forward?
- Q5. Is the Local Plan justified in seeking to allocate significantly more employment land than required?

Issue 6 – Retail Need

- Q1. Where are the anticipated needs for retail, leisure, office and other main town centre uses set out? Is the information on future needs based on appropriate and up-to-date evidence?
- Q2. Does the Local Plan allocate a range of suitable sites in town centres to meet the scale and type of development likely to be needed, looking at least 10 years ahead, as required by paragraph 86 of the Framework?

¹² Core Document EC001

Matter 3 – Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Development

Issue 1 – Settlement Hierarchy – Policy S1

- Q1. The *Settlement Hierarchy Methodology Report*¹³ states that the categorisation of settlements is a continuation of the hierarchy in the existing Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2017). Is this appropriate and justified? If not, what changes are necessary to rectify any issues of soundness?
- Q2. Is the continued use of settlement size (by dwelling numbers) a reasonable and appropriate way of categorising settlements? How were other factors such as services, facilities and public transport provision considered?
- Q3. For smaller settlements, and those with dispersed properties, is the methodology described in Core Document ST006 appropriate? Are there any settlements which could (or should) be in a different category depending on how properties are counted?

Issue 2 – Levels of Growth – Policy S2

- Q1. What is the Lincoln 'Strategy Area' based on and does it remain an appropriate geographical area for future growth?
- Q2. What are the reasons for identifying a Lincoln Strategy Area, but then referring to the towns of Sleaford and Gainsborough?
- Q3. Has there been any material change in circumstances since the adoption of the current Local Plan relevant to the Lincoln Strategy Area?
- Q4. If the Lincoln Strategy Area is not an appropriate or justified area to direct the majority of new growth towards, what alternative(s) should be used instead?
- Q5. How was the split in Policy S2¹⁴ considered as part of the Local Plan Review? What alternatives were tested and why were they discounted?

Issue 3 – Distribution of Development – Policies S2 and S28

- Q1. Does the distribution of development from allocations, commitments and completions since the start of the plan period reflect the strategy in Policy S2?
- Q2. What is the justification for the proportion of new housing directed to smaller, rural settlements? Is this sufficient to ensure the long-term sustainability of rural villages beyond the Lincoln Strategy Area, Sleaford and Gainsborough?
- Q3. How did the split in Policy S2 determine the scale of new development in each settlement? How was it taken into account in allocating new sites?
- Q4. How was the amount of growth determined between settlements in the same tier, for example between Large Villages?

¹³ Core Document STA006

¹⁴ 64% to the Lincoln Strategy Area and 12% to Gainsborough, Sleaford and 'Elsewhere'

- Q5. Is the distribution of growth consistent with paragraph 105 of the Framework, which states that significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes?
- Q6. Are there are instances where the distribution of growth is significantly out of proportion with the size of a settlement or its role and function in the hierarchy?
- Q7. How does the Plan seek to maximise the use of previously developed, brownfield land as required by paragraph 119 of the Framework?

Issue 4 – Housing in the Lincoln Urban Area, Main and Market Towns – Policy S3

- Q1. For development within the Lincoln Urban Area, Main Towns and Market Towns, how does Policy S3 differ from the adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan? Are the definitions of 'appropriate locations' and 'developed footprint' the same or different?
- Q2. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities how development proposals will be considered on sites outside, but immediately adjacent to the developed footprint of the Lincoln Urban Area, Main Towns and Market Towns? Is the policy effective?
- Q3. What is the justification for grouping the Lincoln Urban Area, Main Towns and Market Towns together for the purposes of Policy S3?
- Q4. What is the justification for paragraph 2.3.2 which states that "...large sites that are not allocated in the plan will typically be limited to those which do not demonstrably delay or impact upon the delivery of sites allocated in this plan". Is this intended as a policy requirement, and if so, is it clear what sites it would relate to and it would be considered at the planning application stage?

Issue 5 – Housing Development in or Adjacent to Villages – Policy S4

- Q1. What is the justification for the size limits in Policy S4 for schemes within the developed footprint of Villages?
- Q2. Is the restriction of residential development to schemes of no more than 10 dwellings justified and appropriate in Medium and Large Villages?
- Q3. What is the justification for allowing some residential development adjacent to the Lincoln Urban Area, Main Towns and Market Towns, but not villages, especially Large Villages which benefit from a good range of services?
- Q4. What is the justification for the additional requirements for exception sites under Policy S4?

Issue 6 – Development in the Countryside – Policy S5

- Q1. Are the requirements in Policy S5 justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy, having particular regard to the requirement to market vacant buildings, restrictions on the size of replacement dwellings and the circumstances under which new dwellings are permitted?

Conclusion

- Q1. Are the Plan's policies relating to spatial strategy and distribution of development justified, effective, positively prepared and consistent with national planning policy? If not, what changes would be necessary in order to make the submitted Plan sound?

Matter 4 – Site Allocations Process and Methodology

Issue 1 – Site Allocation Methodology

- Q1. The *Central Lincolnshire Policies S76-S82: Sustainable Urban Extensions and Housing Allocations Evidence Report*¹⁵ includes a summary of the site allocation process. As part of the initial sift, how were sites discounted by location? If a site was beyond the edge of a built-up area, was it discounted without further assessment?
- Q2. What was the justification for not considering sites in Hamlets?
- Q3. How was the settlement hierarchy and distribution of development used to inform decisions on which sites to allocate? For example, how did the Committee ensure that, when taking into account commitments, the levels of growth in each location would reflect the overall strategy?
- Q4. Where allocations from the current Central Lincolnshire Local Plan had not been completed, what process did the Committee take? Were they automatically carried forward into the Local Plan Review, or, were they subject to the same analysis as proposed new sites? In answering this question it would be useful for the Committee to provide a list of the existing Local Plan allocations carried forward and include an update on their delivery.
- Q5. Where concerns were raised regarding a technical aspect of a site, such as drainage or visibility splays and access, how were these issues resolved as part of the site allocation process? Was further information requested and if so from whom and when?
- Q6. How did the Committee consider minerals safeguarding areas as part of the site allocation process? Where sites are allocated for development within mineral safeguarding areas, what implications, if any, does this have for the deliverability of housing?
- Q7. Was the site selection process robust? Was an appropriate selection of potential sites assessed, and were appropriate criteria taken into account?

Issue 2 – General Development Requirements

- Q1. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required where allocations have no specific development requirements?
- Q2. What are the reasons for some site allocations including a specific requirement for drainage details, but not others?
- Q3. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required to mitigate the impacts of development on drainage and surface water flooding on necessary sites? Is it clear from the development requirements what are the issues and how they need to be resolved?
- Q4. Where a site allocation is in an area of Biodiversity Opportunity, is it clear what is required of applications for planning permission?

¹⁵ Core Document HOU0002a

Matter 5 – Energy, Climate Change and Flooding

In answering the following questions, participants should have regard to the Committee's response to the Inspectors' Initial Questions (Examination Document EX004, available on the examination website).

Issue 1 – Design Principles for Efficient Buildings – Policies S6 and S20

- Q1. Is Policy S6 intended to apply to all development proposals in all locations and will applications have to demonstrate compliance with all the criteria? If so, when taking into account the predominantly rural nature of large parts of Central Lincolnshire, is the policy justified in seeking to prevent heating by oil or bottled gas in all circumstances?
- Q2. Is it sufficiently clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required of applications for planning permission under Policy S20?
- Q3. How would the measures be considered as part of a planning application process, for example the use of internal stud walls rather than solid walls?
- Q4. What is the justification for suggested modification MMSC5? Is it necessary for soundness?

Issue 2 – Reducing Energy Consumption and Renewable Technologies for New Development – Policies S7, S8, S9, S11, S13 and NS18

The supporting text to the Plan (paragraph 3.2.7) states that the Government is committed to improving the energy efficiency of new homes through the Building Regulations system as part of the 'Future Homes Standard' ('FHS'). However, the FHS is proposed to take effect from 2025, with an uplift in Building Regulations in 2022 a step towards future standards. The Plan therefore states that it intends to go 'further, and faster' by introducing standards through development plan policies.

- Q1. Given that the Government's intention is to improve standards through the FHS, on a nationally consistent basis as part of the Building Regulations, what evidence is there to support the use of such policies now in Central Lincolnshire? Are the policies justified?
- Q2. As part of the proposed changes in Building Regulations (working towards FHS) standards are envisaged to improve incrementally. Does the Plan propose to take a similar approach in implementing (phasing) the higher standards? If not, why not?
- Q3. Where energy reduction is concerned, is the Plan consistent with paragraph 154(b) of the Framework, which states that any local requirements for the sustainability of buildings should reflect the Government's policy for national technical standards?
- Q4. What evidence can the Committee point to which suggests that the measures set out are deliverable and the policies effective?
- Q5. Have the full range of measures been tested, alongside other planning policy costs, to determine how they will impact upon the viability of development? Are the conclusions accurate and robust?

- Q6. In the Committee's response to the Inspectors' Initial Questions reference is made to the Planning and Energy Act 2008 in support of the Plan. It states that local planning authorities may in their development plan documents, "...include policies imposing *reasonable* requirements for a) *a proportion of energy used in development in their area to be energy from renewable sources in the locality of the development; [and] a proportion of energy used in development in their area to be low carbon energy...*" (our emphasis). Is the submitted Plan consistent with this approach?
- Q7. Policy S7 states that there are three exceptions which may allow certain developments to come forward without meeting the energy requirements. Is it sufficiently clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what 'technical' and other 'policy reasons' could entail? Is the policy effective?
- Q8. Policy S7 clause 1 states that a lack of financial viability will not be a technical or policy reason for failing to meet the required standards. However, clause 3 then specifically refers to viability issues in Sleaford and Gainsborough. If there is an acceptance that costs could preclude the full range of energy saving measures, why is this consideration prohibited elsewhere?
- Q9. What is the justification for requiring a financial contribution from exempt schemes, at a value sufficient to enable the LPA to offset the development from renewable energy schemes elsewhere? How would these off-site schemes be identified and costed? Would it be sufficiently clear to developers (for example, converting a listed building) what the requirements would be?
- Q10. Further to Question 8 above, how have the £5,000 and £15,000 values been calculated in Policy S7? What are they based on and have they been subject to viability testing?
- Q11. How have the values of £5,000 and £100,000 been calculated in Policy S8? What are they based on and have they been subject to viability testing?
- Q12. Policies S7 and S8 state that "*Weight will be given to proposals which demonstrate a deliverable commitment to on-going monitoring of energy consumption, post occupation...*". Is this sufficiently clear enough to be effective? What is expected of developers?
- Q13. Is Policy S9 consistent with national planning policy in paragraph 155 of the Framework? It states that Plans should (amongst other things) identify opportunities for development to draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers. Decentralised energy is defined by the Framework as local renewable and local low carbon energy sources.
- Q14. Is Policy S11 justified and consistent with national planning policy in its 'presumption against demolition'?
- Q15. Is it justified (or viable and feasible) to require extensions to existing buildings to improve the energy efficiency of the remainder of the property, as set out in Policy S13?

- Q16. Is the requirement to "*not cause harm*" to the significance of heritage assets in Policy S13 consistent with national planning policy in the Framework?
- Q17. What is the justification for all relevant planning applications to meet the requirements in Building Regulations under Policy NS18?

Issue 3 – Renewable Energy, Protecting Energy Infrastructure and Wider Energy Infrastructure – Policies S14, S15 and S16

- Q1. The supporting text at paragraph 3.3.4 of the Plan refers to 150MW of capacity from wind turbines and 230MW of capacity from solar PV. What is the justification for the inclusion of these targets in the supporting text if they are not "*...set as either a cap or a ceiling*"?
- Q2. How have the locations 'suitable in principle' for large scale wind turbines been established? Are the locations appropriate and justified by evidence?
- Q3. How did the assessment of suitable locations take into account heritage assets and landscape designations, particularly long-range views?
- Q4. What is the definition of a large wind turbine based on and is it appropriate and justified?
- Q5. Are the requirements in Policy S14 consistent with national planning policy where wind turbines are concerned, having particular regard to paragraph 54 of the Framework?
- Q6. Is the presumption in favour of solar based energy proposals consistent with national planning policy? Have suitable locations for solar based energy schemes been considered in the same way as large wind turbines?
- Q7. Is the approach to Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land in Policy S14 consistent with national planning policy?
- Q8. Does paragraph 3.3.12 intend to list all exclusion zones around airports and airfields? If not, is such a change necessary for soundness?
- Q9. What is the justification for suggested modification MMSC2? Is it necessary for soundness?

Issue 4 – Carbon Sinks and Fossil Fuel Exploration – Policies S17 and S19

- Q1. Is Policy S17 consistent with paragraph 180 of the Framework? As the Plan is read as a whole, would other policies apply to development proposals affecting irreplaceable habitats?
- Q2. Is Policy S19 consistent with paragraphs 209 and 210 of the Framework, which state that it is essential that there is a sufficient supply of minerals and that planning policies should provide for the extraction of mineral resources of local and national importance. Annex 2 of the Framework includes oil and gas within the definition of mineral resources of local and national importance.

Issue 5 – Sustainable Water Management and Flood Risk – Policies S12 and S21

- Q1. Is the use of the Optional Technical Standard for water justified in Central Lincolnshire?

- Q2. What is the justification for requiring any flat-roofed area to be a green roof in new developments? Is this appropriate in all circumstances?
- Q3. For the purposes of Policy S21, how would a developer demonstrate that adequate foul water treatment and disposal can be provided "*...in time to serve the development*" where works are required by the relevant water authority?

Matter 6 – Sustainable Urban Extensions ('SUE's') and Regeneration Opportunity Areas

Issue 1 – Sustainable Urban Extensions – Policies S68 and S76

- Q1. The strategy for the Local Plan Review carries forward the SUEs at Lincoln, Gainsborough and Sleaford. Did the Committee consider alternative strategies at any stage as part of the Plan's preparation?
- Q2. Have the SUEs progressed as expected following adoption of the existing Local Plan? If not, what are the reasons for their delay?
- Q3. Have there been any material changes in circumstances since the adoption of the existing Local Plan which has (or will) affect the deliverability of the SUEs?
- Q4. What are the projected delivery rates for the SUEs during the course of the plan period? What are they based on and are they realistic?
- Q5. In Sleaford and Gainsborough in particular, how has the Committee taken into account the risk of potential market saturation? Will there be sufficient capacity to bring forward large SUEs concurrently?
- Q6. What contingency arrangements are in place in the event that the SUEs do not come forward as expected?
- Q7. In the current Local Plan, Policy LP54 identified broad locations for future growth which could come forward under certain circumstances. Does the Local Plan Review take a different approach, and if so, why?
- Q8. Is it necessary, in the interests of soundness, to list the requirement for development proposals to consider their impacts on existing infrastructure, such as electricity, rail and drainage infrastructure?
- Q9. What is the justification for suggested modification MMSC13? Is it necessary for soundness?

Issue 2 – Lincoln Sustainable Urban Extensions – Policy S69

Lincoln Western Growth Corridor – Land at Swanpool, Fen Farm and Decoy Farm

- Q1. What is the latest position regarding planning applications on the site? Do they cover the entire allocation?
- Q2. What is the justification for the amount of employment land proposed, having particular regard to the projected supply from committed schemes? Has this been reviewed as part of the preparation of this Plan?
- Q3. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is meant by a 'regional' leisure centre?
- Q4. Is it sufficiently clear to users of the Plan where key infrastructure will be provided, such as any necessary links over the railway line or possible future connections with the A46?

South East Quadrant – Land at Canwick Heath

- Q5. What is the latest position regarding the approved planning application for 450 dwellings on land north of Canwick Avenue?
- Q6. What is the latest position regarding planning application Ref 20/0057/OUT?
- Q7. How will the site be developed, by whom and when? Do the approved schemes cover the entire allocation?
- Q8. What is the status of the *Lincoln South East Quadrant Broad Concept Plan and Design Code*¹⁶? Are plans for the SUE coming forward in accordance with the concept plan?

North East Quadrant – Land at the Greetwell Area

- Q9. What is the latest position regarding planning approvals and construction timeframes for the site?
- Q10. How will the different components of the site come forward and how will the Committee ensure that they integrate successfully?

South West Quadrant – Land at Grange Farm, Hykeham

- Q11. Is it sufficiently clear how and when the development will come forward and how it will be linked to delivery of the North Hykeham Relief Road? Is the policy effective in this regard?
- Q12. Are the proposed access arrangements sufficiently clear and achievable?
- Q13. What is the boundary of the allocation based on and will the Plan be effective in maintaining adequate separation from South Hykeham?

Issue 3 – Gainsborough Sustainable Urban Extensions – Policy S70

Gainsborough Southern Neighbourhood

- Q1. What is the latest position regarding planning approvals and construction timeframes for the site?
- Q2. How will the remainder of the allocation come forward and how will the Committee ensure that the different component parts integrate successfully?
- Q3. In the event that new outline planning application is required, is it sufficiently clear what that scheme will be required to include?

Gainsborough Northern Neighbourhood

- Q4. What is the latest position regarding the outline planning permission approved in 2020 and any reserved matters applications made pursuant to it?

¹⁶ Examination Document EX009

- Q5. As with the Southern Neighbourhood, in the event that new outline or full planning applications are required, is it sufficiently clear what would be required?
- Q6. How will the remainder of the allocation come forward and how will the Committee ensure that the different component parts integrate successfully?

Issue 4 – Sleaford Sustainable Urban Extensions – Policy S71

Sleaford South Quadrant – Handley Chase

- Q1. What is the latest position regarding planning approvals and construction timeframes for the site?
- Q2. How have proposals for the site (either through the approval of planning permission or allocation in the Local Plan) considered impacts on the level crossing in the centre of Sleaford?

Sleaford West Quadrant – Land West of Drove Lane and East of the A15

- Q3. The *Central Lincolnshire Sustainable Urban Extensions Topic Paper*¹⁷ states that whilst a resolution to grant planning permission was issued in 2017, the Section 106 legal agreement has been outstanding. What is the latest position regarding completion of the legal agreement? What were the reasons for its delay and how will that affect delivery going forward?
- Q4. In the event that alternative proposals need to come forward, is Policy S71 sufficiently detailed enough to be effective? For example, is it clear how many dwellings can be served from The Drove?

Issue 5 – Regeneration and Opportunity Areas – Policies NS72, NS73 and NS74

- Q1. What are Regeneration and Opportunity Areas and what is their justification for inclusion in the Plan?
- Q2. How do they differ from site allocations and what were the reasons for not allocating land in the same way as other sites in the Plan?
- Q3. How were the sites identified? Were alternatives considered and/or discounted?
- Q4. How are the sites expected to come forward? How would a decision-maker be expected to react to a proposal for a smaller form of development, on individual sites withing larger regeneration areas?
- Q5. Are Policies NS72-NS74 intended to set out development requirements in the same way as site allocation policies? For example, the wording of the policies refers to development being 'preferably' progressed with masterplans. Are the policies effective?
- Q6. Are the requirements sufficiently clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities? For example, what is expected of development proposals at site ROA1?

¹⁷ Core Document HOU011

- Q7. How has the Committee considered the ongoing operation of existing businesses within Regeneration and Opportunity Areas, such as The Maltings at Gainsborough?
- Q8. How does the approach to the regeneration of the Gainsborough Riverside area differ from the existing Local Plan? What are the reasons for taking an alternative approach (if materially different)?
- Q9. Will the policies in the Plan be effective in securing the regeneration of areas identified under NS72-NS74, or are they intended to guide proposals for redevelopment as and when they come forward?

Issue 8 – RAF Scampton – Policy S75

- Q1. What does the Plan safeguard RAF Scampton for until the site is vacated?
- Q2. Once vacated, what mix of uses and scale of development does Policy S75 permit? Is it appropriate to defer decisions over the use and scale of future development to a masterplan, which would not be subject to examination in the same way as a development plan document?
- Q3. What is the justification for considering the 'value' of the airspace above RAF Scampton and within 5 nautical miles of its centre, including for any ongoing need for use by The Red Arrows? How would this be determined as part of a planning application process?
- Q4. What evidence has been prepared to support the allocation of the site and demonstrate the likelihood of an alternative scheme coming forward, having particular regard to impacts on heritage, highways and the provision of necessary infrastructure?
- Q5. In the event that the RAF leave the site, what is the justification for criterion k)?
- Q6. Policy S75(m) requires future development proposals to demonstrate that they are deliverable and viable. Is this not a requirement of the policy itself?
- Q7. Is criterion (g) achievable and effective given the nature of the site and potential for reusing buildings?

Matter 7 – Housing Sites

Sites with Planning Permission and/or Under Construction

- Q1. What is the latest position regarding the sites listed under Policies S77, S78, S79, S80, S81 and S82? Are any changes necessary to ensure that the Plan is up-to-date upon adoption?
- Q2. Have any of the sites under construction been completed, or are any nearing completion?
- Q3. What is the justification for allocating sites for development which are under construction and almost complete?
- Q4. Where sites have planning permission, are there any instances where their allocation in the Plan and/or their development requirements materially differ from the approved development?

Sites Allocated in Neighbourhood Plans

- Q5. Which sites proposed for allocation in the Local Plan, are already allocated in made Neighbourhood Plans?
- Q6. Where sites are already allocated in made Neighbourhood Plans, is it necessary to include them in the Local Plan, having particular regard to paragraph 16f) of the Framework?

Issue 1 – Lincoln Urban Area – Policy S77

COL/ABB/002 – Former Main Hospital Complex, St. Anne’s Road

- Q1. The site is allocated in the existing Local Plan. When is it expected to come forward for development?
- Q2. How have the effects of development on the setting of nearby listed buildings, the Arboretum Historic Park and Garden and the Arboretum Conservation Area been considered? Can a suitable scheme be achieved on this site whilst maintaining the significant of nearby heritage assets?

COL/MIN/001 – Roman Gate 2, Land off Flavin Road, Lincoln

- Q3. What is the most up-to-date position regarding approved developments on this site and adjacent parcels?
- Q4. The site is allocated in the existing Local Plan. When is it expected to come forward for development?
- Q5. Is it sufficiently clear what infrastructure requirements will be necessary for this site, including surface and wastewater drainage?

COL/MIN/005 – Land at Cathedral Quarry, Riseholme Road

- Q6. Why is it necessary to assess drainage and flood risk? What is the issue and how is development expected to mitigate against any harm or risk?
- Q7. What is the justification for requiring a scheme for the retention and maintenance of bunds on the site?

- Q8. How have issues relating to land stability and land contamination been considered as part of the allocation process? Is the site developable within the plan period?

COL/MIN/006 – Land at Nettleham Road

- Q9. The site is allocated in the existing Local Plan. When is it expected to come forward for development?
- Q10. What is the current use of the site? Is it justified for allocation in the Plan?

NK/WAD/004a – Land South of Station Road, Waddington Low Fields

- Q11. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required to mitigate the impacts of development on drainage and surface water flooding? What are the issues and how have they been considered as part of the site allocation process?
- Q12. Are the requirements for a transport assessment, travel plan and contribution to Lincoln Southern bypass justified? What are the issues and how have they been considered as part of the site allocation process?
- Q13. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities how development is expected to be 'sensitive' to views in/out/across the Area of Great Landscape Value?
- Q14. How have the effects of development on the setting of the Waddington Conservation Area been considered as part of the site allocation process? Is the allocation justified?
- Q15. Is it sufficiently clear what is expected of applications for planning permission in respect of additional infrastructure requirements, including healthcare and education?

WL/RISE/001 – Land off Millbeck Drive, Lincoln

- Q16. How does the site relate to the area of land allocated in the existing Local Plan? When is it expected to come forward for development?
- Q17. What is the current use of the site? Is it justified for allocation in the Plan?
- Q18. How will the site be accessed?

Issue 2 – Main Towns – Policy S78

WL/GAIN/014 – Former Environment Agency Office, Corringham Road, Gainsborough

- Q1. What is the current use of the site?
- Q2. Is it the allocation of the site justified, developable and consistent with national planning policy?

WL/GAIN/020 – AMP Rose Housing Zone, Gainsborough

- Q3. What is the most up-to-date position regarding any submitted planning applications on this site?

Issue 3 – Market Towns – Policy S79

WL/CAI/001 – Land to South of North Kelsey Road, Caistor

- Q1. The site is allocated in the existing Local Plan. When is it expected to come forward for development?
- Q2. How have the effects of development on the setting of the Medieval Fishponds Scheduled Monument been considered as part of the site allocation process? Is the allocation justified?

WL/CAI/002 – Land at Sunnyside, West of Tennyson Close, Caistor

- Q3. The site is allocated in the existing Local Plan. When is it expected to come forward for development?
- Q4. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required to mitigate the impacts of development on biodiversity?

WL/MARK/001 – Land adjacent to Davens Court, Market Rasen

- Q5. What is the proposed site area based on and how has the scale of residential development been established?
- Q6. Can the proposed allocation come forward in a way that respects the character and appearance of its surroundings on the edge of the town?
- Q7. Is the requirement to provide a pedestrian footway with crossover points to the existing footway on Legsby Road deliverable?
- Q8. How will development address low voltage power lines across the site?

WL/MARK/003 – Land East of Gordon Field and South of Chapel Street, Market Rasen

- Q9. The site is allocated in the existing Local Plan. When is it expected to come forward for development?
- Q10. How have the effects of development on the setting of the Market Rasen Conservation area and nearby Grade II* listed Methodist Chapel and Grade II listed Railway station and the Maltings been considered as part of the site allocation process? Is it clear what is expected of a proposed development in terms of neighbouring listed buildings?

WL/MARK/007 – Land at Highfield, Linwood Road, Market Rasen

- Q11. What is the most up-to-date position regarding approved development on the site?

WL/MIDR/016 – Land north of Gallamore Lane, Market Rasen

- Q12. What is the most up-to-date position regarding approved development on the site?
- Q13. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required to mitigate the impacts of development on biodiversity?

Issue 4 – Large Villages – Policy S80

- Q1. What is the justification for suggested modifications MMSC14 and MMSC15? Are they necessary for soundness?

Billingham

- Q2. How do sites NK/BIL/003, NK/BIL/004, NK/BIL/005 and NK/BIL/006a relate to the land parcels allocated for development in the existing Local Plan?
- Q3. What is the current planning status on each of the parcels allocated for development?
- Q4. What is the justification for allocating individual land parcels, rather than a single site?
- Q5. How will the Committee ensure that development comes forward in a comprehensive and coherent manner across the sites?
- Q6. Is it sufficiently clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities how access to and between the sites will be provided? Are the access requirements effective in the Plan?
- Q7. What impact does the fact that the sites are within, or includes, an area of Biodiversity Opportunity potentially have on their deliverability?
- Q8. Are the requirements to improve pedestrian and cycle links deliverable?

NK/BRAN/007 – Land West of Station Road and North of Nettleton Close, Branston

- Q9. What is the current planning status of this site and how does it relate to the site under construction at NK/BRAN/012?

NK/HEC/004 – Land off Sleaford Road, Heckington

- Q10. Is it sufficiently clear what infrastructure requirements will be necessary for this site, particularly sewage treatment pipes and capacity?
- Q11. Is it sufficiently clear what is expected of the density of development? What are the reasons for requiring a low-density development in this location?

NK/WAD/015 – Land East of Grantham Road, Waddington

- Q12. Is it sufficiently clear what design and MoD safety requirements will be necessary for this site? Why does the RAF/MoD need to be consulted in relation to the development of this site?
- Q13. Is the removal of permitted development rights on this site justified?
- Q14. Are the requirements to provide pedestrian links deliverable and is it sufficiently clear what is required?
- Q15. Is it sufficiently clear what is expected of the density of development? What are the reasons for requiring a low-density development in this location?

WL/BARD/012A – Land North of Abbey Road and Wragby Road, Bardney

- Q16. The site is allocated in the existing Local Plan. When is it expected to come forward for development?
- Q17. Is it sufficiently clear what infrastructure requirements will be necessary for this site, having particular regard to the need for additional community facilities?

WL/CW/001 - Land North of Rudgard Avenue, Cherry Willingham

- Q18. What is the current planning status of this site? Has planning permission now been granted?

WL/CW/002 – Land East of Rudgard Avenue, Cherry Willingham

- Q19. The site is allocated in the existing Local Plan. When is it expected to come forward for development?
- Q20. What is the justification for requiring development to come forward after Phase 1 has been completed?
- Q21. Is the deliverability of this site dependent on the delivery of sites WL/CW/001 and WL/CW/003?

WL/CW/003 – Land East of Thornton Way, Cherry Willingham

- Q22. The site is allocated in the existing Local Plan. When is it expected to come forward for development?
- Q23. What is the justification for requiring development to come forward after Phase 1 and Phase 2 are completed?
- Q24. Is the deliverability of this site dependent on the delivery of sites WL/CW/001 and WL/CW/002?

WL/DUNH/010 – Land South of Honeyholes Lane, Dunholme

- Q25. How does development of this site relate to neighbouring schemes already completed and/or under construction? Will the allocation come forward as a separate site?
- Q26. Are the requirements to provide pedestrian links deliverable and is it sufficiently clear what is required?
- Q27. Is it sufficiently clear what is expected of the density of development? What are the reasons for requiring a low-density development in this location?

WL/KEE/003 – Land at Church Lane, Keelby

- Q28. The site is allocated in the existing Local Plan. When is it expected to come forward for development?

WL/NHAM/010 – Land off Larch Avenue, Nettleham

- Q29. How does the site relate to the neighbouring land allocated for development in the existing Local Plan? Will the sites come forward together or in isolation?

- Q30. Is it sufficiently clear what is required by the need to address proximity to the sewage treatment works? Is the policy effective?

WL/NHAM/011 – Land East of Brookfield Avenue, Nettleham

- Q31. How does the site relate to the neighbouring land allocated for development in the existing Local Plan? Will the sites come forward together or in isolation?
- Q32. How will access to the site be achieved? Are there alternative ways of accessing the site without requiring land to the south?
- Q33. Part of the site is within Flood Zone 3. Is the allocation consistent with paragraph 161 of the Framework, which states that all plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property?
- Q34. Are the requirements to improve pedestrian and cycle links deliverable?

WL/NHAM/024a – Land North of Lechler Close, Nettleham

- Q35. What is the site area based on and how has it been established? How have issues such as the settlement edge and the character and appearance of the village been taken into account in allocating the site?

WL/SAXI/004 – Land off Sykes Lane, Saxilby

- Q36. If access to the site were to be provided via Sykes Lane, would the required widening of the lane and footpath provision be deliverable?
- Q37. Is it sufficiently clear what is expected of the density of development? What are the reasons for requiring a low-density development in this location?

WL/SAXI/007 – Land West of Rutherglen Park, Saxilby

- Q38. What is the current use of the site? What is the allocation site boundary based on and is it justified?
- Q39. Is it sufficiently clear what is expected of the density of development? What are the reasons for requiring a low-density development in this location?

WL/WELT/001A – Prebend Lane, Welton

- Q40. What is the justification for the scale of residential development proposed through new allocations at Welton? Is the cumulative scale of development proportionate to the size of the village and services on offer?
- Q41. What is the site area based on and how has it been established? How have issues such as the settlement edge and the character and appearance of the village been taken into account in allocating the site?
- Q42. Is the site allocation appropriate and justified?
- Q43. How will the site be accessed? Is this sufficiently clear enough to be effective?

- Q44. What is the justification for the primary access being taken from Heath Lane? How have effects on the highways network and safety been considered?

WL/WELT/003 – Land at The Hardings, Welton

- Q45. How does the proposed site area relate to the existing allocation in the adopted Local Plan? How and when is the site expected to come forward for development?
- Q46. How will the site be accessed, including for vehicles and pedestrians? How have effects on the highways network and safety been considered?

WL/WELT/007 – Land East of Prebend Lane, Welton

- Q47. What is the justification for the primary access being taken from adjacent site WL/WELT/011? How have effects on the highways network and safety been considered?

WL/WELT/008A – Land North of 77 Eastfield Lane, Welton

- Q48. How does the proposed site area relate to the existing allocation in the adopted Local Plan in this part of the village?
- Q49. What is the justification for the proposed phasing of the site?
- Q50. What is the justification for the primary access being taken from Eastfield Lane? Is a safe access achievable and how have effects on the highways network and safety been considered?
- Q51. What is the justification for suggested modification MMSC16? Why is this necessary for soundness?

Issue 5 – Medium Villages – Policy S81

- Q1. What is the justification for suggested modification MMSC17? Is it necessary for soundness?

NK/DIG/001 – Land North of Station Road, Digby

- Q2. Does the whole site benefit from planning permission for residential development? How does the approved scheme differ from the proposed allocation?
- Q3. What is the issue with the electricity line within the site? Is it sufficiently clear what infrastructure requirements will be necessary for this site?
- Q4. Are the requirements to improve pedestrian links deliverable?

NK/DUNS/001 – Land off Fen Lane, Dunston

- Q5. Does the whole site benefit from planning permission for residential development? How does the approved scheme differ from the proposed allocation?
- Q6. Are the requirements to improve pedestrian links deliverable?
- Q7. What impact does the fact that the site is within a Limestone Minerals Safeguarding Area potentially have on its deliverability?

NK/EAG/005 – Land at Back Lane, Eagle

- Q8. How have the effects of development on the setting of, and views towards, the Grade II listed Village Farmhouse, the Grade II listed Ford Cottage and the wider settings of other nearby listed buildings been considered as part of the site allocation process? Is the allocation justified?
- Q9. Is it sufficiently clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required of the design in relation to designated heritage assets?
- Q10. Is it sufficiently clear what is expected of the density of development? What are the reasons for requiring a low-density development in this location?
- Q11. How will the site be accessed and what are the concerns referred to in Policy S81?
- Q12. How have effects on the highways network and safety been considered? Can a safe and suitable site access be achieved?

NK/GHAL/002 – Land at Hall Farm, Great Hale

- Q13. Does the whole site benefit from planning permission for residential development? How does the approved scheme differ from the proposed allocation?
- Q14. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required to mitigate the impacts of development on drainage and surface water flooding?

NK/LEAS/001 – Land off Meadow Lane, Leasingham

- Q15. What is the justification for the primary access being taken from Deepdale Drive? How have effects on the highways network and safety been considered?
- Q16. Is the allocation consistent with paragraph 161 of the Framework, which states that all plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property? What is proposed for parts of the site in Flood Zones 2 and 3?
- Q17. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required to mitigate the impacts of development on the existing drainage network?
- Q18. What effect will the allocation have on the rural character of Leasingham? How has this been considered as part of the preparation of the Local Plan?
- Q19. What is the current status of the Leasingham and Roxholm Neighbourhood Plan? Is this site included as an allocation in the neighbourhood plan?

NK/LEAS/006 - Land north of Moor Lane, Leasingham

- Q20. Does the whole site benefit from planning permission for residential development? How does the approved scheme differ from the proposed allocation?
- Q21. Part of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Is the allocation consistent with paragraph 161 of the Framework, which states that all plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property? What is proposed for parts of the site in Flood Zones 2 and 3?
- Q22. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required to mitigate the impacts of development on the existing drainage network?
- Q23. Are the requirements to improve pedestrian and cycle links deliverable?
- Q24. What effect will the allocation have on the rural character of Leasingham? How has this been considered as part of the preparation of the Local Plan?
- Q25. What is the current status of the Leasingham and Roxholm Neighbourhood Plan? Is this site included as an allocation in the neighbourhood plan?

WL/BLYT/006 – Land South of Rowan Drive, Blyton

- Q26. What effect will the allocation have on the rural character of Blyton? How has this been considered as part of the preparation of the Local Plan?
- Q27. Are the required improvements to highway/access including the maintenance and enhancement of the public right of way and the retention of existing pedestrian linkages to Martin's close deliverable and justified?
- Q28. Is the requirement to retain and enhance the existing allotments justified?

WL/FISK/001A – Land North of Corn Close, Fiskerton

- Q29. What effect will the allocation have on the rural character of Fiskerton? How has this been considered as part of the preparation of the Local Plan?
- Q30. What is the justification for the access being taken from Corn Close and Hall Lane? How have effects on the highways network and safety been considered?
- Q31. How will development address the issue of low voltage power lines along the southern boundary of the site? Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required to mitigate the impacts of development on this infrastructure?

WL/MIDR/002 – Gainsborough Road, Middle Rasen

- Q32. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required to mitigate the impacts of development on biodiversity?
- Q33. What effect will the allocation have on the rural character of Middle Rasen? How has this been considered as part of the preparation of the Local Plan?

WL/SC/003 – Land Southwest of Main Street, Scothern

- Q34. What is the most up-to-date position regarding the neighbouring biomass plant?
- Q35. How have the effects of development on the setting of, and views towards, the Grade II listed Manor House and the Grade II* listed Church of St Germain been considered as part of the site allocation process?
- Q36. What effect will the allocation have on the rural character of Scothern? How has this been considered as part of the preparation of the Local Plan?

WL/SC/004A – Land off Jupiter Drive, Scothern

- Q37. What effect will the allocation have on the rural character of Scothern? How has this been considered as part of the preparation of the Local Plan?

WL/STUR/003 – Land at High Street, Sturton by Stow

- Q38. How have the effects of development on the setting of, and views towards, the Grade II listed Old Hall and Church of Hugh of Avalon been considered as part of the site allocation process?

WL/STUR/006a – Land South of Gilberts Farm, Sturton by Stow

- Q39. What effect will the allocation have on the rural character of Sturton by Stow? How has this been considered as part of the preparation of the Local Plan?

Issue 6 – Small Villages – Policy S82

- Q1. What is the justification for suggested modification MMSC17? Is it necessary for soundness?

NK/LEAD/001 – Station Yard, Cliff Road, Leadenham

- Q2. How have the effects of development on the setting of the Grade II listed Station House been considered as part of the site allocation process?
- Q3. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required to mitigate the impacts of development on visually sensitive landscapes such as the nearby Area of Great Landscape Value?
- Q4. What effect will the allocation have on the rural character of Leadenham? How has this been considered as part of the preparation of the Local Plan?
- Q5. Why do the mature trees to the eastern part of the site need to be retained?

NK/MART/001 – Land at 114 High Street, Martin

- Q6. How have the effects of development on the setting of the Heighington Conservation Area been considered as part of the site allocation process?
- Q7. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required to mitigate the impacts of development on biodiversity?
- Q8. What effect will the allocation have on the rural character of the area? How has this been considered as part of the preparation of the Local Plan?

WL/COR/002A – Land North of High Street, Corringham

- Q9. How will development address the issue of low voltage power lines? Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required to mitigate the impacts of development on this infrastructure?
- Q10. What effect will the allocation have on the rural character of Corringham? How has this been considered as part of the preparation of the Local Plan?

Matter 8 – Meeting Housing Needs

Issue 1 – Affordable Housing – Policy S22

- Q1. The plan area has been divided into four value zones where the percentage of affordable housing sought will differ in each zone on qualifying developments as set out by Policy S22. Is this approach justified by robust, up-to-date evidence?
- Q2. Are the different areas sufficiently clear? Will the policy be effective?
- Q3. Policy S22 states that the starting point for discussions on the exact tenure mix of affordable homes will be based on the delivery of approximately 25% of all affordable housing through planning obligations as first homes which would be priced at least 30% below full market value at a maximum value of £140,000. Is this approach justified? What is it based on, how was it calculated and what alternatives were considered?
- Q4. Based on the requirements for qualifying developments, how many affordable homes is the Local Plan expected to deliver? How does this compare to the identified need?
- Q5. How does this compare to previous performance? How many affordable homes have been provided as a percentage of total output over the past 5-10 years?
- Q6. Policy 22 states that that if a proposed development scheme falls below the relevant thresholds for the provision of affordable housing but is followed by an obviously linked subsequent development scheme at any point where the original planning permission remains extant, or up to five years following completion of the first scheme, then relevant affordable housing policies will apply. Is this approach justified?
- Q7. Is it sufficiently clear to decision makers, developers and local communities how this 'back-dated' approach to the provision of affordable housing on two or more linked schemes will work in practice? Is this part of the policy effective?
- Q8. Are the thresholds set out in part one of the policy justified?
- Q9. Is the requirement for the provision of affordable specialist housing for older people deliverable and justified?
- Q10. Part three of Policy S22 allows for sites adjacent to an existing settlement to be developed for affordable housing where a local need has been identified. For effectiveness should the scale of development, which is intended to be allowed, and the relevant settlements, be identified?
- Q11. Is part three of Policy 22 consistent with national policy as set out in paragraph 78 of the Framework?

Issue 2 – Meeting Accommodation Needs – Policy S23

- Q1. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required of applications for planning permission under the first paragraph of Policy S23?
- Q2. Paragraph 62 of the Framework states that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies, including housing for older people and people with disabilities. What is the need for housing for older people and how will this be met over the plan period? Has the Committee considered the need for different types of accommodation, such as sheltered accommodation or extra care needs?
- Q3. Is the requirement for residential care accommodation to only be located within a settlement in levels 1 to 4 of the Settlement Hierarchy set out under Policy S1 justified?
- Q4. The supporting text to Policy S23 refers to M4(2) standards. Is there a policy requirement to meeting this standard?
- Q5. Is it clear what developments will be expected to meet M4(3) standards?
- Q6. Is it necessary to distinguish between wheelchair accessible (a home readily useable by a wheelchair user at the point of completion) and wheelchair adaptable (a home that can be easily adapted to meet the needs of a household including wheelchair users) dwellings?
- Q7. Based on the number of housing sites allocated in the Local Plan (without planning permission) how many wheelchair adaptable dwellings are expected to be provided? How does this compare to the identified need?
- Q8. Does Policy S23 provide an effective mechanism to ensure that development proposals contribute towards meeting the need for older persons accommodation, where required?

Issue 3 – Custom and Self-Build Housing – Policy NS24

- Q1. How has Committee identified the need for self-build and custom housebuilding?
- Q2. How many self or custom build homes is the Local Plan expected to deliver and will the identified need be met?
- Q3. How many self or custom build homes have been provided as a percentage of total output over the past 5 years?
- Q4. Part 3 of Policy NS24 stipulates that residential development proposals for 100 or more dwellings will provide serviced plots to deliver at least 5% of the total number of dwellings as self or custom build homes. What is the justification for this percentage?
- Q5. Is the requirement for each plot on qualifying sites to include a 'plot passport' justified?
- Q6. What is the justification for requiring the submission of additional specifications such as landscaping details on each plot after outline planning permission or permission in principle has been obtained?

Q7. If plots remain unsold, they can be built out as conventional market housing subject to detailed planning permission being secured after a thorough and proportionate marketing exercise has been undertaken. What is the justification for the period of this exercise being at least 36 months from the date at which the plots are made available?

Q8. What is the justification for suggested modification MMSC6? Is it necessary for soundness?

Issue 4 – Sub-Division and Multi-Occupation of Dwellings in Lincoln – Policy S25

Q1. How will an applicant demonstrate that there is a lack of demand for the single-family use of a property before planning permission is granted under Policy S25?

Q2. Is it sufficiently clear what is meant by 'over-concentration' for the purposes of Policy S25?

Q3. What are 'appropriate locations' where purpose built accommodation is proposed?

Issue 5 – Houseboat Moorings and Caravans – Policy S26

Q1. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required of applications for planning permission under Policy S26?

Issue 6 – Residential Annexes – Policy NS27

Q1. Is Policy NS27 justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?

Issue 7 – Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople – Policy S83

Q1. Is the identified need for 32 additional pitches justified based on appropriate and up-to-date evidence?

Q2. Does the plan make suitable provision to meet this identified need? Will needs be met in full?

Q3. What is the justification for the inclusion and location of sites allocated in the Plan? What process did the Committee take to allocating suitable sites?

Q4. Is Policy S83 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy as set out in paragraph 62 of the Framework?

Q5. Do the site allocations provide sufficient pitches to provide five-years' worth of supply?

COL/GT/001 – Washingbrough Road, Lincoln

Q6. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required to mitigate the impacts of development on biodiversity?

Q7. How will the site be developed and is it sufficiently clear how it can be developed in a way that does not compromise the living conditions of existing occupants?

WL/GT/001 – Trent Port Road, Marton

- Q8. What is the current use of the site and what are the reasons why it has not yet come forward for development? Is the allocation effective?
- Q9. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what is required to mitigate the impacts of development on biodiversity?

Matter 9 – Housing Land Supply

Issue 1 – Total Housing Land Supply

- Q1. What is the most up-to-date position regarding the projected supply of housing over the plan period?
- Q2. Is the projected supply of housing justified and has sufficient land been identified to ensure that housing needs will be met?
- Q3. Does the total housing land supply include an allowance for windfall sites? If so, what is this based on and is it justified?
- Q4. Paragraph 69 of the Framework states that in order to promote the development of a good mix of sites, local planning authorities should (amongst other things) identify land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than 1 hectare, unless there are strong reasons why this cannot be achieved. What proportion of the housing requirement will be met from sites no larger than 1 hectare?

Issue 2 – Five-Year Housing Land Supply

- Q1. Taking into account completions since the based date of the Plan, what will be the anticipated five-year housing land requirement upon adoption of the Plan?
- Q2. Based on the housing trajectory, how many dwellings are expected to be delivered in the first five years following adoption of the Plan? Where is this set out?
- Q3. What evidence has the Committee used to determine which sites will come forward for development and when? Is it robust?
- Q4. Where sites have been identified in the Plan, but do not yet have planning permission, is there clear evidence that housing completions will begin within five years?
- Q5. What allowance has been made for windfall sites as part of the anticipated five-year housing land supply? Is there compelling evidence to suggest that windfall sites will come forward over the plan period, as required by paragraph 70 of the Framework?
- Q6. Having regard to the questions above, will there be a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites on adoption of the Plan?
- Q7. What flexibility does the plan provide if the SUEs in particular do not come forward in the timescales envisaged?
- Q8. Is it necessary to have a review mechanism in the Plan to consider progress against these, and other sites, and to identify any appropriate steps to increase supply if required?
- Q9. In the current Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, Policy LP54 identified broad locations for future growth which could come forward where certain criteria were met. Is a similar policy required for soundness in the Local Plan Review?

Matter 10 – Ministry of Defence Establishments ('MoD')

Issue 1 – Development Related to Operational Purposes and Development Affecting MoD Establishments – Policy S84

- Q1. How does part two of Policy S84 assist in safeguarding against inappropriate development close to key Defence sites which would adversely affect matters of National Defence?

Issue 2 – Development of MoD Land and Assets Surplus to Requirements – Policy S84

- Q1. Part three of Policy S84 supports the redevelopment or change of use of MoD land and assets surplus to requirements. Are all MoD sites suitably located for redevelopment or change of use? How would a decision maker balance the support for a proposal under Policy S84 with the requirement of other policies in the plan, such as the distribution of housing and employment development in Policies S1, S2, S3 and S4?
- Q2. Is the policy sufficiently clear as to which former MoD sites should be developed and how, particularly in relation to infrastructure requirements and the provision of adequate services and facilities? Is Policy S84 effective?

Matter 11 – Employment and Economic Development

Issue 1 – Spatial Strategy for Employment – Policy S28

- Q1. What evidence is there that there will be significant growth over the plan period in several sectors, most notably agri-food, manufacturing, business services and the visitor economy, including accommodation and food services?
- Q2. Is the evidence underpinning the employment strategy based on robust, up-to-date information about growth in these sectors?

Issue 2 – Strategic Employment Sites - Policy S29

- Q1. How were the Strategic Employment Sites selected for inclusion in the Plan? What factors were taken into account and were alternatives considered?
- Q2. What is the most up-to-date position regarding approved development on these sites? Are they developable within the plan period?
- Q3. Part 2 of Policy S29 allows for proposals that would result in the loss of business uses on Strategic Employment Sites. Are the requirements sufficiently clear for the policy to be effective and are they justified?

Issue 3 – Employment Allocations on SUEs – Policy S30

- Q1. For each site, how has the scale of proposed development been determined? Are they amounts justified given the overall need and existing level of committed provision?
- Q2. Are the amounts of employment land proposed across the sites achievable?
- Q3. Is the provision of employment land expected to be linked to housing delivery, or will the sites come forward independently?
- Q4. Should additional flexibility be provided to allow for alternative amounts/uses on the SUEs?

Issue 4 – Important Established Employment Areas – Policy S31

- Q1. How were the sites selected and has a robust process been followed including the consideration of alternatives?
- Q2. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities how applicants for planning permission should demonstrate that any loss would not have an unacceptable impact on the overall supply of employment land or premises?
- Q3. What is the justification for suggested modification MMSC7? Is it necessary for soundness?

Issue 5 – Local Employment Areas - Policy S32

- Q1. Local Employment Areas (LEA) are defined as sites sized 0.5ha or more, at least 2,500sqm of existing floor space and with 3 or more units occupied by separate businesses, within Tiers 1-6 of the Settlement Hierarchy as defined in Policy S1. How was this definition derived and is it justified?

- Q2. Is Policy S32 sufficiently clear as to whether a piece of land is a Local Employment Area or not? Should these sites be listed in order for it to be effective?

Issue 6 – Employment Proposals in Settlements – Policy S33

- Q1. Is it sufficiently clear as to what scale and type of employment use would be supported on unallocated sites in accordance with the settlement hierarchy defined by Policy S1?
- Q2. Does Part 1(a) apply to all development proposals, even small-scale schemes for individual premises?
- Q3. How would proposals demonstrate no significant adverse impact on the viability of delivering allocated employment sites? Is this justified and effective?

Issue 7 – Employment Proposals in the Countryside – Policy S34

- Q1. Policy S34 limits proposals for employment generating development in the countryside to the expansion of an existing employment use and development proposals that support the growth of the agri-food sector or other land-based rural businesses and buildings. What is the justification for this approach? How would a development proposal for other employment uses in the countryside such as minerals extraction be dealt with?
- Q2. Is Policy S34 consistent with paragraph 84 of the Framework, which states that planning policies should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of businesses in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings?

Matter 12 – Green Spaces

Issue 1 – Green Wedges – Policy S63

- Q1. Is Policy S63 sufficiently clear as to whether an area of land is a Green Wedge or not? Should these areas be listed in the policy?
- Q2. How were Green Wedges identified and assessed as part of this Local Plan? What factors were taken into account and where is this evidenced?
- Q3. Are the development requirements relating to the Green Wedges justified and effective?

Issue 2 – Local Green Space – Policy S64

- Q1. Is Policy S64 sufficiently clear as to which sites are designated as Local Green Spaces?
- Q2. How were sites selected and do they meet the requirements designation under paragraph 102 of the Framework?
- Q3. Paragraph 101 of the Framework states that the designation of land as Local Green Space through local plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them. Have all the designations been put forward by local communities? If not, which ones have been identified by the Committee?
- Q4. Have any Local Green Spaces been identified in Neighbourhood Plans which have either been through examination or formally made since submission of the Local Plan?

Issue 3 – Important Open Space – Policy S65

- Q1. Is Policy S65 sufficiently clear as to whether an area of land is Important Open Space? Should all these areas be listed in the policy?
- Q2. How were the spaces selected and what factors were taken into account? Are they justified?

Matter 13 – Retail and Town Centres

Issue 1 – Retail Hierarchy – Policy S35

- Q1. Is the retail hierarchy justified and appropriate? Does it adequately reflect the size, role and function of the settlements and the level of existing provision?
- Q2. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities how applications for retail uses within identified regeneration and opportunity areas will be considered?
- Q3. What are the thresholds for considering impacts on centres based on? Are they justified, appropriate and based on up-to-date evidence?

Issue 2 – Lincoln City Centre and Primary Shopping Area - Policy S36

- Q1. How has the Primary Shopping Area ('PSA') been determined for the purposes of this Plan? Is it justified?
- Q2. Is it sufficiently clear that the policy allows for the provision of medical or health services, principally to visiting members of the public within each of the PSAs?
- Q3. It is sufficiently clear what is meant by 'over-concentration' of non-retail uses for considering proposals in the PSA?
- Q4. Are there any restrictions on the number of non-retail uses permitted in the same street elsewhere in the town centre?
- Q5. What is the justification for suggested modification MMSC8? Is it necessary for soundness?

Issue 3 – Gainsborough, Sleaford, Market Rasen and Caistor Town Centres – Policies S37, S38 and S39

- Q1. How have the PSAs and town centre boundaries been determined for the purposes of this Plan? Are they justified?
- Q2. Do Policies S37, S38 and S39 recognise that residential development often plays an important role in ensuring the vitality and viability of centres and encourage residential development on appropriate sites, as required by paragraph 86 of the Framework?
- Q3. Is it clear where and when development proposals will be required to assist in meeting wider regeneration and investment objectives in Gainsborough? Likewise, is it sufficiently clear what development proposals must do in order to contribute towards the objectives of the Sleaford masterplan?
- Q4. Are the development schemes referred to in Policies S37 and S38 developable over the plan period?
- Q5. Are the development requirements for non-town centre uses sufficiently clear? Are they effective?

Issue 4 – District, Local and Village Centres - Policy S40

- Q1. Is Policy S40 justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy?
- Q2. What is the justification for suggested modification MMSC9? Is it necessary for soundness?

Issue 5 – Frontages - Policy NS41

- Q1. Are the requirements for new frontages or alterations to existing frontages justified and effective?

Matter 14 – Design and The Built Environment

Issue 1 – Delivering Good Design and Advertisements – Policies S53 and NS55

- Q1. Are policies S53 and NS55 consistent with paragraph 130 of the Framework, which sets out requirements for planning policies?
- Q2. Are the requirements justified and effective?

Issue 2 – Health and Wellbeing – Policy S54

- Q1. How were the thresholds set out under criterion b) determined and are they justified?

Issue 3 – Contaminated Land – Policy S56

- Q1. Is the requirement for all risk assessments to be carried out prior to the grant of planning permission justified?
- Q2. How does the Local Plan consider land instability, and does it include policies which contribute to the remediation of unstable land?

Issue 4 – Historic Environment – Policy S57

- Q1. Is Policy S57 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy, in particular paragraphs 194-208 of the Framework?
- Q2. What is the justification for suggested modification MMSC11? Is it necessary for soundness?

Issue 5 – Protecting Lincoln, Gainsborough and Sleaford’s Setting and Character – Policy S58

- Q1. Is Policy S58 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy, in particular paragraphs 194-208 of the Framework?

Matter 15 – Tourism, the Visitor Economy and Education

Issue 1 – Sustainable Tourism - Policies S42 and S43

- Q1. Are policies S42 and S43 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Issue 2 – Lincolnshire Showground – Policy S44

- Q1. Is it sufficiently clear what infrastructure requirements will be necessary for this site, particularly in relation to mains sewerage?
- Q2. Are the types and scales of development that Policy S44 would support in principle justified? What is this approach based on, how was it derived and what alternatives were considered? Is the site deliverable and viable over the plan period?

Issue 3 – Universities and Colleges – Policy S52

- Q1. Is Policy S52 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy, in particular paragraph 96 of the Framework?

Matter 16 – Natural Environment

Issue 1 – Green and Blue Infrastructure – Policy S59

- Q1. What is the current status of the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document and how has it influenced the formulation of Policy S59?
- Q2. Is the Local Plan justified in requiring development to be in accordance with a Supplementary Planning Document?
- Q3. Is Policy S52 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy, in particular paragraphs 20 and 92 of the Framework?

Issue 2 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity – Policies S60 and S61

- Q1. Are policies S60 and S61 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy, in particular paragraphs 174, 179 and 180 of the Framework?
- Q2. What is the justification for suggested modification MMSC12? Is it necessary for soundness?

Issue 3 – Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Areas of Great Landscape Value – Policy S62

- Q1. Is Policy S62 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy, in particular paragraphs 176 and 177 of the Framework?

Issue 4 – Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows – Policy S66

- Q1. Is Policy S66 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy, in particular paragraph 131, 174 and 180 of the Framework?

Issue 5 – Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land – Policy S67

- Q1. Is Policy S67 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy, in particular paragraph 174 of the Framework?

Matter 17 – Transport and Infrastructure

Issue 1 – Strategic Infrastructure Requirements – Policy S45

- Q1. Is the Local Plan consistent with paragraph 34 of the Framework, which states that plans should set out the contributions that are expected from development, including infrastructure for, amongst other things, education, health and transport?
- Q2. Is Policy S45 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy, in particular paragraphs 20 and 22 of the Framework?

Issue 2 – Safeguarded Land - Policy S46

- Q1. What is the latest position regarding the funding necessary to deliver the North Hykeham Relief Road? Will it be delivered within the plan period?

Issue 3 – Accessibility and Transport – Policies S47 and S48

- Q1. Has the preparation of the Local Plan been consistent with paragraph 102 of the Framework, which states that transport issues should be considered at the earliest stages of plan-making?
- Q2. For Policy S47, what is the justification for requiring all development proposals to be accompanied by a travel plan, transport assessment or transport statement?
- Q3. Are policies S47 and S48 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy, in particular paragraphs 20 and 22 of the Framework?
- Q4. What is the justification for suggested modification MMSC10? Is it necessary for soundness?

Issue 4 – Parking Provision - Policy S49

- Q1. Paragraph 107 of the Framework states that if setting local parking standards, policies should take into account;
 - The accessibility of the development;
 - The type, mix and use of development;
 - The availability of and opportunities for public transport;
 - Local car ownership levels; and
 - The need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.

How have these factors been taken into account in setting the residential parking standards in Policy S49? Are they justified?

Issue 5 – Community Facilities – Policy S50

- Q1. Is Policy S50 consistent with paragraph 93 of the Framework which, amongst other things, requires planning policies to guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs?

- Q2. Is it clear to decision-makers, developers and local communities what types of use constitute 'community facilities', particularly in relation to commercial operations?

Issue 6 – New Open Space, Sports and Leisure Facilities – Policy S51

- Q1. What is the current status of the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document and how has it influenced the formulation of Policy S51?
- Q2. Is Policy S51 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy, in particular paragraphs 20, 84, 92, 93, 99 and 187 of the Framework?