



At Day 3 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan examination, the Inspectors requested the Committee to double check some factual details about a number of sites in the Site Allocations Evidence Report (EVR076-082).

This note has been prepared on 18 November 2022 by the Committee in response to this request and the following observations have been made:

WL/ING/005 (located in HOU002e)

- It was suggested that the incorrect data in relation to local wildlife sites was presented in the evidence and had not been picked up by the Committee at regulation 18 stage.
- Having checked this site, the evidence report correctly identifies that there is no local wildlife site at this location – this is in agreement with the site promoter.
- However, the summary of the site provided in the evidence report has not been updated to reflect this. This has not affected the Committee's conclusion on this site.
- Furthermore, the evidence report also incorrectly reports under "Summary of Regulation 18 Consultation" that no comments were received at the Regulation 18 stage. This is factually incorrect. The comments received were considered as part of the process, but it is accepted that details of this response should be included in this document at this location.

WL/LEA/002 (located in HOU002e)

- It was suggested that the site allocations evidence report did not take account of the information submitted on this site.
- The details on this site have been checked and it is concluded that there are no factual errors in the evidence and the representations have been taken into account in the process.

COL/PAR/024 (located in HOU002b)

- It was suggested that the information relating to flood risk was incorrect on this site in the evidence report.
- Having checked this, it is identified that the scoring on the site for flood risk is correct in that there are areas of flood zone 3 and 2 on the site and has been scored amber. However, under "Conclusion" the evidence report states that almost all of the site is in flood zone 3 and it is agreed that this is incorrect. This has not, however, affected the Committee's conclusion on this site