

Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (June 2021)

Appendix 5: Reasons for Selecting Preferred Policies



Contents

Appendix 5: Reasons for Selecting Preferred Policies 3

Appendix 5: Reasons for Selecting Preferred Policies

The Central Lincolnshire authorities have prepared an evidence report for each policy within the Local Plan. These reports provide background information and justification, including the reasonable alternatives considered and the rationale for the preferred policy. They are the audit trail of policy development for the Local Plan.

The following table therefore only provides a brief summary of the justification for selecting the preferred policy approach – these should be cross referenced with the corresponding evidence report for more detail. These can be viewed on the Central Lincolnshire website.

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
Spatial Strategy		
Policy S1: The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy	<p>Option 1: A strategy which identifies a settlement hierarchy and which focuses most growth at the larger settlements with well-connected smaller settlements also receiving some growth.</p> <p>Option 2: A strategy which identifies a settlement hierarchy but distributes growth more evenly across smaller settlements.</p> <p>Option 3: A strategy which does not include a settlement hierarchy.</p>	<p>The preferred option is expected to deliver certainty and a sustainable pattern of growth. The settlements at the top of the hierarchy are considered to be the most sustainable. Directing development to these settlements will enable residents to access day to day services and facilities by walking, cycling and public transport and help to retain, enhance and make efficient use of these. Development in these areas will maximise the use of existing infrastructure and allow infrastructure providers to plan for new facilities in the most efficient way. Focusing growth in areas which are already built up will help to preserve rural character.</p> <p>Option 2 was dismissed. It risks development taking place where there is not the greatest housing need. More dispersed growth could result in increased use of the private car to access employment and services and facilities.</p> <p>Option 3 was also dismissed. It would detract from investment being made to maximum effect.</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
Policy S2: Growth Levels and Distribution	<p><u>Part One: Assessing the Amount of Growth</u></p> <p>Option 1: A housing range of between the latest local housing need figure (currently 1,086 dwellings) and 1,325 dwellings per year and delivery of approximately 24,000 jobs as defined by local evidence</p> <p>Option 2: A fixed housing figure at the Local Housing Need Figure (currently 1,086 dwellings) and no locally set number of jobs to be delivered</p> <p>Option 3: A fixed housing figure of 1,325 dwellings and delivery of approximately 24,000 jobs as defined by evidence</p> <p><u>Part Two: Assessing the Distribution of Growth</u></p> <p>Option 1: A policy which continues the approach to distribution in the adopted local plan – based on existing population levels, with a focus on the Lincoln Strategy Area (prioritising urban regeneration, sustainable urban extensions to Lincoln and settlements which serve, and are serviced by Lincoln), and a slight boost to levels for the main towns of Gainsborough and Sleaford and nearby villages</p> <p>Option 2: A policy which delivers more growth to ‘Elsewhere’, i.e. not the Lincoln Strategy Area and not the main towns</p>	<p><u>Part One: Assessing the Amount of Growth</u></p> <p>Option 1 is preferred as it is expected to deliver additional housing over the government mandated minimum, meeting evidenced need for housing and affordable housing.</p> <p>Option 2 has been discounted, as the evidence suggests it would not deliver enough homes to match anticipated job growth.</p> <p>Option 3 has also been discounted.</p> <p><u>Part Two: Assessing the Distribution of Growth</u></p> <p>Option 2 to was discounted because it would likely result in more development taking place in locations where there is not ready access to services and infrastructure resulting in the increase in travel distances and private car vehicle movements.</p> <p>Option 3 was discounted as it was felt that the inability to focus investment at the locations where it could have the greatest impacts could result in substantial uncertainty.</p> <p>Option 4 require substantially more investment to deliver than option 1, potentially to the detriment of the areas with the largest population and with a greater carbon footprint than the preferred policy due to the increase in new facilities that would need to be built. Given the scale that would be needed for such a development it is highly likely</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	<p>Option 3: A policy which does not actively distribute growth to locations and lets the market decide.</p> <p>Option 4: Creation of one or more new settlements</p>	<p>that it would result in the loss of high grade agricultural land. It was therefore also discounted.</p>
Policy S3: Housing in Urban Areas	<p>Option 1: A policy which supports non-allocated development on small/medium sized sites in urban areas and which provides clarity on how large, non-allocated sites or sites at the edge of a settlement should be considered</p> <p>Option 2: A policy which restricts development on non-allocated sites in and adjacent to urban areas</p> <p>Option 3: No policy and instead rely on general plan policies and the NPPF</p>	<p>Option 2 was dismissed, as it would result in need for housing not being met in areas that can accommodate it.</p> <p>Option 3 was also discounted. Whilst it would allow additional growth to take place within urban areas without any restrictions, on balance it could lead to negative impacts, as there would be less certainty of impacts than the other options and would rely on other policies to assess suitability of development.</p>
Policy S4: Housing Development in or Adjacent to Villages	<p>Option 1: A policy which allows for development on suitable small sites or in allocations in the development plan within villages and seeks to ensure that any other residential development proposals for unallocated sites will not harm the village character and restricting unallocated development outside of the village</p> <p>Option 2: A policy which seeks to restrict all unallocated development in villages</p> <p>Option 3: Retain the approach in the adopted Local Plan applying a percentage growth for villages</p>	<p>The preferred approach is expected to provide a positive approach to managing growth in rural areas ensuring that negative impacts are minimised and that positive gains are not lost.</p> <p>Option 2 was discounted as it was felt to be too restrictive and could stifle the rural economy and housing market.</p> <p>Option 3 was discounted as it would prevent all development once the percentage is achieved regardless of the suitability of a proposed scheme.</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	Option 4: No policy and reliance placed on the wider plan and the NPPF	Option 4 would likely result in benefits to the rural economy and would see more housing delivered, but would also have negative impacts as a result of poor accessibility to services and facilities and an increased need to travel.
Policy S5: Development in the Countryside	<p>Option 1: A policy that provides clarity for what development will and will not be allowed in the countryside limiting it to very specific types of development</p> <p>Option 2: No policy and instead relying on general local plan policy and national policy</p>	Option 2 was discounted, as it risks development taking place in the open countryside beyond existing settlements, increasing the need to travel by car, length of journeys and associated greenhouse gas emissions. A less restrictive approach could also result in the countryside becoming urbanised, either on an individual development basis or cumulatively.
Energy, Climate Change and Flooding		
Policy S6: Reducing Energy Consumption – Residential Development	<p>Option 1: A policy requiring all residential proposals (except those meeting an exception clause) to provide an Energy Statement confirming all units achieve certain energy standards.</p> <p>Option 2: A policy setting optional standards relating to energy consumption.</p> <p>Option 3: No local policy: rely on national policy and guidance as set out in the NPPF and NPPG, and building regulations.</p>	<p>Option 2 was discounted as it is highly unlikely that most new homes would be built to net zero carbon standards and therefore would not deliver the benefits needed to help ensure Central Lincolnshire is carbon neutral. Such failure would also add to the challenge of achieving net zero at a national level.</p> <p>Option 3 was discounted as whilst Building Regulations are moving towards requiring homes that are net zero with greater efficiency being required in recent updates, Government has made clear in the PPG that Local Planning Authorities are well placed to deliver on climate change and so taking a local stand is supported by the Government.</p>
Policy S7: Reducing Energy Consumption – Non-Residential Buildings	Option 1: A policy requiring all non-residential development (except those meeting an exception clause) to provide an Energy	Option 1 is preferred over the other two alternatives because it offers more certainty that building will be built to higher environmental

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	<p>Statement confirming all units achieve certain energy standards.</p> <p>Option 2: A policy setting optional standards relating to energy consumption.</p> <p>Option 3: No local policy, rely on national policy and guidance as set out in the NPPF and NPPG</p>	<p>standards. While there are some exception clauses, these clauses are relatively stringent, and should ensure that proposals meet the policy requirements other than in exceptional circumstances. While options 2 and 3 may result in positive impacts, this is uncertain given the onus would be on the applicant / developer. The lack of specific policy requirement would mean that the impact of both of these options is likely to result in far fewer numbers of buildings being built to higher standards, and that the standards achieved may not be as high as those required by policy option 1.</p>
<p>Policy S8: Decentralised Energy Networks and Combined Heat and Power</p>	<p>Option 1: A policy requiring that in the case of major development proposals, where an existing decentralised energy network exists in the locality, connection of the development to the network is considered, as long as this would not result in increased fossil fuel consumption. Policy also expresses support for new and extended combined heat and power networks provided the power source of such a network is not fossil fuel based.</p> <p>Option 2: A policy requiring that all major and minor development proposals connect to an existing decentralised energy network where capacity exists or a new/ existing combined heat and power network.</p> <p>Option 3: No local policy, rely on national policy and guidance as set out in the NPPF and NPPG</p>	<p>Option 2 was discounted because it offers no clear benefit over policy option 1 and it is anticipated that policy option 1 will deliver larger scale benefits from major development proposals.</p> <p>While policy option 2 sets a requirement for both minor and major development (compared to option 1 which applies to only major development) and so has potential to deliver wider benefits, the extent and scale of the benefits are uncertain, given that connection may not be viable technically and/ or financially, or there may not be capacity for connection. Furthermore, policy option 2 may delay the delivery of minor scale developments.</p>
<p>Policy S9: Supporting a Circular Economy</p>	<p>Option 1: A policy supporting, in principle, proposals that demonstrate their compatibility</p>	<p>Option 1 has been identified as the preferred policy approach to be taken forward because:</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	<p>with or furthering of a strong circular economy in the local area.</p> <p>Option 2: A policy requiring demonstration of how proposals contribute to the circular economy principles.</p> <p>Option 3: No local policy, rely on national policy and guidance as set out in the NPPF and NPPG</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both policy options scored similarly overall in the SA • In instances where option 2 has scored 'significant positive', the score awarded was mixed (+ / ++), compared to a positive (+) score for option 1: the potential for significant effects is not guaranteed • The Local Plan as a whole places multiple and varying requirements on applicants: given the negligible difference in predicted impact between policy options 1 and 2, it is felt that option 1 does not place undue burden on applicants. • Policy option 3 was discounted because it was likely to have neutral or negligible effects in relation to all 15 of the Sustainability Appraisal objectives.
Policy S10: Embodied Carbon	<p>Option 1: A policy setting specific requirement for major development proposals to minimise embodied carbon and requirement for all other development to take opportunities to reduce embodied carbon content.</p> <p>Option 2: A policy setting out specific requirements for minimising embodied carbon in both major and minor development proposals.</p> <p>Option 3: No local policy, rely on national policy and guidance as set out in the NPPF and NPPG</p>	<p>Policy option 2 was discounted because, while it sets specific requirements for both major and minor proposals, compared to the preferred policy approach which sets a specific requirement only for major proposals and a general requirement for all other proposals, the effects are anticipated to be similar, with both the preferred policy and policy option 2 scoring the same in the SA. A lack of specific criteria in relation to minor development will allow applicants' flexibility in how they achieve the policy requirements, and provides balance in terms of what is expected from applicants and developers when considering the Local Plan requirements as a whole. Option 3 was discounted because it was likely to have neutral or negligible effects in relation to all 15 of the Sustainability Appraisal objectives.</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
Policy S11: Water Efficiency and Sustainable Water Management	<p>Option 1: A policy requiring development proposals to achieve water standard of 110 litre per day per person and setting out other requirements for water management applicable to all proposals comprising of new buildings.</p> <p>Option 2: A policy setting out requirements for water management applicable to all proposals comprising of new buildings. No requirement to meet 110 litre water standard.</p> <p>Option 3: No local policy, rely on national policy and guidance as set out in the NPPF and NPPG.</p>	<p>Option 3, to have no policy, was discounted as a local policy is likely to deliver more significant benefits and greater certainty in terms of positive outcomes.</p> <p>While option 2 is likely to result in positive effects in relation to several of the SA objectives, and no negative impacts are predicted, policy option 1 will deliver more substantial benefits and thus this policy option is preferred and taken forward in the draft Local Plan.</p>
Policy S12: Reducing Energy Consumption in Existing Buildings	<p>Option 1: A policy encouraging proposals involving change of use or extension to buildings to improve the building's energy efficiency, and expressing particular support for proposals which take viable opportunities to do so.</p> <p>Option 2: A policy setting specific requirements in relation to energy efficiency for proposals involving change of use or extension to an existing building.</p> <p>Option 3: No local policy, rely on national policy and guidance as set out in the NPPF and NPPG.</p>	<p>Option 1 is taken forward as the preferred policy approach in the draft Local Plan because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of viability considerations associated with making the considerations requirements • Policy option 1 may result in positive impacts • The impacts of both policy options 1 and 2 may be limited as the policies would only apply to proposals which need planning permission: some proposals for change of use and extensions do not require permission, so would not be subject to the policy • Policy option 2 could be difficult to condition and enforce.
Policy S13: Renewable Energy	<p>Option 1: A Policy setting out general criteria for all renewable energy proposals, and additional specific criteria for solar and wind</p>	<p>Option 2: Separating these two policies would not necessarily affect how applications would be treated. As such it is more streamlined to include</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	<p>developments, as well as for the decommissioning of renewable energy infrastructure.</p> <p>Option 2: Separate policies setting out the considerations for solar development and wind energy development, including decommissioning considerations.</p> <p>Option 3: No local policy, rely on national policy and guidance as set out in the NPPF and NPPG</p>	<p>requirements that apply to the two forms of renewable energy infrastructure (as well as other forms of renewable energy generation) in one policy, drawing out the specific additional requirements which apply solely to wind turbines.</p> <p>Option 3: This option would be contrary to national policy and would not be providing a positive strategy with addressing climate change. It would also impact on the key goal of delivering a net zero carbon Central Lincolnshire, given that the other policies in the plan alone would not be able to deliver this.</p>
Policy S14: Protecting Renewable Energy Infrastructure	<p>Option 1: A policy preventing development that would significantly harm existing or approved renewable energy infrastructure.</p> <p>Option 2: No local policy, rely on national policy and guidance as set out in the NPPF and NPPG</p>	<p>Option 2 scored poorly in the sustainability appraisal compared to the preferred option, with option 2 resulting in neutral or negligible effects in relation to many objectives, and uncertain, or uncertain negative effects in relation to a few of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>The preferred policy option will deliver significant benefits in relation to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, reducing dependency on fossil fuels, minimising vulnerability and improving resilience.</p>
Policy S15: Wider Energy Infrastructure	<p>Option 1: A policy expressing support in principle for development for significant investment in new and upgraded energy infrastructure which is necessary for/forms part of the transition to a net zero carbon sub-region</p> <p>Option 2: No local policy, rely on national policy and guidance as set out in the NPPF and NPPG</p>	<p>While the impacts of the preferred approach are uncertain, given the fact that such infrastructure proposals may not be dealt with by a Central Lincolnshire authority/ authorities, the potential for positive impacts exists in the instances where they are.</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
Policy S16: Carbon Sinks	<p>Option 1: A policy setting out requirement for proportionate evaluation of impact of proposal on peat soil/carbon sink, and setting out criteria that must be met in order for planning permission to be granted. Policy also includes carbon sequestration considerations.</p> <p>Option 2: No local policy, rely on national policy and guidance as set out in the NPPF and NPPG</p>	<p>Option 2 has the potential for significant negative effects in relation to the pollution and climate change sustainability appraisal objectives, while the preferred policy approach had potential for positive or significant positive effects in relation to many of the SA objectives.</p>
Policy NS17: Electric Vehicle Charging	<p>Option 1: A policy requiring a minimum of 10% of parking spaces to have electric vehicle charging points for all development proposals which include parking spaces (except those in use classes C3 and C4) and remaining spaces to be serviced by infrastructure to allow installation of further points at a later date. For development in use class categories C3 and C4, the requirement is for an electrical supply to the driveway and/or garage, and/or parking space.</p> <p>Option 2: A policy which sets an optional requirement to provide electric vehicle charging points.</p> <p>Option 3: No local policy, rely on national policy and guidance as set out in the NPPF and NPPG</p>	<p>Options 1 is preferred because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is anticipated to have positive impacts in relation to several SA objectives. • It will further encourage and enable households to use electric vehicles. • The policy requirements support the development of a low carbon economy, as businesses can transition more easily to electric fleet. • Accessible and plentiful electric vehicle charging points will also improve the areas attraction as a tourist destination for some households.
Policy S18: Fossil Fuel Exploration, Extraction, Production or Energy Generation	<p>Option 1: A policy stating that all applications for fossil fuel-based exploration, extraction, production or energy generation should be refused.</p>	<p>Option 1 offers greater certainty and likelihood of more positive sustainability outcomes.</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	Option 2: No local policy, rely on national policy and guidance as set out in the NPPF and NPPG	
Policy S19: Resilient and Adaptable Design	<p>Option 1: A policy setting requirements in relation to heat resilience and adaptable design.</p> <p>Option 2: A policy outlining optional considerations in relation to heat resilience and adaptable design.</p> <p>Option 3: No local policy, rely on national policy and guidance as set out in the NPPF and NPPG</p>	Option 1 therefore offers greater certainty for more positive sustainability outcomes, and is considered to be achievable as most of the measures outlined can be easily integrated into proposal at an early design stage.
Policy S20: Flood Risk and Water Resources	<p>Option 1: Local policy covering flood risk, water resources and protecting the water environment.</p> <p>Option 2: No local policy and rely on national policy</p>	Option 1 is the preferred approach as it expands on national policy and guidance seeking to address locally specific issues such as applying the optional increased water efficiency due to being located in a higher water stress area. Option 2 is discounted as it could lead to missed opportunities to address local issues.
Housing		
Policy S21: Affordable Housing	<p>Option 1: Set a varied percentage for delivery of affordable housing dependent on value zones with the lowest value zones receiving a baseline of 10%</p> <p>Option 2: Require a set percentage based on the NPPF requirement of at least 10% to deliver homes available for affordable home ownership</p> <p>Option 3: Do not require any set percentage and rely on negotiation on a site-by site basis</p>	Options 2 and 3 were discounted, as they were not expected to provide the volume and range of homes required to meet the identified needs.

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
Policy S22: Meeting Accommodation Needs	<p>Option 1: A policy which supports the delivery of housing that meets higher accessibility standards (M4(2) and M4(3))</p> <p>Option 2: A policy which requires a proportion of all housing to be delivered to higher accessibility standards.</p> <p>Option 3: No policy relating to accessible housing and rely on national policy.</p>	<p>Option 2 was discounted as although it would provide certainty in relation of delivery of homes, it raises the potential for other key infrastructure to not be delivered as a result of viability impacts. This was considered to provide too high a level of uncertainty and risk.</p> <p>Option 3 was discounted, as it would not provide an acceptable level of certainty in respect of the delivery of homes that meet the higher accessibility standards.</p>
Policy NS23: Custom and Self-Build Build Housing	<p>Option 1: One discrete development management policy to cover Custom and Self Build using a threshold allowance.</p> <p>Option 2: Including Custom and Self Build within other policies within the plan with no threshold allowance.</p> <p>Option 3: No local policy on Custom and Self Build - rely on national guidance relating to types of tenures set out in the NPPF and NPPG</p>	<p>Option 1 is the preferred policy as having a discrete policy allows greater opportunities for CSB plots to be made available and allows a further way of monitoring the supply of this form of tenure within the Districts.</p> <p>If a CSB policy were to be included in part of a wider housing planning policy this runs a higher risk that the supply of the CSB registers may not meet the demand in future years during the plan period. Similarly, relying just on national policy does not provide sufficient opportunities for development to bring about opportunities for CSB homes in a localised approach.</p>
Policy S24: Sub-Division and Multi-Occupation of Dwellings within Lincoln	<p>Option 1: Policy controlling conversion to houses in multiple occupation in Lincoln and their concentration and supporting development of appropriate purpose built multi occupancy accommodation.</p> <p>Option 2: No specific policy for housing in multiple occupation in Lincoln.</p>	<p>The preferred policy would allow for the conversion of properties into houses in multiple occupation while helping to prevent unsympathetic conversions and over concentrations of subdivided houses with transient residents.</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
		Option 2 was discounted as no specific policy on houses in multiple occupation risks over concentration. Increasing the number of residents in a property is likely to increase noise pollution (people and traffic). Without a policy approach to control the number and concentration of subdivided houses, there is a risk of negative impacts on residential amenity, including noise pollution.
Policy S25: Houseboat Moorings and Caravans	<p>Option 1: A policy which provides a framework for proposals for houseboat moorings and caravan pitches to be considered</p> <p>Option 2: No policy on houseboat moorings and caravan pitches, rely on national policy</p>	Option 2 was discounted as it would not provide an acceptable degree of certainty in respect of the provision of houseboat moorings, caravans and park homes to meet the identified needs.
Policy NS26: Residential Annexes	<p>Option 1: A policy setting out the requirements for the delivery of residential annexes</p> <p>Option 2: No policy on residential annexes, rely on national policy</p>	Option 2 would be a continuation of the current approach (i.e. no local policy) and was discounted as it would not provide any certainty in approach, or protection of residential areas from over development.
Employment		
Policy S27: Spatial Strategy for Employment	<p>Option 1: A spatial strategy for employment aligned to the overall spatial strategy and distribution of growth for Central Lincolnshire.</p> <p>Option 2: A spatial strategy that is different to the overall spatial strategy and distribution of growth more evenly across smaller settlements</p>	<p>The preferred option aligns with the spatial strategy for housing growth. The spatial strategy ensures economic activity is focused around the main urban conurbations but also features within all aspects of the settlement hierarchy that is proportionate in nature for rural areas.</p> <p>Option 2 spreads economic growth across Central Lincolnshire. This approach would not</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	Option 3: No local based strategic policy and rely on national policy	align to the objectives identified by the GLLEP within the LIS and SEP objectives. Option 3 was discounted as it relies on national policy and other Local Plan policies and is likely therefore to generate a great deal of uncertainty for the growth of the local economy in Central Lincolnshire.
Policy S28: Strategic Employment Sites (SES)	<p>Option 1: Retain the allocated strategic employment sites in the adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2017.</p> <p>Option 2: Allocate further strategic employment sites above those already allocated.</p> <p>Option 3: No local policy allocating Strategic Employment Sites - rely on a criteria based windfall employment policy, national policy and other Local Plan policies</p>	<p>Option 2 was discounted as allocating more sites for employment than is required could flood the market with land availability, which may result in lower investment.</p> <p>Option 3 was discounted as relying on windfall sites would create uncertainty and development is at risk of taking place wherever land is made available rather than in the most sustainable locations.</p>
Policy S29: Employment allocations on Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs)	<p>Option 1: Retain the allocated employment site allocations on the SUEs from the adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2017.</p> <p>Option 2: No allocated employment provision on the SUEs – let the market deliver and rely on national policy.</p>	Option 2 was discounted as not allocating employment land at the SUEs creates uncertainty for businesses looking to invest in the main urban areas within Central Lincolnshire.
Policy S30: Important Established Employment Areas (IEEA)	Option 1: Retain the Important Established Employment Areas allocated in the adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2017 and set out criteria for development proposals.	Option 2 was discounted as is it was felt it was likely to create a climate of uncertainty for investors and land owners, resulting in a loss of employment land or buildings to other uses and eroding the available land supply. Development is at risk of taking place wherever land is made

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	Option 2: Do not designate IEEAs. Rely on national policy to ensure employment is directed to the most sustainable and appropriate locations.	available rather than in the most sustainable locations.
Policy S31: Local Employment Areas (LEA)	<p>Option 1: A defined policy defining what a Local Employment Area (LEA) is and setting out criteria for proposals within or adjacent to a LEA.</p> <p>Option 2: No definition of what a LEA is and retain the existing policy wording from policy LP5 within the adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (April 2017).</p> <p>Option 3: No local based approach to smaller employment sites set out in the Local Plan and rely on national policy and other Local Plan policies.</p>	<p>Option 2 was discounted as the LESs are not clearly defined in the adopted policy in terms of their size or function and this could create uncertainty for applicants looking to invest in the area.</p> <p>Option 3 was also discounted, as it could lead to a loss of employment land and/or buildings to other uses, resulting in people having to travel further to access employment, potentially outside of Central Lincolnshire.</p>
Policy S32: Non-designated employment proposals within identified settlements	<p>Option 1: A policy for non-designated sites for employment proposals within defined settlements applying a sequential test.</p> <p>Option 2: No local based policy approach to non-designated employment sites within identified settlements. Rely on national policy and other Local Plan policies to ensure employment is directed to the most sustainable and appropriate locations.</p>	<p>The preferred option offers opportunities for new employment growth under a set criteria and will ensure the most sustainable locations for employment proposals are used including existing allocated sites and Local Employment Areas (LEAs).</p> <p>Option 2 was dismissed as it could result in employment land being located further away from local communities, increasing the need to travel by private car and therefore reducing opportunities for physical activity via walking or cycling to work, increased greenhouse gas emissions and a loss of employment land to other uses.</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
Policy S33: Non-designated employment proposals in the countryside	<p>Option 1: A specific policy for non-designated sites employment proposals in the countryside.</p> <p>Option 2: No local based policy for employment proposals in the countryside. Rely on national policy and other Local Plan policies.</p>	<p>The preferred option is expected to facilitate the expansion of existing businesses and support the limited development of certain new businesses within countryside locations, boosting the rural economy and improving access to employment opportunities.</p> <p>Option 2 has been discounted as it was felt it has the potential for harmful effects, especially in relation to the environmental SA objectives, as there would be no control over the scale and type of employment development that could come forward in countryside locations.</p>
Retail: City and Town Centres and District, Local and Village Centres		
Policy S34: Network and Hierarchy of Centres	<p>Option 1: A policy that sets out a retail hierarchy with named centres and identified boundaries across central Lincolnshire and sets out a tiered locally set floorspace threshold for impact assessments.</p> <p>Option 2: A policy that sets out a retail hierarchy with named centres in the upper tiers, identifying boundaries in the main towns only with a tiered locally set floorspace threshold for impact assessments.</p> <p>Option 3: A policy that sets out a retail hierarchy identifying town centres and primary shopping areas only, relying on other Local Plan policies, other local authority documents and national policy for development elsewhere and national default floorspace threshold for impact assessments.</p>	<p>All options, where they focus on the City Centre, will result in some people having to travel further to access services and facilities, but it is the most accessible location for most people and will encourage uses in areas better served by walking, cycling and public transport. Option 2 would spread uses over a wider area which may make private car use more likely and investment in other infrastructure less viable as would the out of town retail centres of option 3. The preferred policy would allow for investment and growth of the City whilst still maintaining a clear focus for transport infrastructure.</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
Policy S35: Lincoln's City Centre and Primary Shopping Area	<p>Option 1: Identify a City Centre and Primary Shopping Area with policy outlining suitable uses in each</p> <p>Option 2: Identify larger City Centre and Primary Shopping Area boundaries with policy outlining suitable uses in each</p> <p>Option 3: Identify smaller City Centre and Primary Shopping Area boundaries with identified out of town retail centres with policy outlining suitable uses in each</p>	<p>All options, where they focus on the Town Centre, will result in some people having to travel further to access services and facilities, but it is the most accessible location for most people and will encourage uses in areas better served by walking, cycling and public transport. Option 2 would spread uses over a wider area which may make private car use more likely and investment in other infrastructure less viable as would the out of town retail centres of option 3. The preferred policy would allow for investment and growth of the Town whilst still maintaining a clear focus for transport infrastructure.</p>
Policy S36: Gainsborough Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area	<p>Option 1: Identify a Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area with policy outlining suitable uses in each</p> <p>Option 2: Identify larger Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area boundaries with policy outlining suitable uses in each</p> <p>Option 3: Identify smaller Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area boundaries with identified out of town retail centres with policy outlining suitable uses in each</p>	<p>All three options concentrate town centre uses in an identified Town Centre, ensuring a viable and vibrant primary shopping core. However, the preferred policy, unlike options 2 and 3, would allow for clear specific guidance for the two towns whilst also allowing for a more flexible approach to suitable uses, acknowledging their role as service hubs for wider catchment areas as well as retail centres.</p>
Policy S37: Sleaford Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area	<p>Option 1: Identify a Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area with policy outlining suitable uses in each.</p> <p>Option 2: Identify larger Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area boundaries with policy outlining suitable uses in each</p>	<p>All three options concentrate town centre uses in an identified Town Centre, ensuring a viable and vibrant primary shopping core. However, the preferred policy, unlike options 2 and 3, would allow for clear specific guidance for the two towns whilst also allowing for a more flexible approach to suitable uses, acknowledging their role as service hubs for wider catchment areas as well as retail centres.</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	Option 3: Identify smaller Town Centre and Primary Shopping Area boundaries with identified out of town retail centres with policy outlining suitable uses in each	
Policy S38: Market Rasen and Caistor Town Centres	<p>Option 1: Identify a Town Centre boundary with policy outlining suitable uses within it</p> <p>Option 2: Identify a Town Centre boundary and Primary Shopping Area with policy outlining suitable uses in each</p> <p>Option 3: Identify a Town Centre boundary with no specific Market Rasen or Caistor policy but rely on the retail hierarchy policy, other policies in the Local Plan and national planning policy and guidance.</p>	All three options concentrate town centre uses in an identified Town Centre, ensuring a viable and vibrant primary shopping core. However, the preferred policy, unlike options 2 and 3, would allow for clear specific guidance for the two towns whilst also allowing for a more flexible approach to suitable uses, acknowledging their role as service hubs for wider catchment areas as well as retail centres.
Policy S39: District, Local and Village Centres	<p>Option 1: Identify and provide boundaries for village centres and local shopping centres in Gainsborough and Sleaford in addition to the existing district and local shopping centres within the Lincoln Urban Area</p> <p>Option 2: Maintain the existing list and boundaries of district and local shopping centres within the Lincoln Urban Area.</p> <p>Option 3: Unnamed district, local and village centres with no boundaries shown, relying on the general retail and community facilities policies and national guidance.</p>	<p>Option 1 is preferred as it seeks to protect and direct investment to district, local and village centres across Central Lincolnshire ensuring the maintenance of a network of locally accessible shops and services meeting local needs within accessible locations, potentially by means other than the private car.</p> <p>Options 2 and 3 were dismissed. Option 2 would focus on the Lincoln Urban Area only and therefore result in minor positive effects on the SA objectives. Option 3 is unlikely to actively protect or support existing district, local or village centres and their loss or conversion to other uses could have a detrimental impact on social equality and community.</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
Policy NS40: City and Town Centre Frontages	<p>Option 1: Local criteria based policy for city and town centre frontages and security shutters</p> <p>Option 2: A combined policy for main town centre use frontages, security shutters and advertisements</p> <p>Option 3: No local policy, relying on other local plan policies and national policy</p>	<p>Option 2 was discounted. Whilst a combined shopfront, security shutter and advertisement option would be expected to have similar major positive and positive impacts on the SA objectives to the preferred policy, it could result in mixed messages and inconsistent approach to decisions for those advertisements not in a city or town centre.</p> <p>Option 3 was also discounted. The level of detail and local relevance provided by national policy and guidance and other Local Plan policies on this area is mixed particularly for shop fronts and shutters. This option would offer the least positive impact on the SA objectives and is therefore the least preferred option.</p>
Tourism and Visitor Economy		
Policy S41: Sustainable Urban Tourism	<p>Option 1: A locally specific policy supporting new tourism related proposals within urban areas, and protecting existing facilities within specific areas of Lincoln</p> <p>Option 2: A general Central Lincolnshire wide policy promoting sustainable tourism, leisure and cultural facilities and directing development to existing settlements</p> <p>Option 3: No policy, rely on other Local Plan policies and national policy</p>	<p>Option 2 has been dismissed because it was considered that one single policy would not be as effective in addressing and supporting the different aspects of sustainable tourism as having separate, specific policies.</p> <p>Option 3 was also discounted, as it will not provide the same level of protection for existing destinations and facilities nor will it ensure the most appropriate development for Central Lincolnshire in the same way a local policy will.</p>
Policy S42: Sustainable Rural Tourism	<p>Option 1: A rural focussed policy, ensuring development is of a scale and nature to respect the local environment and its qualities. Development is directed towards existing settlements</p>	<p>Option 2 has been dismissed because it was considered that one single policy would not be as effective in addressing and supporting the different aspects of sustainable tourism as having separate, specific policies.</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	<p>Option 2: A general Central Lincolnshire wide policy promoting sustainable tourism, leisure and cultural facilities and directing development to existing settlements</p> <p>Option 3: No policy, rely on other Local Plan policies and national policy</p>	<p>Option 3 was also discounted, as it will not provide the same level of protection for existing destinations and facilities nor will it ensure the most appropriate development for Central Lincolnshire in the same way a local policy will.</p>
Policy S43: Lincolnshire Showground	<p>Option 1: A locally specific criteria based policy to guide development at the Lincolnshire Showground</p> <p>Option 2: To have no Local Plan policy and rely on other general policies in the Local plan, and national policy</p>	<p>Option 2 was discounted as it would not provide the level of detail required to ensure that only appropriate and necessary development for the operation of Lincolnshire Showground takes place.</p>
Transport and Infrastructure		
Policy S44: Strategic Infrastructure Requirements	<p>Option 1: A general policy covering the areas of non-transport based infrastructure and developer contributions</p> <p>Option 2: To have no policy and rely on national policy</p> <p>Option 3: To not have a specific policy, but rely on infrastructure requirements for each site through allocation policies</p>	<p>Option 2 was discounted, as although it may lead to some infrastructure improvements, without a locally specific policy, confusion may arise regarding provision, and what infrastructure is required where.</p> <p>Option 3 was also discounted because although it was acknowledged to have likely benefits, however, these would not be as wide ranging, as they would only be in relation to sites allocated for development and not all development.</p> <p>Option 1 would apply to all development and is therefore the preferred approach.</p>
Policy S45: Safeguarded Land for Future Key Infrastructure	<p>Option 1: To have a specific policy safeguarding the preferred route of the North Hykeham Relief Road</p>	<p>Option 2 would not provide certainty over what type of infrastructure land is to be provided, or where it would be located. This option has the</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	Option 2: Have no specific policy safeguarding the route	potential to see land that could be required for an infrastructure scheme lost to other development.
Policy S46: Accessibility and Transport	<p>Option 1: General policy covering objectives for specific transport modes and general requirements</p> <p>Option 2: To have no policy and rely on national policy</p> <p>Option 3: To have no policy, but rely on transport requirements for each site through allocation policies</p>	<p>Option 2 was discounted as it was considered to have minimal impact as it does not provide for locally specific solutions to come forward.</p> <p>Whilst Option 3 may result in some benefits, it would have a specific focus on the allocated sites, and thus would miss opportunities offered by other sites coming forward.</p>
Policy S47: Walking and Cycling Infrastructure	<p>Option 1: A specific detailed local policy ensuring the provision of walking and cycling infrastructure</p> <p>Option 2: To have no local policy and rely on national policy</p> <p>Option 3: No specific policy, but incorporate walking and cycling infrastructure requirements in site allocation policies.</p>	<p>Option 2 would not provide certainty around potential sustainability impacts as it would not provide any locally specific guidance.</p> <p>Option 3 was also dismissed, as although it would have some clear positive effects, these would be limited to only the largest of developments, and therefore would not provide as great a level of benefit as the preferred option.</p>
Policy S48: Parking Provision	<p>Option 1: To have a specific, detailed, policy setting parking standards for the Central Lincolnshire area</p> <p>Option 2: To continue as per the 2017 Local Plan, and not have a policy and rely on National policy</p>	Option 2 did not perform well against the SA objectives, and does not provide the same degree of certainty in approach to parking provision as the preferred option.

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
Policy S49: Community Facilities	<p>Option 1: A policy in two parts, protecting existing community facilities, and seeking the provision of new facilities</p> <p>Option 2: To have no local policy and rely on national policy</p> <p>Option 3: To identify and safeguard community facilities (through the identification of specific sites/facilities)</p>	Options 2 and 3 were discounted as although they would provide some protection for existing facilities, they would not ensure that new facilities came forward.
Policy S50: Creation of New Open Space, Sports and Leisure Facilities	<p>Option 1: A policy that sets out open space requirements for new residential developments in accordance with local open space standards, based on local assessments of need (generally a carry-over of the adopted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan policy LP24)</p> <p>Option 2: Have no policy on open space standards in the Local Plan</p> <p>Option 3: Rely on national policy and guidance and adopt nationally recommended benchmark open space standards</p>	<p>Option 2 was discounted because there would be no requirements for new open space provision set out in the Local Plan. Any open space secured through new development would be that which is promoted by the applicant. This creates uncertainty around how and when new open space will be provided.</p> <p>Option 3 was also dismissed. Best practice guidance recommends setting locally derived open space standards based on local assessments of need. The FiT standards are generic standards for the whole country, and do not take into account local characteristics or issues. Additionally, FiT guidance states that the quantity guidelines “should not be interpreted as maximum levels of provision, and it is recommended that these are adjusted to take into account of local circumstances”.</p>
Policy S51: Lincoln’s Universities and Colleges	<p>Option 1: A policy supporting the delivery of higher education facilities</p>	Option 2 was dismissed as it would not provide the support or certainty in relation to the development of the universities and colleges that is provided by the preferred option.

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	Option 2: No policy relating to universities and colleges, rely on national policy	
Design and Amenity		
Policy S52: Design and Amenity	<p>Option 1: A policy providing a framework for delivering good design in new development and for detailed design codes and policies to be produced in neighbourhood plans set out in common with the national design guide themes</p> <p>Option 2: Retain the design policy in the adopted local plan</p> <p>Option 3: To not have a design and amenity policy and rely on national policy</p>	<p>Option 2 was discounted as it would not take into account the Government's new design guidance or introduction of design codes.</p> <p>Option 3 was also dismissed as it would not take into account the Governments new design guidance, nor would it provide any degree of certainty in approach for new development proposals and residents.</p>
Policy S53: Health and Wellbeing	<p>Option 1: To have a local policy with the expectation that development proposals will promote, support and enhance physical and mental health and wellbeing and setting a requirement for Health Impact Assessment (HIA) for developments of 150 dwellings or more, or 5ha or more for other development</p> <p>Option 2: To have a local policy on health and wellbeing but no requirement for Health Impact Assessment</p> <p>Option 3: To have no local policy on health and wellbeing in the plan. Rely on national policy</p>	Options 2 and 3 were dismissed as they are likely to result in missed local opportunities to enhance health and wellbeing and to ensure large scale developments devise appropriate mitigation measures to address any health impacts.
Policy S54: Advertisements	Option 1: Local criteria based policy for advertisements	Options 2 and 3 were dismissed as it was felt they would provide less certainty than option 1.

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	<p>Option 2: No local policy for advertisements, relying on other Local Plan policies and national policy</p> <p>Option 3: Have a combined policy with frontages for main town centre uses</p>	
Policy S55: Development on Land Affected by Contamination	<p>Option 1: To have a policy that requires development proposals to undertake a preliminary risk assessment with development only permitted if it can be demonstrated that the site is suitable.</p> <p>Option 2: To have no local policy and rely on national policy only</p>	<p>Option 1 will ensure that development proposals fully consider the risk of contamination.</p> <p>Under option 2, development proposals are only likely to investigate contamination where statutory consultees, such as EA or Environmental Health, raise concerns or there is known contamination. Although national policy requires the effects of pollution on the natural environment to be taken in to account, this option does not take a precautionary approach and may limit investigation of contamination to development proposals where there is known contamination or where a statutory consultee raises concerns. Hence Option 2 was dismissed.</p>
Built Environment		
Policy S56: The Historic Environment	<p>Option 1: One overarching development management policy covering the historic environment.</p> <p>Option 2: Separate policies covering specific heritage assets, including listed buildings, archaeological sites, conservation areas, registered parks and gardens and non-designated assets.</p>	<p>Option 2 has been discounted, as it was felt an overarching policy on the historic environment was needed to reflect the requirements of the NPPF to set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment.</p> <p>Option 3 was also discounted, as whilst national policy on heritage assets is quite extensive, the</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	Option 3: No local policy. Rely on national policy and guidance on the historic environment as set out in the NPPF and NPPG.	NPPF requires local authorities to set out “a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment” and it is felt that a specific policy in relation to this is the most appropriate approach.
Policy S57: Protecting Lincoln, Gainsborough and Sleaford’s Setting and Character	<p>Option 1: Policy seeking to make a positive contribution to Lincoln, Gainsborough and Sleaford’s built and natural environment, protecting setting and character and views into and out of the City and Town.</p> <p>Option 2: To have no local policy, but to rely on general Central Lincolnshire green infrastructure, heritage and other Local Plan policies or national policy</p>	The preferred option includes elements specific to the setting and character of Lincoln, Gainsborough and Sleaford and references the character assessments, masterplans and regeneration SPD that allow specific issues and opportunities to be captured rather than getting lost within or dominating Central Lincolnshire wide policies, hence Option 2 has been discounted.
The Natural Environment		
Policy S58: Green Infrastructure Network	<p>Option 1: A local policy which identifies a green infrastructure network and which seeks to protect, extend and enhance the network in Central Lincolnshire</p> <p>Option 2: Not to have a local policy on green infrastructure and instead rely on other local plan policies designed to protect and enhance open space</p>	<p>The preferred approach has been selected as it promotes a green infrastructure network not just single green space sites; promotes a range of different scales of green infrastructure provision, and promotes green infrastructure that is multifunctional. This is predicted to result in a number of positive impacts against the SA objectives.</p> <p>Option 2 has been dismissed, as although it is also expected to generate some positive effects, there is greater uncertainty.</p>
Policy S59: Protecting Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Option 1: To have a local policy for the protection, conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geodiversity throughout Central Lincolnshire.	The preferred approach seeks to protect biodiversity and geodiversity assets within Central Lincolnshire. The policy requires development proposals to follow the mitigation hierarchy, which

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	<p>Option 2: To have no local policy and rely on national policy in the NPPF to protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity.</p>	<p>will limit the negative impacts of development on biodiversity and geodiversity.</p> <p>Option 2 was discounted, as reliance on the NPPF provides an overarching approach but does not allow decisions to be informed by local priorities.</p>
<p>Policy S60: Biodiversity Opportunity and Delivering Measurable Net Gains</p>	<p>Option 1: All new development proposals must deliver a minimum 10% measurable biodiversity net gain, in line with Environment Bill</p> <p>Option 2: Similar policy approach to preferred policy, but go beyond the Environment Bill and require a higher % of biodiversity net gain</p>	<p>Option 2 is a similar policy approach to option 1 but seeking a biodiversity net gain above the minimum 10%. This could impact on the delivery of housing and employment but otherwise the positive effects, in sustainability terms, are similar if not greater than Option 1.</p> <p>Option 1 was selected as it aligns with the proposed Environment Bill.</p>
<p>Policy S61: Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Areas of Great Landscape Value</p>	<p>Option 1: Maintain the protection of landscapes and townscapes, including specifically identifying Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) and the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, allowing for changes to the boundaries of AGLVs to reflect settlement boundaries and recent new development.</p> <p>Option 2: To have no local policy and to rely on national policy</p>	<p>Option 2 has been discounted as it would only offer protection to a small geographical area; the Area of Outstanding Beauty. Other important and sensitive local landscapes within Central Lincolnshire would not benefit from any policy protection.</p>
<p>Policy S62: Green Wedges</p>	<p>Option 1: Local, criteria based policy to maintain and enhance open space and countryside identified as Green Wedges in the adopted Local Plan</p>	<p>Option 2 has been dismissed. Whilst other Local Plan policies and national policy would restrict development in the countryside to some extent, Green Wedge designations provide an additional level of protection for specific areas around and</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	<p>Option 2: Do not maintain and enhance open space and countryside identified as Green Wedges in the adopted Local Plan and allow development applications in these areas to be assessed free of any Green Wedge designations, relying on other policies in the Local Plan and national policy.</p>	<p>between settlements that in particular are experiencing pressure for development.</p>
Policy S63: Local Green Space	<p>Option 1: A local policy which protects Local Green Space on the Policies Map in line with the NPPF, and ruling out development on these sites other than in very special circumstances</p> <p>Option 2: Do not protect Local Green Spaces within the Local Plan, leave their identification and protection to Neighbourhood Plans</p> <p>Option 3: Local policy which protects Local Green Spaces on the Policies Map in line with the NPPF, which rules out development on these sites other than in very special circumstances, and which protects other existing Important Open Space. (as per adopted plan)</p>	<p>Option 2 was dismissed. While Neighbourhood Plans can, and do, make designations for Local Green Space, not every Parish or settlement have prepared a Plan, this would leave a large number of the previously designated Local Green Spaces without protection. This could potentially result in their loss.</p> <p>Option 3 was also discounted. Whilst it would provide the same protection for Local Green Space sites as the preferred option, it was considered that having two separate policies for the two different types of designation, as per option 1 would give rise to less confusion in relation to type and level of protection.</p>
Policy S64: Important Open Space	<p>Option 1: A local policy which protects Important Open Spaces on the Policies Map in line with the NPPF, and ruling out development on these sites other than in very special circumstances</p> <p>Option 2: Do not protect Important Open Spaces within the Local Plan, rely on the NPPF</p>	<p>Option 2 was discounted as it would not provide the same level of protection for those open spaces that are important to the community, but do not meet the Local Green Space designation, and could potentially result in losses of open space.</p> <p>Option 3 was also discounted. Whilst it would provide the same protection for Important Open Spaces as the preferred option, it was considered</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	Option 3: Local policy which protects Local Green Spaces on the Policies Map in line with the NPPF, which rules out development on these sites other than in very special circumstances, and which also protects other existing Important Open Space (as per adopted plan).	that having two separate policies for the two different types of designation, as per option 1 would give rise to less confusion in relation to type and level of protection.
Policy S65: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows	<p>Option 1: To have a policy relating to all trees, woodland and hedgerows seeking to maintain, improve and expand upon existing levels of cover</p> <p>Option 2: Have no policy and instead rely on the NPPF and other Local Plan policies</p>	Option 2 was discounted. While it would protect the most valuable trees and woodland, it would not offer protection for locally significant and important trees and woodland, or hedgerows.
Policy S66: Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land	<p>Option 1: Have a specific, criteria based policy to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land</p> <p>Option 2: To not have a specific local policy, and instead rely on national policy.</p>	Option 2 was dismissed because it would not provide the same level of protection for the best and most versatile agricultural land as having a specific policy would.
SUEs, Regeneration Areas and Opportunity Areas		
Policy S67: Sustainable Urban Extensions	Option 1: A policy setting out the general approach to delivering SUEs	No reasonable alternative has been identified to the preferred policy. It is required to avoid repetition within each of the individual SUE policies to ensure a concise Local Plan and ensure a consistent approach to key requirements across all of the SUEs.
Policy S68: Lincoln SUEs	Option 1: A policy setting out in detail the expectations for each Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE)	Option 2 has been discounted. Although it is likely to contribute positively in terms of most of the SA objectives, it is less likely to deliver major positive benefits, because it is not site specific and does not provide detailed criteria, therefore

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	Option 2: No policy and rely on policy criteria set out in a generic SUE policy (Policy S67 Sustainable Urban Extensions)	enhancement opportunities may be missed. The generic nature of this policy option generates a degree of uncertainty in relation to many of the SA objectives.
Policy S69: Gainsborough SUEs	<p>Option 1: A policy setting out in detail the expectations from each SUE</p> <p>Option 2: No policy and rely on policy criteria set out in a generic SUE policy (Policy S67 Sustainable Urban Extensions)</p>	Option 2 has been discounted. Although it is likely to contribute positively in terms of most of the SA objectives, it is less likely to deliver major positive benefits, because it is not site specific and does not provide detailed criteria, therefore enhancement opportunities may be missed. The generic nature of this policy option generates a degree of uncertainty in relation to many of the SA objectives.
Policy S70: Sleaford SUEs	<p>Option 1: A policy setting out in detail the expectations from each SUE</p> <p>Option 2: No policy and rely on policy criteria set out in a generic SUE policy (Policy S67 Sustainable Urban Extensions)</p>	Option 2 has been discounted. Although it is likely to contribute positively in terms of most of the SA objectives, it is less likely to deliver major positive benefits, because it is not site specific and does not provide detailed criteria, therefore enhancement opportunities may be missed. The generic nature of this policy option generates a degree of uncertainty in relation to many of the SA objectives.
Policy NS71: Lincoln Regeneration and Opportunity Areas	<p>Option 1: A policy which provides a positive framework to promote the redevelopment or regeneration of these areas with specific criteria for each areas</p> <p>Option 2: A generic policy promoting the regeneration of all of these areas</p>	<p>The preferred approach is expected to create a higher degree of certainty for regenerating the identified locations during the plan period. This certainty will encourage inward investment to these sites as clear parameters are set out for each location.</p> <p>Option 2 gives some degree of certainty but is not refined to local circumstances compared to the preferred policy. It allows a broad-brush approach</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	<p>Option 3: No policy with development proposals being considered against general policies in the plan</p>	<p>to regeneration to be applied to Central Lincolnshire giving more detail than national based policies and guidance. It has therefore been discounted.</p> <p>Option 3 has also been discounted as it is the least sustainable option when appraised against the SA objectives, and creates the least degree of certainty for regeneration activity within Central Lincolnshire.</p>
<p>Policy NS72: Gainsborough Regeneration and Opportunity Areas</p>	<p>Option 1: A policy which provides a positive framework to promote the redevelopment or regeneration of these areas with specific criteria for each areas</p> <p>Option 2: A generic policy promoting the regeneration of all of these areas</p> <p>Option 3: No policy with development proposals being considered against general policies in the plan</p>	<p>The preferred approach is expected to create a higher degree of certainty for regenerating the identified locations during the plan period. This certainty will encourage inward investment to these sites as clear parameters are set out for each location.</p> <p>Option 2 gives some degree of certainty but is not refined to local circumstances compared to the preferred policy. It allows a broad-brush approach to regeneration to be applied to Central Lincolnshire giving more detail than national based policies and guidance. It has therefore been discounted.</p> <p>Option 3 has also been discounted as it is the least sustainable option when appraised against the SA objectives, and creates the least degree of certainty for regeneration activity within Central Lincolnshire.</p>
<p>Policy NS73: Sleaford Regeneration and Opportunity Areas</p>	<p>Option 1: A policy which provides a positive framework to promote the redevelopment or</p>	<p>The preferred approach is expected to create a higher degree of certainty for regenerating the identified locations during the plan period. This</p>

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
	<p>regeneration of these areas with specific criteria for each area</p> <p>Option 2: A generic policy promoting the regeneration of all of these areas</p> <p>Option 3: No policy with development proposals being considered against general policies in the plan</p>	<p>certainty will encourage inward investment to these sites as clear parameters are set out for each location.</p> <p>Option 2 gives some degree of certainty but is not refined to local circumstances compared to the preferred policy. It allows a broad-brush approach to regeneration to be applied to Central Lincolnshire giving more detail than national based policies and guidance. It has therefore been discounted.</p> <p>Option 3 has also been discounted as it is the least sustainable option when appraised against the SA objectives, and creates the least degree of certainty for regeneration activity within Central Lincolnshire.</p>
Policy S74: RAF Scampton	<p>Option 1: A policy which provides a positive framework to promote the regeneration of this site as a Regeneration Opportunity Area with specific criteria</p> <p>Option 2: Formal allocation of this site with a strict list of policy requirements but no requirement for a comprehensive site masterplan</p> <p>Option 3: No specific policy for RAF Scampton, with development proposals being considered against general policies in the Local Plan</p>	<p>Option 1 is the preferred option as it sets out a requirement for a masterplan and comprehensive policy criteria.</p> <p>Option 2 has been discounted as it would not require a site masterplan. This could result in less positive benefits and greater uncertainty as to what may come forward on the site.</p> <p>Option 3 was also dismissed. The absence of a specific policy on RAF Scampton does not promote the site as an area for regeneration once the RAF departs, which could result in a number of negative impacts on the SA objectives.</p>
Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople		

Preferred policy in the Local Plan	Reasonable alternatives considered (Preferred Approach in Bold)	Summary of justification for selecting the preferred policy approach over the alternatives
Policy S82: Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation	<p>Option 1: A policy which will deliver adequate pitches to meet the evidenced need and provide a criteria-based policy for considering applications for new sites.</p> <p>Option 2: A policy which will deliver adequate pitches to meet the evidenced need but without a policy framework against which new sites can be considered.</p> <p>Option 3: No policy and instead rely on wider Local Plan policies or national policy.</p>	<p>Option 2 was discounted. Although it would provide some positives through the allocation of land to meet needs, by not including any criteria for the consideration of other schemes, this would reduce flexibility to deliver additional pitches and is less certain to result in positive effects on many of the SA Objectives.</p> <p>Option 3 was also dismissed as the uncertainty of not allocating sites and not including any locally specific policy is expected to have negative impacts on meeting identified housing needs.</p>
Ministry of Defence Establishments		
Policy S83: Ministry of Defence Establishments	<p>Option 1: A policy which provides criteria against which development relating to MOD land or assets can be considered</p> <p>Option 2: No policy and instead relying on general policies in the Local Plan and national policy</p>	<p>Option 2 was discounted as it would not provide an acceptable degree of certainty, potentially introducing risks from development affecting Ministry of Defence sites. Should the Ministry of Defence dispose of a site, this option would not provide certainty in ensuring that the benefit of any redevelopment outweighs any impacts</p>