

# North Lincolnshire Council

www.northlincs.gov.uk

## NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN REGULATION 19 PUBLICATION DRAFT ADDENDUM CONSULTATION LIST OF RESPONSES -SORTED BY POLICY

### Introduction

This document is an extract of all responses received at the Regulation 19 Publication Draft Addendum May 2022 Consultation. In this document the responses are sorted in plan order.

The Publication Version of the Local Plan was the preferred strategy, and the plan that it is intended to submit to the Planning Inspectorate for examination. However, in response to a handful of representations made during the consultation a focussed number of changes are proposed to the Local Plan. To ensure the proposed changes to the Local Plan are fully considered by the Inspector as part of the submission plan, a Regulation 19 Consultation took place on the Publication Version Addendum of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan 2020-2038 alongside the updated policies map, updated proposed submission documents and associated evidence base. **This consultation gave the community and stakeholders an opportunity to comment on the proposed modifications only.**

By the close of publication draft addendum consultation, the Council received a total of 49 respondents providing 105 individual responses on the proposed addendum changes. Not all chapters received comments therefore the summaries include comments relating to the necessary chapters.

19 comments from 13 individuals or organisations sent comments which did not relate to any of the proposed changes. These have been logged separately for the Inspector to decide if they can be considered so are not part of this document. In the tables below all comments against each policy or other part of the document or other submission documents are provided with details of the response.

During the consultation of the Publication Draft Addendum Consultation document, it was accompanied by a response form, Guidance notes and frequently asked questions. It related to the questions being posed in the document and could be completed on-line via the Local Plan website. A paper version of the consultation form was available upon request and responses sent by paper or email were also accepted.

Majority of comments were received online via the online consultation system. However, some representations had to be typed into the consultation database by officers if they were received by email or post and some also included the submission of maps, documents, or other evidence to support the comments being made these are all stored and can be viewed in the consultation database through the attached links.

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>1. Introduction</b> .....  | <b>4</b>  |
| Paragraph 1.16.....   | 4         |
| Paragraph 1.32.....   | 4         |
| Paragraph 1.38.....   | 4         |
| <b>2. North Lincolnshire: Facts &amp; Figures</b> .....                                 | <b>4</b>  |
| "Our Transformation So Far, Paragraph 2.4 2.....  | 4         |
| Key Challenge – Natural Environment .....   | 5         |
| Paragraph 2.72.....   | 6         |
| Policy SS3: Criteria J .....  | 6         |
| <b>4. A Spatial Strategy For North Lincolnshire</b> .....                               | <b>6</b>  |
| Policy SS7: Question 9.....   | 6         |
| Policy SS7: Strategic Site Allocation Lincolnshire Lakes .....                          | 6         |
| <b>5. Meeting Our Housing Need</b> .....  | <b>7</b>  |
| Table 5.1 Housing Delivery.....   | 7         |
| Policy H1P-20: Land off Ferry Road.....   | 7         |
| Policy H1P-23: Land off Mill Road.....  | 7         |
| Paragraph 5.153.....  | 7         |
| <b>6. Delivering Jobs &amp; Supporting Our Economy</b> .....                            | <b>7</b>  |
| Policy EC1-: Employment Land Supply.....  | 7         |
| Policy EC1-6: Land at North West of the A15 Barton Interchange.....                     | 7         |
| Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to The West of The A18..... | 7         |
| Policy EC1-8: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the East of the A18..... | 11        |
| Policy EC4: South Humber Bank - Landscape Initiative .....                              | 11        |
| Paragraph 6.85.....   | 11        |
| Policy EC5: Wharves.....  | 11        |
| <b>7. Prosperous Town Centres</b> .....   | <b>11</b> |
| Paragraph 7.21 - additional paragraph after Paragraph 7.20.....                         | 11        |
| <b>11. Creating Sustainable Communities and Better Places</b> .....                     | <b>13</b> |
| Policy CSC2 Health Care Provision .....   | 13        |
| Policy CSC12: 1h .....  | 13        |
| Policy CSC17: Camping and Caravan Sites .....   | 13        |
| <b>12. Planning for a Sustainable Supply of Minerals</b> .....                          | <b>13</b> |
| Chapter 12 Planning for a Sustainable Supply of Minerals.....                           | 13        |
| "Policy MIN6: Mineral Sites, point 1 MIN6-14a" .....                                    | 13        |
| "Policy MIN6: Mineral Sites, point 1 MIN6-14a" .....                                    | 13        |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>13. Sustainable Waste Management.....</b>           | <b>13</b> |
| Paragraph 13.15.....                                   | 13        |
| <b>14. Connecting North Lincolnshire .....</b>         | <b>14</b> |
| Policy T2: Promoting Public Transport .....            | 14        |
| Policy T6: Freight.....                                | 14        |
| Paragraph 14.47.....                                   | 14        |
| Paragraph 14.48.....                                   | 19        |
| Paragraph 14.49.....                                   | 21        |
| <b>15. Development Management .....</b>                | <b>21</b> |
| Paragraph 15.38-15.41 Additional paragraphs.....       | 21        |
| DM3: Environmental Protection Question 10 .....        | 21        |
| <b>Appendix 1: Mineral Site Details.....</b>           | <b>21</b> |
| Appendix 1 MIN6-14a.....                               | 21        |
| <b>Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework.....</b>           | <b>22</b> |
| Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework Policies .....        | 22        |
| Evidence Base Barton Link Road Technical Note #2 ..... | 22        |
| <b>General.....</b>                                    | <b>22</b> |
| General.....   | 22        |
| Habitats Regulations Assessment.....                   | 23        |
| Infrastructure Delivery Schedule April 2022 .....      | 25        |
| Infrastructure Delivery Plan April 2022 .....          | 25        |
| Map 07a Barton Upon Humber Proposed Link Road.....     | 25        |
| Map Inset 05 - Barnetby le wold .....                  | 25        |
| Spatial Vision.....                                    | 25        |
| Sustainability Appraisal .....                         | 25        |

| Rep Id | Name | Document Reference | Test of Soundness |                   |       |                    | Comments | Soundness | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files |
|--------|------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|----------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
|        |      |                    | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  |

### 1. Introduction

|     |  |                |         |     |     |     |   |           |   |    |      |                          |
|-----|--|----------------|---------|-----|-----|-----|---|-----------|---|----|------|--------------------------|
| 370 | Jess Lowden                                    | Paragraph 1.16 | support | yes | yes | yes | 100% support for traffic to divert via Caistor road   | justified | 100% support to divert via Caistor road | no | NULL |                          |
| 404 | Holly Hanson - Clerk to Worlaby Parish Council | Paragraph 1.32 |         |     |     |     | "Hi,The Draft Local Plan, published in October 2021, includes two paragraphs that refer to the submitted status of the Worlaby Neighbourhood Plan. However, since the Draft Plan was published in October, the Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted (December 2021).If the final version the Local Plan is to be published dated 2022, can references to the Worlaby Neighbourhood Plan in sections 1.26 and 4.31 be amended to refer to it as an adopted plan rather than a submitted plan?Section 1.26 reads: '.....In North Lincolnshire Appleby has an adopted Neighbourhood Plan and a further fourteen communities have designated Neighbourhood Areas including Worlaby, whose Plan and supporting documents have been submitted to North Lincolnshire Council in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.....'" |           |   |    |      | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 405 | Holly Hanson - Clerk to Worlaby Parish Council | Paragraph 1.32 |         |     |     |     | "If the final version the Local Plan is to be published dated 2022, can references to the Worlaby Neighbourhood Plan in sections 1.26 and 4.31 be amended to refer to it as an adopted plan rather than a submitted plan? Section 4.31 reads: 'In North Lincolnshire, Appleby has an adopted Neighbourhood Plan and a further fourteen communities have designated Neighbourhood Areas including Worlaby whose Plan and supporting documents have been submitted to North Lincolnshire Council in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.....'"   |           |   |    |      | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 408 | Paul Foster on behalf of Egdon Resources       | Paragraph 1.38 | Support |     |     |     | The inclusion of Policy MIN5 (Energy Minerals) as a strategic policy is welcomed.   |           |   |    |      | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 412 | Emilie Carr on behalf of Historic England      | Paragraph 1.38 | Unsound |     |     |     | "Policy HE1 should also be included as a strategic policy, in accordance with para 20, criteria d) of the NPPF."  |           |   |    |      | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |

### 2. North Lincolnshire: Facts & Figures

|     |   |  |         |     |     |     |  |                                 |   |    |  |  |
|-----|---|--|---------|-----|-----|-----|--|---------------------------------|---|----|--|--|
| 377 | Jason McElhoney on behalf of Aecom  | "Our Transformation So Far, Paragraph 2.4 2  | object  | yes | yes | yes | "At paragraph 2.4 of the Publication Draft Addendum document a list of the investment projects anticipated within the area over the plan period is provided. The publication draft addendum document includes two new projects; the South Humber Industrial Investment Plan and The Humber Low Carbon Pipelines Project (HLCP)<br><br>Harbour Energy consider that, as a National Significant Infrastructure Project, the V Net Zero pipeline scheme should also be included within this list of investment projects. The scheme scoping report has been submitted to PINS and an initial round of consultation has taken place within the local community. The scheme will be cross-boundary located within North Lincolnshire, North-East Lincolnshire, Lincolnshire County, East Lindsey District and West Lindsey District Councils. Alternatively if the Council do not see fit to include reference to this important investment in the region we respectfully request the wording is generalised to remove reference to other projects but remain supportive of the carbon capture industry and associated infrastructure."   | justified                       | "In order to ensure the plan is positively prepared we would suggest that the wording of the text is altered to either make it generally supportive of carbon capture industry given the plan period runs to 2038 or alternatively names the V Net Zero pipeline as detailed below."The V Net Zero pipeline scheme will transport carbon dioxide from emitters in the South Humber region via a new 53km pipeline from Immingham to the former Theddlethorpe Gas Terminal. From here, it will join an existing offshore pipeline to the Viking area in the UK southern North Sea, where the carbon dioxide will be injected into depleted gas reservoirs 9,000 feet beneath the seabed.""   | no |  |  |
| 385 | Colin Turnbull - DWD on behalf of Humber Zero (VPI Immingham LLP and Phillips 66 Limited) | "Our Transformation So Far, Paragraph 2.4 2" | support | yes | no  | yes | "The NPPF 2021 broadened the soundness test around national policy to go beyond the NPPF: the test reads consistent with national policy " enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant. The 2011 adopted national policy statements and the 2021 consultation draft energy national policy statements, along with the 2021 Net Zero Strategy, all require the delivery of carbon capture clusters, with the Net Zero Strategy (October 2021) stipulates the delivery of four carbon capture usage and storage (CCUS) clusters, capturing 20-30 MtCO2 across the economy, including 6 MtCO2 of industrial emissions, per year by 2030.<br><br>Carbon capture clusters are inherently spatial, being agglomerations of existing industry and power development also possessing proximity to potential carbon storage sites: the Net Zero Strategy also refers to them as SuperPlaces (page 21). The Humber region is the UKs biggest industrial cluster and biggest industrial emitter, emitting 40% of the UKs industrial emissions. There is a plan to invest substantially in industrial clusters in areas such as the Humber. These clusters will be the starting point for a new carbon capture industry, which could support up to 50,000 jobs in the UK by 2030.It is therefore considered that this section of the Local Plan should more comprehensively describe the projects and plans underway that relate to this national policy, which has evolved at pace (and largely since the reg 18 stage of local plan development)." | Consistent with national policy | "We do not propose any alteration to the existing text, which relates to a project by different promoters, but recommend additions comprising the following text at new bulletpoints.<br><br>-Humber Zero is a project that will deliver post-combustion carbon capture plants within the Phillips 66 Limited Humber Refinery for the Fluid Catalytic Cracker, and for two of the gas turbines and auxiliary boilers within the VPI Immingham Combined Heat and Power Plant. The project could capture up to 3.8 million tonnes per year of carbon emissions by 2028, before they enter the atmosphere, and compress them ready for safe storage or export. The captured carbon will be taken offshore via a pipeline and stored in rock formations under the North Sea. We would also recommend adding a paragraph in at the end of, or after, :<br>>>>>>> |    |  |  |

| Rep Id | Name   | Document Reference                           | Test of Soundness |                   |       |                    | Comments  | Soundness  | Modifications  | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments   | Additional Files |
|--------|--|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|---|--|--|-------------------------|--|------------------|
|        |  |  | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty |   |  |  |                         |  |                  |
|        |  |  |                   |                   |       |                    |   | >>>> paragraph 2.10 to provide spatial context.<br>North Lincolnshire represents a large part of one of the SuperPlaces recognised in the governments Net Zero Strategy (October 2021): the Humber carbon capture, usage and storage (CCUS) cluster. North Lincolnshire possesses existing industrial agglomerations and skills bases, along with land availability, a range of supporting infrastructure, and proximity to strategically important geological sites under the North Sea for the storage of carbon dioxide, capable of supporting timely deployment of carbon capture at a large scale. The Net Zero Strategy identifies that these clusters deliver multiple opportunities (page 21): growing new industries in low carbon hydrogen alongside CCUS and renewable energy will put our industrial SuperPlaces at the forefront of technological development "accelerating decarbonisation in clusters, which account for approximately half of the UKs industrial emissions. The governments CCUS policy is underpinned by a range of support including the £1 billion CCS Infrastructure Fund and revenue support mechanisms." | no   |                         |  |                  |
| 386    | David Jones on behalf of Arcadis Consulting (UK) Ltd | "Our Transformation So Far, Paragraph 2.4 2" | support           | yes               | yes   | yes                | "The statement is a recognition of the transformational nature of the proposed project, in supporting the delivery of sustainable development in line with national policy."  | Consistent with national policy  |  | no                      |  |                  |
| 371    | Kevin Ibbertson                                      | Key Challenge – Natural Environment          | object            | yes               | no    | no                 | "I am referring to the proposed Development Plan for Broughton, and in particular the area highlighted for proposed housing H1P-21. On the plan you will see the current field boundary that runs immediately below where H1P-21 is typed. This boundary line comprises an ancient hawthorn hedge, with numerous very old mature trees and live electricity cables. In addition, immediately to the north of this boundary there are some 200 well established trees that were planted about 5 years ago. To destroy these trees for housing development goes against the government policy of increasing forested areas in the UK, and will negatively affect the local wildlife, removing habitats.<br><br>In addition, PA/2020/2046 was approved in 2021, which is outside the proposed Development Plan, but does not affect the hedge or trees. A previous revised Development Plan I have a copy of, brought in this approved development, but did not include the land to the north of the field boundary, which appears to be more sensible.<br><br>I would like to kept advised and included in any meetings where the proposed new Broughton Development plan is considered with regard to this particular site.<br><br>I have been told that the proposed plan went to public consultation in November 2021, but I and none of the residents of The Dell, Broughton were aware of this, which is strange considering we are the immediate neighbours to the site." | Consistent with national policy  | "Retain the land in the Development Plan south of the field boundary I have mentioned to match the planning application that has already been approved, and exclude the pocket of land to the north of the field boundary.<br><br>This will leave the hedge, mature trees and 200 other trees unaffected." | yes                     | I am an immediate neighbour to the site and wish to retain the trees and wildlife habitats unscathed. I was unaware of any previous public consultations.        |                  |
| 373    | Mr & Mrs Hanson                                      | Key Challenge – Natural Environment          | object            | yes               | no    | no                 | "Having attended the Local Plan public consultation in Barton upon Humber yesterday, we were able to discuss various points of concern regarding the local plan in Broughton. We did not receive notification for Broughton's public discussion, and were therefore not able to voice our opinions. The particular area of concern is south and adjacent to our houses in The Dell, off Scawby Road (HIP-21 on the new local plan). We see from the new proposed plan that this area is now included in that plan and would be a designated area for potential development, whereas previously it was excluded.<br><br>Some years, about 5, several hundred trees were planted in this area, a good majority of them are now established and the area has been left to go wild, therefore enhancing the wildlife, it's habitat and the environment. It is also bounded by a mature hawthorn hedge and includes several mature trees. To include this in the new plan would be detrimental to the country's conservation plan, of everyone planting trees and protecting wildlife areas. We therefore feel it would not be appropriate to include this area in the new plan.<br><br>Also noted is the proposed building area to the south which has been awarded outline planning permission (PA/2020/2046) is not include in the new local plan.<br><br>We would therefore wish to be kept advised of any future meetings with regards to Broughton and this particular site" | Consistent with national policy  | "Include the proposed building development at Vicarage Fields, which has been granted outline planning, in the Development Plan, but exclude the land to its north boundary to retain the 200 or so trees, hedging and any mature trees therefore leaving wildlife habitats unaffected."                   | yes                     | "Our house is adjacent to the site of concern, we wish to leave wildlife and newly planted trees to flourish. Did not know about previous public consultations." |                  |

| Rep Id | Name                                      | Document Reference     | Test of Soundness |                   |       |                    | Comments  | Soundness | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files         |
|--------|---|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|---|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|        |   |                        | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty |   |           |               |                         |                          |                          |
| 409    | Paul Foster on behalf of Egdon Resources  | Paragraph 2.72         | Support           |                   |       |                    | "We support the inclusion of Wressle as an operational oil well. However, the following text should be added after "Wressle" to state "where oil has been produced since early 2021." |           |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 413    | Emilie Carr on behalf of Historic England | Policy SS3: Criteria J | Sound             |                   |       |                    | Criteria j) and the additional reference to settings as suggested is welcomed   |           |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |

#### 4. A Spatial Strategy For North Lincolnshire

|     |   |  |         |  |  |  |   |  |  |  |                          |                          |
|-----|---|--|---------|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 434 | Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water | Policy SS7: Question 9                                   | Support |  |  |  | "Severn Trent are supportive of the inclusion of point 9, which highlights the need for early engagement with the utility companies, to ensure that there is sufficient infrastructure capacity and initiate further investigations into capacity improvements where required to meet the needs of a development."  |  |  |  |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 428 | Simon Jones on behalf of Highways England     | Policy SS7: Strategic Site Allocation Lincolnshire Lakes | Support |  |  |  | <p>"Lincolnshire Lakes-The Addendum states that this will now comprise of 2,150 dwellings, although this is not shown in red text as an amendment. This compares with 3,000 dwellings at the time of the SRN Evidence Base report and 2,000 dwellings at the time of the SRN Evidence Base Addendum.</p> <p>Given that we have already agreed the infrastructure required at this location, based on 3,000 dwellings coming forward at this location, the reduction in dwellings at this location should create less of an impact at the M181 terminating junction, as well as on the local road network within its vicinity.</p> <p>In our previous response and as noted above, we have stated that the proposed infrastructure at the M181 terminating junction does not necessarily accommodate the quantum of development within the Plan throughout the plan period and that the detrunking of the M181 places the onus of infrastructure provision onto the council. In addition, it was also concluded that this location may require a more detailed analysis through the plan period to ascertain if any further mitigation needs to be provided at this location.</p> <p>We also note that the AAP (adopted in 2016) references delivery of up to 6,304 new homes. Whilst we assume that the numbers provided to us in February 2021 (2,150) are the most up to date numbers for delivery in the plan period, referencing the AAP suggests that there are potentially up to 4,154 more dwellings to be provided post plan. In 2021, NPPF was updated and, in paragraph 22, states that: "Where larger scale developments such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns form part of the strategy for the area, policies should be set within a vision that looks further ahead (at least 30 years), to take into account the likely timescale for delivery". Clarification is therefore sought on the status of the AAP, the full anticipated quantum of housing delivery on the site, and how the impacts of any further post plan development will be assessed in accordance with NPPF.</p> <p>We have recently provided a consultation response on an Environmental Impact Assessment screening opinion in relation to the erection of 599 dwellings (planning reference: PA/SCR/2022/1) and the reduction of the permitted red line boundary in relation to PA/2015/0396 (planning reference: PA/SCR/2022/2) on land north of Burringham Road. We are aware that the development is located within the Lincolnshire Lakes Area Action Plan. We have noted the provision of a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, and would request to be consulted at the earliest opportunity on these documents.</p> <p>This review has highlighted that the issues which are required to be considered in association with the Publication Draft Addendum Plan remain largely the same as previously advised, and that our previously presented evidence bases remain robust subject to clarification of any post plan impacts of Lincolnshire Lakes.</p> <p>Our evidence base has identified that the M180 Junction 5 and the A160 / Habrough Road junction is approaching capacity in 2038.</p> <p>We therefore require that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan makes reference to the need for these junctions to be monitored over the plan period, and we look forward to continuous regular liaison on this matter."</p> |  |  |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                          |
| 414 | Emilie Carr on behalf of Historic England     | Policy SS7: Strategic Site Allocation Lincolnshire Lakes | Unsound |  |  |  | " Due to the archaeological importance of the site, a heritage criteria is required, building on our previous engagement. The Lincolnshire Lakes Development offers opportunities for the better understanding of North Lincolnshire's dynamic wet / dry landscapes - characterised by natural and artificial flooding and silting events across millennia. A staged process of archaeological investigation based upon deposit modelling is essential. A deposit modelling led approach is essential to the effective management of archaeological risks given the complex character of buried landscapes below the superficially flat modern ground surface. See <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/deposit-modelling-and-archaeology/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/deposit-modelling-and-archaeology/</a> and <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/technical-advice/archaeological-science/preservation-in-situ/">https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/technical-advice/archaeological-science/preservation-in-situ/</a> ."   |  |  |  |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |

| Rep Id | Name | Document Reference | Test of Soundness |                   |       |                    | Comments | Soundness | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files |
|--------|------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|----------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
|        |      |                    | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  |

### 5. Meeting Our Housing Need

|     |  |                                    |         |     |    |     |  |                     |  |     |  |                          |
|-----|--|------------------------------------|---------|-----|----|-----|--|---------------------|--|-----|--|--------------------------|
| 376 | Neil Taylor-Matson on behalf of Kirton in Lindsey Town Council | Table 5.1 Housing Delivery         | object  | yes | no | yes | "The soundness of proposals for Kirton in Lindsey are of concern as they only consist of housing developments and no allocations for commercial development, in effect the proposal is for the creation a commuter town with expansion of commerce not specified. For soundness, Brownfield sites in the area should be reserved for commercial use and not approved for housing stock in order to give provision for employment opportunities." positively prepared   |                     | "The soundness of proposals for Kirton in Lindsey are of concern as they only consist of housing developments and no allocations for commercial development, in effect the proposal is for the creation a commuter town with expansion of commerce not specified. For soundness, Brownfield sites in the area should be reserved for commercial use and not approved for housing stock in order to give provision for employment opportunities." | no  |  |                          |
| 388 | Robert Ian Stuart on behalf of Avoca PLD                       | Policy H1P-20: Land off Ferry Road | object  | yes | no | yes | "One questions why it is regarded as necessary to add further detail to the requirement for a heritage assessment? This site is well situated to offer an obvious extension of the settlement and whilst heritage issues must be taken due note of, the additional wording implies the possibility of a negative approach to the assessment of the proposed development.<br><br>It is noted that the assessed potential allocation of 54 dwellings remains unchanged which leads one to think that heritage [ and possibly other ] constraints have not been properly assessed in other proposed allocations. Certainly many, such as the Brigg sites H1P 14/15/16 and 17, require a heritage assessment and reference to proposed Policy HE1 suggests that consequences might be significant in terms of the development potential of some sites. This would have a knock on affect in respect of overall housing numbers.<br><br>Please note that the form does not allow more than one box below to be ""ticked"" but it is also considered that the tests of being justified and effective are not met." | positively prepared | Remove the additional wording  | yes | Because of the potential implication relating to housing numbers both on this site and in general. | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 416 | Emilie Carr on behalf of Historic England                      | Policy H1P-20: Land off Ferry Road | Sound   |     |    |     | The addition of the criteria "including protecting and enhancing the important approach views of the tower of the Grade I church of the Holy Trinity." As suggested is strongly welcomed.  |                     |  |     |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 417 | Emilie Carr on behalf of Historic England                      | Policy H1P-23: Land off Mill Road  | Sound   |     |    |     | "The addition of the criteria "including for the retention and sympathetic reuse of the pair of cottages on the site, which are non-designated heritage assets." is welcomed."   |                     |  |     |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 467 | Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency                    | Paragraph 5.153                    | Support |     |    |     | The text has been corrected to state that the site is in SFRA flood risk zone 1. The following text regarding the need for the Exception Test should be removed accordingly.   |                     |  |     |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |

### 6. Delivering Jobs & Supporting Our Economy

|     |   |  |         |     |     |     |   |                     |   |     |  |                          |
|-----|---|--|---------|-----|-----|-----|---|---------------------|---|-----|--|--------------------------|
| 468 | Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency | Paragraph 6.12   | Support |     |     |     | "This has been correctly updated. However, in the first sentence, 'is' is not needed."  |                     |   |     |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 453 | James Rigby on behalf of Brocklesby Estate  | Policy EC1-: Employment Land Supply  | Object  |     |     |     | Reinsert site reference EC1-7 as an allocated employment site (specifically for a service station and lorry park).  |                     |   |     |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 365 | Simon Morgan                                | Policy EC1-6: Land at North West of the A15 Barton Interchange                     | Object  | yes | no  | yes | "Appendix 8 of the Publication Addendum states this change has been made following a meeting with Severn Trent Water. However Barton Upon Humber falls under the remit of Anglian Water. My overall support for this policy, as provided during the publication draft consultation (stage 4), reference R190400045, remains." | justified           | "The need to modify, or not, the original publication draft should be determined after consultation with the correct water company."  | no  |  |                          |
| 424 | William Mollett on behalf of Hemex LLP      | Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to The West of The A18 | Support |     |     |     | Supportive of this amendment to the local plan  | yes                 | yes   | yes |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 378 | William Mollett on behalf of Hemex LLP      | Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to The West of The A18 | support | yes | yes | yes | This allows better public consultation and planning consideration for alternative roadside sites which may come forward in the area and be better suited to serve the M180 directly.  | positively prepared | "EV charging & motorway restaurant services may be better located at the M180/A15 interchange adjacent to the roundabout and between the existing petrol station/EV chargers and the A15 Humber Bridge approach road.<br><br>This would improve existing facilities and availability directly off the M180/A15 and offer the motorist better certainty and choice for en route charging." | no  |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |

| Rep Id | Name  | Document Reference   | Test of Soundness |                   |       |                    | Comments  | Soundness           | Modifications  | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files         |  |
|--------|---|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|---|---------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
|        |   |  | object/ support   | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty |   |                     |  |                         |                          |                          |  |
| 382    | Martin Haworth                                      | Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to The West of The A18 | support           | yes               | yes   | yes                | "I support the amendment to remove from the local plan the land at Barnetby Top from the local plan. This land should remain as agriculture land, it is not a suitable location for any development."   |                     |  |                         |                          |                          |  |
| 395    | Rachael Reddin on behalf of Barnetby Parish Council | Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to The West of The A18 | support           | yes               | yes   | yes                | "Barnetby le Wold Parish Council strongly support the amendment to remove EC1-7 as this site is completely unsuitable for the purposes of any development. The parish council in consultation with residents, would support that the site is completely removed from the local plan and not used for any other developments and that the area is retained as Farm land / Open countryside.<br><br>The site is not suitable for employment in the interests of traffic safety it is important that the area remains free flowing for traffic when accidents occur on the M180. Traffic can often back up in all direction from M180 and A180 using Barnetby top as the diverted route. Adding further congestion to this in the form of employment site or the presently proposed lorry park is not supported.<br><br>In relation to EC1-7 and EC 1-8 two employment sites / business parks would not be favourable."  |                     |  |                         |                          |                          |  |
| 396    | Nigel Nutting                                       | Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to The West of The A18 | support           | yes               | yes   | yes                | This land should be left as farmland to be used to grow much needed crops. At no time should this land be considered for any form of industrial or commercial development.  | justified           |  | no                      |                          |                          |  |
| 454    | James Rigby on behalf of Brocklesby Estate          | Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the West of the A18 | Object            |                   |       |                    | Reinsert site reference EC1-7 as an allocated employment site (specifically for a service station and lorry park).  |                     |  |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |  |
| 379    | William Mollett on behalf of Hemex LLP              | Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to The West of The A18 | support           | yes               | yes   | yes                | Allows better public consultation and planning consideration for alternative roadside sites which may come forward in the area and be better suited to serve the M180 directly.   | positively prepared | EV charging & motorway restaurant services may be better located at the M180/A15 interchange adjacent to the roundabout and between the existing petrol station/EV chargers and the A15 Humber Bridge approach road. This would improve existing facilities and availability directly off the M180/A15 and offer the motorist better certainty and choice for en route charging. | no                      |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |  |
| 456    | James Rigby on behalf of Brocklesby Estate          | Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to The West of The A18 | Object            |                   |       |                    | "Wording to be amended (see covering letter).<br><br>The Publication Draft Addendum deletes Site Reference EC1-7 as a draft Allocated Employment Site from emerging Policy EC1 and Inset 05 - Barnetby le Wold.<br><br>1.5. The deletion of Site Reference: EC1-7 is explained at Pages 371 and 373 of Publication Draft Addendum with the following statement added: "Policy EC-1.7 allocated land to the south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the west of the A18 for development as a service station and lorry park. This allocation is no longer required as policies TC1 and T6 have now been amended to provide a policy framework supporting any suitable proposals for roadside retail, lorry parking and other facilities essential to support the safety and welfare of motorists. This allows a range of suitable proposals to come forward wherever the need arises".<br><br>1.6. Specifically, these representations OBJECT to the deletion of Site Reference EC1-7 as a draft Allocated Employment Site from emerging Policy EC1 & Policy EC1-7 and Inset 05 - Barnetby le Wold.<br><br>1.7. These representations also suggest modifications to Publication Draft Addendum Policy TC1 (Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre and District Centre Development) and Policy T6 (Freight) to provide additional clarity and bring the policies in line with National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 109. The National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF) states at Paragraph 106 e) that planning policies should "provide for any large-scale transport facilities that need to be located in the area, and the infrastructure and wider development required to support their operation, expansion and contribution to the wider economy".<br><br>2.2. A related footnote (FN44) indicates that "policies for large scale facilities should, where necessary, be developed through collaboration between strategic policy-making authorities and other relevant bodies. Examples of such facilities include ports, airports, interchanges for rail freight, public transport projects and roadside services. The primary function of roadside services should be to support the safety and welfare of the road user (and most such proposals are unlikely to be nationally significant infrastructure projects)".<br><br>2.3. Providing safe and secure overnight parking for HGVs is a priority for the Government with the following statement provided at NPPF Paragraph 109 (emphasis added): "Planning policies and decisions should recognise the importance of providing adequate overnight lorry parking facilities, taking into account any local shortages, to reduce the risk of parking in locations that lack proper facilities or could cause a nuisance. Proposals for new or expanded distribution centres should make provision for sufficient lorry parking to cater for their anticipated use".<br><br>>>>>> |                     |  |                         |                          |                          |  |



| Rep Id | Name | Document Reference | Test of Soundness |                   |       |  | Comments | Soundness | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files |
|--------|------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--|----------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
|        |      |                    | object/ support   | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty   |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  |
|        |      |                    |                   |                   |       | <p>&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</p> <p>2.4. Alongside the NPPF, Written Ministerial Statements (WMS) are also capable of being considered by the decision-maker as material considerations within the context of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 – as confirmed by NPPF Paragraph 6. Accordingly, it is important to highlight Written Ministerial Statements issued which relate to the haulage industry and, therefore, material to the determination of the Application.</p> <p>2.5. Of particular note is the WMS published on 8 November 2021 where the Rt Hon Grant Shapps, Secretary of State for Transport, set out how the Department for Transport and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities were working together to improve hauliers' access to parking and services.</p> <p>2.6. The WMS - Planning reforms for lorry parking – sets out how the Government will seek to address the strategic national need for more lorry parking and better services in lorry parks in England. Mr Shapps set out how the departments were working with local authorities to help identify areas of lorry parking need, and identify and deliver temporary sites where short-term modular facilities could be installed. He also outlined how the planning system needed to adjust and support proposals which provide much needed additional facilities for lorry drivers, stating: "This government is also determined that the planning system should play its part in meeting the needs of hauliers and addressing current deficiencies. Planning plays a critical part in the allocation of land for lorry parking".</p> <p>2.7. Mr Shapps also references the NPPF and draws attention to NPPF Paragraph 109 which sets out that local planning policies and decisions should recognise the importance of providing adequate overnight lorry parking facilities.</p> <p>2.8. Also relevant is the WMS published on 21 May 2018 (Statement UIN HCWS698) by the then Secretary of State for Transport (Rt Hon Jesse Norman MP) under the heading 'Road Haulage Update'. The WMS announced the publication of the Government commissioned National survey of lorry parking (published 18 May 2018) which involved a comprehensive study undertaken in 2017 of the capacity and utilisation rates of overnight lorry parking facilities in England. The study also included an analysis of the welfare standards of formal facilities and of the extent of overnight parking in informal locations such as industrial estates and other locations, such as laybys. In the WMS, the minister states: "I have written with [the then] Planning Minister Dominic Raab to local planning authorities to draw their attention to the survey results, which show a strategic national need for more lorry parking and highlight shortages in specific areas". Referring to the findings of the National survey of lorry parking – which identified a theoretical excess of 3,658 vehicles that could not park in an on-site space provided in dedicated lorry parks and/or service areas –the WMS highlights a "mismatch between supply and demand" and sets out that the provision of dedicated lorry parks are a key part of the strategy needed to meet evident need for further parking spaces.</p> <p>2.9. Of further relevance is the WMS published on 22 June 2011 (Column WS113) when the then Secretary of State for Transport (Rt Hon Mike Penning MP) introduced a change in policy which now allowed the provision of lorry parks immediately adjacent to the motorway network. The WMS reiterated the Government's support for the haulage industry and acknowledged the importance and value of on-line lorry parks and dedicated rest facilities on the strategic road network.</p> <p>2.10. There is a need to provide additional, high-quality services along the M180 to cater for both the anticipated increase in HGV movements as well as addressing current under-provision. Along this key corridor, HGV drivers often have no alternative but to park up in laybys or other inappropriate off-line locations, such as industrial estates, and stop overnight. Such a situation is far from ideal and creates a number of significant social and environmental issues as well as being a genuine threat to driver welfare. These concerns are reflected within the National Survey of Lorry Parking (2017), which details parking shortage 'hotspots' and outlines the areas of the country where stakeholders felt that a shortage of lorry parking facilities is the most pronounced.</p> <p>2.11. A letter from the Rt Hon Grant Shapps, Secretary of State for Transport to the Rt Hon Huw Merriman MP, Chair of the Transport Select Committee dated 13 May 2022 reiterates that fact that the Government recognises the need to ensure hauliers have access to appropriate services and facilities. Mr Shapps' letter goes on to state that the Government are aware of the concerns expressed by many HGV drivers about the provision, quality and value of lorry parking in the UK. The letter confirms that HGV drivers will benefit from £52.5 million investment in driver facilities, including £20m National Highways funding to improve roadside facilities in addition to the £32.5m investment in HGV parking announced in the December 2021 Spending Review. The Government's Queen's Speech delivered on 10 May 2022 included a commitment to reform the planning system. Moreover, the Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill, which had its first reading on 11 May 2022, includes plans to "enable the right infrastructure to come forward where it is needed" – this is expected to include refocussing the NPPF, making changes to the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime, and empowering New Local Plan Commissioners who may be deployed to support or ultimately take over plan-making if local planning authorities fail to meet their statutory duties.</p> <p>2.12. Pertinently, the Transport Committee Road Freight Supply Chain report (HC 161 incorporating HC 828 of Session 2021-22, Published on 1 June 2022) notes the following: 35 Overnight parking facilities for HGV drivers are insufficient, especially on key road freight routes. This lack of capacity is not new; the Department's previous lorry parking survey identified it five years ago. &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</p> |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  |

| Rep Id | Name | Document Reference | Test of Soundness |                   |       |  | Comments | Soundness | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files |                          |
|--------|------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--|----------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
|        |      |                    | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty   |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  |                          |
|        |      |                    |                   |                   |       | <p>&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</p> <p>2.13. And 37. Without clear direction from the Government's planning legislation and guidance, building desperately-needed new driver's facilities, and even upgrading old ones, is a tortuous process. Local authorities in Kent, and other parts of the country where supply chain movements are prominent, face an impossible task and cannot be expected to elect to provide for lorry parks in their local plans in the face of opposition from residents impacted by such large projects. This is a national issue which requires a national Government fix.</p> <p>2.14. Strategically, the Site is very well positioned on the motorway network relative to Scunthorpe, Immingham, Grimsby, and Hull. The Humber currently accounts for 23% of all goods travelling through English ports (source: Greater Lincolnshire Local Economic Partnership). It is also anticipated that the recent Humber Region Freeport status and associated economic incentives will encourage more businesses to use the Humber and, more locally, the Port of Immingham, as their core logistics port for customs processing. Alongside this, the Council's Economic Growth Plan focuses on the opportunities of both the energy corridor stretching from the coast to South encompasses growing, logistics, processing and research and development. For North Lincolnshire to build on its strengths and locational advantages it is essential that additional Yorkshire, encompassing energy production and consumption, steel and process engineering, chemicals and associated logistics, and the food belt corridor from York to Lincoln which infrastructure is provided to support these sectors and the efficient movement of goods – HGV driver welfare is critical to this aim.</p> <p>2.15. The location of a lorry park adjacent to Junction 5 of the M180 will reduce the need for HGVs to travel greater distances away from the M180 to find places to park overnight or for rest breaks –they currently travel to locations such as industrial estates from west Scunthorpe to Grimsby Docks. These are considered inappropriate locations, conflict with other road users, and present highway safety concerns.</p> <p>2.16. There is increasing recognition that the existing infrastructure, both nationally and locally, fails to meet the needs of HGV drivers. Workloads and driving patterns are increasingly governed by a rest and recuperation approach with driver welfare at its heart. However, the shortage of safe and secure off-road parking facilities for HGVs on key transport corridors, alongside the provision of hygienic catering and bathroom facilities for HGV drivers is a major challenge facing the haulage industry. Current legislation relating to driver rest periods, combined with a proven lack of adequate rest facilities, results in many drivers having to stop in inappropriate locations – this situation creates safety and welfare issues for HGV drivers.</p> <p>2.17. In accordance with the above, it is argued that the deletion of Site Reference EC1-7 as a draft Allocated Employment Site from emerging Policy EC1 &amp; Policy EC1-7 and Inset 05 - Barnetby le Wold is not justified and not effective.</p> <p>2.18. Paragraph 1.17 of the Publication Draft Addendum is a newly inserted paragraph under 'What have we done so far' and states:"The Publication Version of the Local Plan was the preferred strategy, and the plan that it is intended to submit to the Planning Inspectorate for examination. However, in response to a handful of representations made during the consultation a focused number of changes are proposed to the Local Plan".</p> <p>2.19. Having discussed the above further with the Council's officers it is understood that, in the case of the Site, representations objecting to the allocation were received from Barnetby le Wold Parish Council, the Council for the Preservation of Rural England (North Lincolnshire), and a single member of the public. It is, therefore, considered that 3 no. comments arising from the consultation exercise do not provide sufficient justification to delete the draft Allocated Employment Site. A representation from a single member of the public does not indicate a groundswell of opinion objecting to the principle of a service station and lorry park at this location. Furthermore, any objection should be balanced and considered against the strong representations made by Brocklesby Estate in support of Policy EC1 &amp; Policy EC1-7 during the NLLPPD consultation.</p> <p>2.20. Site Reference EC1-7 is deliverable in the next 5 years and is under the control of a willing landowner. The Council will be aware that the Site is currently subject to an undetermined planning application (Planning Application Reference: PA/2021/2273) which is supported by a substantial volume of technical evidence. Accordingly, the Site is considered capable of providing up to 200 no. dedicated lorry parking spaces; an amenity building to provide rest and recuperation facilities alongside a food and beverage offer; and a fuel filling station which can easily adapt to further shifts towards electric vehicles and other renewable fuel alternatives, such as hydrogen, in the medium-to-long term.</p> <p>2.21. Whilst the permissive nature of the additions comprising Part (8) of Policy TC1 and Part (4) of T6 are welcomed, it is considered questionable whether the absolute need for additional lorry parking facilities would be delivered without a specific allocation to provide certainty of delivery. Accordingly, the strategy adopted by the Publication Draft Addendum is not considered to be effective, as the required infrastructure necessary to support the haulage industry may not be delivered over the plan period given the deletion of Site Reference EC1-7 as a draft Allocated Employment Site from emerging Policy EC1 &amp; Policy EC1-7 and Inset 05 – Barnetby.</p> <p>It is considered that it is imperative that the Local Plan can support the provision of development that meets the changing need of the freight and logistics sector – the reinsertion of Site Reference EC1-7 as an Allocated Employment Site (specifically for a "service station and lorry park") is critical to achieving this, alongside the permissive policy additions comprising Part (8) of Policy TC1 and Part (4) of Policy T6. "</p> |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |

| Rep Id | Name  | Document Reference   | Test of Soundness |                   |       |                    | Comments  | Soundness | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files         |
|--------|---|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|---|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|        |   |  | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty |   |           |               |                         |                          |                          |
| 397    | Nigel Nutting   | Policy EC1-8: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the East of the A18 | object            | yes               | no    | yes                | "The land is good agricultural land and should remain farmland. NLC were applying for AONB Status for this area, yet are considering industrial development, not exactly an aspect of beauty in the most peoples understanding of what an AONB consists of.<br><br>The increased traffic on an already busy section of road is a consideration which it seems has not been considered. At times it is very difficult to gain access onto the roundabout leaving Barnetby le Wold and a development of this nature will only add to that difficulty.<br><br>It is also very apparent that there are areas where land has been put aside for industrial development with road access, yet still remains undeveloped, so that would strongly indicate the industrial development of this site is not needed."  |           |               | no                      |                          |                          |
| 425    | William Mollett on behalf of Hemex LLP                  | Policy EC1-8: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the East of the A18 | Support           |                   |       |                    | On the mapping change EC1-7 to EC1-8 On the mapping change EC1-8 to EC1-7 Remove Site EC1-7 'Land at south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the west of the A18' Response: Supportive of this amendment to the local plan.  | yes       | yes           | yes                     |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 479    | Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England                 | Policy EC4: South Humber Bank - Landscape Initiative                               |                   |                   |       |                    | Natural England notes and welcomes the addition of criterion g) of Policy SC4 and amendments to paragraph 6.81 (formally 6.86) of the supporting text in line with the comments set out in our letter dated 26 November 2021 (our ref 371224). However we are disappointed that there is no reference to biodiversity net gain in the context of this policy.   |           |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 469    | Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency             | Paragraph 6.85   | Support           |                   |       |                    | Policy DQE6p' has been corrected to 'Policy DQE5p': '5' is correct but 'p' is a residue from the Reg 18 plan and should be removed.   |           |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 442    | Alex Willis on behalf of Associated British Ports (ABP) | Policy EC5: Wharves  | Object            |                   |       |                    | "ABP therefore welcomes the inclusion of reference to the Port of Immingham in paragraph 6.83 of the Local Plan and a Policy within it that deals with the potential development of new or extended port, wharf and jetty facilities on the Rivers Humber and Trent (Policy EC5). However, ABP objects to the proposed revised wording of Policy EC5 reproduced below (see red and underlined text):<br><br>1. Proposals for new or extended port, wharf and jetty facilities on the Rivers Humber and Trent will be permitted provided that there is no adverse impact on:<br><br>a. designated sites and protected and priority species as well as the need to account for measurable biodiversity net gain;<br>b. high quality agricultural land;<br>c. the landscape of river corridors and coastal margins;<br>d. the flood defence system;<br>e. the strategic and local road network; and,<br>f. the amenity of settlements.<br><br>g. any SAC, SPA or Ramsar Sites, or proposals will only be permitted where there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest, there is no alternative and compensatory measures are provided for the loss of designated habitat in line with the Habitats Regulations.<br><br>Existing wharf and jetty facilities on the Rivers Humber and Trent are safeguarded for cargo handling facilities. Any development which will prejudice the use of these sites for the handling of cargo will not be permitted, unless it can be proven that the use is no longer viable and that the site is not required for such purposes." |           |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 480    | Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England                 | Policy EC5: Wharves  |                   |                   |       |                    | "Natural England notes and welcomes the updates to policy EC5 and supporting paragraph 6.84 (formally 6.89) however consider that the new criterion g), while technically correct, may prove confusing for users of the Plan. We advise that the criterion is rephrased to improve clarity. For example along the lines of the following:<br><br>"g) any SAC, SPA or Ramsar Sites, or Any such proposals will only be permitted where there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest, there is no alternative and compensatory measures are provided for the loss of designated habitat in line with the Habitats Regulations.""  |           |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |

#### 7. Prosperous Town Centres

|     |  |  |         |  |  |  |   |     |     |     |  |                          |
|-----|--|--|---------|--|--|--|---|-----|-----|-----|--|--------------------------|
| 426 | William Mollett on behalf of Hemex LLP | Paragraph 7.21 - additional paragraph after Paragraph 7.20 | Support |  |  |  | "Roadside retail and other facilities will be permitted where they are necessary and provide for basic needs such as fuel, food, drink, public conveniences and parking..."<br>Response: Supportive of this amendment to the local plan.Suggested Modifications to Paragraph 7.21:<br><br>A presumption in favour of supplementary EV charging and accompanying driver service facilities where immediate access to the motorway network is available." | yes | yes | yes |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
|-----|--|--|---------|--|--|--|---|-----|-----|-----|--|--------------------------|

| Rep Id | Name                                       | Document Reference   | Test of Soundness |                   |       |                    | Comments  | Soundness           | Modifications  | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files         |
|--------|--|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|---|---------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|        |  |  | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty |   |                     |  |                         |                          |                          |
| 380    | William Mollett on behalf of Hemex LLP     | Paragraph 7.21 - additional paragraph after Paragraph 7.20 | support           | yes               | yes   | yes                | Allows better public consultation and planning consideration for roadside sites which may come forward in the area dedicated to serve the needs of M180 exclusively.  | positively prepared | EV charging & motorway restaurant services may be located at the M180/A15 interchange adjacent to the roundabout and between the existing petrol station/EV chargers and the A15 Humber Bridge approach road.<br><br>This would improve existing facilities and availability directly off the M180/A15 and offer the motorist better certainty and choice for en route charging.<br><br>Such schemes are primarily to serve the National Highways network, therefore the sequential test for a town centre alternative should not be considered so significant where such a town centre or edge of town centre would not provide a direct service to the motorway and would otherwise create traffic to and from the motorway network in supplying the same facility." | no                      |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 391    | James Rigby on behalf of Brocklesby Estate | Paragraph 7.21 - additional paragraph after Paragraph 7.20 | object            | yes               | no    | yes                | <p>"Roadside retail and other facilities will be permitted where they are necessary and provide for basic needs such as fuel, food, drink, public conveniences and parking, which are essential to support the safety and welfare of motorists and lorry drivers. The scale and nature of roadside facilities would need to be appropriate to their location, and safely accessible and, where possible, located within a settlement. They should not become a destination in their own right. Proposals would need to meet an identified need in a particular location, which means demonstrating that no suitable alternative facilities exist that could meet those needs. For example, it is unlikely a mobile food outlet would be appropriate close to a village which already has a service station providing for basic food needs.</p> <p>3. SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS</p> <p>SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS TO PUBLICATION DRAFT ADDENDUM POLICY TC1 (RETAIL HIERARCHY AND TOWN CENTRE AND DISTRICT CENTRE DEVELOPMENT)</p> <p>3.1. Notwithstanding Brocklesby Estates objection to the deletion of Site Reference EC1-7 as a draft Allocated Employment Site from emerging Policy EC1 &amp; Policy EC1-7 and Inset 05, the permissive policy addition comprising Part (8) of Policy TC1 is generally welcomed should the Site not be reinserted as an Allocated Employment Site.</p> <p>3.2. Newly inserted Paragraph 7.21 is considered to be poorly drafted and onerous, therefore, Brocklesby Estate object to this paragraph. Department for Transport Circular 02/2013 sets out the roadside facilities perform an important road safety function by providing opportunities for the travelling public to stop and take a break in the course of their journey . It goes on to state that the network of service areas on the strategic road network has been developed on the premise that opportunities to stop are provided at intervals of approximately half an hour . Compliance with DfT Circular 02/2013 and driver welfare considerations dictate that the location of roadside facilities should be located either on-line or within close proximity to a junction. When considering Paragraph 7.21 it is important to draw a clear distinction between roadside related services " such as drive-thru units " and more conventional town centre uses defined in NPPF Annex 2. Of particular relevance is an appeal decision relating to a proposed drive-thru restaurant in Oxfordshire to be operated by McDonalds Restaurants Limited " in this case the application was refused by Cherwell District Council and considered at a Hearing led by Inspector Amanda Blicq . Inspector Blicq allowed the appeal and makes the following statement immediately after the formal decision at the start of the appeal decision notice (emphasis added):</p> <p>Procedural Matters</p> <p>2. The development is categorised as a town centre use in the Glossary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). As the appeal site is within the countryside, the appellant has carried out a sequential test to support the application at the appeal site as required by Paragraph 24 of the Framework. However, the purpose of the sequential test is to demonstrate that there are no alternative sites within a town centre or edge of centre locations. Given that the purpose of this development is to provide roadside facilities for motorists on the A43, which by definition is unlikely to be within a town centre, I consider the sequential test to be of little relevance to this appeal and this was confirmed by the Council at the hearing. Furthermore, the Councils statement notes that disputing whether or not there are alternative sites available will not be beneficial to either party. The Council also confirmed at the hearing that the question of alternative sites does not arise in this case, as there are none under consideration.</p> <p>3.3. Accordingly, it is considered that Paragraph 7.21 is not consistent with national policy and, consequently, is not sound. Specifically, placing a requirement for facilities to be where possible located within a settlement fails to recognise the needs of motorist are best served by facilities which are either online or close to a junction. It is suggested that where possible, located within a settlement is deleted. Similarly, the final sentence of Paragraph 7.21 incorrectly infers that opportunities for the travelling public to stop and take a break in the course of their journey can be met through an existing facility in a nearby settlement. This is contrary to national policy and the guidance within DfT Circular 02/2013.</p> |                     |  |                         |                          |                          |

| Rep Id | Name | Document Reference | Test of Soundness |                   |       |                    | Comments   | Soundness                       | Modifications  | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments   | Additional Files         |
|--------|------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|--------------------------|
|        |      |                    | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty |  |                                 |  |                         |  |                          |
|        |      |                    |                   |                   |       |                    | >>>>><br>3.4. The nearest designated centre to the Site (and associated edge of centre) is Brigg town centre as defined by Inset 10 (Brigg, Scawby Brook & Castlethorpe) of the Housing and Employment Land Allocations Development Plan Document (HELA DPD), located approximately 6 kilometres (straight-line distance) south-west of the Site " this amounts to a 7-minute drive and a 6.5km drive distance from the Site and Junction 5 of the M180. East-bound traffic on the M180 would essentially have to double-back this distance, adding approximately 13km to their onward journey and, in turn, resulting in further unnecessary vehicle emissions. Consistent with the reasoning applied by Inspector Blicq in relation to the Oxfordshire appeal, it is well established that roadside related services such as the proposed drive-thru units need to be convenient and accessible to the passing motorist. Any detour from the main motorway or trunk road network should be minimal with traffic contained to avoid mixing and adding unnecessarily to local traffic flows.<br><br>3.5. In summary, it is suggested that Publication Draft Addendum Paragraph 7.21 is modified in accordance with the wording below. Text to be deleted is shown in strikethrough and new text is in bold underlined.<br><br>7.21. Roadside retail and other facilities will be permitted where they are necessary and provide for basic needs such as fuel, food, drink, public conveniences and parking, which are essential to support the safety and welfare of motorists and lorry drivers. The scale and nature of roadside facilities would need to be appropriate to their location, and safely accessible and, where possible, located within a settlement. They should not become a destination in their own right. Proposals would need to meet an identified need in a particular location., which means demonstrating that no suitable alternative facilities exist that could meet those needs. For example, it is unlikely a mobile food outlet would be appropriate close to a village which already has a service station providing for basic food needs." " | Consistent with national policy | Roadside retail and other facilities will be permitted where they are necessary and provide for basic needs such as fuel, food, drink, public conveniences and parking, which are essential to support the safety and welfare of motorists and lorry drivers. The scale and nature of roadside facilities would need to be appropriate to their location, and safely accessible and, where possible, located within a settlement. They should not become a destination in their own right. Proposals would need to meet an identified need in a particular location., which means demonstrating that no suitable alternative facilities exist that could meet those needs. For example, it is unlikely a mobile food outlet would be appropriate close to a village which already has a service station providing for basic food needs." | yes                     | "Attendance at the hearing sessions is considered necessary to fully represent the interests of our client, Brocklesby Estate, and to ensure that the Inspector has the opportunity to ask any further questions (if deemed necessary) on the content of these representations." | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |

### 11. Creating Sustainable Communities and Better Places

|     |   |   |         |     |     |     |   |  |  |  |     |                          |
|-----|---|---|---------|-----|-----|-----|---|--|--|--|-----|--------------------------|
| 484 | Ian Stuart on behalf of Keigar Homes        | Policy CSC2 Health Care Provision       | Object  |     |     |     | "The Addendum proposes a change to the policy by reducing the "cut-in" point from 11 or more dwellings to 10 or more and by increasing S.106 contributions by approximately £56 per dwelling. This is an additional cost which will have to be passed on to the purchasers of dwellings. There appears to be no evidence to justify such an increase whilst the policy lacks the flexibility to take account of changing circumstances. It is noted that the inclusion of such a precise figure is not in line with other infrastructure requirements in policies relating to such things as education.<br><br>Objection: For these reasons we object on the grounds that it fails the test of soundness in not being positively prepared and not justified.<br><br>Modification: The present text of sub paragraph 7 should be deleted and replaced with the following: "The level of S 106 contributions per dwelling should be calculated on an analysis of future requirements and standardised BCIS building rates for health centre accommodation".<br><br>Hearing Sessions: Keigar Homes wishes to participate in hearing sessions because as a very experienced local company it feels well able to contribute to the debate. |  |  |  |     | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 366 | Simon Morgan                                | Policy CSC12: 1h                        | support | yes | yes | yes | "This comment relates to policy CSC13 - burial ground and cemetery provision. The online form does not include any paragraph of this policy on the document reference drop down.<br><br>The allocation in Barton Upon Humber is fully supported, and fully addresses the objection I made in the publication draft (Stage 4) consultation, reference R190400083."   |  |  |  | yes |                          |
| 470 | Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency | Policy CSC17: Camping and Caravan Sites | Support |     |     |     | We note point d has been added in line our representation on the Regulation 19 Plan.  |  |  |  |     | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |

### 12. Planning for a Sustainable Supply of Minerals

|     |   |  |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |                          |
|-----|---|--|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| 402 | Mike Daley on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council | Chapter 12 Planning for a Sustainable Supply of Minerals | Support |  |  |  | "Thank you for including Lincolnshire County Council in the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2020 – 038) – Publication Draft Addendum Consultation. Further to our previous consultation response, we have taken account of the findings of the updated Minerals Background Paper (March 2022) in conjunction with the amendments to the minerals related policies in the North Lincolnshire Local Plan_ Publication Draft Addendum Plan (May 2022). The updated evidence and policies provided set out an appropriate and sound approach to the provision of Minerals for the duration of the plan period. Consequently, the issues identified in our previous consultation response(s) have been satisfied." |  |  |  |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 411 | Paul Foster on behalf of Egdon Resources            | "Policy MIN6: Mineral Sites, point 1 MIN6-14a"           | Support |  |  |  | "We welcome the inclusion of the Wressle wellsite in the policy as MIN6-14a: Wressle (Oil). However, the appeal decision granting planning permission allowing for the production of both oil and gas. Therefore, we wish to see "and Gas" added after "Oil"."   |  |  |  |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 418 | Emilie Carr on behalf of Historic England           | "Policy MIN6: Mineral Sites, point 1 MIN6-14a"           | Unsound |  |  |  | Please see detailed comments for MIN6-17 and MIN6-18 within Appendix B of the previous response.   |  |  |  |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |

### 13. Sustainable Waste Management

|     |   |                 |         |  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |                          |
|-----|---|-----------------|---------|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| 471 | Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency | Paragraph 13.15 | Support |  |  |  | The additional text states that the assessment takes into account the Waste Framework Directives (2008) and the NPPF and National Planning Policy for Waste. You may wish to note whether it takes into account the Environment Act 2021 to move towards a circular economic model. |  |  |  |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
|-----|---|-----------------|---------|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|

| Rep Id                                   | Name                                       | Document Reference                    | Test of Soundness |                   |       |                    | Comments   | Soundness                       | Modifications   | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments   | Additional Files         |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|--|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------|--|--------------------------|
|  |  |                                       | object/ support   | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty |  |                                 |   |                         |  |                          |
| <b>14. Connecting North Lincolnshire</b> |  |                                       |                   |                   |       |                    |  |                                 |   |                         |  |                          |
| 367                                      | Simon Morgan                               | Policy T2: Promoting Public Transport | support           | yes               | yes   | yes                | "The proposed change fully addresses the objection I made in the consultation on the publication draft (stage 4), reference R190400085."   |                                 |   |                         |  |                          |
| 392                                      | James Rigby on behalf of Brocklesby Estate | Policy T6: Freight                    | object            | yes               | no    | yes                | <p>"SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS TO PUBLICATION DRAFT ADDENDUM POLICY T6 (FREIGHT)</p> <p>3.6. Notwithstanding Brocklesby Estates objection to the deletion of Site Reference EC1-7 as a draft Allocated Employment Site from emerging Policy EC1 &amp; Policy EC1-7 and Inset 05, the permissive policy addition comprising Part (4) of Policy T6 is welcomed should the Site not be reinserted as an Allocated Employment Site.</p> <p>3.7. Whilst the spirit of Part (4) of Policy T6 is supported, Brocklesby Estate wish to object to the current wording of the policy. Specifically, it is suggested that Part (4) should be revised so it is consistent with national policy and, in particular, NPPF Paragraph 109 and DfT Circular 02/2013 which sets out lorry parking facilities should be located within close proximity to the strategic road network .</p> <p>3.8. It is suggested that Publication Draft Addendum Policy T6 (Freight), Part (4) is modified in accordance with the wording below.</p> <p>4. Overnight lorry parking facilities located within close proximity to the strategic road network and essential to support the safety and welfare of drivers will be permitted, where they are of an appropriate scale, meet an identified need, and can be accessed safely."</p>   | Consistent with national policy | "Overnight lorry parking facilities located within close proximity to the strategic road network and essential to support the safety and welfare of drivers will be permitted, where they are of an appropriate scale, meet an identified need, and can be accessed safely."  | yes                     | "Attendance at the hearing sessions is considered necessary to fully represent the interests of our client, Brocklesby Estate, and to ensure that the Inspector has the opportunity to ask any further questions (if deemed necessary) on the content of these representations." | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 457                                      | James Rigby on behalf of Brocklesby Estate | Policy T6: Freight                    | Object            |                   |       |                    | "Whilst the spirit of Part (4) of Policy T6 is supported, Brocklesby Estate wish to object to the current wording of the policy. Specifically, it is suggested that Part (4) should be revised so it is consistent with national policy and, in particular, NPPF Paragraph 109 and DfT Circular 02/2013 which sets out lorry parking facilities should be located within close proximity to the strategic road network. It is suggested that Publication Draft Addendum Policy T6 (Freight), Part (4) is modified in accordance with the wording below. Text to be deleted is shown in strikethrough and new text is 4. Off-road overnight lorry parking facilities located within close proximity to the in bold underlined. Policy T6 (Freight) strategic road network and essential to support the safety and welfare of drivers will be permitted, where they are of an appropriate scale, meet an identified need, and can be accessed safely."   |                                 |   |                         |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 372                                      | Ursula Vickerton                           | Paragraph 14.47                       | support           | yes               | no    | no                 | <p>"Over 30 years ago our Council was consulting on a relief road for Barton upon Humber. Since 2020 the council has allowed a massive number of more houses to be built mainly in NE of town, on the last plan zoned for industry without a junior school or adequate infrastructure.</p> <p>The central core, of an old town with 200 plus listed buildings mainly in the central conservation area, has been pounded day and night by extra heavy and light traffic as a result of NLC actions.</p> <p>I support the new route of the relief road but THIS IS NEEDED NOW... since the planning permissions and extra funding from council tax and WREN manufacturing site, doubling in size has already been received. To be told at the consultation evening, that an application for this funding would be made for the period to 2032 is not FAIR or GOOD ENOUGH.</p> <p>Barton upon Humber has a special/ unique built environment and it and the residents needs the RELIEF ROAD As Soon As Possible and not decades away. The original consultation was over 30 years ago.</p> <p>NLC promised and purchased a site for a 4th infant junior school in the NE of the town where the majority of these houses were built. Instead of building this 4th infant/ junior school, NLC SOLD this site for more building and in the current proposal intends to extend Bowmandale School in the SW and with no public transport services and the most distant from the new housing. Requiring even more vehicle traffic and not providing a school local to the children living in the new housing area of the town."</p> |                                 | "see above for suggestions... Also poor consultation below<br>People attending the brief public consultation event on 20 June 2022 4-7pm.<br>The Council employees did not even know the key used.<br>There were no paper copies of feedback forms to allow views to be gathered at the event by people who do not have computer access.<br>Time and again we were referred to the NLC Planning Portal to view material and express our views.<br>Only on questioning did the receive the information to build even the small stretch of NEW Road, NLC would apply for capital funding in the period to 2032! The Road needs to be built NOW since the Houses and Industry have been built already and the extra traffic is here now. TO give no timescale for the now decided relief road at this event was MISLEADING." | no                      |  |                          |
| 374                                      | Phil Vickerton                             | Paragraph 14.47                       | object            | yes               | no    | no                 | <p>"Barton Link Road.</p> <p>I have attended several poorly presented, vague ""public Consultations"" on this matter. My comments are;</p> <p>1) this latest proposal is probably the better route.</p> <p>2) However detail is lacking. proposals to use the existing Caistor Road and B1206 look fine on paper, but take no account of the narrow width of the roads, bends (B1206) and gradients (Caistor Road). These roads are barely adequate for 2 lorries to pass currently. Try cycling along them.</p> <p>3) Being country roads, these routes also have significant farm traffic.</p> <p>4) How is current traffic (particularly Wren lorries, often articulated and with double trailers) to be persuaded to take this longer route rather than directly through Barton Centre?</p> <p>5) The interchange with the A15 is already a poor design, with poor visibility of, and for, traffic joining the A15 (both directions). Increased traffic use with worsen this situation."</p>   |                                 | "1) Improvements needed to existing Caistor Road and B1206 to accommodate a higher traffic load with a high proportion of HGV and farming machinery usage.<br>2) Improvements needed for improved visibility of/for vehicles joining/leaving at the interchange with the A15.<br>3) Enforcement provision to ban/ restrict HGV passage through Barton Town centre."   | no                      |  |                          |

| Rep Id | Name   | Document Reference | Test of Soundness |                   |       |                    | Comments   | Soundness                       | Modifications  | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments  | Additional Files |
|--------|--|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------|---|------------------|
|        |  |                    | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty |  |                                 |  |                         |   |                  |
| 375    | Lorraine Stanley                                       | Paragraph 14.47    | support           | yes               | yes   | yes                | "I support the proposed new route via Caistor Road and to the existing junction with A15, which, although needing some new Road and road improvements in some areas, would utilise existing HGV- suitable roads.<br><br>In addition, a weight limit through Barton would ensure that all HGV traffic except loading would be pushed out of the town, leaving more space for cars, further reducing congestion and improving safety for pedestrians and cyclists and the environment for all.<br><br>Vehicle and noise pollution would also be reduced."  | justified                       |  |                         |   |                  |
| 383    | Timothy Woollard                                       | Paragraph 14.47    | support           | yes               | yes   | yes                | I support the modification to change the Barton Link Road indicative route to the Updated Option 1 on the proposals map. The provision of a roundabout at A1077/Falkland Way/Link Road should be the first priority. I believe that the upgrading of the the section of Caistor Road from the proposed Link Road to B1206 should take place before the construction of the new Link Road itself from the A1077 to Caistor Road.  |                                 |  |                         |   |                  |
| 384    | Neil Jacques   | Paragraph 14.47    | object            | yes               | no    | no                 | "The aim of a relief road for Barton is to move the optimum amount of car and lorry traffic from using the A1077 through the Town Centre. The revised route will not achieve this for the traffic heading north as nobody with climate change and fuel costs in mind will travel south to go north.<br><br>The route was chosen by a questionable public vote which should not be binding as it was open to fraud. The on line survey enabled people to vote multiple times. The final decision should be made on what is best for the Town to achieve the aim of having a relief road, not a small sample of the population swayed by a pressure group with vested interests."  | Consistent with national policy | "Design a route that meets the aim of removing traffic from the Town. Falklands way looping south round to town to join Horkstow Road at the existing bridge over the A15 and re joining the A1077 west of the Humber Bridge roundabout near Gravel Pit Lane. This option was not even put to the ""vote""."   | yes                     | To emphasise that the proposed route fails to achieve the aim of traffic reduction and seek consideration of the Horkstow Rd alternative.                               |                  |
| 387    | Ian Lawless  | Paragraph 14.47    | object            | no                | no    | no                 | "It is regrettable that the consultation with some of the people of Barton resulted in the decision of North Lincolnshire Council deciding not to run with either of the Councils past proposals. The manner of the consultation which allowed 2 self interest groups to be involved with the proposal without publicly inviting any other groups to be involved, does not seem right. There has been no public invitation for people to be involved in working with the Council in making a proposal to the consultation. Further, we never seemed to have any support from our own politicians for the Councils proposal which would eventually lead to a proper town bypass connecting to the A15. How the votes were counted also appears open to fraud. Once phase 2 of WREN is open, which will create 1100 new jobs, Barton roads will become more clogged with this additional car traffic. The new relief road only creates a truck bypass which the Council will force the lorry drivers to use. This will add an additional 2-3 miles of journey and use much extra diesel. How environmentally friendly is this, not to mention the thousands of cars driving through our town centre and other residential roads. And don't forget the 500+ homes being added out by the WREN factory. So this is not meeting the overall objective of removing traffic from the town centre, only some lorries, if the Council can force them off an A road. There is also an additional technical note 2 (25/03/2022) from Local Transport Projects, a consultant hired by North Lincs Council, making a comment on the legality of making trucks use the route, which states: 'Where operators can demonstrate that their costs would exceed the scheme benefits, they would be potentially able to successfully object to the making of the TRO on the basis of the scheme being inequitable.<br><br>Do you think WREN will want to add the additional mileage charges to their delivery costs? There might be a fight on with a legitimate claim. I would ask that the final approving authority investigate how the consultation case was organized, without full involvement of the residents of Barton. I would also ask that a proper vote, which was what the consultation turned out to be, be run like an election or referendum with a simple question: Do you want a bypass of Barton connecting eventually to the A15 as originally suggested by the Council? If North Lincolnshire Council really wants a true opinion of the people of Barton, this is the way forward. So spending £12 million of tax payers funds on a non effective route in ludicrous and I would ask the final approval authority to look at how public funds might be spent in arriving at a solution which does not address the issue of the thousands of cars coming through the centre of Barton every day.'" effective |                                 | "The decision process is not legal, if the decision was based on all of Barton people being involved in the ""vote"". If this was a vote and not a consultation only, then a vote should be held as any normal election process, especially with the sums of money involved.<br><br>Further, the legality of making trucks use the new route has not been answered by the Council in writing, which would be a complete waste of money if trucks are forced to use a B road instead of an A road."                                 | yes                     | "I would consider it necessary only if representations are being heard from the other side. If the Committee were deciding themselves, then it would not be necessary." |                  |
| 390    | Wendy Bannerman on behalf of The British Horse Society | Paragraph 14.47    | object            | yes               | no    | yes                | "The revised relief road plans appear to cross the Viking Way, a promoted route and national trail, Bridleway Thornton/Barton 34. the PRow is severed by the current road network. How does the authority plan to protect the vulnerable road users following the trail and provide safe passage for them to connect from BW 34 Thornton Curtis to BW 34 Barton Upon Humber?<br><br>The North Lincolnshire ROWIP commits to promoting recreational routes for walkers, horse riders and cyclists eg bridleways. The Active Travel agenda provides for vulnerable road users: Jesse Norman in House of Commons debate on Road Safety, 5 November 2018 said:<br><br>We should be clear that the cycling and walking strategy may have that name but is absolutely targeted at vulnerable road users, including horse-riders. Final point by Jesse Norman in debate: Horse riders are vulnerable road users" there is no doubt about that, and there never has been" and they have been included in the work we are doing.  | Consistent with national policy | "To explore options to connect the PRow as part of the proposed development in order to safeguard vulnerable road users including equestrians. For example, light controlled crossing. The BHS has detailed guidance to ensure all users are included and developers meet requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and associated legislation. See further guidance via <a href="https://www.bhs.org.uk/advice-and-information/free-leaflets-and-advice">https://www.bhs.org.uk/advice-and-information/free-leaflets-and-advice</a> " | no                      |   |                  |
| 393    | Christopher Snell                                      | Paragraph 14.47    | object            | no                | no    | no                 | "The process to arrive at the decision not to go with the Councils first plan is flawed. If you want a vote on the issue it should be done as a ballot so that all the people of Barton can vote. The way in which the vote was done was an open vote in which you could repeatedly vote by pressing a button online and it did not require a postcode. It is a system set up to be unfair and abused.<br><br>The manner in which the consultation was conducted allowed 2 interested groups to be involved with the proposal without publicly inviting any other groups to be involved. >>>>>   |                                 |  |                         |   |                  |

| Rep Id | Name                                 | Document Reference | Test of Soundness |                   |       |                    | Comments  | Soundness           | Modifications   | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments   | Additional Files         |
|--------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|---|---------------------|---|-------------------------|--|--------------------------|
|        |                                      |                    | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty |   |                     |   |                         |  |                          |
|        |                                      |                    |                   |                   |       |                    | >>>>><br>Additional comments<br>You have no confirmation that you can force the trucks onto a B road. As per the technical report by your consultants.<br>The current proposal does not solve the problem of the traffic in the town, there are hundreds of cars that will not use the truck relief road, cars which start to arrive after 5am. This proposal is inadequate and pointless."   | positively prepared | "A proper vote and a proper consultation with all parties allowed to vote, with a voting system. Don't only invite selected parties i.e, the people that don't want the original planned road."   | yes                     | I would like to ensure a balanced view.  |                          |
| 394    | Ralph Norfolk                        | Paragraph 14.47    | object            | yes               | no    | yes                | "There seems to be no indication that HCV can be forced to use the relief road. Unless this can be guaranteed, with the current route encompassing a 10 km journey extension foot traffic heading North, and a longer journey time I think that the development of this road will not accomplish its aims."   | effective           |   |                         |  |                          |
| 398    | Colin Ronald McCorkindale            | Paragraph 14.47    | object            | no                | no    | no                 | "As a resident of Barton, I have issue with the proposed link road choice.<br>The current and future traffic volumes (following the opening of Wren phase 2) are not addressed by this option.<br>Whilst in theory hgvs will be forced to utilise the route, the additional 1100 Wren employees will not.<br>Even at current traffic levels they represent a nuisance in both morning and evening, this will be further exacerbated as the proposed route is not joined up with the wider needs for traffic control in the town.<br>The previous proposal supported by the local council was a better option as it linked to the A15 close to town and would be more attractive for the Wren traffic to utilise." | effective           | Refer to comment above  | no                      |  |                          |
| 399    | Carol Brandrick-Dyke                 | Paragraph 14.47    | object            | no                | no    | no                 | "All of the people were not asked to vote for the council's original plan. It was called a consultation which was turned into a vote by the council. This was not explained to the people at the beginning. Also, the consultation allowed 2 self interest groups to be involved without allowing or informing anyone else that they could be involved.<br>To correct this, a vote for the scheme should be sent to all residents, similar to an election. This way the many people who cannot use the internet can make comments and vote."  | effective           | "To make this plan effective, it should follow either of the 2 schemes which the Council had previously presented to us. This scheme might only divert lorries, if the council can legally force lorries from an A road to a B road. Their own consultants say this might not be possible." | no                      |  |                          |
| 400    | Alison Jenkins                       | Paragraph 14.47    | object            | no                | no    | no                 | "The consultation for the truck relief road did not involve all residents of Barton. A consultation is not a vote, but it was turned into a vote. For such a major issue all of the people should have been asked to vote, like a referendum or election.<br>Further, the Council has not provided any written confirmation saying that they can force trucks to use a B road from an A road. Why would we spend this amount of money without knowing this answer.<br>The council never invited any parties to participate in the planning consultation, only 2 self interest groups, who were self serving?"   | effective           | The bypass should connect eventually to the A15 as originally promised by the Council.  | no                      |  |                          |
| 401    | Adrian Branderick                    | Paragraph 14.47    | object            | no                | no    | no                 | "At no time were, other parties invited to participate in the writing of the consultation documents, like the 2 self interest groups were.<br>At no time were people residing in Barton told the consultation would result in a final plan. The council's previous plans did not. Why not have a full vote for all residents (as many do not have internet skills) like an election.<br>Lastly, the Council's own consultants state that they might not have a case to force trucks onto a B road from an A road. Is this not the first step before spending 12 million pounds?"  | effective           | This does not address removing cars from the centre of the town and might not even rectify lorry traffic. The Council has nowhere shown in writing that they can force the cars to use the much longer diversion.   | no                      |  |                          |
| 440    | Peter Dixon                          | Paragraph 14.47    | Support           |                   |       |                    | Is anything actually happening? I don't care which plan is being suggested as long as something happens to stop this relentless traffic crashing through Barton.  |                     |   |                         |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 445    | Ian Stuart on behalf of Keigar Homes | Paragraph 14.47    | Support           |                   |       |                    | "It is now proposed that the link road should merely run from Barrow Road to Caister Road. In principle this is supported although the precise alignment and funding arrangements are questionable.<br>Hearing Sessions: Keigar Homes wishes to participate in hearing sessions because as a very experienced local company it feels well able to contribute to the debate. In particular the company is currently developing land in the locality and has a continuing interest in the area."  |                     |   | yes                     | Keigar Homes wishes to participate in hearing sessions because as a very experienced local company it feels well able to contribute to the debate. In particular the company is currently developing land in the locality and has a continuing interest in the area. | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 447    | David Medd                           | Paragraph 14.47    | Object            |                   |       |                    | "Having read a random newsletter delivered to my property on Ferriby Road, Barton upon Humber, I'm dismayed and disgusted months of meetings and proposals have failed, to provide Barton with a much needed relief road.<br>Comments from Wren Kitchens of apparent additional fuel costs by trucks adding mileage to their journey. Wren Kitchens must generate millions in revenue annually. Owned by the Healey's who reside near Hull, probably wouldn't want the same heavy traffic near their residence especially the sleepy village of Hotham where Malcom Healey himself resides. The wealthy businessman worth over £1 billion! >>>>>  |                     |   |                         |  |                          |



| Rep Id | Name                                 | Document Reference | Test of Soundness |                   |       |  | Comments | Soundness | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions  | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files |
|--------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--|----------|-----------|---------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
|        |                                      |                    | object/ support   | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty   |          |           |               |                          |                          |                  |
|        |                                      |                    |                   |                   |       | >>>>><br>Barton doesn't need the added traffic to an already chaotic town centre. To read the findings that a relief road is now looking to be not happening is preposterous. I shall personally now seriously be thinking of selling my property in a bid to escape the mayhem in the town centre caused by Wren Kitchens and their employees."   |          |           |               |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                  |
| 452    | Helen Wilkinson                      | Paragraph 14.47    | Object            |                   |       | "I wish to make some short representations in regards to the current consultation on the proposed Barton Link Road.<br><br>I understand that the proposals to safeguard the Barton Link Road route would form a link road through a proposed development forming part of a housing allocation, to join the A1077/ Falkland Way to Caistor Road and connect to the A15 Bonby Lodge interchange via the B1206.<br><br>I have a number of concerns with this proposal, including the effects on the area around the proposed upgrading of Caister Road. The hamlet of Deepdale is likely to bear the brunt of the proposed works, especially during any upgrading or installation of a new roundabout, despite lying within a Special Landscape Area; this designation and any potential impacts upon it, should be considered in full prior to the route being safeguarded to ensure there are no negative impacts, or that any impacts can be effectively mitigated. Additional landscaping along the safeguarded route should be considered, providing screening, reducing travelling noise but also enhancing biodiversity.<br><br>I appreciate that currently, the Local Plan is only seeking to safeguard the proposed route, however the currently proposed link road could act as a precursor to wider development in this area, leading to urban sprawl beyond current development limits to the south-east of Barton, negatively impacting the Special Landscape Area and the open countryside. Developments shouldn't be considered in isolation, and a more holistic approach should be considered as to the wider and longer term impacts of safeguarding this route. Indeed, the Barton Link Road Technical Note 2 Final Issue 25.03.2022 document, which I note is not subject to this consultation, considered that the proposed link road in its current form could 'unlock potential future development land to the south-east and east of Barton.'<br><br>One less invasive option could be to upgrade the existing Burnham Road/Caistor Road junction, rather than commit to a new roundabout, which will be of a significant expense and cause significant disruption. Whatever the solution, if the proposed route is safeguarded, mitigation measures to reduce through traffic, such traffic calming measures and weight limitations are essential along Burnham Road to not only protect residential amenity, but to also help to conserve the Special Landscape Area and the associated ecology. Burnham Road is a country lane with no road markings and is not suitable for an increase in traffic. |          |           |               | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                          |                  |
| 458    | Ian Lawless on behalf of Jane Kirkby | Paragraph 14.47    | Object            |                   |       | "Having been informed that final plans for a Barton relief road would be put forward by North Lincs own consultants, at a town meeting, I question how did it evolve that 2 self interest parties were allowed to present and advise on the subject.<br><br>The relief road being considered fails to provide the infrastructure needed to relieve the traffic problems within the town. WREN personnel commuting from the North bank, are as much an issue as the trucks. Even when in place there is no promise that lorries can be removed from the town centre. Surely a road to the south of the town to Brigg road and then which can eventually connect to the A15 can provide the infrastructure necessary for future industrial and residential growth of the town.<br><br>Unless internet savvy, it has been virtually impossible to follow the course of this enquiry. Reflecting in a vote of (700) surely does not represent a fair portion of the towns population. Proposed traffic signals at Holydyke/ Ferriby Road:<br><br>When traffic lights have been erected during recent roads works, it has caused huge backlogs through the town and distressing noise/ pollution problems from some residents. The present system works better. Three lanes of traffic would force vehicles even closer to the cottages on North Holydyke."   |          |           |               | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                          |                  |
| 461    | Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group | Paragraph 14.47    | Object            |                   |       | "a) Positively prepared – there is no objectively assessed need for the road and this would therefore be inappropriate development in the countryside that is not outweighed by evidence.<br>b) Justified – Proportionate evidence in relation to Ecology impact; heritage, the costs of the road; light pollution; Landscape impact has not been provided.<br>c) Effective – the road is not deliverable as the costing is inaccurate and incomplete. The source of finance for this road is also undefined therefore it is unclear who will pay for this road, and when.<br>d) Consistent with national policy – The proposed Link road would contradict NPPF 130, 131, 153, 174, 185. Amongst other impacts, landscape and climate change have not been considered."<br><br>"Unsustainable pattern of growth into Countryside Policy area, away from main arterial transport corridor.<br><br>New carriageway section in consistent with national policy (longer journey times, undesirable; economic impact on Town centre of banning HGVs (deliveries); environmental impact of building a physical structure on Grade 2 agri land; landscape impact has not been properly assessed<br><br>Climate change – NPPF 8c) aims to minimise pollution. The elongated vehicular routes that would be created by the proposed link road would unnecessarily extend vehicle journeys and would therefore be contrary to this point. The 'disposal of unacceptable material' >>>>>  |          |           |               |                          |                          |                  |

| Rep Id | Name                                 | Document Reference | Test of Soundness |                   |       |   | Comments | Soundness | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files |
|--------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|---|----------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
|        |                                      |                    | object/ support   | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty  |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  |
|        |                                      |                    |                   |                   |       | <p>&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</p> <p>and associated haulage would have a significant environmental impact in terms of creation of waste and air pollution – this environmental impact has not been properly considered in the context of climate change. there has been no comparison of the increased journey times/ carbon impact versus the environmental impact of keeping HGVs in the town. The focus of the assessment centres around traffic numbers albeit the conclusions of the report are not conclusive. No consideration has been given to any carbon offsetting for the new road nor to the associated costs. Further justification in terms of pedestrian/ cyclist/ AQ benefits in the town centre should be evidenced/ reported as they are necessary in order to substantiate the logic behind the road.</p> <p>Tree-lined streets – “Planning policies ... should ensure that new streets are tree-lined” – this cost has not been considered by the Council. This should encompass the initial cost of the trees being bought and planted, as well as the ongoing maintenance costs which would inevitably fall to the Council. Whilst proving that the proposal is economically unsustainable, it also demonstrates that NLC have ignored NPPF policies.</p> <p>Landscape - the proposed upgrade to the section of Caistor Road would fall within the protected “Deepdale” (policy DQE1 8.f) Landscape area. Insufficient consideration has been given toward the light pollution that would arise from the proposed road alignment; the increase in light pollution would cause detriment to the wider countryside policy area and to the ‘Deepdale’ Landscape designation. The topography of the proposed link road, and the NPPF requirement (131) for new streets to be treelined would introduce a significant new feature in the landscape. As the proposed development of a new link road would introduce large physical features and introduce more traffic, intensifying the use of the existing road (hence more noise and pollution); it would blatantly contradict the Council’s own policy wording under DQE1 1. The proposed link road would also contradict NPPF 20 d (conservation of landscapes); 130 c; 153, 174; 185 c.</p> <p>Ecology – planning application 2021/0151 was refused due to its impacts upon the Humber Estuary. The impact of the proposed link road upon the Humber Estuary have not been proportionately assessed. The loss of hedgerows associated with the proposed link road have also not been properly quantified or considered.</p> <p>HCV restrictions would have inevitable impacts upon businesses in Barton town Centre that would be limited in receiving deliveries and would have impacts on locations to the east of Barton, such as Barrow upon Humber. A weight restriction was not deemed to be necessary at the time of consideration of the Wren Kitchen site planning application, therefore there is no justifiable need at this point. “4 HCV’s per hour” in the peak hour would not necessitate a weight restriction and would undermine the Council’s assertion as to the necessity of this link road. The enforcement of a restriction is unrealistic and uneconomical.</p> <p>The need for the road has not been robustly justified; the purpose of the scheme seems to be to displace lorries from the Town Centre rather than to meet an identified lack of capacity in the town. This scheme is more of a highway environmental scheme rather than a scheme necessary as a result of development and there is no explanation in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan about this road or how it will be financed. It appears that the evidence has been retrofitted to respond to the political ambition, rather than using an evidence-led approach to determine local requirements</p> <p>The proposed link road is inherently unsustainable due to the environmental and economic impacts. Suggested actions--</p> <p>Publish all referenced documents for a full consultation in accordance with the Local Plan Regulations.</p> <p>Provide a robust justification for the road, including a detailed costing of all aspects.</p> <p>Provide detailed assessments for the impacts of the road in relation to: ecology; landscape; heritage trees/hedgerows and climate change.</p> |          |           | Yes           |                         | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                  |
| 464    | Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group | Paragraph 14.47    | Object            |                   |       | <p>"Banks Property object to the assertion in paragraph 14.47 that Barton upon Humber can only accommodate an additional 583 dwellings prior to any link road being implemented and operational. As set out in our representations to the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan, we do not believe that the town’s highways capacity is restricted to such a quantum of new housing growth. This position is reinforced by a general lack of evidence provided by the Council. Despite the additional information being made publicly available through the local plan addendum, there remains documents referred to that have not been published and reliance on an evidence base which is not properly justified.</p> <p>5.2 Furthermore, there is little explanation as to the change in route proposed for the link road. The new alignment has been drawn precisely and the assertion that only an ‘indicative route’ has been identified does not appear to be accurate. It appears that the alignment is referred to as an ‘indicative route’ to ensure less scrutiny is placed on the route.</p> <p>5.3 As previously stated in our representations to the pre-submission draft local plan, Banks Property support a Barton link road in the future once a clear requirement for the road has been established to support future housing growth in the town and following an alignment which has been carefully considered taking into account environmental constraints and detailed costings for the delivery of the road. As set out in our representations to the pre-submission draft local plan, proposed housing site H1P-13 (Land off Barrow Road) appears to be reliant on the delivery of the first section Barton link road. The proposed alignment would place a burden upon the H1P-13 housing site through the need to build an overengineered route through their site &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</p>  |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  |

| Rep Id | Name              | Document Reference | Test of Soundness |                   |       |  | Comments  | Soundness  | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files         |  |
|--------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--|-----------|--|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
|        |                   |                    | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty   |           |  |               |                         |                          |                          |  |
|        |                   |                    |                   |                   |       |  |           |  |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |  |
| 369    | Simon Morgan      | Paragraph 14.48    | object            | yes               | no    | yes  | justified | "North Lincolnshire Council need to pause the local plan process, prepare a road safety analysis of the new Barton Link Road alignment, then publish it and reconsult regarding the Barton Link Road route. A further publication addendum could then be prepared for the local plan.<br><br>Alternatively revert to the proposed alignment in the publication draft (stage 4)." | no            |                         |                          |                          |  |
|        |                   |                    |                   |                   |       | >>>>><br>or to provide funding to support the delivery of a road which is yet to be objectively justified in planning terms. It is likely that further sites, adjacent to the proposed road, will come forward in the future. H1P-13 (319 dwellings) makes insufficient reference to a Link Road in the Local Plan; it does not include a trigger for funding or a mechanism for bringing forward the road, it is also ambiguous as to what an 'appropriate financial contribution' comprises. The financial contribution has not formed part of the viability assessment for this site and the site has not been properly assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal. Additional access points (H1P-13.1.c) are likely to cause detriment to highways safety due to the proximity with the proposed A1077 roundabout on the proposed road alignment. It is also unclear what proportion of the link road will draw funding from this site - whether it is just the new section, the upgrade or the associated works such as tree planting.<br><br>- The Council acknowledge that "there is a risk that new house building (and associated population increase) would not be matched by an increase in provision of local services, placing existing facilities under increased pressure". This therefore alludes to the necessitates locating new housing close to existing services where there is capacity to accommodate and scope to improve to meet the needs of an increased population." |           |  |               |                         |                          |                          |  |
| 403    | Veronica Pettifer | Paragraph 14.48    |                   |                   |       |  |           |  |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |  |
| 406    | Ian Burnett       | Paragraph 14.48    | Object            |                   |       |  |           |  |               |                         |                          |                          |  |
|        |                   |                    |                   |                   |       | "Looking at the new revised route it is obvious that this will "direct" much of the diverted traffic due south down Burnham<br><br>Road - a National Cycle Route. Why would you divert along Caistor Road to the new roundabout with the B1206 when you can whizz down Burnham Road? >>>>>   |           |  |               |                         |                          |                          |  |

| Rep Id | Name                         | Document Reference | Test of Soundness |                   |       |  | Comments | Soundness | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files |
|--------|------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--|----------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
|        |                              |                    | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty   |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  |
|        |                              |                    |                   |                   |       | >>>>><br>There isn't a mention in the plan of a weight limit through Deepdale and this definitely needs implementing. The aforementioned weight limit wouldn't deter cars from using this route, so surely traffic calming measures/speed limit changes would be essential. A part-solution to this may be to exclude the roundabout at the top of Burnham Road (reducing costs) and simply swing the new carriageway in an arc to join Caistor Road – heading south-east."  |          |           |               |                         | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                  |
| 437    | John French                  | Paragraph 14.48    | Object            |                   | Yes   | I believe the plan is unsound because the proposed route for a link road is not fit for purpose. The option 2 route - both phase 1 and phase 2 should be reinstated in the plan for the reasons set out in my previous representation.   |          |           |               |                         | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                  |
| 441    | Gillian Judge                | Paragraph 14.48    |                   |                   |       | "Barton needs a relief road to take the through traffic out of the town however the proposed route will not solve the issue, only causing more problems. The road from Caistor Road to the B1206 will need to be widened and dangerous bends straightened to accommodate heavy lorries. A large roundabout will be needed at the junction of the B1206 and at the Deepdale junction if cars are expected to use the road through the hamlet. The present road through Deepdale is a route one cycle route, which is the only quiet road out of Barton up to the Wolds. It is very popular with cyclists many coming from over the Humber Bridge and from the North sea Ferry. The roads are also used by runners, the Deepdale Dash being very popular with runners from all over the North of England- this will not be able to take place with heavy traffic. A different route from caistor Road to Brigg Road would be the best route with connection to the Humber bridge hen funds allow. Barton will not benefit from Wrens lorries taking a longer route to the A15 junction. The cars are causing the problem and will not use the proposed route, adding more time and fuel to their journey. Barton needs a relief road connection to the Humber Bridge eventually and the route through to Brigg Road is 3 quarters of the way there. "  |          |           |               |                         | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                  |
| 443    | Pete Adams on behalf of RAID | Paragraph 14.48    | Support           |                   |       | <p>"(1) Areas of High Landscape Value</p> <p>Policy DQE1 specifies Deepdale (para 8f) in this category. Rightly so, we believe. NLC has previously been asked, via several routes (including in writing) why the directly adjoining and equally attractive Southern Approach to Barton upon Humber should be any different to this rating. No response or explanation has been forthcoming. This is a highly relevant and important question as a Developer (Banks) is seeking to build on this greenbelt land that is currently outside of current/proposed development areas - and that would fall within the proposed AONB area extension application referred to in the Local Plan.</p> <p>(2) Relief Road (aka Link Road)</p> <p>Subsequent to a major (and fully democratic) Consultation exercise, Sections 14.47 and 14.48 now describe the road route preferred by circa 75% of those who responded. Having proposed this route, RAID continues to support its early implementation. Important associated issues include NLC's acknowledgement that Barton's services and infrastructure are already seriously overloaded and that building development should be carefully regulated pending the opening of this route. This acknowledged need for regulation raises severe concerns about the Developer-led outline planning application (currently refused), referred to in (1), above.</p> <p>(3) Relief Road Technical Support Document - Previous</p> <p>There have been various road schemes evaluated and there is potential for confusion when referring to the numbering system.</p> <p>History In the most recent consultation (Q1, 2022) Relief Road Option 2 - skirting relatively close to the Southern boundary of Barton, connecting to the B1218 and with eventual intent to connect to the A15 - is similar, in principle, to a route previously tabled for consultation in mid 2021. The validity of this earlier consultation was challenged. There was absolutely no mention of housing development and the Banks outline application materialised soon after the mid 2021 road consultation had closed. Subsequent to FOI (and other) requests, a previous Local Plan consultation period was extended on the verge of its originally proposed cutoff date - when a Technical Note (May 2021) relating to the Relief Road was released. This indicated that various routes - none like the one now covered via Section 14.47 and 14.48 - were focused on building development rather than prioritising early traffic relief.</p> <p>Facts It's not thought that anybody would argue that the exponential increase in traffic travelling through Barton is primarily due to Wren's site to the East of Barton. Also, that the A1077 route through Barton between the Wren site and the A15/A1077 interchange is the shortest road distance available, in practical terms.</p> <p>(4) Relief Road Technical Document - Current</p> <p>This was released as a supporting document for the current (Stage 5) Local Plan consultation. We consider it's not difficult to conclude that the Consultants seem to be rather keen to identify reasons why the ""peoples choice"" (quote from Barton Civic Society newsletter) route described in Section 14.47 and</p> <p>14.48 may not work, as opposed to wanting to make it work. This is despite it being similar, in principle, to a route proposed by Humberside County Council in the 1990s. Is this a case of ""not invented here""? Or some other agenda?</p> <p>It raises issues including the Authorities potentially not being able/bothered to enforce weight/access restrictions. That's equally applicable to the previous options they covered - yet never highlighted at the time of the report's release. That's curious, and the reality is that such issues are increasingly addressed via CCTV/ANPR nowadays. Also of concern is that the Consultants appear to have a somewhat blinkered view. Have they even considered that routing (at least) the Wren HGV traffic via Bonby Interchange would encourage such travel to/from Scunthorpe via the A15/M180/M181 and mainly distant from dwellings? &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</p> |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  |

| Rep Id | Name        | Document Reference | Test of Soundness |                   |       |  | Comments | Soundness | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files         |
|--------|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--|----------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|        |             |                    | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty   |          |           |               |                         |                          |                          |
|        |             |                    |                   |                   |       | >>>>><br>That is, instead of using the A1077 (Barton/South Ferriby/Winterton/Roxby) and negotiating noise and pollution-generating routes and inclines along the way. Plus negotiating the chicane frequently created via (perfectly legitimate) vehicles parked at South Ferriby Post Office. Wren (and others) should encourage using (or be encouraged to use) major trunk roads for (at least) HGVs. Wren have previously stated that they would support any relief road solution. We don't recall that important claim being mentioned in the report. The reality is that many private/smaller vehicles would still use their own preferred route through Barton. Because they can. However, sensible traffic controls and Wren applying robust Transport Plans and ""Good Neighbour"" policies (as utilised by other community-sensitive companies in the area) could provide at least some mitigation. In summary, we consider it to be a somewhat negatively biased document with selective content. |          |           |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 438    | Nick Turner | Paragraph 14.49    | Support           |                   |       | "Everything should b done to keep Wren generated traffic off the streets and roads of this historic market town. At the present time the traffic levels are intolerable and the prospect of increasing the Wren – generated traffic significantly is intolerable. The construction of a southern relief road would seem to us to be the right course of action and if it means that costs would rise as a result, so be it   |          |           |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 439    | Gill Turner | Paragraph 14.49    | Support           |                   |       | "Everything should b done to keep Wren generated traffic off the streets and roads of this historic market town. At the present time the traffic levels are intolerable and the prospect of increasing the Wren – generated traffic significantly is intolerable. The construction of a southern relief road would seem to us to be the right course of action and if it means that costs would rise as a result, so be it   |          |           |               |                         |                          |                          |

### 15. Development Management

|     |   |  |         |  |  |  |  |   |  |   |  |                          |
|-----|---|--|---------|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|--------------------------|
| 472 | Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency   | Paragraph 15.38-15.41 Additional paragraphs. | Support |  |  | "We welcome the inclusion of this section on Water Environment, which we proposed in our Regulation 19 comments."  |  |   |  |   |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 435 | Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water | Paragraph 15.38-15.41 Additional paragraphs. | Support |  |  | "Severn Trent are supportive of the principles outlined within paragraph 15.39, but would recommend that a minor amendment to the wording to support Severn Trent and Anglian Water's River Pledge."   |  |   |  |   |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 446 | Ian Stuart on behalf of Keigar Homes          | Paragraph 15.38-15.41 Additional paragraphs. | Object  |  |  | "At paragraph 10.a of the Addendum it now states that development proposals should include an assessment of whether an adequate supply of water would be available to support the proposed development. This Policy purports to be about protection of the environment but this form of wording could be construed as relating to the availability of a water supply which is a very different thing. As such it could improperly be used as a tool to undermine and potentially prevent the provision of housing as otherwise provided for in the draft Local plan. Paragraph 10 f of the policy effectively offers protection to aquifers and groundwater sources so paragraph 10 a is unnecessary.<br><br>Objection: For these reasons we object on the grounds that it fails the test of soundness in not being justified and inconsistent with national policy. |  | Delete paragraph 15.40 and sub paragraph 10a of Policy DM3. |  | Keigar Homes does not feel it necessary to be present but is willing to participate if it is considered to be helpful." |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 436 | Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water | DM3: Environmental Protection Question 10    | Support |  |  | "Severn Trent are supportive of the principles outlined within Policy DM3, in particular the inclusion of the additional text on Bullet point 10 b, highlighting that infrastructure capacity can be provided for new development. We are also supportive of the approach to reduce household demand to 110 l/hd/d. and the need to protect groundwater and prevent contamination."  |  |   |  |   |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 473 | Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency   | DM3: Environmental Protection Question 10    | Support |  |  | "In line with our advice, the heading 'Water Environment' has been moved to include point 9 and the text of point 10 has been amended. However, point 10f reads 'protecting aquifers and groundwater are protected in sensitive'... 'protecting' should be removed."   |  |   |  |   |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 477 | Ian Stuart on behalf of Keigar Homes          | DM3: Environmental Protection Question 10    | Object  |  |  | "At paragraph 10.a of the Addendum it now states that development proposals should include an assessment of whether an adequate supply of water would be available to support the proposed development. This Policy purports to be about protection of the environment but this form of wording could be construed as relating to the availability of a water supply which is a very different thing. As such it could improperly be used as a tool to undermine and potentially prevent the provision of housing as otherwise provided for in the draft Local plan. Paragraph 10 f of the policy effectively offers protection to aquifers and groundwater sources so paragraph 10 a is unnecessary.<br><br>Objection: For these reasons we object on the grounds that it fails the test of soundness in not being justified and inconsistent with national policy. |  | Delete paragraph 15.40 and sub paragraph 10a of Policy DM3. |  | Keigar Homes does not feel it necessary to be present but is willing to participate if it is considered to be helpful." |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |

### Appendix 1: Mineral Site Details

|     |  |                     |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |                          |
|-----|--|---------------------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| 407 | Paul Foster on behalf of Egdon Resources | Appendix 1 MIN6-14a | Support |  |  | "Appendix 1 – Site Ref MIN6-14a – Wressle Oil Well: We welcome the inclusion of the Wressle Oil Well as a Mineral Site in Appendix 1. The appeal granting planning permission allowed for the production of both oil and gas at Wressle. Therefore, we wish to see the title amended to "Wressle Oil and Gas Well site". The following information is missing and should be included:<br>- Mineral: Oil and Gas<br>- Gross Site Area: 1.85ha |  |  |  |  |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
|-----|--|---------------------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|

| Rep Id | Name | Document Reference | Test of Soundness |                   |       |                    | Comments | Soundness | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files |
|--------|------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--------------------|----------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
|        |      |                    | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  |

**Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework**

|     |   |  |        |  |  |  |  |  |     |  |                          |
|-----|---|--|--------|--|--|--|--|--|-----|--|--------------------------|
| 430 | Simon Jones on behalf of Highways England | Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework Policies        |        |  |  | <p>"Appendix 6 contains additional items added to the monitoring framework, of note are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• T1: Promoting Sustainable Transport</li> <li>• T2: Promoting Public Transport</li> <li>• T3: New Development and Transport</li> <li>• T4: Parking</li> <li>• T7: Safeguarding Transport Infrastructure</li> </ul> <p>We welcome the inclusion of these additional items and would request to have sight of the monitoring data surrounding these additional items, when available. These monitoring items will be of assistance in managing impacts on the SRN in the plan period."</p>  |  |  |     |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 460 | Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group      | Evidence Base Barton Link Road Technical Note #2 | Object |  |  | <p>"a) Positively prepared – irrespective of the final proposed route, the need for this link road has not been objectively assessed, the justification is based on political ambition rather than evidence.</p> <p>b) Justified – The evidence used is not 'proportionate' as it has not been properly scrutinised by the public hence has contravened the processes set out in the Local Plan Regulations.</p> <p>c) Effective – the Local Plan is ineffective as it does not demonstrate a need for the link road</p> <p>d) Consistent with national policy – all policies should be underpinned by up-to-date evidence (NPPF 31.). The Barton Highways Masterplan (LTP, 2018) has not been published on the Council's Evidence Base therefore cannot be relied upon in this Local Plan. The date of publication (2018) would also suggest that this document precedes much of the development in recent years in Barton Upon Humber and the document therefore is out-of-date. "</p> <p>"According to the Council, the following documents have been used to inform the 'BARTON LINK ROAD TECHNICAL NOTE #2 (25/03/2022)':</p> <p>'Barton Highways Masterplan (LTP, 2018), Barton Link Road Preliminary Design Layout Briefing Note (LTP, 2020a), Barton Southern Access Road, North Lincolnshire Feasibility Design Assessment Summary Note (LTP, 2020b), Barton Link Road Technical Note (LTP, 2021a) and A1077 Corridor Improvements Technical Note (LTP, 2021b).'</p> <p>The only documents from this list that have been published in the Evidence Base are the Barton Link Road Technical Note (May 2021) and A1077 Corridor Improvements Technical Note (LTP, 2021b). None of the remaining documents in this list documents have been published to the Council's evidence base nor have they been subject to proper consultation they therefore should not form the basis on which this technical note is written. Documents referenced in a Local Plan should form part of the evidence base and should follow the formal consultation process. This lack of proper process therefore undermines the integrity of the Barton Link Road policy that forms part of the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>Suggested Actions-Publish all refenced documents for a full consultation in accordance with the Local Plan Regulations. These documents should be subject to a separate 6 week consultation in order to substantiate the assumptions made in the Technical Note. Any valid points made in response to this consultation should be addressed through amendments made by the Council."</p> |  |  | Yes |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |

**General**

|     |  |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |                          |
|-----|--|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--------------------------|
| 423 | Guy Hird on behalf of North East Lindsey Internal Drainage Board | General |  |  |  | <p>"Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2020 to 2038) - Publication Draft (Regulation 19) Addendum Consultation</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this aspect of the Local Plan. North East Lindsey Internal drainage Board district covers part of the Humber bank East of South Ferriby within the area of interest.</p> <p>The Board has no further comment on the Addendum.The Board will continue to comment on individual planning applications."</p>   |  |  |  |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 427 | Nicola Ward on behalf of Doncaster Council                       | General |  |  |  | <p>"Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Doncaster Council on the North Lincolnshire Local Plan – Publication Draft (Regulation 19) Addendum. This is an email to confirm that Doncaster Council will not be commenting on this stage of the Local Plan.</p>   |  |  |  |  | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 432 | Simon Jones on behalf of Highways England                        | General |  |  |  | <p>"Thank you for consulting us on the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2020 – 2038)</p> <p>Publication Draft Addendum (May 2022). We acknowledge the consultation no longer seeks views on alternative options, but instead presents the opportunity to comment on focussed, proposed changes within a specific remit. We have reviewed the Addendum, taking into account our previous advice provided within the following documents issued to the LPA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North Lincolnshire Local Plan – GraHAM Analysis and SRN Evidence Base (July 2020); and</li> <li>• North Lincolnshire Local Plan SRN Evidence Base – Addendum (February 2021).</li> </ul> <p>For reference, our conclusion stated within these documents was that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is considered that the proposed infrastructure at the M181 terminating junction does not necessarily accommodate the quantum of development within the Plan throughout the plan period; and that the de-trunking of the M181 places the onus of infrastructure provision onto the council. As such, this location may require a more detailed analysis through the plan period to ascertain if any further mitigation needs to be provided at this location;</li> </ul> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</p> |  |  |  |  |                          |

| Rep Id | Name  | Document Reference              | Test of Soundness |                   |       |  | Comments | Soundness | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files |
|--------|---|---------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|--|----------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
|        |   |                                 | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty   |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  |
|        |   |                                 |                   |                   |       | <p>&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The eastbound merge at M180 Junction 5 approaches capacity in the 2038 morning peak and this may require a more detailed analysis through the plan period to ascertain if any mitigation needs to be provided at this location; and</li> <li>Given the flows generated in the 2038 scenarios, it is considered that the A160 /Habrough Road roundabout may require a more detailed analysis through the plan period to ascertain if any mitigation needs to be provided at this location."</li> </ul>   |          |           |               |                         | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                  |
| 433    | Corinna Dietz on behalf of Marine Management Organisation | General                         | No                |                   |       | <p>"Thank you for your invitation to participate in the consultation for the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2020 to 2038) - Publication Draft (Regulation 19) Addendum.</p> <p>The MMO has previously been engaged with the North Lincolnshire Council regarding previous plan stages and has provided recommendation to refer to the East Marine Plans in the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2020 to 2038).</p> <p>The engagement in previous plan stages included a response to the Issues and Options stage on the 12/03/2018 and the Preferred Options stage on the 26/03/2020. Further, the MMO has provided a response to the Duty to Cooperate on the 06/04/2020 and signed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Statement of Common Ground on the 26/11/2020. Lastly, a response was provided in November 2021 during the Publication Draft (Regulation 19) consultation.</p> <p>The MMO is aware of the limits to respond to consultation comments during the latest plan development stages and notes the endeavours of the council to comply with the Duty to Cooperate, but note that following the responses provided, North Lincolnshire Council has not made reference to the MMO or the East Marine Plans in the next stage of the plan development and has not provided a reasoning.</p> <p>We advise that you consider any relevant policies within the East Marine Plan Documents in regard to areas within the plan that may impact the marine environment, including the tidal extent of any rivers. We recommend the inclusion of the East Marine Plans when discussing any themes with coastal or marine elements.</p> <p>When reviewing the East Marine Plans to inform decisions that may affect the marine environment, please take a whole-plan approach by considering all marine plan policies together, rather than in isolation.</p> <p>For further information, a copy of the standard response is attached. Please note when considering the MMO as a consultee in the future to send correspondence directly to the consultation mailbox (cc'd in) to ensure the right person will pick it up."</p> |          |           |               |                         | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                  |
| 450    | Melanie Lindsley on behalf of The Coal Authority          | General                         | Support           |                   |       | <p>"The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department of Business, Energy &amp; Industrial Strategy. As a statutory consultee, The Coal Authority has a duty to respond to planning applications and development plans in order to protect the public and the environment in mining areas.</p> <p>Although our records indicate that there are three mine entries present in the North Lincolnshire area none of these appear to be related to past coal mining activity. On this basis I can confirm that the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no specific comments to make on the consultation document.</p>  |          |           |               |                         | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                  |
| 459    | Chris Cole on behalf of East Riding of Yorkshire Council  | General                         | Support           |                   |       | <p>The Publication Plan document is comprehensive and the overall approach complements the East Riding's Local Plan. There are limited functional housing and economic market connections between the two Authorities and we have responded to previous versions of the plan. We have no matters of soundness or legal compliance to raise. The following matters have been identified for consideration in making any further minor amendments to the Plan as it progresses through its examination process.</p>  |          |           |               |                         | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                  |
| 463    | Joe Perkins   | Habitats Regulations Assessment | Object            |                   |       | <p>"4.1 Banks Property support the HRA Addendum which identifies that the existing policies and provisions in the of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft Addendum, in relation to recreational pressures, urbanisation, atmospheric pollution, water pollution/siltation and flood and water management will ensure that the Local Plan will have no adverse effects on these European sites either alone or in combination with any other plans or projects."</p>   |          |           | Yes           |                         | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                  |
| 482    | Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England                   | Habitats Regulations Assessment |                   |                   |       | <p>"2.1 Recreational Pressures</p> <p>2.1.1 Natural England notes that the assessment relies on Footprint Ecology studies which were carried out at an estuary scale and in 2012 and 2014 so are now getting quite out of date. We recommend that you consider the approach undertaken by East Riding of Yorkshire Council to update these studies with more bespoke evidence for your plan area specifically.</p> <p>2.1.2 This will specifically assist in understanding the impacts of recreation (arising from new housing development and tourism) upon European sites within the Humber Estuary and be in line with the work East Riding of Yorkshire Council have used to underpin their evidence base and provide detailed and up to date visitor information (including the activities undertaken on site, reasons for site choice, and routes taken on site) on the parts of the Humber Estuary likely to be used for recreation by residents of North Lincolnshire.</p> <p>2.1.3 The visitor data can identify where new housing might result in increased recreation use of the estuary and provide the necessary information to underpin the HRA of the North Lincolnshire Plan.</p> <p>2.1.4 We consider that it would be of great benefit to join up the approach to recreational disturbance across the Humber Estuary so recommend that consideration is given to the approaches being undertaken by East Riding and North East Lincolnshire Council. &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</p>  |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  |

| Rep Id | Name | Document Reference | Test of Soundness |                   |       |   | Comments | Soundness | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files |
|--------|------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|---|----------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
|        |      |                    | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty  |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  |
|        |      |                    |                   |                   |       | <p>&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</p> <p>2.1.5 Proposals that have the potential to increase recreational pressures on designated biodiversity assets should provide mitigation in the form of blue/green infrastructure provision. This could include provision of additional green spaces to provide choice and deter an increased number of visitors from using designated assets for recreational purposes.</p> <p>2.1.6 The potential impact of recreational pressure on international (habitats) sites should be considered in proximity to sensitive sites. Proposals for residential and/or tourism accommodation key sensitive locations may consider zoning, recreational pressure zone of influence which could contribute towards strategic programmes aimed at managing the impact of tourism and residents on international (habitats) sites.</p> <p>2.1.7 We have been unable to find any addition assessment regarding the impact of allocations on Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA, Thorne Moor SAC and Hatfield Moor SAC and refer you to our response dated 26 November 2021 (our ref 371224) regarding this matter.</p> <p>2.2 Urbanisation (functionally linked land for SPA/Ramsar birds)</p> <p>2.2.1 Natural England notes the updated assessment regarding the potential for a loss of functionally linked land for Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar and Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA birds in para 6.2 of the updated assessment. While we welcome the additional detail provided regarding the approach we consider that there is insufficient evidence for how this approach has been utilised in the screening and Appropriate Assessment stages of the assessment where little evidence of the approach is presented.</p> <p>2.2.2 Natural England advises that the assessment should include a table of allocations and policies relevant to this matter with details about how each one has been assessed in line with the criteria.</p> <p>2.2.3 Regarding the methodology employed Natural England has a number of questions about the approach set out in para 6.2 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For points 1) to 4) for sites related to the Humber Estuary to be screened in, is it considered LSE if a site meets any of these characteristics or only if multiple characteristics are met?</li> <li>• We note that the Humber Estuary High Tide Roosts Review and South Humber Bank bird data is now quite dated. Mitigation has already been agreed for the South Humber Bank sites however for sites which may be high tide roosts we would advise seeking further evidence from the Local Records Centre and local experts such as the RSPB to compensate for the age of the data.</li> <li>• We would like to see a definition for 'Large Fields'.</li> <li>• Is it the gigantic one Hughes, James has been looking at?</li> <li>• Regarding indicators 1) to 4) to rule out LSE in relation to functionally linked land on the Humber Estuary, is it considered not LSE if a site meets any of these characteristics or only if multiple characteristics are met?</li> <li>• For the indicator regarding the enclosure of land we advise that, if the site is of a sufficient size the enclosure of the land will be less of a factor.</li> </ul> <p>2.2.4 We strongly advise that local records centre data and evidence held by local groups such as the Wildlife Trust, RSPB and Local Nature Partnerships etc are taken into consideration and that, where uncertainties remain regarding whether a site is functionally linked or not, that bird surveys are undertaken.</p> <p>2.2.5 It may be helpful to use a risk based or traffic light assessment of allocations in order to assess the relative risk of different sites based on, for instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distance to the designated site;</li> <li>• Habitat type/ land use, current and recent habitat;</li> <li>• Size of the ecological unit where development site is located. (for example, whole field/ open area); and</li> <li>• Current and recent human disturbance levels.</li> </ul> <p>2.2.6 Regarding Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA we would like to see further details of the screening assessment undertaken for sites in proximity to the SPA and consideration of taking a policy approach similar to Doncaster Local Plan Policy 30 for windfall development.</p> <p>2.3 Atmospheric Pollution</p> <p>2.3.1 Natural England notes the reference to traffic modelling studies in Table 7-1 and 7-4 of the Appropriate Assessment however we are unable to find any data or description of what study has been undertaken. Natural England would need to see this evidence in order to satisfy the concerns set out in our letter dated 26 November 2021 (our ref 371224).</p> <p>2.3.2 We welcome the reference to guidance NEA001 Natural England's approach to advising competent authorities on the assessment of road traffic emissions under the Habitats Regulations (Natural England, 2018) however we would recommend only judicious use of Highways Agency (2019) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air Quality as we do not recommend some of the methods set out. On a precautionary basis we would recommend the use of a 200m buffer distance around roads rather than the 20-100m distance.</p> <p>2.3.3 Natural England is unclear how in-combination assessment has been undertaken and advises that where traffic data is available for neighbouring plans and programmes &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</p> |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  |



| Rep Id | Name  | Document Reference                            | Test of Soundness |                   |       |   | Comments | Soundness | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files         |
|--------|---|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------|---|----------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
|        |   |   | object/support    | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty  |          |           |               |                         |                          |                          |
|        |   |   |                   |                   |       | <p>&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</p> <p>this should be considered in the in-combination assessment. Furthermore we advise, in line with Wealden v SSCLG [2017] ('the Wealden Judgment 2017'), in combination assessment should consider the combined effects of predicted traffic levels below the significance thresholds (eg 1000AADT or 200 AADT for HDV).</p> <p>2.3.4 Finally we note that the Appropriate Assessment relies on mitigation in policy DM3 for point source emissions and a wider requirement under Policy MIN6. Natural England notes that DM3 is concerned only with AQMA's which are for human receptors and as such will not provide mitigation for ecological impacts while MIN6 makes only a very brief reference to air quality and is concerned with specific minerals sites only.</p> <p>2.3.5 Natural England advises that these policies do not provide appropriate mitigation for the issues identified in the Appropriate Assessment. We advise that the Plan should include specific policy wording and supporting text in order to ensure that adequate assessment is undertaken and that appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures are incorporated in projects that come forward."</p>   |          |           |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 476    | Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency | Infrastructure Delivery Schedule April 2022   |                   |                   |       | "Item 16 Flooding and Drainage – South Humber Bank – 2020-2038: Site developer in consultation with NLC and EA: 'Food defence enhancement scheme to land north of Humber Sea Terminal' – typo, should be 'Flood'."  |          |           |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 429    | Simon Jones on behalf of Highways England   | Infrastructure Delivery Plan April 2022       |                   |                   |       | "This review has highlighted that the issues which are required to be considered in association with the Publication Draft Addendum Plan remain largely the same as previously advised, and that our previously presented evidence bases remain robust subject to clarification of any post plan impacts of Lincolnshire Lakes. Our evidence base has identified that the M180 Junction 5 and the A160 / Habrough Road junction is approaching capacity in 2038."   |          |           |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 475    | Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency | Infrastructure Delivery Plan April 2022       |                   |                   |       | "Spelling error on front cover - 'Infrastructure'. Page 19 - 'H2100' - 'due to be submitted to Defra for approval at the end of 2021'. The Local Plan Addendum on page 224, 9.45 has a more recent target: 'due to be submitted to Defra for approval at the end of 2023.'"   |          |           |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 421    | Emilie Carr on behalf of Historic England   | Map 07a Barton Upon Humber Proposed Link Road |                   |                   |       | "Archaeology should be fully considered and the advice of NLC's heritage officer followed for a staged program of investigation to inform the minimisation of impact through design as well as mitigation. Beacon Hill within the area enclosed by the bypass line is noted, this and the historic turnpike heading south are important landscape features and should be carefully considered."   |          |           |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 455    | James Rigby on behalf of Brocklesby Estate  | Map Inset 05 - Barnetby le wold               | Object            |                   |       | Reinsert site reference EC1-7 as an allocated employment site (specifically for a service station and lorry park).  |          |           |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 431    | Simon Jones on behalf of Highways England   | Spatial Vision                                |                   |                   |       | <p>"At the time of undertaking the SRN Evidence Base report (July 2020), 8,666 dwellings were considered within the report based on information provided by the council. At the time of the most recent previous assessment undertaken by us (February 2021), the information provided by the council stated that there were to be 7,986 dwellings built out over the plan period.</p> <p>The new information provided in the Publication Draft Addendum Plan states in paragraph 5.8 that there are to be 7,937 dwellings built out over the plan period.</p> <p>However, we have identified that Chapter 3 states that there will be 7,128 dwellings delivered over the plan period. While either of the above figures presents an overall reduction (and hence no new assessments are needed), we would request confirmation on which figure is correct. We acknowledge that Chapter 5 provides details of the housing allocation sites, with no changes to site locations or quantum. However, we would expect to see changes to allocations considering the reduction in the housing allocation figure stated in Chapter 3 (which requires clarification). We would request a list of allocations with up to date information on the quantum of development at each site."</p>   |          |           |               |                         |                          | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |
| 462    | Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group        | Sustainability Appraisal                      | Object            |                   |       | <p>"a) Positively prepared – The strategy does not meet the OAN for housing as the strategy is discordant with NPPF. New homes should be 'Well located', meaning that they are located in the most sustainable locations adjacent to high levels of service provision. The submitted site to the South of Horkstow Road in Barton upon Humber would improve 'the scope for access ... by public transport', whilst delivering up to 400 homes in one of the most sustainable locations in the Local Authority – these credentials have been ignored by the Council due to political ambitions.</p> <p>b) Justified – Proportionate evidence in relation to Ecology impact; the costs of the road; light pollution; Landscape impact has not been provided.</p> <p>c) Effective – The Council has erred when stating it has allocated development in 'the most appropriate locations'. The allocated site in the plan fail to respond to local service provision and seem to ignore the settlement hierarchy. Other questions of deliverability arise when looking at sites that strongly relate to, or are dependent upon, the delivery of a relief road. The Council have asserted that only 583 dwellings can be delivered over the plan period, however this figure has not been robustly justified with objective evidence. As stated in our previous representations, we therefore fundamentally disagree with the Council's spatial strategy and choice of housing sites.</p> <p>d) Consistent with national policy – NPPF (15) requires plans to 'provide a positive vision for the future of each area'. The Council's vision is too restrictive and does not promote growth.</p> <p>&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</p> |          |           |               |                         |                          |                          |

| Rep Id | Name  | Document Reference       | Test of Soundness |                   |       |   | Comments | Soundness | Modifications | Attend hearing sessions | Hearing Session Comments | Additional Files |
|--------|---|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------|---|----------|-----------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
|        |   |                          | object/ support   | Legally compliant | sound | complies with duty  |          |           |               |                         |                          |                  |
|        |   |                          |                   |                   |       | <p>&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</p> <p>"The draft Local Plan vision and spatial objectives were set out by North Lincolnshire Council at the Issues &amp; Options (Regulation 18) stage, during which they were assessed against the SA framework and were subject to public and stakeholder consultation. At this stage the Vision and Objectives were found to be acceptable in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>"Sustainable growth will be at the heart of all policies in the Local Plan" And "Growth will take place in the most appropriate locations". Barton upon Humber is the second most sustainable location in the Local Authority, yet the Council have significantly reduced the number of houses in this location on the basis of Local objections and political aspirations, rather than an objective assessment of the suitability of each site and the sustainability of the settlement.A78.Suggested Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publish all referenced documents for a full consultation in accordance with the Local Plan Regulations.</li> <li>• The wording of the Council's vision should be amended to be more positive and promote growth.</li> <li>• Amend allocations to comply with the Council's vision of allocating sites in the 'most appropriate locations'."</li> </ul>  |          |           | Yes           |                         | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                  |
| 465    | Joe Perkins                                 | Sustainability Appraisal | Object            |                   |       | <p>"Spatial Objective 3 scores weakly against the SA objectives. (table 5-2), suggesting that significant changes need to be made to housing related policies. The most notable (table 6-1) are policies SS5 and SS6, additionally the affordable housing policy scored weakly (6-2), which suggests that additional housing sites are required.</p> <p>Table 7-4 highlights that all the highlighted sites in Barton create Heritage issues. These issues have not been properly addressed within the policy wording. More suitable alternative sites are available, name land to the South of Horkstow Road.</p> <p>Table 7-5 highlights the high level of service provision in Barton upon Humber – this, again, confirms that more homes should be allocated in Barton.</p> <p>Figure 7-2 and table 5-15 have failed to assess several reasonable alternative sites that have been confirmed to be available via the submission of planning applications outwith the Local Plan process. These sites, including land to the S of Horkstow Road in Barton upon Humber, should be assessed as reasonable alternatives in the Sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>In appendix A of this document, Policy SS2 is not fully assessed. Whilst the different options are mentioned, there is no assessment of which is the best option for the spatial strategy and no robust justification has been provided for the spatial strategy.</p> <p>In the Appendix A of this document, Policy SS5.3 is incorrectly assessed as automatically creating a greater flood risk. This should be amended to confirm that a property mitigated scheme can actually potentially alleviate flood risk in some circumstances. Policy SS5.7 is incorrectly omits that fact the suitably located sites with proper mitigation strategies can actually help to combat climate change, for example the planning application at Land S of Horkstow Road in Barton proposed a bus route extension that would provide a sustainable transport option for all new residents in addition to 600 existing residents who previously did not live within walking distance of a bus stop. Scheme can also be designed to promote the sustainable travel hierarchy through cycle and pedestrian facility provision.- Paragraph 14.47 refers to the reduced numbers of housing in Barton, however no robust justification for this reduction in numbers has been published anywhere. This therefore appears to be a political whim to respond to local objections, rather than an objectively assessed methodology in relation to the Spatial Strategy and Location of new homes."</p> |          |           | Yes           |                         | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                  |
| 474    | Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency | Sustainability Appraisal | Support           |                   |       | <p>"Overall, we support the content of the Sustainability Appraisal. However, we have the following comments on Table 2-1: Summary of the key sustainability issues in North Lincolnshire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Water environment' currently only includes one key challenge - flood risk and development. Given there are several sustainability issues listed relating to water quality, should another key challenge be added relating to this?</li> <li>• 'Land' has several sustainability issues noted relate to risk to the water environment. Should a key challenge be added relating to these issues?"</li> </ul>  |          |           |               |                         | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                  |
| 483    | Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England     | Sustainability Appraisal |                   |                   |       | <p>"3.1 Natural England advises that concerns regarding the Habitats Regulations Assessment set out above should be taken into account in the Appraisal. For example we would expect SSSI's to be a part of the traffic modelling study and for this to be taken into account in the assessment against objectives SA2 and SA6.</p> <p>3.2 Not withstanding these matters, however, Natural England is broadly content with the Sustainability Appraisal and offer the following advice.We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us. "</p>  |          |           |               |                         | <a href="#">View PDF</a> |                  |