North
Lincolnshire
Council

www.northlincs.gov.uk

NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN REGULATION 19 PROPOSED SUBMISISON CONSULTATION LIST OF RESPONSES -SORTED BY RESPONDENT

Introduction

This document is an extract of all responses received at the Regulation 19 Proposed Submission Consultation. In this document the responses are sorted in plan order.

At the regulation 19 consultation 230 respondents provided 888 individual responses using the on-line questionnaire, via e-mail or in writing during the consultation period. Over 70 omission sites were put forward for consideration as part of the public consultation stage. 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 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.

Contents

Pete **Adams** on behalf of RAID (Residents against Inappropriate development) 7

Sunny **Ali** 8

Kevin and Pat **Armstrong** 9

Merlin **Ash** on behalf of Natural England 9

David **Atkin** 18

Sarah **Atkin** 18

Celia **Atkinson** 18

Katie **Atkinson**, KVA Planning consultancy on behalf of Jenny Hayenes Planning Lead for CPRE Northern Lincolnshire 19

Mandy **Atkinson** 22

William **Atkinson** 23

Jayne **Baldwin** 23

Luke **Bamforth** on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership 24

Suzanne **Bamforth** 40

Bethany **Banks** 40

Wendy **Bannerman** on behalf of The British Horse Society 42

Sharon **Bell** 45

Kate **Billmore** 46

Chris **Bramley** on behalf of Severn Trent Water 47

Candace **Brent** on behalf of Burton upon Stather Parish Council 58

David **Brierley** on behalf of Network Rail Infrastructure Limited 58

Paul **Brown** 62

Geoff **Bullock**, DWD on behalf of PHILLIPS 66 LTD & VPI Immingham 64

Mr J **Butterfield** 68

Jon **Campbell** 70

Emile **Carr** on behalf of Historic England 70

Richard **Cawson** 75

Helen **Chafer** 75

Caroline **Chave**, Chave Planning on behalf of Qudos Homes LTD 76

Mrs S **Chester** 81

Trevor **Clark** 81

Tom **Clarke** on behalf of Theatres Trust 83

Jill **Copeland** on behalf Barton RAID 84

David **Cox** 85

Lindsay **Coy** 85

John **Craig** on behalf of Hull City Council 86

Heather **Cawson** 87

Carl **Curtis** 88

Sharon **Curtis** 89
Mike **Daley** on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council 89
Natalie **Dear**, Natalie Dear Planning Consultancy on behalf of DDM Agriculture Ltd 91
Corinna **Dietz** on behalf of Marine Management Organisation 105
Robert **Doughty**, RDC Consultancy on behalf of RM and EF Davey 106
Philip **Drury** 107
James **Durham** on behalf of East Riding Council 107
Mark **Eagland**, Peacock and Smith on behalf of Gleeson Regeneration 108
Amie **Easey** 112
Mrs M. **Easton** 112
Brian **Edwards** 113
Jay **Everett** on behalf of Addison Planning Consultants Ltd 114
David **Fallowfiled** 118
Debra **Fallowfield** 119
Nicola **Farr** on behalf of Environment Agency 120
Kevin **Farrow** 127
Yvonne **Farrow** 128
Kerry **Fawcett** 129
Steven **Field** 129
Mrs **Fisher** 130
Simon **Fisher** on behalf of NFU East Midlands Region 131
Mirjam **Fogarty** on behalf of Pipers Crisps 131
Paul **Foster**, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited 132
Suzanne **Fysh** on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust 136
Jayne **Gale** on behalf of South Killingholme Parish Council 165
Joanne **Gander** 166
George **Gladwin** 166
Joanne **Gladwin** 169
Tony **Goss** 170
Eleanor **Gribben** 170
Kim **Gribben** on behalf of Kimberley Performing Arts Centre 172
Michael **Griffiths** 173
Mr and Mrs **Griffiths** 175
Elizabeth **Hackney** 176
Jim **Hackney** on behalf of Barrow upon Humber Parish Council Neighbourhood Planning 177
John **Hancock** 180
Joanne **Harding** on behalf of Home Builders Federation 181
Sally **Hare** 188
Dave **Harford** on behalf of West Stockwith Parish Council 189
Jennifer **Harrison** 189

Roger **Harrison** 190
Maxine **Harvey** 191
Anna **Hearfield** 191
Callum **Hearfield** 192
Tori **Heaton** on behalf of DDM Agriculture 193
Mrs Pauline **Hepworth** 215
Ann **Hindley** 215
James **Hobson**, JEH Planning on behalf of Jalapeno Ventures Ltd and Mr Day 216
James **Hobson**, JEH Planning on behalf of Moorwalk Ltd 229
James **Hobson**, JEH Planning on behalf of the Partners T A White & Sons 249
Janet **Hodson**, JVH Planning on behalf of Scawby Estate 252
Kevin **Holmes** 258
Michelle **Holt** 259
Amy **Hordon**, Avison Young on behalf of National Grid 260
Andrew **Horner** 262
Dian **Horner** 263
Deb **Hotson** on behalf of Elsham Parish Council 263
Deb **Hotson** on behalf of Haxey Parish Council 263
Rebecca **Housam** on behalf of Savills 265
Mrs Fay **Husler** 273
Mark **Husler** on behalf of Husler Developments Ltd 275
Becky **Johns** 275
Ian **Johns** 276
Gillian **Kendall** 277
Jamie **Kendall** 277
Michael **Kendall** 278
Ivor **Keyes** 279
Andy **Killip** on behalf of National Grid 281
Roy **Kitching** 287
Marta **Kotwica** 287
Jeffrey **Laird** 288
Mrs Susan **Laird** 289
Ashley **Lambert-Jefferson** 289
Stephen **Lambert-Jefferson** 290
Peter **Large** 290
Katie **Laughton** 291
Mrs Shirley **Leach** on behalf of Thornton Curtis Parish Council 291
Rebecca **Leconte** on behalf of ADC Infrastructure 291
Hannah **Lewis** 292
Mr Tom **Libera** 292

Melanie **Lindsley** on behalf of The Coal Authority 293
Pauline **Maksymowych** 293
Monty **Martin** 294
Neil **Taylor-Matson** on behalf of Kirton in Lindsey Town Council 295
Jake **McLeod**, Walsingham Planning on behalf of Lidl Great Britain Limited 297
John **Medley** 298
Frazer **Melton** 299
Claire **Mills**, Savills UK Limited on behalf of St John's College 300
Mrs Kay **Mitchell-Gough** 301
Simon William Paul **Morgan** 301
Sebastian **Musil** 306
Stuart **Nash** 306
Kristin Sutton **Nelthorpe** 307
Alison **Nettleton** 307
M **Nettleton** 308
Victoria **Nettleton** 308
Mark E **North** on behalf of Aggregates and Production and Dimension Stone- Mineral Products Association 309
Dot **Oaks** 311
Colin **Parker** 311
David **Parker** 320
Eric **Parker** 320
Richard **Patterson** 321
Greg **Pearce** on behalf of David Lock Associates 321
Joe **Perkins** on behalf of Banks Group 331
Karen **Pickering** on behalf of Scawby Parish Council 352
Karen **Pickering** on behalf of Ulceby Parish Council 352
Karen **Pickering** on behalf of Wootton Parish Council 352
Mike **Pilsworth** on behalf of RSPB 352
Mark **Plaskitt** 353
Steve **Pluta** 354
Lorraine **Preston** 355
Stewart **Provan** on behalf of The Banks Group 356
Ian **Ransford** 357
Rachael **Reddin** on behalf of Barnetby le Wold Parish Council 361
Sallyanne **Reed** 362
Hugh **Rees** 363
James **Rigby**, Globe Consultants Limited on behalf of Globe Consultants Limited 364
Jamie **Roberts** 370
Michelle **Robinson**, Barton Willmore on behalf of Barratt Homes Yorkshire East and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East 374
Michelle **Robinson**, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea Land Epworth Limited 377

Paul **Rounce** 390
Clive **Sargeantson** 391
Darren **Saunders** 391
S **Sharpe** 392
Mrs S **Sharpe** 393
Nicholas **Shoot** 394
Elayne **Smith** 395
James **Smith** 396
Mike **Smith** 396
Nigel **Smith** 397
Paul **Smith** on behalf of The Strategic Land Group 397
Stuart **Smith** 400
Thomas **Smith** 401
Jack **Startin** 401
Mr Justin **Steggles** 405
Lee **Storey** 406
Ian **Stuart**, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd 408
Robert Ian **Stuart**, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd 411
Paul **Sutton** on behalf of P.S. Planning & Heritage 430
Darl **Sweetland** on behalf of Anglian Water 431
Lynette **Swinburne**, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance 433
Gary **Tanswell** 465
Paul **Tattersfield** on behalf of GPM Group 465
Dave **Telford** on behalf of Wroot Parish Council 468
Ziyad **Thomas**, Planning Issues Ltd on behalf of Churchhill Retirement Living and Mccarthy Stone 468
Nolan **Tucker** & Emma Gomersal on behalf of Church Commissioners for England 474
Simon **Tucker** on behalf of Canal and River Trust 478
C **Turnbull** on behalf of DWD Property and Planning 481
W B **Turner** 485
Zoe **Tuxworth** 485
Gregg **Tyers** 485
Ruth **Tyers** 486
Mike **Upton** on behalf of Earn Design Services Limited 486
Josh **Van Den Bos** 487
Ursula **Vickerton** 487
Curtis **Walker** 489
David **Walker** 490
Georgina **Walker** 491
Ian **Walker** 491
Susan **Walker** 492

David **Walters** 492
David **Walton** on behalf of Sustainability Manager Sibelco 493
Nicola **Ward** on behalf of Doncaster Council 494
Spencer **Warren**, Heaton planning on behalf of The Lapwing Estate 494
Richard **Webster** 500
Brian **Wesley** 501
Lisa **White** 502
Nicolas **White** 502
C **Wilkinson** 503
Sue **Williamson** 503
Alex **Willis**, BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of Associated British Ports 504
Dr Christopher **Wilson**, BE Group on behalf of Mr Tim Lumley 506
Jess **Wilson** 509
Megan **Wilson**, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd 511
Megan **Wilson**, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Cyden Homes 523
Megan **Wilson**, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Glenrock 523
Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Mr G Jewitt 523
Trudie **Wilson** 524
Mark **Wood** 524
Richard **Wright** on behalf of North East Lindsey Drainage Board 524

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Pete **Adams** on behalf of RAID (Residents against Inappropriate development)												
0403	Pete Adams on behalf of RAID (Residents against Inappropriate development)	Evidence Base	Object				Referencing Page 55 of the Housing Site Selection Topic Paper, site 3HCCA - one reason for not considering this area is given as "The site is within an Area of Special Historic Landscape Interest. Within this area development will not be permitted which would destroy, damage or adversely affect the character, appearance or setting of the historic landscape or any of its features". Surely, this applies to H1P26, given it is on the edge of the village, and such a large development will spoil this area of Haxey - residents have chosen to live in this area for a reason.					View PDF
0389	Pete Adams on behalf of RAID (Residents against Inappropriate development)	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0802	Pete Adams on behalf of RAID (Residents against Inappropriate development)	Paragraph 14.47					Although previously advised by NLC (Lesley Potts) that the Barton Link (aka Relief) Road does not form part of the Local Plan (LP), I hereby formally submit a copy of the concept proposed by Residents Against Inappropriate Development (RAID). The Evidence Base information regarding the Relief Road seems to have been (quietly and perhaps deliberately?) released after the original LP cut-off date of 26/11/21. The revised consultation cut-off date is currently today (3/12/21). We would question if that is adequate notice and/or duration to permit wide review of this addendum. The reasons given for this late release included openness and FOI requests. Indeed a FOI request was submitted by RAID on 24/9/21 and - after a missed deadline and several unanswered prompts - was finally responded to on 2/12/21. In the main, it merely referred to said Evidence Base document. We find it curious to be advised that the Relief Road forms no part of the LP. Yet Section 14.47 not only refers to it, but (in its current form) tends to pre-judge the outcome. NLC will have received many communications about this - both from RAID and individually. Also, we find it curious that - in response to an email about RAID's Relief Road proposal and an attempt to clarify NLC's stance on it - Cllr Paul Vickers has suddenly asked if we have submitted the RAID Relief Road proposal to NLC (presumably for LP consideration). In fact: It was handed (to all attendees) at a meeting held between NLC and RAID on 2/11/21. It had also been submitted to NLC previously via email.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							There have been both RAID and individual written submissions that include this topic and confirmation is sought that these have been recorded and will be passed on to the Inspectorate. However, if NLC is not inclined to officially recognise and consider the RAID proposal, here is a formal copy. Submitted before the revised LP deadline date of today. Please confirm acceptance of this email and that the attachment content is clear.					
0450	Pete Adams on behalf of RAID (Residents against Inappropriate development)	Paragraph 14.47					The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0490	Pete Adams on behalf of RAID (Residents against Inappropriate development)	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS					Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0684	Pete Adams on behalf of RAID (Residents against Inappropriate development)	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Sunny **Ali**												
0416	Sunny Ali	General	Support				Thank you for consulting National Highways on your recent publication of the Draft Local Plan. You will be aware that Highways England (as then) signed a Statement of Common of Ground [SoCG] with North Lincolnshire Council [the Council] in October 2020 regarding their Local Plan. Having reviewed the contents of the Publication Draft Local Plan, I can report that National Highways offers no objection to the Publication Draft. We will continue to work collaboratively as highlighted in the SoCG.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Kevin and Pat **Armstrong**												
0472	Kevin and Pat Armstrong	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0512	Kevin and Pat Armstrong	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				(2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0704	Kevin and Pat Armstrong	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Merlin **Ash** on behalf of Natural England												
0376	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework					Natural England notes that a BNG indicator and target has been identified for SS7 only and suggest that one should also be included for other relevant policies, for example SSC3, RD1 and DQE3. 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. For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter please contact Merlin Ash at Merlin.ash@naturalengland.org.uk or on 02080 266382. For any new consultations, or to provide further information on this consultation please send your correspondences to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.					View PDF
0414	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	Evidence Base South Humber Gateway Mitigation Strategy					The South Humber Gateway Mitigation Strategy Natural England broadly welcomes the Mitigation Strategy which addresses the comments made previously. However we advise that Map 2 should be updated, as the planning inspectorate recently approved the moving of mitigation area A for Able Marine Energy Park to be located at Halton Marshes. Therefore the eastern yellow area should be moved					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							adjacent to the western area. Please also be aware that it is very difficult to read the writing in the legend.					
0437	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	Habitats Regulations Assessment Report	Object				1.1 Functionally-linked land Natural England notes the conclusions of the assessment of the loss of functionally linked land for Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar birds in table 7-4 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment report and of Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA in table 7-5 however we are unclear from the information presented how allocations and policies have been screened in relation to the loss of functionally linked land and what evidence has been utilised in the assessment. We would expect the assessment to identify screening distances or criteria for assessing sites. We note that Table 6-3 includes a screening distance for recreational disturbance on the Humber Estuary designated sites and considers factors such as water supply and discharge but it is not clear whether allocations have been considered for their potential to be functionally linked land for SPA/Ramsar birds. We advise that screening distances are set for the Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar and Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA and that housing, employment and minerals allocations which fall within this distance should be subject to a desk-based assessment of their suitability for SPA and Ramsar birds. This should involve: • A data search from the local Ecological Data Centre • Consultation with the Council's Ecologist • Consultation with local bird groups and other organisations that may hold relevant information • A desk-based assessment - using aerial photography, mapping, habitat maps and relevant ecological literature – of the suitability for SPA birds of the habitats present on the proposed allocation. In cases where there is no evidence of the potential for use by SPA and Ramsar birds, then no further assessment of this issue is needed at plan stage. Where it is not possible to conclude that SPA and Ramsar birds would not use the site, further surveying may need to be undertaken prior to the allocation of the sites in order to properly understand the level of use by SPA and Ramsar birds and any identified impacts on these birds should be avoided or mitigated. Where evidence suggests SPA and Ramsar bird species are using a particular site, mitigation requirements should be set out in the Plan. We note that the appropriate assessment refers to mitigation in policy DQE3, concerning this matter, however we consider that the wording is too generic in this regard and strongly recommend that specific policy wording regarding the loss of functionally linked land should be considered, particularly for windfall development. For individual allocations where a threat to functionally linked land has been identified, and which can be adequately mitigated for, we would expect specific criteria regarding avoidance and mitigation measures in the allocation					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							policies.. In addition, with regards to significance thresholds for Humber Estuary SPA birds on allocations, we advise that where species are demonstrating critical declines at a site level, exceptions to the 1% threshold are made. Many wader species are suffering major reduction in numbers with for example Curlew are considered to be in critical decline on the Humber Estuary SPA and require further assessment if this species occurs on functionally-linked land. 1.1.2 Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA Finally we note that there is insufficient detail regarding the assessment of the impact of the plan on Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA birds. We note that the plan proposes housing development in proximity to Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA in areas such as Crowle, Ealand and Epworth which may impact on foraging land for SPA nightjar. Natural England advises that Doncaster has adopted a 3km screening distance for nightjars around Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA and specifies that proposals within this distance which impact upon nightjar foraging habitat will only be supported where they deliver a net gain in such habitat. We advise that your authority considers a similar approach for allocations within 3km of Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA and to capture windfall development. For more information see criterion E) of Policy 30 of the Doncaster Local Plan and the supporting text. 1.2 Atmospheric Pollution Natural England advises that it is not appropriate to screen the assessment of traffic and air quality to the project stage. It is not possible to rule out adverse effects on the integrity of designated sites without traffic modelling and, as appropriate, air quality assessment which demonstrates whether the growth proposed in the plan will lead to unacceptable air quality impacts on sensitive habitats. In line with Natural England publication NEA001, which is referred to in the assessment, we advise that a screening exercise must be carried out to determine whether development and growth proposed in the plan will lead to significant increases in traffic in proximity to designated sites. Should significant increases be identified then air quality modelling of impacts should be carried out and as necessary mitigation and avoidance measures should be specified in the Plan. 1.3 Recreational Disturbance 1.3.1 Humber Estuary sites Natural England notes that recreational disturbance on the Humber Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar as a result of housing and tourism/visitor development proposed in the plan is screened through to the appropriate assessment and that adverse effects on integrity is ruled out on the basis of mitigation provided by policies DQE10, DQE11 and CSC3. Natural England does not consider that measures set out in these policies					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							are sufficiently specific in order to mitigate for the impacts predicted. We recommend that policy DQE10 should be clear that open space which is important for reducing recreational disturbance on the Humber Estuary designated sites should protected or compensated for in order to avoid adverse effects on Habitats Sites. Furthermore DQE11 and CSC3 should specify that development in proximity to the Humber Estuary designated sites will need to provide alternative facilities specifically for the purpose. We note also that the assessment refers to requirements in DQE3 in relation to mitigating for recreational disturbance and recommend that the policy should explicitly state that development should avoid and mitigate for recreational disturbance where appropriate. Concerning specific housing allocations identified as having likely significant effects with regards to recreational pressures in table 6-3, we recommend that the policy wording for these allocations should explicitly state that measures to avoid and mitigate for recreational disturbance must be incorporated into the allocations. Where appropriate we advise that specific measures should be identified for individual allocations. Natural England is particularly concerned regarding allocations H1P-12 and H1P-13 in Barton Upon Humber which lie in close proximity to Waters Edge Country Park and Far Ings National Nature Reserve which are significant honey-pot sites for visitors on the Humber. These sites are managed by North Lincolnshire Council and the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust respectively. We recommend that further consultation is undertaken with council staff involved with these sites and the Wildlife Trust in order to identify existing pressures and that appropriate measures such as alternative green space provision in the area, improved signage and wardening on the designated site should be carefully considered in relation to these allocations. We note also that Alkborough and Blacktoft Sands lie within or in close proximity to the Plan area and attract visitors to habitats close to and within the Humber Estuary designated sites and recommend that consideration is given to whether housing growth and tourism development proposed in the plan is likely to impact on these areas. Natural England notes that CSC6 is screened in to the Appropriate Assessment but is unsure how the measures identified in Table 7-1 and 7-4 relate to the assessment of this policy. Additional green infrastructure, for instance, would not help mitigate for development or water based activity within the Humber Estuary. We recommend that the policy is updated to refer specifically to the need to avoid and mitigate for development within or which encourages disturbing activities within the boundaries of the Humber Estuary designated sites. 1.3.2 Thorne and Hatfield Moors sites Natural England considers that insufficient detail has been presented regarding the assessment of recreational disturbance on Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA, Thorne Moor SAC and Hatfield Moor SAC in order to come to the conclusions reached. We note in particular that around 173 dwellings proposed in Crowle and					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Ealand lie in close proximity to a key access point for the SPA and SAC including a council owned car park. Natural England considers that the general protected site policies and green infrastructure and open space policies are inadequate to avoid and mitigate for development proposed in the plan. We advise that specific reference is made in the policies to avoiding and mitigating for recreational impacts. Furthermore we recommend that allocations in proximity to the Thorne and Hatfield Moors sites should include specific recommendations regarding avoiding and mitigating for recreational pressures. The assessment should include a screening distance in order to identify these sites. Finally we consider that provision of attractive alternative dog walking facilities is likely to be of particular value in avoiding and mitigating for impacts on Thorne and Hatfield Moors. We advise that opportunities may exist on council owned land in proximity to the council car park close to Crowle. 1.4 South Humber Bank Natural England broadly agrees with conclusions of the assessment however we consider that insufficient detail has been provided regarding the evidence underlying the assessment of the South Humber Bank proposals and the avoidance and mitigation measures adopted. We recommend that greater reference is made to the existing Habitats Regulations Assessments of the Able Marine Energy Park (ref TR030001) Able Logistics Park (ref PA/2015/1264) in order to evidence the conclusions reached.					
0379	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	Paragraph 2.1					Natural England welcomes the inclusion of the natural environment as a key challenge for the local plan and the specific reference to mandatory biodiversity net gain (BNG). This highlights the integral nature of BNG as a theme throughout the Local Plan and clearly aligns it with the objectives of the 25 Year Environment Plan, and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Environment Bill. However, we suggest the statement should be strengthened by referring to 'measurable' BNG, as stated in paragraph 179 (b) and 180 (d) of the NPPF (2021). Reference to 'measurable' BNG should then be used consistently throughout the remainder of the document.					View PDF
0380	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	Paragraph 3.1					The Spatial Vision and Objectives specifically refer to the role of BNG - this puts it at the heart of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan and its policies. The Local Spatial Vision at 3.10 states that "Biodiversity net gain and an enhancement of the area's coherent ecological networks will be a requirement for all proposals where viability allows." It should be noted that the Environment Bill includes a mandatory requirement for all developments to achieve BNG, therefore this statement should be strengthened by removing the text 'where viability allows'. Natural England welcomes the reference to BNG within Spatial Objectives 6 and 11 which will address key challenges and issues that face the area, as well as national planning policy requirements.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0382	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	Paragraph 5.5					Natural England suggests that allocations which state that "A comprehensive landscaping scheme, including biodiversity enhancement is required" should be amended to make specific reference to 'achieving a measurable net gain in biodiversity' (H1P-1 to H1P-6, H1P-11, H1P-19 to H1P-25, H1P-27). Policies H1P-15 to H1P-18 state that "biodiversity enhancements should be incorporated into site design" – again this should be amended to make specific reference to achieving a 'measurable net gain in biodiversity'. We also suggest that all other allocations make specific reference to BNG - all developments will need to achieve BNG even if there is no impact on existing habitats. The wording at Policy EC1-1 Normandy Enterprise Park criterion h could be used across these allocations, however, the wording should be strengthened by replacing 'should' with 'must' and the insertion of 'measurable'.					View PDF
0384	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	Support				Natural England welcomes that policy DQE1 makes specific reference to the "provision of measurable net gains to biodiversity" and suggest that a similar reference 'and provides a measurable net gain in biodiversity' is added to DQE2 criterion 2.					View PDF
0542	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	POLICY DQE3: BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY					Natural England welcomes the detail provided about BNG in the policy wording and supporting text, specifically the: • identification of the Environment Bill as a key policy driver; • clear links to related elements of the Environment Bill – Local Nature Recovery Strategies and the Nature Recovery Network; • commitment to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to provide supporting information and guidance on how to approach development proposals. Natural England can provide advice to you on this and suggest that the document should be published in advance of, or at, adoption of the Local Plan; • clear reference to the mitigation hierarchy as set out in the NPPF. Reference could also be made to the CIRIA/CIEEM/IEMA 'Biodiversity Net Gain Good practice principles for development' which provide developers with industry best practice principles to achieve biodiversity net gain. In order to achieve BNG, a project must be able to demonstrate that it has followed all 10 of the Principles of BNG; • statement that a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain will be required, which is consistent with the mandatory requirement of the Environment Bill, and also the clear reference to the British Standard for Biodiversity Net Gain (BS 8683); • clear reference to the use of the Defra Biodiversity Metric 2.0. However, please note that Biodiversity Metric 3.0 was recently published and is likely to be periodically updated, therefore it may be better to amend the wording to 'the latest version of the Biodiversity Metric'. To better reflect the requirements of the Environment Bill the policy wording and/or supporting text should be amended to include: • the intended delivery mechanism, for example planning conditions or					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							S106 agreements, and how BNG sites will be managed in the longer term. The Environment Bill requires that sites are managed and maintained for a minimum 30-year period. However, Natural England would welcome net gain sites being protected in perpetuity, subject to landowner agreement, and the new conservation covenants within the Environment Bill can provide a mechanism for this; • what developers need to provide and when. CIEEM have published 'BNG Report and Audit Templates' provides a framework for writing reports for projects that are aiming to achieve BNG). British Standard BS 8683 'A process for designing and implementing biodiversity net gain' provides further useful guidance for developers and is intended to be applicable for large or small development projects.					
0383	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	POLICY EC1: EMPLOYMENT LAND SUPPLY	Support				Natural England welcomes that policies EC1-1 and EC1-4 make specific reference to BNG, however, we suggest that where text refers to 'biodiversity enhancements' (EC1-2, EC1-3, EC1-5 to EC1-9) specific reference to achieving measurable biodiversity net gain should be made. We also suggest that more consistent wording is used across the policies and could be based on the amended EC1-1 text (see above). Natural England welcomes the reference to BNG in policies EC5 to EC7, however, we suggest the wording at EC5 is amended to read 'designated sites and protected and priority species and a measurable net gain in biodiversity.'					View PDF
0566	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	POLICY EC4: SOUTH HUMBER BANK - LANDSCAPE INITIATIVE					2.2.2 Policy EC4 For clarity we recommend that the following sentence is added to policy EC4: "Any landscaping provided should be appropriate to the location and sensitivities of nearby habitats and species." Natural England notes that para 6.86 refers to 'neutral capital' rather than 'natural capital'. We also recommend that you consider including a reference to incorporate biodiversity net gain through habitat provision in this context.					View PDF
0567	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	Policy EC5: Wharves					Wharves Natural England advises that policy EC5 should be clear that, where proposed wharves are found to have adverse effects on the integrity of Habitats Sites, for instance because they are within the boundaries of a designated site, proposals can only proceed if it can be demonstrated that there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest (IROPI), that there is no alternative and that compensatory measures are provided for the loss of designated site habitat in line with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). In addition we advise that para 6.89 should refer to Special Areas of					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Conservation (SACs) as well as Ramsar, SPA, SSSI, LNR and SINC.					
0745	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	POLICY SS10: STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION - SOUTH HUMBER BANK					2.2.1 Policy SS10 Natural England recommends that the last clause of para 4.91 should read: “and provide additional mitigation to that identified within the Mitigation Strategy, if required.” Rather than: “and provide additional mitigation if required and not already functionally linked to that identified within the Mitigation Strategy.” We note that our previous comments with regards to this matter may not have been clear and apologies for any confusion caused. Natural England advises that the reference to ‘birds regulations’ is removed from criterion 2 a of Policy SS10. The requirement should simply state that “…this includes complying with the tests of the Habitats Regulations”. Overall we consider that the list of criteria in section 2 of policy SS10 would be clearer if criteria e and f were swapped.					View PDF
0381	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	POLICY SS3: DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES					Natural England welcomes Policy SS3 Development Principles which states that all proposals for development should reflect several key principles, including measurable BNG (criterion i) - this will contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities and a sense of place. Natural England welcomes that Policy SS7 Strategic Site Allocation Lincolnshire Lakes (criterion 5) states planning applications should “assess specific impact of development proposals on biodiversity and associated opportunities for ecological protection and enhancement within each strategic allocation and the surrounding area to provide biodiversity net gain.” The provision of detail regarding the types of enhancement and creation for each strategic allocation is welcomed and will provide valuable direction to developers on how best to achieve BNG. Policy SS10 Strategic Allocation South Humber Bank (criterion 2j) also refers directly to BNG and states the framework within which it will be considered, again providing useful direction to developers.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0762	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	POLICY SS7: STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION – LINCOLNSHIRE LAKES					Natural England notes and welcomes the updated policies concerning the Lincolnshire Lakes Strategic Allocations however we advise that policies should be more specific with regards to mitigation measures necessary to avoid significant effects on the Humber Estuary SAC, SPA, Ramsar and SSSI. We note for instance that Table 7-4 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment identifies impacts on Humber Estuary designations including the need to mitigate for the loss of Humber Estuary SPA birds, in relation to the Lincolnshire Lakes Strategic Allocations. The Table states that policy SS7 commits to the "…protection of existing features, and inclusion of new areas of woodland, acid grassland, neutral grassland, ditches, swales, wetland and ponds within the development, integrated with strategic green linkages". We recommend however that the policy wording of SS7 should be clear where measures are necessary for mitigating for impacts on the Humber Estuary designations rather just general references to provision. In addition Table 6-3 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment report screens in water discharges in relation to the Lincolnshire Lakes allocations for likely significant effects on Habitats Sites. We advise that Policy SS7 should be clear that drainage design should consider impacts on the Humber Estuary SAC, Ramsar and SSSI including the application of SuDS. Finally we note that the previous Lincolnshire Lakes Area Action Plan distinguished between publicly accessible natural and semi-natural greenspaces and wetland areas with limited public access and advise that this is made clear in policy SS7.					View PDF
0759	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	Sustainability Appraisal					Sustainability Appraisal Notwithstanding our concerns regarding the Habitats Regulations Assessment set out above (which should be taken into account in the Appraisal, Natural England is broadly content with the Sustainability Appraisal and offer the following advice. Natural England welcomes the objectives set out. Please note that biodiversity net gain is now mandatory in the enacted the Environment Bill and the SA will need to be updated to reflect this. Objective "Biodiversity and nature conservation, 2 Protect and enhance biodiversity habitats and species", It currently says "ensure Biodiversity Net Gain", it is recommended it includes more detail around this as it a bit vague, and included relevant national BNG related influences, namely the Environment Bill and the UK Government's 25 YEP. This could potentially also refer to the NPPF. It is noted that new policies were introduced (SS9 – Land at North KillingHolme Airfield, TC2 –Placemaking & Good Urban Design and H4 Specialist and Supported Housing) and one policy was removed (DQE5 – Nature Conservation & Recreational Land Uses).					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
David **Atkin**												
0700	David Atkin	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comment, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Sarah **Atkin**												
0874	Sarah Atkin	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Celia **Atkinson**												
0879	Celia Atkinson	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
0518	Celia Atkinson	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0800	Celia Atkinson	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation.”					
Katie **Atkinson**, KVA Planning consultancy on behalf of Jenny Hayenes Planning Lead for CPRE Northern Lincolnshire												
0742	Katie Atkinson, KVA Planning consultancy on behalf of Jenny Hayenes Planning Lead for CPRE Northern Lincolnshire	Paragraph 3.1	Support				Support			Yes	Yes	View PDF
0561	Katie Atkinson, KVA Planning consultancy on behalf of Jenny Hayenes Planning Lead for CPRE Northern Lincolnshire	POLICY EC1-6: LAND AT NORTH WEST OF THE A15 BARTON INTERCHANGE	object				It is considered that development of this site at this location would create indefensible boundaries by developing at this open countryside location. CPRENL believe this should be deallocated			Yes	Yes	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0421	Katie Atkinson, KVA Planning consultancy on behalf of Jenny Hayenes Planning Lead for CPRE Northern Lincolnshire	General					KVA Planning Consultancy has been commissioned to consider the Publication draft version of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan on behalf of the Northern Lincolnshire local group of CPRE The Countryside Charity (CPRENL), to be submitted to North Lincolnshire Council. The emerging Local Plan, once adopted, will replace the saved policies of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan, the Core Strategy and the Housing and Employment Land Allocations Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and the Lincolnshire Lakes Area Action Plan (AAP) and will be a consolidated and comprehensive single Local Plan setting out the principles for development until 2038. CPRENL commented previously on the Regulation 18 document in both April 2017 and March 2018 and the Preferred Options version in March 2020. Having had the opportunity to read the Publication version of the draft document, CPRENL remains on the whole supportive of the document and pleased to see the commitments to the preservation and enhancement of the North Lincolnshire countryside and open green spaces including to its biodiversity and geodiversity. CPRENL welcomes the various positive changes to the draft Plan as a result of comments made at the Preferred Options stage particularly the strengthening of policies and text in relation to biodiversity net gain, minerals and a brownfield first priority. The Environment Act 2021 has now been passed as such all developments are required to deliver a measurable net gain for biodiversity. Furthermore, the Prime Minster has recently repeated his party's view that development should be on brownfield land leaving greenfield sites green wherever possible. The following table highlights those areas most pertinent to this charity, silence on a matter, therefore, should be viewed as an in-principal support for the draft plan. Should the Plan change in future documents, however, CPRENL reserve the right to comment as appropriate. For ease of interpretation, please see the following acronyms for the tests of soundness as set out in Paragraph 35 of the NPPF: PP - Positively Prepared; J – Justified; E – Effective; C - Consistent with National Policy Underlined text sets out the proposed modification. In conclusion, CPRENL welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Publication Draft Local Plan produced by the Council. In general, the charity believes the document is consistent with national guidance and the NPPF subject to the suggested amendments above which we believe provide opportunities to ensure the document is as robust as possible. It is considered the suggested additions would allow effective development management to occur. CPRENL would wish to be kept informed of the process of this and other planning policy documents as they progress through the plan preparation process.			Yes	Yes	View PDF
0563	Katie Atkinson, KVA Planning consultancy on behalf of Jenny Hayenes	POLICY EC1-7: LAND AT SOUTH OF BARNETBY TOP INTERCHANGE AND TO THE WEST OF THE	object				Whilst located close to a major transport interchange, the site is a major greenfield location away from a settlement which means that the site is not located where the need to travel can be minimised as such it is not consistent with national policy. CPRENL believe this should be deallocated			Yes	Yes	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	Planning Lead for CPRE Northern Lincolnshire	A18										
0564	Katie Atkinson, KVA Planning consultancy on behalf of Jenny Hayenes Planning Lead for CPRE Northern Lincolnshire	POLICY EC1-8: LAND AT SOUTH OF BARNETBY TOP INTERCHANGE AND TO THE EAST OF THE A18	object				Whilst located close to a major transport interchange, the site is a major greenfield location away from a settlement which means that the site is not located where the need to travel can be minimised as such it is not consistent with national policy. CPRENL believe this should be deallocated			Yes	Yes	View PDF
0565	Katie Atkinson, KVA Planning consultancy on behalf of Jenny Hayenes Planning Lead for CPRE Northern Lincolnshire	POLICY EC1-9: LAND TO THE SOUTH OF THE CROWLE GYRATORY	object				Whilst located close to a major transport interchange, the site is a major greenfield location away from a settlement which means that the site is not located where the need to travel can be minimised as such it is not consistent with national policy. CPRENL believe this should be deallocated			Yes	Yes	View PDF
0746	Katie Atkinson, KVA Planning consultancy on behalf of Jenny Hayenes Planning Lead for CPRE Northern Lincolnshire	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	Support				Support			Yes	Yes	View PDF
0755	Katie Atkinson, KVA Planning consultancy on behalf of Jenny Hayenes Planning Lead for CPRE Northern Lincolnshire	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	support				Support			Yes	Yes	View PDF
0756	Katie Atkinson, KVA Planning consultancy on behalf of Jenny Hayenes Planning Lead for CPRE Northern	POLICY SS7: STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION – LINCOLNSHIRE LAKES	Object				The Environment Act 21 has now been passed into law, as such point 5 should refer to the required 10% target for biodiversity net gain to be consistent with national policy. Suggested modification: Planning applications should also assess the specific impact of development proposals on biodiversity and associated opportunities for ecological protection and enhancement within each strategic allocation and surrounding area to provide a minimum of 10% measurable			Yes	Yes	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	Lincolnshire						biodiversity net gain.					
0760	Katie Atkinson, KVA Planning consultancy on behalf of Jenny Hayenes Planning Lead for CPRE Northern Lincolnshire	POLICY TC2: PLACEMAKING & GOOD URBAN DESIGN	object				The Local Plan does not make reference to the creation of 'high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places' as required by the NPPF 2021. It is thought that to be found sound and encourage appropriate place making these words should be included within the policy. The text justification should also be updated to reference these important words.2. Proposals should adhere to the following detailed design points to ensure high quality; beautiful and sustainable developments are delivered throughout North Lincolnshire:			Yes	Yes	View PDF
Mandy **Atkinson**												
0346	Mandy Atkinson	Paragraph 8.1	support	yes	yes	yes	I find the local plan as a whole and in particular POLICY RD1: SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE - as Sound and agree to all areas as Protection of low growth settlements and grade 1 agricultural land is vital to health and well being and the rural way of life. POLICY RD1: SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE Noting also that the protection of out of development limits and grade 1 agricultural land included in many of the policies also being Consistent with national policy and current and future main stream Government policies. being of brownfield first. Development will be expected to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. Areas of lower quality agricultural land should be used where the proposals result in the significant development of agricultural land in preference to the best and most versatile agricultural land Smaller Rural Settlements Alkborough; Althorpe; Appleby; Bonby; Burringham; East Butterwick; Eastoft; Elsham; Flixborough; Garthorpe & Fockerby; Howsham; Kirmington; Luddington; North Killingholme; Redbourne; West Halton; Wootton & Worlaby These settlements will accommodate small-scale development of a limited nature, within their defined settlement developments, that supports their vitality and viability. Small sites will have a role to play. All development should reflect the character and nature of these villages and give due consideration to the availability and capacity of infrastructure to support its growth. All proposals will be considered on their merits.	Consistent with national policy		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
William **Atkinson**												
0345	William Atkinson	Paragraph 8.1	support	yes	yes	yes	I find the local plan as a whole and in particular POLICY RD1: SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE - as Sound and agree to all areas as Protection of low growth settlements and grade 1 agricultural land is vital to health and well being and the rural way of life. POLICY RD1: SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE Noting also that the protection of out of development limits and grade 1 agricultural land included in many of the policies also being Consistent with national policy and current and future main stream Government policies. being of brownfield first. Development will be expected to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. Areas of lower quality agricultural land should be used where the proposals result in the significant development of agricultural land in preference to the best and most versatile agricultural land Smaller Rural Settlements Alkborough; Althorpe; Appleby; Bonby; Burringham; East Butterwick; Eastoft; Elsham; Flixborough; Garthorpe & Fockerby; Howsham; Kirmington; Luddington; North Killingholme; Redbourne; West Halton; Wootton & Worlaby These settlements will accommodate small-scale development of a limited nature, within their defined settlement developments, that supports their vitality and viability. Small sites will have a role to play. All development should reflect the character and nature of these villages and give due consideration to the availability and capacity of infrastructure to support its growth. All proposals will be considered on their merits.	Consistent with national policy		no		
Jayne **Baldwin**												
1769	Jayne Baldwin	POLICY H1P-26: LAND AT FIELD HOUSE	Object	No	No	No	Please see over for concerns/reasons why this land should not be granted planning permission or developed. In all of the Local Plan documents (including the 2003 version) this section of land is highlighted as an area that needs to be protected due to Haxey & this land being part of the Isle of Axholme Area of Special Historic Landscape Interest why has this not been taken into account and why would you want to destroy this? 2. Graizelound Fields Road is a single track ancient road-it is not suitable and inadequate for a considerable increase in traffic ff 75 new dwellings were built it cannot be widened at the Graiselound end and is a blind corner. 3. The area of land is part of a flood plain and would need considerable amounts of work on drainage to combat this. The land highlighted to be developed is currently harvested and productive soil and animal feed/hay/corn there are other areas of land farming currently does not take place. 4. Adequate/no notice was given to the meeting that took place on 15th November 2021 which is not acceptable for a Local Authority. 5. An assessment of potential development land areas with higher scores of sustainability than this land have been disregarded.	No	There are a number of other landowners with land in the village with closer access to the local amenities and land that is not on a flood plain, greenbelt, historic or currently farmed that have not been approached or considered. The area of land in-between Haxey and Westwoodside was rejected as it would join the 2 villages together this would also be the case with Haxey and Graizelound there must be consistent approaches when considering pieces of land. To find suitable land in the village that will not cause major disruption to the infrastructure	Yes	I wish to participate in the hearing as I would like to hear first hand what exactly is happening and when as mentioned previously we were not informed about the initial meeting and to put it only on the website is not satisfactory. I am not against change but change should not be detrimental to the area.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									and land (single track road).			
Luke **Bamforth** on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership												
0233	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	Paragraph 2.36	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. As stated in the previous consultation the GLNP believe that Local Plan policies must recognise the value of Greater Lincolnshire's natural environment to the visitor economy, while the NPPF (paragraph 174b) requires that the planning system contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services. Therefore, the GLNP supports the inclusion of the natural environment as an asset for the visitor economy.	Consistent with national policy		no		
0234	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	Paragraph 2.45	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. The GLNP supports the recognition of access to quality green space and its role in enabling healthy lives. This is in line with the Governments commitment to connect people with the environment to improve health and wellbeing by Working with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to see how our commitments on green infrastructure can be incorporated into national planning guidance and policy. (25 year plan for the environment, pg77). It also contributes towards the requirement of the NPPF laid out in paragraph 92c which reads: Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which: c) enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs " for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure.	Consistent with national policy		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0235	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	Paragraph 2.52	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. The GLNP supports the reference to the different landscapes and national character areas within North Lincolnshire. This shows that the Local Plan is underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. As required by the NPPF (paragraph 31). Additionally, the GLNP feels that all planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity (for example those in NPPF paragraphs 8c, 20d, 174 and 179) and as such supports the inclusion of the Natural Environment as a Key Challenge, including reference to the wider ecological network within the wording of that key challenge. It is also important that there is an emphasis on biodiversity net gain and connectivity of the ecological network. As required by the NPPF in paragraphs 174d and 179b which state: 174d Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures; 179b To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should: promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The GLNP therefore supports the wording regarding biodiversity net gain within the text of the key challenge, which is in line with its response to the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0237	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	Paragraph 3	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. Outcomes for North Lincolnshire The GLNP believe that Local Plan policies must recognise the value of Greater Lincolnshire's natural environment to public health and wellbeing, it therefore supports the inclusion of greener spaces within the Well section of the Outcomes for North Lincolnshire. Which contributes towards the requirement of the NPPF laid out in paragraph 92c which reads: Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which: c) enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs " for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure Priority: Keeping people safe and well The GLNP believe that Local Plan policies must recognise the value of Greater Lincolnshire's natural environment to public health and wellbeing, it therefore supports the inclusion of Provide cleaner and greener space for people to enjoy and use within the Taking action section of the Local Plan. This contributes towards the requirement of the NPPF laid out in paragraph 92c which reads: Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which: c) enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs " for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure. Spatial Vision for North Lincolnshire Paragraph 5 Local Plan policies must recognise the value of Greater Lincolnshire's natural environment to the visitor economy, while the NPPF (paragraph 174b) requires that the planning system contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services. Therefore, the GLNP supports the inclusion of the natural environment as an asset for the visitor economy. Paragraph 9 Local Plan policies must recognise the value of Greater Lincolnshire's natural environment to public health and wellbeing. The Governments 25 year plan for the Environment states that: urban greenspace is unequally distributed. The provision of more and better quality green infrastructure, including urban trees, will make towns and cities attractive places to live and work, and bring about key long-term improvements in peoples health (Pg. 76).	Consistent with national policy	Spatial Vision for North Lincolnshire paragraph 9 alternate wording could be as follows: Local people will have good access to quality open spaces (including greenspace), play and sporting facilities, better access to the countryside and the natural environment, increased opportunities for cycling and walking, and good quality health facilities.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							The plan also pledges to Help people improve their health and wellbeing by using green spaces (Pg. 71). Equally, the NPPF includes reference to safe and accessible green infrastructure as an example of how to enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs(paragraph 92c). It is felt that the use of countryside alone is not enough as it does not necessarily include truly natural space. The GLNP therefore feels that there should be specific mention of green spaces or green infrastructure and the natural environment. Paragraph 10 All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, as required by the NPPF (including paragraphs 8c, 174, 179 and 180), therefore the GLNP support recognition of risks to wildlife and the commitment to avoid these risks when considering renewable and low carbon energy. Paragraph 12 All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity. This paragraph contributes towards requirements of the NPPF regarding sustainability and protecting and enhancing the natural environment as covered in paragraphs 8c, 174, 175, 179, and 180. As well as supporting the commitment to safeguarding the natural environment within the spatial strategy the GLNP also supports requirements for development to enhance ecological networks and achieve biodiversity net gain, contributing to requirements of the NPPF for commitments to seek net gain (paragraphs 174d, 179b, 180d) and reference to the enhancement of ecological networks as per the NPPF paragraphs 174d and 179a.					
0238	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	Paragraph 3.11	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. Spatial Objective 4: Delivering Infrastructure for Growth (A Connected North Lincolnshire) As stated in the previous consultation the GLNP feel that Local Plans should contain robust policies for the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure and therefore support its inclusion here, however it also feels that the wider benefits of green infrastructure should be recognised and as such more detail of the multiple benefits should be included within the policy wording. This could be as follows: We will also seek to deliver the necessary community infrastructure/facilities and green infrastructure to support the creation of sustainable communities and cleaner and greener spaces, providing multiple benefits such as improved health and wellbeing, climate mitigation and flood resilience.	Consistent with national policy		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							This detail would serve to evidence the need for green infrastructure and support its inclusion within the policy meeting the NPPF (Paragraph 31) requirement for policy to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. It would also contribute to requirements of the NPPF to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services (paragraph 174b) as well as paragraphs 20c which requires that Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places, and make sufficient provision for: community facilities (such as health, education and cultural infrastructure) and 20d which requires that the same is required in regards to conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation. Spatial Objective 6: Protecting and Enhancing Our Natural, Built and Historic Environment All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity and therefore it is encouraging to see the inclusion of Spatial Objective 6: Protecting and Enhancing Our Natural, Built and Historic Environment. In line with comments on the preferred options consultation the GLNP supports the inclusion of biodiversity net gain and a commitment to enhancing ecological networks meeting requirements presented within paragraphs 174d and 179b of the NPPF. Spatial Objective 9: Improved Enabling Quality of Life In line with the GLNPs comments on the preferred options consultation it supports the recognition of the value of Greater Lincolnshire's natural environment to public health and wellbeing, contributing to requirements set out by the NPPF (paragraph 174b) which states that plans should recognise the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services this would include the value of the natural environment for, and the role of green infrastructure in, promoting positive health and wellbeing outcomes. It also feeds into the Governments commitment, in the 25 Year Plan for the Environment to connect people with the environment to improve health and wellbeing. Spatial Objective 10: Developing Our Visitor Economy As highlighted by the GLNPs response to the Preferred Options consultation, Local Plan policies must recognise the value of Greater Lincolnshire's natural environment to the visitor economy and as such the GLNP support the recognition of nature as an asset to visitor economy. There is a responsibility to ensure the appropriate use and management of the natural environment. The NPPF calls for a sustainable approach which includes making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution (paragraph 8c). Therefore the GLNP also supports the commitment that The visitor economy's impact on the natural					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							environment will be mitigated to reduce negative effects on biodiversity and natural resources within the objective. Spatial Objective 11: Planning for Climate Change All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity. The NPPF requires Planning Policy to make a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating from rising temperatures (paragraph 153) and for Plans to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity by promoting the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.(179b) Therefore the GLNP supports the commitment to enhancing biodiversity within the objective. Specifically reference to nature based solutions to climate change and the impacts of climate change, the creation of new habitats, biodiversity net gain and the Nature Recovery Network. The GLNP also supports the commitment to an ambitious tree and hedge planting strategy, but would like to highlight the importance that it should include a principle of right tree in the right place.					
0240	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	Paragraph 4.20	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. The planning system should recognise the concept of natural capital and the wider benefits of the natural environment, integrating these within planning aspirations and seeking to deliver multiple benefits. The NPPF requires the planning system to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognizing the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services (paragraph 174b). As such the GLNP supports the inclusion of paragraph 4.20.	Consistent with national policy		no		
0241	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	Paragraph 4.26	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. The GLNP supports the recognition of access to quality green space and its role in enabling healthy lives. This is in line with the Governments commitment to connect people with the environment to improve health and wellbeing by Working with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to see how our commitments on green infrastructure can be incorporated into national planning guidance and policy. (25 year plan for the environment, pg77). It also contributes towards the requirement of the NPPF laid out in paragraph 92c which reads:	Consistent with national policy		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which: c) enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs " for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure, sports facilities, local shops, access to healthier food, allotments and layouts that encourage walking and cycling.					
0245	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	Paragraph 6.84	object	no	no	no	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. In line with its response to the Preferred Options consultation the GLNP believes that better communication and joint working between all involved are key ways to achieving a more effective planning system. Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states that there is a duty to cooperate with prescribed bodies (subsection 9) this includes any Local Nature Partnerships relevant to the area. The NPPF supports this in paragraphs 16c, which states that there should be proportionate and effective engagement between plan makers and local organisations and 25, which requires Strategic policy-making authorities to engage with relevant bodies including Local Enterprise Partnerships and Local Nature Partnerships. Therefore the addition of ˜and other stakeholders is supported. However, this is not strong enough and should be strengthened. Ultimately explicit reference to environmental stakeholders would be preferred as the partnership in question relates to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment.	Consistent with national policy	While the addition of and other stakeholders is supported it doesn't go far enough and should be strengthened, potentially with the following suggested wording: To protect important sites of nature conservation or amenity value, it is proposed to set up a partnership involving the industrial, agricultural communities and all other relevant stakeholders, including environmental, to co-ordinate and progress schemes of environmental enhancement.	yes	National Policy requires engagement with relevant bodies, without the specific inclusion of environmental organisations within a partnership set up to discuss schemes of environmental enhancement there is the potential that these experts will be left out and therefore schemes will not be planned in a way which meets objectives regarding the protection and enhancement of the natural environment. Therefore if these modifications are not agreed upon it will be necessary to attend the hearing sessions.	
0252	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	Paragraph 8.4	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the natural environment and biodiversity are key elements of what makes up the countryside. Therefore, in line with its response to the Preferred Options consultation, the GLNP supports the recognition of this in the wording. It is important that the Local Plan plays a role in maintaining and enhancing a sustainable	Consistent with national policy		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							countryside, whilst protecting and enhancing biodiversity, as the areas natural environment is one of its key assets. The paragraph as it is contributes to requirements of the NPPF (paragraphs 8c, 174d, 179b and 180d).					
0253	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	Paragraph 9.1	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments.Sourcing and maintaining credible data is central to ensuring effective local planning and policy making. The NPPF states that The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence (paragraph 31). The GLNP supports the text in Paragraph 9.1 that makes reference to all national character areas present in North Lincolnshire not just the Lincolnshire Wolds, this makes it clear that this section and the policy attached is informed by the proper evidence.	justified		no		
0264	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	Paragraph 9.103	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d). To meet these requirements policy should include a principle of biodiversity net gain. Therefore the GLNP, in line with previous responses supports reference to an SPD which will provide supporting information and guidance on how to approach development proposals, relating to the natural environment, in a way that will facilitate sustainable planning decisions to be made. This will contribute to the production of high quality, sustainable development with a focus on achieving a net gain in biodiversity and discharging Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) obligations.	Consistent with national policy		no		
0262	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	Paragraph 9.93	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. The planning system should recognise the wider benefits of natural environment such as a regulated climate. The reference to the role of landscape within paragraph 9.93 shows that the Local Plan is working towards NPPF requirements such as mitigating and adapting to climate change (8c), making sufficient provision for planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation (20d) and evidence that the Plan policies take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change (153). Therefore in line with previous consultation	Consistent with national policy		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							responses the GLNP supports the inclusion of this can contribute to the proactive approach that North Lincolnshire Council is taking to mitigate and adapt to climate change locally.					
0265	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY CSC1: 1c.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. Local Plan policies must recognise the value of Greater Lincolnshire's natural environment to public health and wellbeing and that interaction with nature is beneficial to both physical and mental health and wellbeing. This is supported by the Governments commitment to connect people with the environment to improve health and wellbeing by Working with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to see how our commitments on green infrastructure can be incorporated into national planning guidance and policy. (25 year plan for the environment, pg77). Therefore, the GLNP supports the addition of and nature to principle 1c of the policy, which is in line with representations made in previous consultations.	Consistent with national policy		no		
0270	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY CSC15: 1c.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d). To meet these requirements policy should include a principle of biodiversity net gain. Therefore the GLNP supports the inclusion of wording in principle 1.c. that states it does not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the areas valuable natural, built or heritage assets and helps to enhance any affected asset, including through the provision of measurable Biodiversity Net Gain.	Consistent with national policy		no		
0272	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY CSC17: 1b.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around	Consistent with national policy		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d). To meet these requirements policy should include a principle of biodiversity net gain. Therefore the GLNP supports the inclusion of principle 1.b. which commits to supports camping and caravan site development which contributes to measurable Biodiversity Net Gain.					
0266	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY CSC3: 6c.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d). Therefore, the GLNP supports principle 6.c. which requires development resulting in the loss of natural greenspace or open space will be required to achieve biodiversity net gain and principle 6.d. that requires such development to protect or enhance the ecological network.	Consistent with national policy		no		
0267	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY CSC3: 6d.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d). Therefore, the GLNP supports principle 6.c. which requires development resulting in the loss of natural greenspace or open space will be required to achieve biodiversity net gain and principle 6.d. that requires such development to protect or enhance the ecological network.	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0268	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY CSC5: 1f.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d). Therefore, in line with representations to previous consultations, the GLNP supports the inclusion of principle 1.f. which requires development to provide measurable biodiversity net gain in line with the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping to maximise contribution to the Nature Recovery Network and Local Nature Recovery Strategy	Consistent with national policy		no		
0269	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY CSC8: 4.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment (paragraphs 8c, 174d, 179b and 180d). Therefore the GLNP supports the inclusion of principle 4. Which requires that New school development should seek to ensure effective protection of environmental features/assets and that the design of such development should seek to achieve multiple-benefits, including environmental enhancement, low carbon design and renewable energy generation. As highlighted in responses to the Preferred Options consultation, this also brings this policy in line with other policies in Chapter 11 of the draft Local Plan.	Consistent with national policy		no		
0277	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY DM1: 3n.	support	yes	yes	yes	All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity.(180d). Therefore, in line with representations to previous consultations, the GLNP supports the inclusion of principle 3.n. within the policy, which reads Enhance the natural environment through the provision of measurable net gains to biodiversity and contribute to nature's recovery through establishment of Nature Recovery Networks, as appropriate to their nature and scale.	Consistent with national policy		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0254	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY DQE1: 3.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity(180d). Therefore the GLNP supports the addition of principle 3.d. which includes the wording and provide measurable net gains to biodiversity particularly where they contribute to Nature Recovery Networks.	Consistent with national policy		no		
0255	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY DQE1: 6.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments.All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity. (180d). Therefore the GLNP supports the addition of principle 6 which commits to incorporating biodiversity net gain measures identified through ecological assessment.	Consistent with national policy		no		
0261	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY DQE10: IMPORTANT OPEN SPACE	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. The GLNP supports reference to Policy DQE3: Biodiversity and Geology. This will ensure that the content of this and NPPF requirements met by it are not overlooked, specifically in regards to biodiversity net gain and the enhancement of ecological networks (NPPF paragraphs 174d, 179b and 180d).	positively prepared		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0257	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY DQE3: 1c.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d). Therefore in line with its previous response the GLNP supports the inclusion of principle 1.c. which requires development to achieve biodiversity net gains of a minimum of 10% and that the Defra Metric should be used to demonstrate that planned development will meet this target.	Consistent with national policy		no		
0258	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY DQE7: CLIMATE CHANGE & LOW CARBON LIVING	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. The GLNP supports reference to Policy DQE3: Biodiversity and Geology. This will ensure that the content of this and NPPF requirements met by it are not overlooked, specifically in regards to biodiversity net gain and the enhancement of ecological networks (NPPF paragraphs 174d, 179b and 180d).	positively prepared		no		
0259	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY DQE8: RENEWABLE ENERGY PROPOSALS	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. The GLNP supports reference to other Delivering Quality Environment Policies. This will ensure that the content of these policies and NPPF requirements met by them are not overlooked.	positively prepared		no		
0248	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY EC6: SUPPORTING THE RURAL ECONOMY	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d).	Consistent with national policy		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Therefore the GLNP supports the addition of principle 1.h. enhance the natural environment through the provision of measurable net gains to biodiversity.					
0250	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY EC7: 2f.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity. (180d). Therefore the GLNP supports the addition of principle 2.f. enhance the natural environment through the provision of measurable net gains to biodiversity.	Consistent with national policy		no		
0273	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY MIN3: 1b.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d). Therefore the GLNP supports the addition of principle 1.b. regarding impacts to the natural environment especially in respect to biodiversity net gain. The GLNP also supports reference to soil quality which is in line with the NPPF which requires policies to protect and enhance soils (paragraph 174a).	Consistent with national policy		no		
0274	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY MIN8: 3b.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments.All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by establishing coherent ecological networks, (174d) safeguarding wider ecological networks (179a) and promoting the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks (179b). Therefore the GLNP supports the	Consistent with national policy		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							inclusion of principles 3.b. and 5. within the policy.Equally, the NPPF requires policies to enhance the natural environment by protecting and enhancing (174a) and therefore the GLNP supports the inclusion principle 4. within the policy.					
0275	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY MIN8: 4.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by establishing coherent ecological networks, (174d) safeguarding wider ecological networks (179a) and promoting the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks (179b). Therefore the GLNP supports the inclusion of principles 3.b. and 5. within the policy. Equally, the NPPF requires policies to enhance the natural environment by protecting and enhancing (174a) and therefore the GLNP supports the inclusion principle 4. within the policy.	Consistent with national policy		no		
0276	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY MIN8: 5.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by establishing coherent ecological networks, (174d) safeguarding wider ecological networks (179a) and promoting the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks (179b). Therefore the GLNP supports the inclusion of principles 3.b. and 5. within the policy. Equally, the NPPF requires policies to enhance the natural environment by protecting and enhancing soils (174a) and therefore the GLNP supports the inclusion principle 4. within the policy.	Consistent with national policy		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0251	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY RD1: 3.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity and therefore this policy should include a paragraph which requires development to protect and enhance biodiversity as required by the NPPF paragraphs 8c, 170d, 174b and 175d. The NPPF also requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (170d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (174b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (175d). Equally, Sustainable rural development is also a prime opportunity for establishing coherent ecological network as required by the NPPF (paragraph 170d). Inclusion of this within the policy would also evidence a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for biodiversity and landscapes as required by the NPPF (paragraph 149). In light of this and in line with its response to the Preferred Options consultation the GLNP supports the wording of principle 3 of the policy, which states that development is to be only permitted where it safeguards and enhances the natural environment and considers biodiversity through the provision of measurable net gains to biodiversity and links to coherent ecological networks.	Consistent with national policy		no		
0243	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY SS10: 2j.	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. In line with its response to the Preferred Options consultation the GLNP supports principle j which commits to pursuing net gains for biodiversity which contributes to requirements of the NPPF which calls for planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). The GLNP also supports reference to Local Nature Recovery Strategies and Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping which contributes to meeting the NPPF (Paragraph 31) requirement for policy to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence.	Consistent with national policy		no		
0239	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY SS3: DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. Principle 1.h.	Consistent with national policy		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							The GLNP supports the Plans commitment that development should protect and enhance natural capital and also the consideration of impacts upon said natural capital. This contributes to requirements set by the NPPF which requires Plans to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognizing the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services (paragraph 174b). Principle 1.i. In line with our response regarding strengthening wording referring to biodiversity net gain in the Preferred Options consultations, the GLNP supports the Plants commitment to providing measurable net gains for biodiversity in line with NPPF requirements set out in paragraphs 174d, 179b and 180d.					
0242	Luke Bamforth on behalf of Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership	POLICY SS7: STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION – LINCOLNSHIRE LAKES	support	yes	yes	yes	The GLNP is a partnership of 49 organisations working together to achieve more for nature. This response is based on the joint values and positions as agreed by our members. Each of these organisations may respond individually with additional comments. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity. In line with the response to the Preferred Options consultation the GLNP is pleased to see that planning applications will be required to assess the specific impact of development proposals on biodiversity and associated opportunities for ecological protection and enhancement within each strategic allocation and surrounding area to provide biodiversity net gain. Planning applications should include proposals for biodiversity mitigation and enhancement should take into account Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping and demonstrate how linkages will be made within the strategic allocation and into the greater wildlife network This contributes to requirements set out within the NPPF (paragraphs 174d, 179b and 180d) while reference to Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping contributes to meeting the NPPF (Paragraph 31) requirement for policy to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence.	Consistent with national policy		no		
Suzanne **Bamforth**												
0198	Suzanne Bamforth, Conservation Officer	POLICY CSC8: 4.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy CSC8: Educational Facilities Principle 4. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment (paragraphs 8c, 174d, 179b and 180d).	Consistent with national policy				
Bethany **Banks**												
0059	Bethany Banks	POLICY H1P-19: LAND AT KINGS ROAD	object	no	no	no	The land at the back of kinds road is one of the most terrible places to build upon. Its going to put far too much pressure on the structure of the			no		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							village and the houses already standing will be deeply effected by it. The drainage is already terrible in Barnetby as we run on the old system that leads to Skeggar Beck. The beck cannot hold any more volume. We see the damage it has done over the years i.e., flooding under the subway, Keigar estate being flooded and back gardens throughout the village having no end of boggy struggles. The land on kings road is practically a flood plain as it stands and holds a hell of a lot of water. Its a bog throughout all seasons and without the proper measurements and drainage systems being put in, it is us residents of Kings Road who will have to put up with the damage caused. The field that is having the proposed build holds many homes to wildlife and comes in handy for the use of the local farmer. With all that was said during COP 26, you would think we would want to do well by our countryside and not overload it. Its going to cause repercussions. The more housing, the busier the roads will be. The busier the roads, the more danger to those living on Kings Road. With 42 houses. come 42+ cars - therefore adding furthermore pollution through out our glorious countryside. Jobs will be needed, taken away from the long time already existing people from the village. More people have more kids, meaning we would need a bigger school. It is going to take us around in circles. We are village - not a town. We do not want to be over populated with 42 rabbit hutches for housing! To add to this, the people of Barnetby love the countryside views we have. Its something we take pride in and therefore we do not want to ruin this. Not only will you be destroying beautiful land - but the views from our lovely homes will be taken away from us. Its certainly not fair.					
0598	Bethany Banks	POLICY H1P-19: LAND AT KINGS ROAD					Hello, I am emailing today to give my 'feedback' on the proposed development for Kings Road Barnetby. As I can see from the proposed development plans, the land being used for the 43 houses is situated in an area which from my own personal knowledge floods and backs up into the becks. With 43 houses on that bit of land, I assume they'll be rabbit hutches! With an added amount of pressure from housing and a bad job of drainage, this water will quite possibly flood the gardens of the left side (coming down into the village) of Kings road gardens. With the heavy rain we've had over the years, the field is practically a flood plain as it is. With this week being pushed with COP 26 for Climate Change, surely there's a better way of using this land? With 43 houses, may come 43 more cars. Which causes more pollution. With that, there will be far more traffic on kings road, possibly causing more chaos and an accident waiting to happen. With children crossing the roads before and after school, it's a busy road as it is, but could become very unsafe. More people in housing, adds to the pressure of people wanting jobs, meaning more development - to where the point of our lovely VILLAGE					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							becoming a town! It's very disappointing to hear of these plans when we are making such a great deal of COP 26 Climate Change and trying to improve our planet. Barnetby is a village, that we (the residents) would like to keep as a village. I wouldn't like to be living on top of one another, otherwise I would move to town. We bought our property knowing we had the lovely view of countryside views and fresh air. With saying this, there is plenty of wonderful wildlife that graze on this land and will be a natural habitat for many. Doing good for the Earth means helping our Earth, not putting 43 houses on a tiny plot. A great idea for our village community would be by planting trees in this area of land that will help produce more oxygen for the Earth. Another great idea would be to have allotments, many of our villagers have been requesting this for many years and have never been helped! Which gives the council a bad look. It's a wonderful bit of land that is in the rural countryside with access for people to get to. Why would we ruin the beauty of the countryside for extra housing that we don't need? We already have more housing being built towards the centre of the village. A dog park would also be wonderful on this land - there are plenty of pet owners in the village that have no safe place to take their dogs. A beautiful country park with nature walks will bring the community together and allow the beauty of the countryside to carry on. Although, housing I suppose seems more appealing because of the money aspect… sad really. Lorry park, horrific looking warehouses and any other plans there is for the top of Barnetby, we do not agree with and also goes without saying, how bad the pollution, traffic, and litter will be. The fields are used for farming and should stay that way. We need to do good by our planet, not keep over building. It will also ruin the look of the village and trample our beautiful countryside. It will be completely misplaced and the roads CANNOT handle the amount of traffic it will bring - it's going to cause a huge amount of accidents for sure. It'll take away from our village businesses and will be a horrible asset. It is ever so saddening that these plans are being pushed onto a lovely little village situated in the Wolds. COP 26 for Climate change clearly isn't being acknowledged. Unfortunately this isn't going to bring any good to our village and therefore I don't agree with the plans. Like many of the people in the village. It will only bring on a negative knock on effect.					
Wendy **Bannerman** on behalf of The British Horse Society												
0781	Wendy Bannerman on behalf of The British Horse Society	General					The response below is from the British Horse Society however our volunteers in the county may also respond at a local level. The British Horse Society is the UK's largest equestrian Charity, with over 118,000 members representing the UK's 3 million horse riders. Nationally equestrians have just 22% of the rights of way network and are increasingly forced to use busy roads to access them.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Between 29.02.2020 – 28.02.2021 • 1,010 road incidents involving horses have been reported to The British Horse Society • 46 horses have died • 118 horses have been injured • 130 people have been injured • 45% of riders were victims to road rage or abuse • 80% of incidents occurred because a vehicle passed by too closely to the horse • 43% of incidents occurred because a vehicle passed by too quickly This illustrates the importance of protecting, improving and extending safe off-road provision will help to prevent these numbers from increasing in the future. Policy CSC1 refers to active travel in relation to health and wellbeing although reference to PRoW and off-road multi-user routes should feature here.. The government's Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy Safety Review says: "1.2 But safety has particular importance for vulnerable road users, such as walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The more people who use Active Travel, the fitter and healthier they will be, and the more their communities will benefit from lower congestion and better air quality, among a host of other benefits"(Jesse Norman, Minister for Transport). Jesse Norman in House of Commons debate on Road Safety, 5 November 2018 said: “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.” According to BETA two-thirds of equestrians are women and Church et al (2010) found 37% of women who are horse riders are over 45 years of age and over a third would pursue no other physical activity. The therapeutic and physical benefits of horse riding and carriage driving have been proven for people with disabilities (Favali and Milton, 2010). The equestrian industry generates £4.7 billion of consumer spending, £4,174 per horse (BETA, 2019) to the economy benefitting local economies where equestrian activities thrive. There is a strong equestrian community here and local routes are well used and valued. DEFRA has recorded over 2,000 horses just in the immediate postcode areas (2021). It is encouraging to see in Policy RD1 that equine ‘facilities and tourism development’ is included. PRoW and off-road riding/carriage driving routes are essential to draw equestrian industry and tourism. New development plans provide opportunities to improve and extend the bridleway and byway network for the shared enjoyment of equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians. Policy T1 highlights walkers and cyclists however there is a missed opportunity here to share routes with equestrians to avoid horses and riders/handlers being forced to be sandwiched between fast moving MPV traffic on the roads and cyclists on cycling/walking					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							routes. Designing equestrians into development plans will enhance equestrian access and activity, reaping benefits for safety, health and wellbeing. The BHS has detailed guidance on these crucial matters to ensure all users are included and developers meet requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and associated legislation. https://www.bhs.org.uk/advice-and-information/free-leaflets-and-advice The BHS would welcome further consultation.					
0820	Wendy Bannerman on behalf of The British Horse Society	Policy CSC1: Health and Wellbeing					The response below is from the British Horse Society however our volunteers in the county may also respond at a local level. The British Horse Society is the UK's largest equestrian Charity, with over 118,000 members representing the UK's 3 million horse riders. Nationally equestrians have just 22% of the rights of way network and are increasingly forced to use busy roads to access them. Between 29.02.2020 – 28.02.2021 • 1,010 road incidents involving horses have been reported to The British Horse Society • 46 horses have died • 118 horses have been injured • 130 people have been injured • 45% of riders were victims to road rage or abuse • 80% of incidents occurred because a vehicle passed by too closely to the horse • 43% of incidents occurred because a vehicle passed by too quickly This illustrates the importance of protecting, improving and extending safe off-road provision will help to prevent these numbers from increasing in the future. Policy CSC1 refers to active travel in relation to health and wellbeing although reference to PRoW and off-road multi-user routes should feature here.. The government's Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy Safety Review says: "1.2 But safety has particular importance for vulnerable road users, such as walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The more people who use Active Travel, the fitter and healthier they will be, and the more their communities will benefit from lower congestion and better air quality, among a host of other benefits"(Jesse Norman, Minister for Transport). Jesse Norman in House of Commons debate on Road Safety, 5 November 2018 said: "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." According to BETA two-thirds of equestrians are women and Church et al (2010) found 37% of women who are horse riders are over 45 years of age and over a third would pursue no other physical activity. The therapeutic					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							and physical benefits of horse riding and carriage driving have been proven for people with disabilities (Favali and Milton, 2010). The equestrian industry generates £4.7 billion of consumer spending, £4,174 per horse (BETA, 2019) to the economy benefitting local economies where equestrian activities thrive. There is a strong equestrian community here and local routes are well used and valued. DEFRA has recorded over 2,000 horses just in the immediate postcode areas (2021). It is encouraging to see in Policy RD1 that equine 'facilities and tourism development' is included. PRoW and off-road riding/carriage driving routes are essential to draw equestrian industry and tourism. New development plans provide opportunities to improve and extend the bridleway and byway network for the shared enjoyment of equestrians, cyclists and pedestrians. Policy T1 highlights walkers and cyclists however there is a missed opportunity here to share routes with equestrians to avoid horses and riders/handlers being forced to be sandwiched between fast moving MPV traffic on the roads and cyclists on cycling/walking routes. Designing equestrians into development plans will enhance equestrian access and activity, reaping benefits for safety, health and wellbeing. The BHS has detailed guidance on these crucial matters to ensure all users are included and developers meet requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and associated legislation. https://www.bhs.org.uk/advice-and-information/free-leaflets-and-advice The BHS would welcome further consultation.					
Sharon **Bell**												
0039	Sharon Bell	POLICY SS3: DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES	support	yes	yes	yes	As a resident of Belton I examined the map of this area at a recent public event. I noted that HE2 has replaced the former LC14 areas of the existing plan and agree that these areas shown are protecting much of the green space in the village, particularly Belton Fields, which are specifically designated as part of the heritage of the Isle and are of National importance. The protection of this area should remain of paramount concern, as it is of interest to many, not just the local villagers. Given the emphasis that is now placed on mental health wellbeing it follows that these green open spaces have a greater need for the protection that the Local Plan should ensure. The availability of this special area was much in evidence over the recent past during lockdown for the Covid virus and this has stimulated the use of the Fields by more and more people. The green areas currently protected should never be developed, but remain to give access for walking, cycling and horse riding for the local community and visitors from further afield. It is of some concern that there are many sections within the village where planning consent has been granted, but development has not begun or buildings stand partially completed. This aspect needs to be addressed and there should be a restriction on the granting of further planning until these houses are occupied. The village infrastructure cannot cope with the continued influx of individuals, many of whom require both school and doctors facilities in particular; both of which are over-subscribed. In addition the road network in the area is in			no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							need of major repairs, which have been postponed for many years now, thus making transport a major issue. It is hoped that the Local Plan will form the basis to protect Belton from exploitation of avaricious developers and allow residents to enjoy the amenities that are currently available without any further erosion. I trust that the Local Plan will be adopted and afford the protection and subsequent enjoyment that Belton provides for the local community and all visitors to the area. 13 November 2021					
Kate **Billmore**												
0651	Kate Billmore	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	Object				Hello, Planning team Today I visited the Memorial Hall in Haxey to look at the current Local Plan for the Isle of Axholme. I live at 3 Greenhill, Haxey. I have one comment make. When I moved to Haxey in 1985, the village boundary - curtilage - ran all the way along Northside, along the northern boundary to my garden. Over time, and without consultation with my husband or myself, the village boundary at this location has been moved south to somewhere approaching my back door. I feel it is unethical on the part of North Lincs Council not to consult the homeowners personally on something that the Council is imposing which will have a significant impact on the property. On discussing the boundary with your representatives in the Memorial Hall this afternoon, I was informed that my garden, together with next door's field at 1 Greenhill, is of 'historic interest' to the village as it would once have been part of strip farming. I appreciate that very many years ago, all the properties on either side of Church Street (and other roads in the village) would have had long gardens. But these were not areas of strip farming, they were burgage plots, private gardens for keeping livestock and growing vegetables for personal use. Most are now built over, some, such as Holme Dene, with housing estates. My house was the village police house in more recent times and was built about 150 years ago. The house is not historically compatible with burgage plots. My garden is completely enclosed with hedges on either side and a fence at the rear. It is private land and is not accessible to the public in any way. It is my private garden with flower beds, fruit trees and a wildlife pond, and I have no intention of attempting to build on it. I would like it to be acknowledged as a private garden by North Lincs Council by having the village boundary - curtilage - put back to Northside at the rear of 3 Greenhill.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Chris **Bramley** on behalf of Severn Trent Water												
0432	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	General	Support				Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your consultation, Severn Trent are generally supportive of the principles outlined in the Publication version of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan.					View PDF
0433	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	General	Support				Please keep us informed when your plans are further developed when we will be able to offer more detailed comments and advice. For your information we have set out some general guidelines that may be useful to you. Position Statement As a water company we have an obligation to provide water supplies and sewage treatment capacity for future development. It is important for us to work collaboratively with Local Planning Authorities to provide relevant assessments of the impacts of future developments. For outline proposals we are able to provide general comments. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead. We do this to avoid making investments on speculative developments to minimise customer bills. Sewage Strategy Once detailed plans are available and we have modelled the additional capacity, in areas where sufficient capacity is not currently available and we have sufficient confidence that developments will be built, we will complete necessary improvements to provide the capacity. We will ensure that our assets have no adverse effect on the environment and that we provide appropriate levels of treatment at each of our sewage treatment works. Surface Water and Sewer Flooding We expect surface water to be managed in line with the Government's Water Strategy, Future Water. The strategy sets out a vision for more effective management of surface water to deal with the dual pressures of climate change and housing development. Surface water needs to be managed sustainably. For new developments we would not expect surface water to be conveyed to our foul or combined sewage system and, where practicable, we support the removal of surface water already connected to foul or combined sewer. We believe that greater emphasis needs to be paid to consequences of extreme rainfall. In the past, even outside of the flood plain, some properties have been built in natural drainage paths. We request that developers providing sewers on new developments should safely accommodate floods which exceed the design capacity of the sewers. To encourage developers to consider sustainable drainage, Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the sewerage infrastructure charge if					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							there is no surface water connection and a 75% discount if there is a surface water connection via a sustainable drainage system. More details can be found on our website https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/ Water Quality Good quality river water and groundwater is vital for provision of good quality drinking water. We work closely with the Environment Agency and local farmers to ensure that water quality of supplies are not impacted by our or others operations. The Environment Agency's Source Protection Zone (SPZ) and Safe Guarding Zone policy should provide guidance on development. Any proposals should take into account the principles of the Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Plan for the Severn River basin unit as prepared by the Environment Agency. Water Supply When specific detail of planned development location and sizes are available a site specific assessment of the capacity of our water supply network could be made. Any assessment will involve carrying out a network analysis exercise to investigate any potential impacts. We would not anticipate capacity problems within the urban areas of our network, any issues can be addressed through reinforcing our network. However, the ability to support significant development in the rural areas is likely to have a greater impact and require greater reinforcement to accommodate greater demands. Water Efficiency Part G of Building Regulations specify that new homes must consume no more than 125 litres of water per person per day. We recommend that you consider taking an approach of installing specifically designed water efficient fittings in all areas of the property rather than focus on the overall consumption of the property. This should help to achieve a lower overall consumption than the maximum volume specified in the Building Regulations. We recommend that in all cases you consider: • Single flush siphon toilet cistern and those with a flush volume of 4 litres. • Showers designed to operate efficiently and with a maximum flow rate of 8 litres per minute. • Hand wash basin taps with low flow rates of 4 litres per minute or less. • Water butts for external use in properties with gardens. To further encourage developers to act sustainably Severn Trent currently offer a 100% discount on the clean water infrastructure charge if properties are built so consumption per person is 110 litres per person per day or less. More details can be found on our website https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/regulations-and-					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							forms/application-forms-and-guidance/infrastructure-charges/ We would encourage you to impose the expectation on developers that properties are built to the optional requirement in Building Regulations of 110 litres of water per person per day. We would also encourage the use of rainwater harvesting on larger developments, either residential or commercial. This helps to reduce the demand on public supply, associated carbon impact of supply and also reduced site run off and sewer flows. Rainwater Harvesting as a development rather than on a property by property basis is more cost efficient and can produce greater benefits. Both the River Severn River Basin Management Plan (Page 52) and the Humber River Basin Management Plan (page 46) recommend that Local Plan set out policies requiring homes to meet the tighter water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day as described in Part G of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. As such Severn Trent's recommendation is consistent with wider objectives within our water supply regions. We hope this information has been useful to you and we look forward in hearing from you in the near future.					
0484	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	Paragraph 4.22	Support				Severn Trent are supportive of the statement within paragraph 4.22 regarding mitigating Climate change, and the use of SuDS and sustainably utilise resources such as water.					View PDF
0527	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	POLICY CSC12: 1h.	Support				Severn Trent understand that due to the operations within Restaurants and Hot Food Takeaways there are a high amount of Fats, Oils and Grease (FOG) produced, We therefore support the inclusion of bullet point h to require demonstrating of appropriate measures to be put in place to prevent FOG reaching the sewerage network and that these measures will be maintained in perpetuity.					View PDF
0530	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	Policy DM1: General Requirements	Support				Severn Trent are generally supportive of DM1, but would recommend that the policy also highlights the need for water efficiency We are supportive of the inclusion of a reference to watercourses within bullet point 3f as watercourses need to be protected to ensure continuity of the drainage system. We are also supportive of the references to SuDS and the drainage hierarchy in bullet point 3o, the implementation of SuDS should be designed in accordance with current industry best practice C753 (example wording provided in the site specific policies section). It is also recommended that a bullet point is included to reference water efficiency as the sustainable management of our resources is vital to the long-term delivery of growth within the UK.					View PDF
0535	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND	Support				Severn Trent are supportive of the inclusion of bullet point 6 regarding cumulative impacts within Policy DQE1, understanding the impacts of progressive catchment changes such a climate change (including changes to rainfall), urban creep, multiple development sites is key to creating					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
		VIEWS					both a sense of place and retaining pathways / corridors for surface water / exceedance flows to permeate and wildlife to navigate the urban environment.					
0538	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	Policy DQE11: Green infrastructure Network	Support				Severn Trent support the principles of policy DQE11 and the reference of needing to protect green infrastructure including Waterways. However we would recommend that the term waterway is replaced with watercourse. Collins Dictionary definition of a waterway is: "A waterway is a canal, river, or narrow channel of sea which ships or boats can sail along." - Copyright © HarperCollins Publishers A waterway could therefore be deemed to exclude drains and ditches, that also need to be protected for both habitat and drainage reasons, both features would be covered by the term watercourse.					View PDF
0543	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	Policy DQE3: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Support				Severn Trent are supportive of the need to retain and enhance existing natural features including watercourses. Watercourse from a vital part of the natural water cycle conveying surface water through the landscape, providing habitats for wildlife, discharge opportunities for surface water from development sites, and conveyance of water to abstraction locations.					View PDF
0546	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	Policy DQE5: Managing Flood Risk	Support				Severn Trent are supportive of the general principles outlined within Policy DQE5, especially the approach of prioritise development in Flood Zone 1, and the specification detailed in bullet point 3, • the separation of surface water and foul flows, • management of flows to the equivalent undeveloped rate • surface water discharges to be managed in accordance with the drainage hierarchy • implementation of water reuse where appropriate					View PDF
0447	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	Policy DQE6: Sustainable Drainage Systems	Support				Severn Trent are supportive of the principles outlined within Policy DQE6, the appropriate implementation of SuDS within new development is key to ensuring that surface water flows don't cause flooding, and that SuDS provide multiple benefits that meet the four pillars of SuDS detailed within the SuDS Manual (CIRIA C753).					View PDF
0551	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	Policy DQE7: Climate Change & Low Carbon Living	Support				Severn Trent are supportive of the principles in Policy DQE7, in particular the reference to the optional higher water efficiency Standard of 110 litres per person per day, and the need for development to account for flooding from all sources, implementing SuDS and developing Multifunctional Green Space.					View PDF
0556	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	Policy DQE9: Local Green Space	Support				Severn Trent are supportive of policy DQE9 and the inclusion of a statement to support flood alleviation schemes where the primary function of the green space is not adversely impacted.					View PDF
0557	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent	POLICY EC1: EMPLOYMENT LAND	Support				A site by site assessment it attached in an excel format.(see saved Representation sent by email)					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	Water	SUPPLY					There are a number of other sites indicated to be high risk (Red) sites to Severn Trent, this is an indication that we anticipate the need to invest in capacity improvements to be able to accommodate the proposed developments (note these are standalone site assessment cumulatively there may also be a need to assess further at a more appropriate stage of development). SCA level 1 RAG explanation • Red – Sites likely to require capacity improvements to be accommodated, please ensure that sufficient time is allowed for the risk to be assessed in detail and any necessary solutions designed an implement prior to occupation. • Amber – Sites that may require capacity improvements to be accommodated (assess further when additional confidence / information in available) • Green – Sites that are not anticipated to require capacity improvements Due to the need to undertake further investigation and assessment of Red an Amber sites we would recommend that Red sites these are not allocated as deliverable within the next 10 years and amber sites as not deliverable within the next 5 years, providing time to obtain greater certainty regarding development and facilitate the necessary assessment to be implemented reducing the need for Grampian conditions on development. If any of the Red sites are being proposed, we would recommend early consultation with Severn Trent and engagement on the development of a masterplan / drainage plan for the larger developments. Please ensure that these consultations and confidence in development certainty can be provided early, we would recommend that potential developers are also made aware of this requirement. If the allocation of any red sites is proposed please ensure that Severn Trent is notified, where allocation of multiple red sites is unavoidable they should be located in close proximity such that the capacity improvement projects can be delivered for all sites strategically, reducing the risk of spending customers money when not required enabling solutions to be delivered faster. Early conversation on Amber sites is also recommended but as the risks are not anticipated to be as big it is believed that the assessment and where required solution development process would be shorter, We would however still recommend that this engagement need is passed on to the developers. We would be happy to undertake more detailed assessments as your plans develop and engage with you further around ensuring that the Local Plan sites can be demonstrated as sustainable form a water supply and drainage an angle. Allthorpe Catchment					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							There are 2 allocations within the Althorpe Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) catchment both developments are located in Keadby, but are of a scale such that we would not anticipate any significant impacts on the sewerage network provided surface water is discharged sustainably. If surface water was proposed to be discharge to the sewerage network, further site-specific consultation should be held with Severn Trent to understand the impacts. Crowle Catchment There are known constraints within Crowle WwTW Catchment that we anticipate the proposed developments would impact on. There is currently a project in our capital programme to investigate and address the existing constraints. The proposed allocation within Crowle and Ealand should be undertaken carefully with continued liaison with Severn Trent and ensure that surface water is discharged to a sustainable outfall and not the sewerage network. It is also noted that a number of sewer flooding incidents have been attributed to surface water connections to the sewerage network that we originally proposed to be managed via infiltration, but that infiltration in this area is ineffective. It is therefore important that this is accounted for through the planning process, with viable alternatives to infiltration and sewers being identified. Epworth Catchment There are two allocations that are indicated to result in a high risk to the sewerage system, further investigation of these site should be undertaken as confidence in development and the associated timetable for development is understood. In the context of Yealand Flats it is noted that the site is indicated to have a negative impact as a result of Foul flows and that there is potential that a sustainable outfall may not be available, it is important that surface water is managed appropriately and where possible not discharged to the sewers. The Epworth catchment covers the settlements of Belton, Epworth and Sandtoft. Haxey - Graizelound Catchment Both allocations within Haxey and Graizelound are indicated to present a risk due to proximity to existing network constraints. It is therefore recommended that further detailed assessments are carried out as the development of these sites are progressed including the identification of viable surface water outfalls that will not require the use of the sewerage network. Kirton in Lindsey Catchment Whilst only Allocation H1C057 is indicated to present a high risk to the sewerage network there are 3 further sites that present medium risks, indicating that there is likely to be a need to consider the cumulative impact of development. To facilitate the cumulative assessment of development on the network it is vital that Severn Trent are provided with greater confidence in development and proposed timescales for					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							development such that an understanding of how and when development will occur within the catchment enabling a holistic solution to be developed and where a phased delivery of a solution. Yaddlesthorpe Catchment (Scunthorpe and some surrounding villages) There are a number of high risk sites within the Yaddlesthorpe Catchment (SSH1 & SSH2, H1C-3, H1C-6, H1C-16 & EC1-2). These sites are all located to the West of Scunthorpe. There is a project within the capital programme for Severn Trent to deliver capacity improvements within this are, continued liaison between The local Planning Authority, Developers an Severn Trent will be needed to align the development and delivery of any sewer capacity improvements. There are also a number of medium risk locations that will require further assessment as details of the proposal develop, some of these locations may also potentially benefit from the project for the West of Scunthorpe. Site Specific Policies Severn Trent welcome the inclusion of a statement highlighting the need for Early engagement with utility and service providers as understanding the scale and timing for necessary network reinforcements is critical to the sustainable development of our infrastructure such that development needs can be met in time to prevent delays to the development process and minimise the need for Grampian conditions. We also support the promotion of SuDS within site specific polices and recommend that the wording for SuDS is enhanced to highlight the need for SuDS to be designed in accordance with current industry best practice. All major developments shall ensure that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for the management of surface water run-off are put in place unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. All schemes for the inclusions of SuDS should demonstrate they have considered all four aspects of good SuDS design, Quantity, Quality, Amenity and Biodiversity, and the SuDS and development will fit into the existing landscape. The completed SuDS schemes should be accompanied by a maintenance schedule detailing maintenance boundaries, responsible parties and arrangements to ensure that the SuDS are maintained in perpetuity. Where possible, all non-major development should look to incorporate these same SuDS principles into their designs. The supporting text for the policy should also include: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be designed in accordance with current industry best practice, The SuDS Manual, CIRIA (C753), to ensure that the systems deliver both the surface water quantity and the wider benefits, without significantly increasing costs. Good SuDS design can be key for creating a strong sense of place and pride in the community for where they live, work and visit, making the surface water management features as much a part of the development as the buildings and roads. We would also note that as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) are the					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							statutory consultee for the planning process in relation to surface water management that they should also be consulted on any wording regarding SuDS.					
0586	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	Policy H1: Site Allocations	Support				A site by site assessment it attached in an excel format.(see saved Representation sent by email) There are a number of other sites indicated to be high risk (Red) sites to Severn Trent, this is an indication that we anticipate the need to invest in capacity improvements to be able to accommodate the proposed developments (note these are standalone site assessment cumulatively there may also be a need to assess further at a more appropriate stage of development). SCA level 1 RAG explanation • Red – Sites likely to require capacity improvements to be accommodated, please ensure that sufficient time is allowed for the risk to be assessed in detail and any necessary solutions designed an implement prior to occupation. • Amber – Sites that may require capacity improvements to be accommodated (assess further when additional confidence / information in available) • Green – Sites that are not anticipated to require capacity improvements Due to the need to undertake further investigation and assessment of Red an Amber sites we would recommend that Red sites these are not allocated as deliverable within the next 10 years and amber sites as not deliverable within the next 5 years, providing time to obtain greater certainty regarding development and facilitate the necessary assessment to be implemented reducing the need for Grampian conditions on development. If any of the Red sites are being proposed, we would recommend early consultation with Severn Trent and engagement on the development of a masterplan / drainage plan for the larger developments. Please ensure that these consultations and confidence in development certainty can be provided early, we would recommend that potential developers are also made aware of this requirement. If the allocation of any red sites is proposed please ensure that Severn Trent is notified, where allocation of multiple red sites is unavoidable they should be located in close proximity such that the capacity improvement projects can be delivered for all sites strategically, reducing the risk of spending customers money when not required enabling solutions to be delivered faster. Early conversation on Amber sites is also recommended but as the risks are not anticipated to be as big it is believed that the assessment and where required solution development process would be shorter, We would however still recommend that this engagement need is passed on to the developers.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							We would be happy to undertake more detailed assessments as your plans develop and engage with you further around ensuring that the Local Plan sites can be demonstrated as sustainable form a water supply and drainage an angle. Allthorpe Catchment There are 2 allocations within the Althorpe Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) catchment both developments are located in Keadby, but are of a scale such that we would not anticipate any significant impacts on the sewerage network provided surface water is discharged sustainably. If surface water was proposed to be discharge to the sewerage network, further site-specific consultation should be held with Severn Trent to understand the impacts. Crowle Catchment There are known constraints within Crowle WwTW Catchment that we anticipate the proposed developments would impact on. There is currently a project in our capital programme to investigate and address the existing constraints. The proposed allocation within Crowle and Ealand should be undertaken carefully with continued liaison with Severn Trent and ensure that surface water is discharged to a sustainable outfall and not the sewerage network. It is also noted that a number of sewer flooding incidents have been attributed to surface water connections to the sewerage network that we originally proposed to be managed via infiltration, but that infiltration in this area is ineffective. It is therefore important that this is accounted for through the planning process, with viable alternatives to infiltration and sewers being identified. Epworth Catchment There are two allocations that are indicated to result in a high risk to the sewerage system, further investigation of these site should be undertaken as confidence in development and the associated timetable for development is understood. In the context of Yealand Flats it is noted that the site is indicated to have a negative impact as a result of Foul flows and that there is potential that a sustainable outfall may not be available, it is important that surface water is managed appropriately and where possible not discharged to the sewers. The Epworth catchment covers the settlements of Belton, Epworth and Sandtoft. Haxey - Graizelound Catchment Both allocations within Haxey and Graizelound are indicated to present a risk due to proximity to existing network constraints. It is therefore recommended that further detailed assessments are carried out as the development of these sites are progressed including the identification of viable surface water outfalls that will not require the use of the sewerage network. Kirton in Lindsey Catchment					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Whilst only Allocation H1C057 is indicated to present a high risk to the sewerage network there are 3 further sites that present medium risks, indicating that there is likely to be a need to consider the cumulative impact of development. To facilitate the cumulative assessment of development on the network it is vital that Severn Trent are provided with greater confidence in development and proposed timescales for development such that an understanding of how and when development will occur within the catchment enabling a holistic solution to be developed and where a phased delivery of a solution. Yaddlesthorpe Catchment (Scunthorpe and some surrounding villages) There are a number of high risk sites within the Yaddlesthorpe Catchment (SSH1 & SSH2, H1C-3, H1C-6, H1C-16 & EC1-2). These sites are all located to the West of Scunthorpe. There is a project within the capital programme for Severn Trent to deliver capacity improvements within this are, continued liaison between The local Planning Authority, Developers an Severn Trent will be needed to align the development and delivery of any sewer capacity improvements. There are also a number of medium risk locations that will require further assessment as details of the proposal develop, some of these locations may also potentially benefit from the project for the West of Scunthorpe. Site Specific Policies Severn Trent welcome the inclusion of a statement highlighting the need for Early engagement with utility and service providers as understanding the scale and timing for necessary network reinforcements is critical to the sustainable development of our infrastructure such that development needs can be met in time to prevent delays to the development process and minimise the need for Grampian conditions. We also support the promotion of SuDS within site specific polices and recommend that the wording for SuDS is enhanced to highlight the need for SuDS to be designed in accordance with current industry best practice. All major developments shall ensure that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) for the management of surface water run-off are put in place unless demonstrated to be inappropriate. All schemes for the inclusions of SuDS should demonstrate they have considered all four aspects of good SuDS design, Quantity, Quality, Amenity and Biodiversity, and the SuDS and development will fit into the existing landscape. The completed SuDS schemes should be accompanied by a maintenance schedule detailing maintenance boundaries, responsible parties and arrangements to ensure that the SuDS are maintained in perpetuity. Where possible, all non-major development should look to incorporate these same SuDS principles into their designs. The supporting text for the policy should also include: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be designed in accordance with current industry best practice, The SuDS Manual, CIRIA (C753), to					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							ensure that the systems deliver both the surface water quantity and the wider benefits, without significantly increasing costs. Good SuDS design can be key for creating a strong sense of place and pride in the community for where they live, work and visit, making the surface water management features as much a part of the development as the buildings and roads. We would also note that as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) are the statutory consultee for the planning process in relation to surface water management that they should also be consulted on any wording regarding SuDS.					
0669	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	POLICY SS3: DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES	Support				Policy SS3: Development Principles Severn Trent are supportive of the approach detailed in policy SS3 in particular the reference to: • minimise the impact arising from climate change and mitigate against its effects including reducing flood risk • integrated water management, measures to reduce the consumption of resources including water use • separation of surface water and foul drainage, even where existing combined drainage exists and following the non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage. • Plan positively to enhance the natural environment through design of the development and through the provision of measurable net gains to biodiversity, Severn Trent We would however recommend that the Drainage Hierarchy is identified either alongside the Sustainable Drainage and Surface water separation comments or in a separate bullet point, to ensure that the principles of sustainable discharges are undertaken early within development design process.					View PDF
0722	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	Policy SS7: Strategic site allocation – Lincolnshire Lakes	Support				Severn Trent are supportive of the principles outlined within Policy SS& Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to develop a SPD for Lincolnshire Lakes, that will set out a site wide master plan and design code. The need for a development of this scale that will be delivered over a long period of time will be important to ensure continuity of design and deliver appropriate infrastructure to meet the needs of the full development. The design codes should however be adaptable to account for changes in best practice and legislation or technological advancements that would benefit the end users of the development. The need for the development to be design with appropriate SuDS, separation of surface water, use of the principles within the Drainage Hierarchy and the implementation of water efficiency, reuse, and recycling We also support the protection of ditches and drains which can provide suitable outfalls for surface water reducing the reliance of the sewerage network. We would recommend that the wording is amended from drains and ditches to watercourses (including ditches and drains). We are also supportive of the need to develop SuDS and green infrastructure that permeates the built form acting as corridors for wildlife and conveyancing routes for surface water.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0736	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	POLICY TC2: PLACEMAKING & GOOD URBAN DESIGN	Support				Severn Trent are supportive of the general principles within Policy TC2, especially the need for spaces for waterways, retention of these features will be essential for facilitating sustainable outfalls for development and appropriate surface water conveyance. We would also promote the incorporation of Street Trees, and recommend that the use of Tree-pits to incorporate additional benefits through source control SuDS that can create more welcoming areas, and support the delivery of green corridors.					View PDF
0738	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	POLICY WAS5: WASTE WATER TREATMENT	Support				Severn Trent would be generally supportive of the principles outlined within Policy WAS5 and are already working with the environment agency and partners to understand current and future sewage requirements, and undertake a programme of works aimed at helping the UK meet the objectives of the WFD.					View PDF
Candace **Brent** on behalf of Burton upon Stather Parish Council												
0075	Candace Brent on behalf of Burton upon Stather Parish Council	Paragraph 4.8	support	yes	yes	yes	Burton upon Stather Parish Council appreciates that the comments from its public consultation have been taken on board.					
David **Brierley** on behalf of Network Rail Infrastructure Limited												
0286	David Brierley on behalf of Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	Paragraph 14.23	object	yes	no	yes	We write on behalf of Network Rail in response to North Lincolnshire Councils consultation (under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, as amended) on the draft North Lincolnshire Local Plan (October 2021). Network Rail (NR) is the statutory undertaker for railway infrastructure in England, Scotland and Wales, reinstating and protecting the infrastructure for the operational railway. NRs focus is on maintaining (and ensuring the safety of) the railway and railway-related uses. We hope that these comments in relation to Paragraph 14.23 within the draft Local Plan will assist the Council in the preparation of the new Local Plan. Paragraph 14.23 currently states: "Rail transport is suitably well placed to play a significant role in supporting the spatial strategy, not least because the vast majority of identified growth settlements are on the rail network and infrastructure improvements are in the main not required. However, what is needed is a significant alteration to service provision and a transformational change to the timetables and connection opportunities. The rail network in North Lincolnshire is greatly underutilised for the movement of people and is an asset that can, with modest alterations to service provision, provide significant opportunities to support the spatial strategy and encourage and support modal shift and the sustainable movement of people". At some of NRs level crossings (for example the pedestrian level crossing	Consistent with national policy	NR requests that wording is added to Paragraph 14.23 so that it reads as follows: "Rail transport is suitably well placed to play a significant role in supporting the spatial strategy, not least because the vast majority of identified growth settlements are on the rail network and infrastructure improvements are in the main not required. However, what is needed is a significant alteration to service provision, and a transformational change to the timetables and connection opportunities and (where development is located in close proximity to a vehicular or pedestrian level crossing) an assessment of the potential increase in risk at that level crossing and identification of the appropriate mitigation required to reduce or remove such risks. The rail network in	yes	To protect Network Rail's interests and manage the safety of the general public.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							at Crowle Station, to the south of New Trent Street) there are stop, look, listen signs nearby but users of the level crossing are required to check themselves for approaching trains. At the pedestrian level crossing at Crowle Station, there have previously been issues with users of the level crossing traversing the crossing when a train is waiting at the platform, resulting in near misses. Increased use of level crossings (as a result of new development nearby) may mean that additional protection measures at level crossings are necessary. As such, NR requests that wording is added to Paragraph 14.23 so that it reads as follows: "Rail transport is suitably well placed to play a significant role in supporting the spatial strategy, not least because the vast majority of identified growth settlements are on the rail network and infrastructure improvements are in the main not required. However, what is needed is a significant alteration to service provision, and a transformational change to the timetables and connection opportunities and (where development is located in close proximity to a vehicular or pedestrian level crossing) an assessment of the potential increase in risk at that level crossing and identification of the appropriate mitigation required to reduce or remove such risks. The rail network in North Lincolnshire is greatly underutilised for the movement of people and is an asset that can, with modest alterations to service provision, provide significant opportunities to support the spatial strategy and encourage and support modal shift and the sustainable movement of people". This additional wording will help ensure that, in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 104, transport issues are considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals so that the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed.		North Lincolnshire is greatly underutilised for the movement of people and is an asset that can, with modest alterations to service provision, provide significant opportunities to support the spatial strategy and encourage and support modal shift and the sustainable movement of people". This additional wording will help ensure that, in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 104, transport issues are considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals so that the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed. Please see the 'additional comments' section for more information.			
0283	David Brierley on behalf of Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	POLICY T3: 1e.	object	yes	no	yes	We write on behalf of Network Rail in response to North Lincolnshire Councils consultation (under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, as amended) on the draft North Lincolnshire Local Plan (October 2021). Network Rail (NR) is the statutory undertaker for railway infrastructure in England, Scotland and Wales, reinstating and protecting the infrastructure for the operational railway. NRs focus is on maintaining (and ensuring the safety of) the railway and railway-related uses. We hope that these comments in relation to Policy T3 within the draft Local Plan will assist the Council in the preparation of the new Local Plan. Part 1e of draft Policy T3 requires that development proposals should: "Not have an adverse impact on the network's functioning and safety. Proposals that have significant transport implications will be expected to deliver necessary and cost effective mitigation measures. Such measures shall be secured through conditions and/or legal agreements." At some of NRs level crossings (for example the pedestrian level crossing at Crowle Station, to the south of New Trent Street) there are stop, look, listen signs nearby but users of the level crossing are required to check themselves for approaching trains. At the pedestrian level crossing at Crowle Station, there have previously been issues with users of the level	Consistent with national policy	NR requests that wording is added to Part 1e of draft Policy T3 so that it reads as follows: "Not have an adverse impact on the network's functioning and safety. Proposals that have significant transport implications will be expected to deliver necessary and cost effective mitigation measures (including, where a proposal is in the vicinity of a pedestrian or vehicular level crossing, an assessment of the potential increase in risk at that level crossing and identification of the appropriate mitigation required to reduce or remove such risks). Such measures shall be secured through conditions and/or legal agreements." This additional wording will	yes	To protect Network Rail's interests and manage the safety of the general public.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							crossing traversing the crossing when a train is waiting at the platform, resulting in near misses. Increased use of level crossings (as a result of new development nearby) may mean that additional protection at level crossings is necessary. As such, NR requests that wording is added to Part 1e of draft Policy T3 so that it reads as follows: "Not have an adverse impact on the network's functioning and safety. Proposals that have significant transport implications will be expected to deliver necessary and cost effective mitigation measures (including, where a proposal is in the vicinity of a pedestrian or vehicular level crossing, an assessment of the potential increase in risk at that level crossing and identification of the appropriate mitigation required to reduce or remove such risks). Such measures shall be secured through conditions and/or legal agreements." This additional wording will help ensure that, in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 104, transport issues are considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals so that the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed. The addition of the proposed wording will also help ensure that Policy T3 is in accordance with the NPPF (Paragraph 110), which requires that applications for development ensure that safe and suitable access to a site can be achieved and that significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion) or on highway safety can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree. And finally, the additional wording will help ensure that planning policies identify and protect sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice and realise opportunities for large scale development (in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 106).		help ensure that, in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 104, transport issues are considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals so that the potential impacts of development on transport networks can be addressed. The addition of the proposed wording will also help ensure that Policy T3 is in accordance with the NPPF (Paragraph 110), which requires that applications for development ensure that safe and suitable access to a site can be achieved and that significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion) or on highway safety can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree. And finally, the additional wording will help ensure that planning policies identify and protect sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice and realise opportunities for large scale development (in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 106). Please see the 'additional comments' section for more information.			
0285	David Brierley on behalf of Network Rail Infrastructure Limited	POLICY T3: 2a.	object	yes	no	yes	We write on behalf of Network Rail in response to North Lincolnshire Councils consultation (under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, as amended) on the draft North Lincolnshire Local Plan (October 2021). Network Rail (NR) is the statutory undertaker for railway infrastructure in England, Scotland and Wales, reinstating and protecting the infrastructure for the operational railway. NRs focus is on maintaining (and ensuring the safety of) the railway and railway-related uses. We hope that these comments in relation to Policy T3 within the draft Local Plan will assist the Council in the preparation of the new Local Plan. Part 2a of draft Policy T3 requires developers to contribute towards	Consistent with national policy	NR requests that wording is added to Part 2a of draft Policy T3 so that it reads as follows: "Public transport services and infrastructure, providing bus stops within a 400m walk of all new developments and ensuring that there is no increase in risk at level crossings (both vehicular and pedestrian) in the vicinity of the site".	yes	To protect Network Rail's interests and manage the safety of the general public.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							measures in the vicinity of the development to enhance: "Public transport services and infrastructure, providing bus stops within a 400m walk of all new developments". NR requests that wording is added to Part 2a of draft Policy T3 so that it reads as follows: "Public transport services and infrastructure, providing bus stops within a 400m walk of all new developments and ensuring that there is no increase in risk at level crossings (both vehicular and pedestrian) in the vicinity of the site". The addition of the proposed wording will help ensure that the policy is in accordance with the NPPF (Paragraph 110), which requires that applications for development ensure that safe and suitable access to a site can be achieved and that significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion) or on highway safety can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree. As mentioned in NR's response to Part 1e of draft Policy T3, there have previously been issues with users of the level crossing near Crowle Station traversing the crossing when a train is waiting at the platform, resulting in near misses. Increased use of level crossings (as a result of new development nearby) may mean that additional protection measures at level crossings are necessary. The additional proposed wording will also help ensure that Policy T3 identifies and protects sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice and realise opportunities for large scale development (in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 106).		The addition of the proposed wording will help ensure that the policy is in accordance with the NPPF (Paragraph 110), which requires that applications for development ensure that safe and suitable access to a site can be achieved and that significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion) or on highway safety can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree. As mentioned in NR's response to Part 1e of draft Policy T3, there have previously been issues with users of the level crossing near Crowle Station traversing the crossing when a train is waiting at the platform, resulting in near misses. Increased use of level crossings (as a result of new development nearby) may mean that additional protection measures at level crossings are necessary. The additional proposed wording will also help ensure that Policy T3 identifies and protects sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice and realise opportunities for large scale development (in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 106). Please see the 'additional comments' section for more information.			

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Paul **Brown**												
0388	Paul Brown	Evidence Base	Object				The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process. I would also be interested to discover what is the motive behind what seems to be proposals to industrialise BARTON. I do not recall any consultation taking place to ask the inhabitants whether the towns future should be along these lines. BARTON is a town with a proud heritage involving diverse industries such as rope making, cycle manufacture, fertilizer production and tile works and it is interesting to note that if all of those were put together the would disappear into the corner of the development that has been allowed on Barrow Road. Also the damage to the town that will result new road or not is out of all proportion. A development on the scale that has been permitted on Barrow Road would be only appropriate alongside a major motorway or trunk road as can be seen from the M62 and M18. The short sighted decision to permit this development to take place in the Barrow Road location has caused the problems which the Council are now trying to extricate themselves from. DEVELOPMENT IN WRONG LOCATION. !!!!!!!!!!!!!!					View PDF
0798	Paul Brown	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: “To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended. This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV, s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation.” Route options should bear in mind that Barton upon Humber is a town which deserves to be treated with full regard to its heritage. The drive to industrialise the eastern side of the town must consider that the plans and fortunes of large national companies ebb and flow. Therefore, the town must not be sacrificed to developers and manufacturers current short term targets leaving the residents with the possible aftermath. Remember where did Kimberley Clark disappear to.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Who would have thought that could happen????.					
0516	Paul Brown	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				(2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g. In order to bring to your attention better than words ever can I have included two recent photographs showing the current extremely attractive southern approach to the town that would be lost for ever should the Banks Property proposal be accepted.					View PDF
0798	Paul Brown	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for “up to 400 homes” on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include a) that it is outside of the current development line, b) current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded, c) it will cause unwarranted ecological damage and d) this proposal by Banks Property which is essentially speculation in land is an attempt to override the work that has already gone into the Local Plan (Regulation 19) and therefore is an attempt override local democracy.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Geoff **Bullock**, DWD on behalf of PHILLIPS 66 LTD & VPI Immingham												
0125	Geoff Bullock, DWD on behalf of PHILLIPS 66 LTD & VPI Immingham	Paragraph 3.10	object	yes	no	yes	PHILLIPS 66 LTD, Vitol and VPI Immingham (VPI) have formed a partnership to advance the Humber Zero Project on the South Humber Bank. Humber Zero is a large-scale decarbonisation project that aims to remove up to 8 million tonnes of CO2 per annum from the Immingham industrial cluster by 2030. Humber Zero is ideally placed being located in close proximity to empty gas fields in the North Sea (within which captured CO2 can be stored) and also proposed transportation infrastructure for taking the captured CO2 offshore for secure storage. It therefore has the potential, along with other decarbonisation initiatives and projects to play a major role in the decarbonisation of industry and power generation within the Humber region. The decarbonisation of industrial and power generation activities in the Region has a critical role to play in the UK achieving the Government's legally binding net zero by 2050 target. PHILLIPS 66 LTD own and operate the Humber Refinery, which along with the adjacent Lindsey Refinery provides 25% of the UK's total oil refining capacity. The Humber Refinery is Europe's only supplier of graphite coke for EV batteries and consumer goods and produces a range of new lower carbon liquid fuels. VPI owns and operates a 1,200 megawatt (MW) gas-fired combined heat and power (CHP) plant. The CHP plant operates 24/7 to provide the electricity and steam that is critical to the operation of the Humber and Lindsey refineries. Humber Zero will integrate carbon capture and storage (CCS) technology into some of the processes at the PHILLIPS 66 LTD Humber Refinery and the VPI CHP plant. Post-combustion, the CO2 will be captured at source and then transported via pipeline either to CO2 storage fields in the North Sea or exported to international markets from the Port of Immingham. Alongside this, Humber Zero will also produce a combination of blue and green hydrogen that will be used for industrial purposes to decarbonise energy supplies to the Immingham industrial cluster. The Project aims to generate up to 1,000 MW thermal of hydrogen. The CO2 created from the production of blue hydrogen (from natural gas) will be captured at source for transportation and storage. The green hydrogen will be produced using excess electricity from offshore Hornsea Wind Farm to power electrolysers that will split water into hydrogen and oxygen. While PHILLIPS 66 LTD and VPI are broadly supportive of the emerging Local Plan, they are concerned that the Plan, and in particular the Spatial Vision & Objectives (Chapter 3), is not sufficiently sound as it does not recognise the importance of the emerging industrial and power generation decarbonisation initiatives on the South Humber Bank. This in turn means the policies of the emerging Local Plan do not provide the necessary planning framework for such developments and that the Plan will not be sufficiently effective in terms of supporting the decarbonisation of the Humber Region, consistent with national policy objectives. Within the Spatial Vision (box below paragraph 3.10 on page 33) it is	effective	Amendment of the Spatial Vision & Objectives to fully recognise the importance of the emerging industrial and power generation decarbonisation initiatives on the South Humber Bank and the substantial CCS opportunity that exists in the Humber Region, due to the concentration of carbon intensive industries and the offshore geological storage resource and the important contribution this can make toward achieving net zero by 2050 and developing a green industrial cluster with its associated economic benefits.	yes	In order to make oral representations regarding the amendments required to the Spatial Vision & Objectives.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							stated that the: economy will be strong and diverse; part of an energy corridor stretching east to west, (encompassing energy production and consumption, steel and process engineering, chemicals and associated logistics) and a food belt corridor from north to south (encompasses growing, logistics, processing and research and development). Significantly, there is no mention of the importance of CCS and other decarbonisation initiatives both in terms of safeguarding existing businesses and industry or developing a green industrial cluster on the South Humber Bank. Chapter 3 sets out 14 spatial objectives, including (below paragraph 3.11, pages 34): Spatial Objective 1: Growing Our Economy To promote economic growth in North Lincolnshire that increases the area's prosperity through supporting business growth and investment, enterprise and job creation. The area will make the most of its strategic location adjacent to the Humber Estuary, infrastructure and international connections to be a key location for businesses, whilst sufficient employment land will be delivered in sustainable locations that meets the needs of existing and future businesses. Employment levels will be increased, creating more and better job prospects. The vitality and viability of Scunthorpe, our Market Towns, district and local centres as places for shopping, leisure, cultural and community activities will be encouraged and supported. Again, there is no mention of the importance of decarbonising the local economy or recognition of its potential in safeguarding existing jobs while generating economic activity and new jobs for the local area. In summary, the emerging Local Plan, and in particular the Spatial Vision & Objectives, does not recognise the importance of the emerging industrial and power generation decarbonisation initiatives on the South Humber Bank. The emerging Local Plan should therefore be amended to fully recognise this and the substantial CCS opportunity that exists in the Humber Region, due to the concentration of carbon intensive industries and the offshore geological storage resource and the important contribution this can make toward achieving net zero by 2050 and developing a green industrial cluster with its associated economic benefits.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0127	Geoff Bullock, DWD on behalf of PHILLIPS 66 LTD & VPI Immingham	Paragraph 3.11	object	yes	no	yes	PHILLIPS 66 LTD, Vitol and VPI Immingham (VPI) have formed a partnership to advance the Humber Zero Project on the South Humber Bank. Humber Zero is a large-scale decarbonisation project that aims to remove up to 8 million tonnes of CO2 per annum from the Immingham industrial cluster by 2030. Humber Zero is ideally placed being located in close proximity to empty gas fields in the North Sea (within which captured CO2 can be stored) and also proposed transportation infrastructure for taking the captured CO2 offshore for secure storage. It therefore has the potential, along with other decarbonisation initiatives and projects to play a major role in the decarbonisation of industry and power generation within the Humber region. The decarbonisation of industrial and power generation activities in the Region has a critical role to play in the UK achieving the Government's legally binding net zero by 2050 target. PHILLIPS 66 LTD own and operate the Humber Refinery, which along with the adjacent Lindsey Refinery provides 25% of the UK's total oil refining capacity. The Humber Refinery is Europe's only supplier of graphite coke for EV batteries and consumer goods and produces a range of new lower carbon liquid fuels. VPI owns and operates a 1,200 megawatt (MW) gas-fired combined heat and power (CHP) plant. The CHP plant operates 24/7 to provide the electricity and steam that is critical to the operation of the Humber and Lindsey refineries. Humber Zero will integrate carbon capture and storage (CCS) technology into some of the processes at the PHILLIPS 66 LTD Humber Refinery and the VPI CHP plant. Post-combustion, the CO2 will be captured at source and then transported via pipeline either to CO2 storage fields in the North Sea or exported to international markets from the Port of Immingham. Alongside this, Humber Zero will also produce a combination of blue and green hydrogen that will be used for industrial purposes to decarbonise energy supplies to the Immingham industrial cluster. The Project aims to generate up to 1,000 MW thermal of hydrogen. The CO2 created from the production of blue hydrogen (from natural gas) will be captured at source for transportation and storage. The green hydrogen will be produced using excess electricity from offshore Hornsea Wind Farm to power electrolysers that will split water into hydrogen and oxygen. While PHILLIPS 66 LTD and VPI are broadly supportive of the emerging Local Plan, they are concerned that the Plan, and in particular the Spatial Vision & Objectives (Chapter 3), is not sufficiently sound as it does not recognise the importance of the emerging industrial and power generation decarbonisation initiatives on the South Humber Bank. This in turn means the policies of the emerging Local Plan do not provide the necessary planning framework for such developments and that the Plan will not be sufficiently effective in terms of supporting the decarbonisation of the Humber Region, consistent with national policy objectives. Within the Spatial Vision (box below paragraph 3.10 on page 33) it is stated that the: economy will be strong and diverse; part of an energy corridor stretching	effective	Amendment of the Spatial Vision & Objectives to fully recognise the importance of the emerging industrial and power generation decarbonisation initiatives on the South Humber Bank and the substantial CCS opportunity that exists in the Humber Region, due to the concentration of carbon intensive industries and the offshore geological storage resource and the important contribution this can make toward achieving net zero by 2050 and developing a green industrial cluster with its associated economic benefits.	yes	In order to make oral representations regarding the amendments required to the Spatial Vision & Objectives.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							east to west, (encompassing energy production and consumption, steel and process engineering, chemicals and associated logistics) and a food belt corridor from north to south (encompasses growing, logistics, processing and research and development). Significantly, there is no mention of the importance of CCS and other decarbonisation initiatives both in terms of safeguarding existing businesses and industry or developing a green industrial cluster on the South Humber Bank. Chapter 3 sets out 14 spatial objectives, including (below paragraph 3.11, pages 34): Spatial Objective 1: Growing Our Economy To promote economic growth in North Lincolnshire that increases the area's prosperity through supporting business growth and investment, enterprise and job creation. The area will make the most of its strategic location adjacent to the Humber Estuary, infrastructure and international connections to be a key location for businesses, whilst sufficient employment land will be delivered in sustainable locations that meets the needs of existing and future businesses. Employment levels will be increased, creating more and better job prospects. The vitality and viability of Scunthorpe, our Market Towns, district and local centres as places for shopping, leisure, cultural and community activities will be encouraged and supported. Again, there is no mention of the importance of decarbonising the local economy or recognition of its potential in safeguarding existing jobs while generating economic activity and new jobs for the local area. In summary, the emerging Local Plan, and in particular the Spatial Vision & Objectives, does not recognise the importance of the emerging industrial and power generation decarbonisation initiatives on the South Humber Bank. The emerging Local Plan should therefore be amended to fully recognise this and the substantial CCS opportunity that exists in the Humber Region, due to the concentration of carbon intensive industries and the offshore geological storage resource and the important contribution this can make toward achieving net zero by 2050 and developing a green industrial cluster with its associated economic benefits.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Mr J **Butterfield**												
0840	Mr J Butterfield	POLICY H1P-30: LAND SOUTH OF MAIN STREET	object		No		I write to set out to my objection on the above document, specifically in relation to Housing Option Proposal for land behind Main Street & Station Road in Sturton Nr Brigg.Whilst I cannot comment on the legal compliance of the plan in relation to planning statutes, I do however wish to object under the 'Soundness' of the plan in relation to the same, namely it contradicts national and local policy directives as follows.The North Lincolnshire Council Scawby Conservation Area Appraisal report (2005) expresses in its statement 'Modern development around the edges of Scawby has had a negative impact on the quality of the village' Further residential development should be therefore dissuaded.The 5 year target is based entirely on an old and now superseded planning document (Structure Plan) dating back to 1989-2006. Todays annual housing supply targets accord with the number required by this structure plan and it is widely acknowledged that this annual figure exceeds building rates and emerging regional planning requirements and are thus inaccurate. The Office for National Statistics population projections suggest that 'the population of North Lincolnshire may decline by 6,300 people between 1996 and 2021'. The DETR has since amended the figure for North Lincolnshire, which show a broadly static population. To conclude, any shortfall, if any in the current 5 year NLCC housing supply plan should not and cannot be singularly used as the basis for this draft designation. NLCC have also in my opinion conveniently disregarded all of the previously approved housing applications made in its five-year count, a consequence of greedy developers deferring actual building to heighten demand and hence profit. At the end of the day, its 'easy' housing development in rural communities being pushed for approval, all at the expense of the quality and amenity of its villages that its seeking to protect in the first place. On this basis the designation cannot be justified on the 5-year supply plan.In accordance with Policy PPG3 of the local plan, (and I quote policy highlighted in red;)'The Government is committed to promoting more sustainable patterns of development. PPG3 seeks to achieve this by "concentrating most additional housing within urban areas" and by "making more efficient use of land by maximising the re-use of existing buildings". A further central aim of PPG3 is to prioritise the re-use of previously developed land within urban areas to promote urban renaissance to improve the quality of life and to minimise the level of development on Greenfield sites'. This proposed designation is contrary to policy expressed here.'In moving towards more sustainable patterns of development PPG3 identifies also a clear sequential approach to the identification of new housing land as follows. Firstly, re-use of previously developed sites and empty or under-used buildings within town centres and elsewhere in the urban areas which are well located and accessible to jobs, shops and services other than by private car. Secondly, extension of urban areas should be prioritized. Finally, development should focus on areas with good public transport nodes and corridors' Sturton clearly does not fall within any of these areas identified for housing development and therefore the designation here should be strongly rejected.'The settlements identified as rural hamlets and villages are considered entirely unsuitable locations for new residential development, unless related to an agricultural or other special housing need, and are identified as being					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							within the open countryside' Again, policy actively dissuades residential development in these hamlets, and the designation should be rejected.In line with PPG13, the Local Plan now seeks to ensure that future housing development is in locations that help to reduce the need to travel by private car and are well related to existing or proposed employment opportunities. The Plan also reflects government advice to allocate the maximum amount of housing to existing larger urban areas (market towns and above) where they can be easily accessible to facilities and avoid any significant incremental expansion of housing in villages and small towns where this is likely to result largely in car commuting to urban centres and where the travel needs are unlikely to be well serviced by public transport. Designation should be wholly rejected as housing development in Sturton can only attract a transient (car ownership) population as public transportation infrastructure is largely minimal as are local employment opportunities.'For existing Housing allocations inherited from Local Plans only 32.5% are identified within the Scunthorpe and Urban Area and only 19.6% within Barton upon Humber and Brigg whilst more than 47% are identified within the small towns and villages where few jobs and facilities exist. This existing geographic distribution of housing is not in accordance with current settlement hierarchy nor is it sustainable' The sustainable argument against this designation is clearly expressed in policy and government thinking and should as such be rejected..H1(Housing Development Hierarchy) Future housing development will take place in accordance with the following hierarchy:In minimum growth settlements (such as Sturton) new housing development will be restricted to the building of single and in exceptional cases very small groups of dwellings (up to a maximum of three dwellings), on infilling plots in the main body of the settlement provided that such development would be in keeping with the size, form and character of the settlement.Also expansion of these villages on a large scale cannot be achieved without altering their character and function. Any opportunities for housing in such settlements tends to be limited to greenfield land, open spaces, amenity areas and agricultural land, which are not considered suitable for development. The Policy clearly states a presumption against development in villages/hamlets such as Sturton.In summary, I am of the view that existing and proposed policy both at national and local level is set out to minimise/dissuade further residential infill in rural locations such as this. It is clearly seen as unsustainable and not in line with current government trends and thinking. Furthermore, population is seen to be static/reducing in North Lincolnshire and no clear demand has been set out to justify such a designation. With regard to policy, the designation of housing supply land in Sturton should be wholly rejected as it contradicts almost all policy on housing for North Lincs.I hope that my views and comments a properly considered as part of the Regulation 19 Proposal review.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Jon **Campbell**												
0616	Jon Campbell	POLICY H1P-4: LAND AT FORMER SOUTH LEYS SCHOOL ENDERBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object				Dear Sir/Madam. I would like to express my objections to the use of the land at the former south leys school at Enderby road. The reason for this is the Dance School KPAC is where my Daughter attends . This community based school has cared for my Daughters dance passion for the last few years and she would be devastated if the school was closed or relocated. More recently she has suffered from a severe period of exhaustion and chronic head pains which the school managed brilliantly in catering for and to be honest gave her a focus to look forward to while in and out if hospital. My daughter has also developed many friendships while attending the school that were more deep than normal school due to shared passions. My wife also volunteers her time to the school to assist in fund raising and chaperoning the children when required, there are many others who do the same putting their energies into developing the school and keeping it low cost for the area, moving would risk loosing local support if transportation was then required. It would also be a shun to the hard work in developing the facilities the school has developed over the years. The facility has also lent out space to other groups (elderly bingo etc) and held many charity events. I hope the decision can be changed or modified to allow the school and community base to be left open. If you would like to discuss any of my comments please feel free to reply.					View PDF
Emile **Carr** on behalf of Historic England												
0899	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	Evidence Base	Support		Yes		The provision of the HIA and other documents is strongly welcomed following our Regulation 18 response					View PDF
0900	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	Paragraph 1.32	Object		No		Policy HE1 should also be included as a strategic policy, in accordance with paragraph 20, criteria d) of the NPPF		Policy HE1 should be included in the list within paragraph 1.32, as shown in the preferred options consultation (paragraph 1.35)			View PDF
0901	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	Paragraph 2.54	Object		No		Paragraph 2.54 is welcomed. However, it would be beneficial to include reference specifically to non-designated heritage assets. It would be helpful to include reference to settings within the key challenge box.		Include reference to non-designated heritage assets and settings.			View PDF
0902	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	Paragraph 3.11	Support		Yes		Spatial Objective 6: Protecting and Enhancing our Natural, Built and Historic Environment is again welcomed.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0922	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY DM5: 5.	Support		Yes		Section 5 is welcomed					View PDF
0916	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	Support		Yes		Policy DQE1 is welcomed.					View PDF
0917	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY DQE8: RENEWABLE ENERGY PROPOSALS	Support		Yes		The changes to policy DQE8 Renewable Energy Proposals are welcomed in accordance with Historic England's Regulation 18 response					View PDF
0907	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY EC1: EMPLOYMENT LAND SUPPLY	Support		Yes		Criteria l) is welcomed.					View PDF
0908	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY EC1-2: LAND AT NORTH OF DONCASTER ROAD	Support		Yes		Criteria h) is welcomed.					View PDF
0909	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY EC1-3: LAND TO THE WEST OF HUMBERSIDE AIRPORT	Support		Yes		Criteria h) is welcomed.					View PDF
0910	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY EC1-4: LAND NORTH OF THE A18 AT HUMBERSIDE AIRPORT	Support		Yes		Criteria l) is welcomed.					View PDF
0911	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY EC1-5: LAND AT SANDTOFT AIRFIELD	Support		Yes		Criteria h/l) is welcomed.					View PDF
0912	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY EC1-6: LAND AT NORTH WEST OF THE A15 BARTON INTERCHANGE	Support		Yes		Criteria h/l) is welcomed.					View PDF
0913	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY EC1-7: LAND AT SOUTH OF BARNETBY TOP INTERCHANGE AND TO THE WEST OF THE A18	Support		Yes		Criteria f/g) is welcomed.					View PDF
0914	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY EC1-8: LAND AT SOUTH OF BARNETBY TOP INTERCHANGE AND TO THE EAST OF THE A18	Support		Yes		Criteria g/h) is welcomed.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0906	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object		No		Please see objections to site allocations and their specific policies within Appendix B.		Please see Appendix B			View PDF
0894	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY H1P-17: LAND AT WRAWBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object		No		There are important approach views westward from the A1077 approaching the junction with the B1402 of the tower of the Grade I church of the Holy Trinity which should be retained and/or enhanced in the proposed housing development east of the junction. The criteria previously negotiated and agreed during the SOCG discussions has not been added, and as such carries insufficient protection for heritage assets and their settings, specific to this site.		The following criteria is re-added, as previously agreed during the SOCG process November 2020 “A Heritage Assessment will be required to demonstrate that the development will have no adverse impact on the historic environment, including protecting and enhancing the important approach views of the tower of the Grade I church of the Holy Trinity.			View PDF
0895	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY H1P-23: LAND OFF MILL ROAD	Object		No		There is a pair of cottages on the site on Mill Road which are undesignated heritage assets as is the historic strip field form of the site (this was formerly two strips), as such NPPF chapter 16 policies apply. A policy criteria within a site specific policy should be included to retain and sympathetically reuse these two cottages. The criteria previously negotiated during the SOCG discussions has not been added, and as such carries insufficient protection for heritage assets and their settings, specific to this site.		The following criteria is re-added, as previously agreed during the SOCG process November 2020:- “A Heritage Assessment will be required to demonstrate that the development will have no adverse impact on the historic environment, including for the retention and sympathetic reuse of the pair of cottages on the site, which are non-designated heritage assets.”			View PDF
0918	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY HE1: CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT	Support		Yes		Section 10 and its detail is welcomed together with policy HE1. Paragraph 10.4 with reference to the Isle of Axholme is strongly welcomed, together with 11b of policy HE1. The definition of section 1 and 2 of policy HE1 is welcomed. Policy HE2 and its supporting text is strongly welcomed.					View PDF
0896	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY HP1-25: LAND AT YEALAND FLATS					The Isle of Axholme contains an extraordinary survival of a historic rural landscape including, in particular, surviving ancient open strip fields which lie in the heart of the isle. The Ancient Open Strip Fields (AOSF) stretch from Haxey to Epworth and Belton. The strip fields are arranged within larger fields. They adjoin the settlements and were communally farmed. The strips are often marked on the land through their narrow width and changes in crop or cultivation, changes in strip direction and/or ‘reverse S’ boundaries. Some strips have been amalgamated into larger groups but the open, largely unenclosed landscape remains, as do many narrow, often long, strips with ‘soft’ boundaries. Some early enclosures adjoining settlements were created as ‘rear’ crofts or ‘home closes’, including for livestock. Some of these were historically associated with later farms with farm buildings located on the edge of settlements.		Deletion of site			View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							The historic landscape around Epworth, Haxey and Belton including the ancient open strip fields and early enclosed fields has very high significance as a heritage asset and is of national importance even though it is not nationally designated due to current definitions in legislation. The character of the area has been eroded in places due to modern amalgamation of strips. However, a large number of strips survive across the heartland of the area and they make a key contribution to the historic open, unenclosed character of the surviving landscape which retains its coherence with clear historic relationships surviving between the strips, paths, lanes and roads, farms, early enclosed fields and settlements. The character of this historic landscape remains readily apparent. Around Epworth, this historic landscape forms an important part of the setting of Epworth Conservation area with the close relationship between the village and landscape being readily apparent. The historic landscape itself is defined in the Local Plan. The proposed site allocation would result in the loss of part of the early enclosure field and be harmful to the historic landscape area defined in the Local Plan (in accordance with policy HE2 and the HIA) through loss of part of the field through development, and loss of key views of the historic landscape (including the Grade II Listed Maws Mill) from one of the main roads coming into Epworth. These views take advantage of the topography to reveal more of the landscape and the prominence of the mill. The loss of these views would harm the contribution that the setting of Maws Mill makes to its significance. The alteration of the settlement boundary also risks further loss of the historic landscape. The historic landscape area covers the site as shown in the HIA; insufficient justification is given for its altered extent within the Local Plan Accordingly, the proposal is considered to be unsound and should be deleted from the Local Plan.					
0919	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY MIN3: MINERAL EXTRACTION	Support		Yes		Section 1, criteria a), is welcomed.					View PDF
0920	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY MIN6: MINERAL SITES	object		No		Please see detailed comments for MIN6-17 and MIN6-18 within Appendix B.		Please see amendments suggested in Appendix B.			View PDF
0897	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY MIN6: MINERAL SITES					Please read in conjunction with MIN6-18 below as it relates to the same policy and adjoining site. What involvement has the LPA archaeologist had? The setting / related remains impacts of MIN6-17 need to be assessed; does the Roman site extend beyond the scheduled area? Historic England remain concerned that the Roman town may continue into MIN6-17 and in terms of aesthetic impacts. Together with the assessment required as set out for MIN6-18, if MIN-17 is then considered acceptable, a criteria should also be included for MIN6-17 for pre-determination archaeological evaluation requirements and any remains found likely to be of equivalent importance to the adjacent scheduled monument should be preserved through design modification including the understanding of any potential hydrological impacts upon any preserved deposits resulting from working methods.		Historic England would be very happy to assist with wording for the suggested criteria			View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0898	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY MIN6: MINERAL SITES	Object		No		Historic England would object to site MIN6-18 due to its position in relation to Old Winteringham Roman settlement scheduled monument without detailed further assessment, which may illustrate that the proposals are unsuitable due to the level of harm to the significance of heritage assets proportionate to their importance or because harm cannot be successfully mitigated.		The following sentence should be added to the end of criteria 4 of policy MIN6 "the assessments may illustrate that the sites are not suitable or that harm cannot be successfully mitigated." Or 'the assessments may illustrate that the sites are unsuitable due to the level of harm to the significance of heritage assets proportionate to their importance or because harm cannot be successfully mitigated'			View PDF
0921	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY MIN8: RESTORATION, AFTERCARE & AFTERUSE OF MINERAL EXTRACTION SITES	object		No		Proposals for restoration should make a positive contribution to heritage assets and their settings where relevant.		An additional criteria should be included, similar to section 4, criteria a, such as 'to conserve and enhance the setting of heritage assets, where relevant' Historic England would be very happy to assist with wording.			View PDF
0905	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	Object		No		The limits to development have been extended further into the Historic Landscape Area (Policy HE2) to which Historic England are objecting, please see detailed comments in relation to site allocation HP1-25.		Please see HP1-25 in appendix B.			View PDF
0903	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY SS3: DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES					Criteria j) is welcomed, it would be helpful to reference settings		Insert 'settings' after 'heritage assets			View PDF
0904	Emile Carr on behalf of Historic England	POLICY SS7: STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION – LINCOLNSHIRE LAKES	object		No		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 stage 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 https://historicengland.org.uk/imagesbooks/publications/deposit-modelling-and-archaeology/and https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/technicaladvice/archaeological-science/preservation-in-situ/ .		Historic England would be very happy to assist with policy criteria wording.			View PDF
0915	Emile Carr on behalf of	POLICY TC2: PLACEMAKING &	Support		Yes		Policy TC2: Placemaking and Good Urban Design is welcomed.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	Historic England	GOOD URBAN DESIGN										
Richard **Cawson**												
0402	Richard Cawson	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0446	Richard Cawson	Paragraph 14.47					The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation. I request that the text should be revised to: “To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation.”					View PDF
0532	Richard Cawson	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS					(Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any different and request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0682	Richard Cawson	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES					I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for “up to 400 homes” on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage. Barton does not have the infrastructure to cope with this development and those others proposed at Falkland way. It is almost impossible now to get a doctors appointment, or register with a dentist.					View PDF
Helen **Chafer**												
0459	Helen Chafer	Paragraph 14.47					The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: “To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					
0499	Helen Chafer	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS					Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0575	Helen Chafer	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS					I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Caroline **Chave**, Chave Planning on behalf of Qudos Homes LTD												
0260	Caroline Chave, Chave Planning on behalf of Qudos Homes LTD	POLICY H1P-30: LAND SOUTH OF MAIN STREET	object	yes	no	yes	Qudos Homes LTD fully supports the principle of allocating land in this particular location for housing. Sturton (part of Scawby) is a sustainable location for development and the small site allocation proposed would allow proportionate development to contribute towards meeting local housing needs. However, Qudos Homes LTD objects to the extents of the site area proposed to be allocated and to the indicative number of dwellings and density proposed for the site in the policy. These objections are made for reasons of soundness " specifically that the policy is neither justified nor effective in these respects " as will be explained below. Policy H1P-30 proposes a site area of 0.79ha for allocation and indicates that the site could accommodate approximately 24 dwellings. However, this does not take into account up-to-date, site-specific evidence regarding the manner in which the site is likely to be developed, taking into account site opportunities and constraints and local character. Qudos Homes LTD has recently submitted a full planning application for the site and this application relates to an extended site area of 1ha, as shown on the Location Plan appended to these representations. The proposed site layout plan and Design & Access Statement for the application are also appended. The planning application (reference PA/2021/1755) has been prepared taking into account site-specific analysis of environmental constraints and opportunities by specialist consultants and the site layout has benefited from this understanding. This information can and should also benefit the Local Plan making process to ensure that the policy for the site is sound.	justified	Modifications are sought to increase the site area of the proposed allocation to 1ha, as shown on the attached Location Plan, and to adjust the anticipated number of dwellings to be delivered on the site to 14 dwellings. Criterion 1a of the policy should be amended to delete and developed at approximately 30 -35 dwellings per hectare in accordance with Policy H2	yes	In order to contribute site-specific evidence to the debate regarding the site allocation and discuss how the issues of soundness would be addressed by increasing the area of the site allocation and adjusting the number of dwellings anticipated to be achieved on the site.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							As highlighted in other representations in response to the Heritage and Archaeology Impact Assessment (HAIA), the site is located opposite a listed building and therefore the design of the proposals should be sensitive to this context. While we do not agree with the HAIA that there should be an area of the site left open (and we have set this out in representations to the HAIA), we have nonetheless set the development back from the site frontage to respect the pattern of the built form and the primacy of the listed building. We have also considered potential amenity impacts on neighbouring dwellings and laid out the development so that any such impacts are avoided. The development layout has also been informed by advice from ecological and arboriculture consultants with regard to retention of existing features and creation of Biodiversity Net Gain on the site. Account has also been taken of local housing needs and the site layout includes bungalows, which are quite site-hungry. The Design & Access Statement demonstrates how the site's constraints and opportunities have been taken into account to arrive at a development which responds positively to the character, pattern and density of the surroundings. The application site layout results in the site being developed at 14 dwellings per hectare, rather than the 30 -35 dwellings per hectare (approx.) required by Policy H1P-30 in accordance with Policy H2. However, this is justified by taking into account the character, location and setting of the area and supporting the development of sustainable, balanced communities, as described above and in accordance with Policy H2. The 1ha application site only adds a little further land (0.31ha) to the south of the proposed site allocation. This enables a layout which takes account of the pattern of development in the surroundings and creates an attractive and practical arrangement. The extended site area allows for a further row of dwellings so that a cul-de-sac can be formed with dwellings on both side of it. This is a much more attractive arrangement than a one-sided cul-de-sac and affords better community safety. Without this additional land it would be very difficult to create a satisfactory layout. The proposed site allocation has not taken these site layout planning considerations into account, since those preparing the Local Plan did not have this information at the time of preparation, but now that it is known the proposed site allocation should be amended to take this information into account. The 1ha application site is adjoined on approximately 78% of its boundaries by existing and proposed dwellings and their curtilages. Where the site adjoins countryside it is visually contained to a large extent by existing trees and significant hedgerow. The site relates strongly to the village core of Sturton rather than the wider countryside and its development will not impact on any views enjoyed from public vantage points of the wider countryside. From Main Street the site would appear as an infill development. Therefore, the visual impact of development within the 1ha application site boundary would not be significantly different to the proposed allocation site boundary and there are no additional impacts from changing the site boundary as proposed. The modifications to the policy as suggested would make no change to the					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							assessment of site against the Site Assessment Criteria in the Sustainability Appraisal. The site would maintain the same scores and would thus remain a sustainable site allocation as per the Council's assessment. To summarise in terms of the soundness tests, the policy would fail the following tests of soundness, but could be made sound with modifications: Justified " an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence The policy is not justified because it does not take into account site-specific evidence in the current planning application which demonstrates that allocation of the application site area of 1ha would achieve a sensitive development in this location which would allow an attractive, safe and workable site layout. The allocation of the 1ha site area would represent an appropriate strategy, whereas the 0.79ha site allocation proposed would constrain the site's potential and create difficulties in achieving a satisfactory site layout. Effective " deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground The policy is not effective because it would not deliver the 24 dwellings that are anticipated by the policy at the density range of 30-35 dwellings per hectare, when taking into account site-specific considerations and particularly the character of the surrounding area. However, it can be made sound by modifying the number of dwellings to 14 and removing the reference to developing at a density of 30-35 dwellings per hectare.					
0263	Caroline Chave, Chave Planning on behalf of Qudos Homes LTD	POLICY H1P-30: LAND SOUTH OF MAIN STREET	object	yes	no	yes	These representations relate to part of the evidence base in respect of archaeology and heritage for proposed site allocation H1P-30 - North Lincolnshire Local Plan - Heritage and Archaeology Impact Assessment: Methodology and Assessment of Sites, October 2020 Appendix 1 Site Assessment of Site Allocation: H1P-32 Land South of Main Street, Scawby (site reference H1P-30 in the Regulation 19 Submission version of the Local Plan). Qudos Homes LTD fully supports the principle of allocating land in this particular location for housing. Sturton (part of Scawby) is a sustainable location for development and the small site allocation proposed would allow proportionate development to contribute towards meeting local housing needs. However, Qudos Homes LTD objects to certain aspects of the site assessment for this site as set out in the Heritage and Archaeology Impact Assessment (HAIA) within the Council's evidence base. The HAIA says that there is high potential that the allocation site contains unrecorded and significant archaeology. It recognises that the precise significance of archaeological heritage assets within the allocation site is currently unknown due to the lack of archaeological survey and investigation on the site and recommends that there is further assessment	justified	The HAIA site assessment for the site should be amended to: a) note the archaeological field evaluation that has been undertaken for the site and thus conclude that there are no significant archaeological implications from the development of this site; and b) remove the recommendation that the front part or plot of the proposed site facing Main Street is not built on/left open and instead should recommend that the relationship with the listed building opposite is considered carefully in the development management process, supported by proportionate heritage	yes	In order to contribute site-specific evidence to the debate regarding the assessment and discuss how the issues of soundness would be addressed by amending the assessment.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							of the site's heritage significance. It recommends that the results of archaeological field evaluation inform this assessment, including a preliminary review of available historic environment evidence for the site and surrounding area, followed by geophysical survey and sample trial trenching to determine the nature and significance of remains. Qudos Homes LTD is pleased to confirm that this programme of archaeological field evaluation for the site has been undertaken, in consultation with the Council's Historic Environment Officer, to inform planning application reference PA/2021/1755 for the site. The report of this evaluation is appended to these representations and confirms that evaluation yielded only a single sherd of pottery which has been identified as being 13th to 15th century in date. The presence of medieval pottery suggests that this ditch is probably not associated with the nearby Roman villa. The absence of any other features within the proposed development area suggests that the site was used primarily as agricultural land to supplement the nearby settlements. The Council's Historic Environment Officer has advised that, based on these findings, no further archaeological evaluation is required. Qudos Homes LTD would submit that the results of this archaeological field evaluation should be taken into account in the Council's evidence base and the HAIA updated accordingly. Thus the HAIA would conclude that there are no significant archaeological implications from the development of this site. The HAIA also says that the allocation will impact on the setting and significance of Home Farm, a Georgian farmhouse Grade II listed building opposite the allocation site. It recommends that, in order to mitigate harm to the setting of Home Farmhouse, it is important that the front part or plot of the proposed site facing Main Street is not built on and is left open, although it does not specify how large the area of land to be left open should be. Qudos Homes LTD considers this to be only a very cursory and overly reserved assessment of the site's relationship with the heritage asset opposite, resulting in a rather blunt-ended and imprecise recommendation in terms of mitigation. The recommendation could have the effect of sterilising part of the site and should therefore be considered very carefully. The planning application for the site (reference PA/2021/1755) has been prepared taking into account site-specific analysis of environmental constraints and opportunities by specialist consultants and the site layout and design has benefited from this understanding. The proposed site layout plan, Design & Access Statement and Plot 1 design are appended to these representations for information. The Design & Access Statement fully assesses the local character and the relationship of the site to the listed building. Main Street in general is characterised by a mix of dwellings and old farm buildings and has a strong agricultural character. Traditional building materials comprise a mix of red brick and stone. The buildings along the street vary in their setback from the road, with some of the oldest buildings sitting directly on the roadside. The Design & Access Statement explains how the proposed site layout and design responds to this by proposing a mix of two storey dwellings and dormer bungalows, reflecting the mix of building heights in the surrounding area. The design concept		assessment.			

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							draws upon the late 19th Century building styles in the area and exhibits use of characterful architectural detailing such as eaves detailing, use of chimneys and a range of window and door styles. The use of detached garages, in some places linked to create a linear building, reflects the form and character of local agricultural buildings. The building materials also reflect the local materials palette of red brick, stone, red clay pantile and slate. The proposed layout has sited the dwelling on Plot 1 no further forward towards the road than the adjacent dwelling to the west, so as to maintain a suitable setback and not impose upon the setting of the listed building opposite. The adjacent dwelling to the west is the older of the neighbouring dwellings to the site, so the positioning of Plot 1 reflects the historic development pattern rather than more modern development. The design of Plot 1 is in character with the surrounding area, presenting a simple and balanced elevation faced in local stone, so that it will positively address and blend with the street scene and will not conflict with the characteristics of the listed building or its setting. In view of this site-specific assessment and demonstration of how sensitive proposals for the site can respond positively to the assessment, it is considered that the onerous recommendation set out in the HAIA is unfounded and unnecessary. There is no justification for leaving the front part or plot of the site open and to do so would conflict with the existing and historic pattern of development along the street. It is therefore requested that this recommendation is removed from the HAIA, which could instead recommend that the relationship with the listed building opposite is considered carefully in the development management process, supported by proportionate heritage assessment. This would make the HAIA sound, since at present it does not provide proportionate, justified evidence to support the Local Plan. The National Planning Policy Framework says at paragraph 190 c) and d) that Local Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, taking into account the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness and opportunities to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place. The cursory, blunt and overly onerous assessment and recommendations in the HAIA does not reflect this national policy in terms of setting out a positive strategy, looking for opportunities for new development to make a positive contribution and drawing on the cues set out in the historic character of the place. The suggested modification above would remedy this. To summarise in terms of the soundness tests, the policy would fail the following tests of soundness, but could be made sound with modifications: Justified an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence. The recommendation in the HAIA that part of the site should be left open is not justified by any robust evidence and the assessment. Consistent with national policy " enabling the delivery of sustainable					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							development in accordance with the policies in this Framework and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant. The recommendation in the HAIA that part of the site should be left open is inconsistent with national policy as it does not set out a positive strategy, nor look for opportunities for new development to make a positive contribution to the historic environment, nor seek to draw on the contribution made by the historic environment to the character of a place.					
Mrs S **Chester**												
0040	Mrs S Chester	POLICY H1P-30: LAND SOUTH OF MAIN STREET	object	no	no	no	The plan is outside the legal settlement boundary. The road on Main Street is not sufficient to cope with the extra traffic this plan would bring. There is already a risk of flooding as the sewers can not cope with the amount of rain we currently get; more tarmac will only add to the surface run off and increase the risk of flooding even more. The amount of houses in the proposal is almost half the amount of properties currently in the hamlet; this is a dramatic increase on top of other already approved plans. The loss of green land will be detrimental to wildlife and ecology. There is a vast number of birds and other wildlife in the area that this plan will negatively impact.					
Trevor **Clark**												
0407	Trevor Clark	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0447	Trevor Clark	Paragraph 14.47					Clause 14.47 (Page 316) gives a NLC opinion that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. Current text: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future housing, a new road is recommended to the immediate south of the town. This will link the A1077/Falkland Way to the A15 via the B1218, reducing traffic flows, particularly HGVs, through the town centre" To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended. This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							If a route is to be joined to the A15 by a new intersection my personal opinion it should be South of the current Brigg/A!5 bridge thus not requiring a roundabout giving access to/from Brigg Road. Given the route of the relief road is not yet settled then reference Poland for building opposite to Falklands Way should be clearly marked as only suitable for housing once relief road route is determined and that there should be no further development of land South/East of said relief road the logic here being if this constraint is not added the relief road ultimately becomes a road through a new very large housing estate.					
0488	Trevor Clark	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS					Page 210-211, Section 9.4.8 refers. Current text: “8. Areas of High Landscape Value are considered to be of high landscape quality with strong distinctive characteristics which make them particularly sensitive to development. A review of Areas of High Landscape Value has been undertaken in the latest North Lincolnshire Landscape Character Assessment. In light of this review, it is proposed that the following Areas of High Landscape Value should be protected: a. Lincoln Edge Woodland and Heathland areas east of Scunthorpe, extending south to Kirton in Lindsey; b. Lincoln Edge Cliff between Whitton and Flixborough; c. Flat Valley Bottom Farmland, Vale of Ancholme; d. Heathy Woodland near Wrawby Moor; e. Wolds Villages Scarp Slope; and f. Deepdale.” Add g. Barton Southern Gateway (B1218 approach)					View PDF
0540	Trevor Clark	POLICY DQE3: BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY					I was pleased to see that the area North of Dam Road is designated as a Nature/Green area links to the FarIngs reserve. Perhaps to embed this NLC should now tackle the “Traveller Issue” who are creating more and more structures on this land, polluting and fly tipping waste etc which is totally contrary to the intentions of the proposal					View PDF
0541	Trevor Clark	POLICY DQE3: BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY					Whilst I agree with the need for a Relief Road I am concerned as are RAID with the current wording which seems to pre-empt the consultation promised In January 2022. As such I make no apologies in using wording part provided by them i.e. why Deepdale regarded an "Area of High Landscape Value", whereas Barton's Southern Gateway isn’t.					View PDF
0570	Trevor Clark	POLICY EC1: EMPLOYMENT LAND SUPPLY					I was pleased that the developments proposed up to 2038 are contained within the current boundary lines with the exception of the site North West of the Ferriby Road/A15 interchange. This is on greenfield land and to prevent development creep contrary to current government policy should be removed from the plan in entirety.					View PDF
0571	Trevor Clark	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS					whilst not shown in the plan Banks proposal for 400 houses south of Horkstow roads not acceptable. On greenbelt land, developer-driven, over and above housing targets. The wording in the plan directly infers that NLC intend the land to be developed for housing - it should be made clear that any such proposals will not be allowed					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Tom **Clarke** on behalf of Theatres Trust												
0244	Tom Clarke on behalf of Theatres Trust	POLICY CSC10: 5.	support	yes	yes	yes	The Trust welcomes this policy and the strong protection afforded to valued facilities which contribute towards the social and cultural well-being of local people. Part 6 of the policy provides robust criteria by which proposals for loss of facilities can be assessed and is in line with policy wording the Trust would recommend. However at present it is part of a policy in isolation which does not relate to anything specific. It either needs additional wording by way of introduction, to be integrated with part 5 or to be moved to the supporting text.	effective	We would suggest modification of part 5 or 6 of this policy as follows: 5. The loss of community facilities or land allocated for such purposes will be resisted, unless there is no longer a need for the land or building in any form of community use, or there is an acceptable alternative means of meeting such need. THIS MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY evidence of marketing over a period of at least 12 months which shows efforts to sell or let the use or site at an appropriate market price/rent taking into account size and condition. This marketing should be through recognised local and national agents relevant to the nature of use. It also must be shown that efforts have been made to explore alternative community, cultural or social uses before loss to other uses. OR 6. WHERE LOSS OF FACILITIES OR LAND ALLOCATED FOR SUCH PURPOSES IS PROPOSED, THIS MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY evidence of marketing over a period of at least 12 months which shows efforts to sell or let the use or site at an appropriate market price/rent taking into account size and condition. This marketing should be through recognised local and national agents relevant to the nature of use. It also must be shown that efforts have been made to explore alternative community, cultural or social uses before loss to other uses.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									OR The text within part 6 to be moved to supporting text.			
Jill **Copeland** on behalf Barton RAID												
0770	Jill Copeland on behalf Barton RAID	Evidence Base	Object				The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process. I understand that the next stage of the process is for the Plan to go to the Inspectorate. Could you provide their contact details please?					View PDF
0452	Jill Copeland on behalf Barton RAID	Paragraph 14.47					The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation. I request that the text should be revised to: “To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation.”					View PDF
0492	Jill Copeland on behalf Barton RAID	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS					Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0686	Jill Copeland on behalf Barton RAID	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES					I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: 1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for “up to 400 homes” on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0688	Jill Copeland on behalf Barton RAID	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	Object				We have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) We object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
David **Cox**												
0458	David Cox	Paragraph 14.47					The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0498	David Cox	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS					Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0690	David Cox	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES					I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Lindsay **Coy**												
0617	Lindsay Coy	POLICY H1P-4: LAND AT FORMER SOUTH LEYS SCHOOL ENDERBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object				Dear Sirs, I am writing to you to object to the proposed plans for housing on the site of Kimberley Performing Arts Centre. This will have a massive impact on the community as they provide so many services which directly benefit not just the children and parents but also local groups that use our facilities. They are at the very heart of the local community, providing resources for the elderly, photography groups and a Men in Sheds project, not to					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							mention access to the arts which is otherwise out of reach for a lot of the residents. This is a valuable resource which will be greatly missed if the plans go ahead.					
John **Craig** on behalf of Hull City Council												
0429	John Craig on behalf of Hull City Council	General					Thank you for consulting Hull City Council and providing the opportunity to respond to the Local Plan Publication Draft. The Council have responded to the previous stages of the Plan and is a signatory to a Statement of Common Ground with North Lincolnshire Council. The Council has outlined in these previous responses its general support for the vision, objectives and strategic policy framework in terms of how this might impact or align with the Hull's ambitions, including the critical role of the Humber Estuary to both authorities' ambitions and needs. In terms of the specific remit of this Regulation 19 consultation the Council has the following comments Legal compliance – It is not considered appropriate for the Council to provide comment as to legal compliance of the Local Plan Soundness There are a number of strategic elements of the plan that the Council considers demonstrate its soundness, particularly in terms of meeting objectively assessed needs and showing effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters. 1. The Council consider that the plan has sought to meet objectively assessed needs, particularly for housing and employment development within its boundaries. While there are some overlaps in terms of market areas the authority still seeks to identify its needs within its area. 2. The Council has made known its support for the allocation of the South Humber Gateway sites for the specific uses described that are outside of the general need for employment land and supports the need to retain the sites for this use given their unique characteristics. The Council is pleased to see reference to the continued joint approach to allocations, particularly in terms of associated habitat mitigation / compensation, flood defence and transport infrastructure given the potential for wider implications across the estuary. 3. The Council recognises the strategic nature of planning for waste with many cross local authority boundary movements, particularly for more specialised wastes and where specific facilities exist. The Council is therefore supportive of policy that promotes working collaboratively with neighbouring local authorities to ensure a co-operative cross boundary approach to waste management is established and maintained. 4. There are extensive areas of high flood risk around the Humber that cross local authority boundaries. North Lincolnshire Council continues to work in partnership with other Humber authorities on a 'Humber					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Comprehensive Review' – and it remains appropriate that this joint approach informs the development of the Local Plan to ensure a mutually beneficial approach to all areas. 5. The Council has adopted, with the East Riding of Yorkshire Council, a Joint Minerals Local Plan. The evidence for this, including the Humber Area's Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA), was prepared in close collaboration with North Lincolnshire Council and the Council is confident in the collaborative approach being taken to the supply of minerals in the wider sub-region, including North Lincolnshire. 6. Climate change is clearly an emerging agenda in terms of how the wider region can work together to achieve practical solutions as they emerge and develop and to ensure they can be delivered. There are some important pointers within the Plan to how development and land use decisions can contribute to tackling climate change. Duty to Cooperate The Council considers that a proactive approach has been taken to preparation the Local Plan to meet the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate, including joint meetings and through the production and agreement of the Statement of Common Ground. Thank you again for the opportunity to respond to this consultation, and an opportunity to once again demonstrate our collaboration on strategic planning issues across the Humber. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require further information regarding this response.					
Heather **Cawson**												
0473	Heather Cawson	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation. I request that the text should be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0513	Heather Cawson	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any different and request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0705	Heather Cawson	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: 1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Application for “up to 400 homes” on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage. Barton does not have the infrastructure to cope with this development and those others proposed at Falkland way. It is almost impossible now to get a doctors appointment, or register with a dentist and I have heard the schools don’t have enough places.					
Carl **Curtis**												
0387	Carl Curtis	Evidence Base	Object				The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process. You are also now mentioning my address in this document as to where the relief road might go, again with no contact whatsoever with myself, not even as a matter of courtesy, which I find very intrusive. May I also reiterate that I am not willing to sell any of my land at Barton Hill Farm as this would mean us having to move to somewhere new as we won’t have enough land for our horses, the main reason we purchased the property 3 years ago.					View PDF
0801	Carl Curtis	Paragraph 14.47	object				The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: “To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation.” The proposed route for the Relief Road currently encompasses some of my property. I have had no contact from North Lincs Council with regard to this. We will not be selling any of our land, as it would make our current property unfit for the purpose we bought it for only 3 years ago and spoil the full use and enjoyment of our property. The loss of habitat and trees and wildlife in this area would be unthinkable. The main entrance to our property will be blocked off and unusable and a new entrance looks like it comes off the 3rd roundabout directly in our garden so our security and privacy would be non existent.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0520	Carl Curtis	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0882	Carl Curtis	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for “up to 400 homes” on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Sharon **Curtis**												
0386	Sharon Curtis	Evidence Base	Object				The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process. You are also now mentioning my address in this document as to where the relief road might go, again with no contact whatsoever with myself, not even as a matter of courtesy, which I find very intrusive. May I also reiterate that I am not willing to sell any of my land at Barton Hill Farm as this would mean us having to move to somewhere new as we won’t have enough land for our horses, the main reason we purchased the property 3 years ago.					View PDF
Mike **Daley** on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council												
0783	Mike Daley on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council	POLICY MIN6: MINERAL SITES	object				Lincolnshire County Council response to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2020 to 2038) - Publication Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation Thank you for consulting Lincolnshire County Council on the Publication Draft of the Plan. This reply sets out the County Council's comments and response in its capacity as the Mineral and Waste Planning Authority only. The views/comments of other relevant service areas/departments within the County Council (e.g. Highways & SuDs, Education, Historic Environment, etc) should therefore also be sought where appropriate and taken into account. We note overall that whilst requirements for aggregates have been identified, the proposed plan and supporting documents are far from clear or sufficient in terms of demonstrating how these requirements are actually proposed to be met over the entirety of the plan period and is not therefore sound in this regard.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							The Minerals Apportionment Background Paper (2020 to 2038) has demonstrated significant growth in both sand and gravel and crushed rock sales since 2016 and 2013 respectively, and it is expected a continuation of a high demand would be seen in the missing 2 years data for 2019/20 had these been provided. Notwithstanding this however, the report goes on to essentially discount the significant level of current and future growth with industrial development around the Humber Ports and the Lincolnshire lakes development to state it is difficult to be sure as to whether or not such major infrastructure projects will have a significant impact upon the aggregate supply within NLC, as materials may be sourced from elsewhere. This approach does not accord with the NPPF which requires that Minerals Planning Authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates (Para 2.13) and that policies should aim toward sourcing minerals indigenously (Para 210/b). It is therefore considered that more weight should have been given to the significant level of future/planned infrastructure when setting future requirements for aggregates. For sand and gravel, there is no information setting out how much the existing S&G sites/reserves will contribute to requirements over the plan period as there are no details of reserves or production capacity. In addition, in Policy MIN 6: Mineral Sites, the proposed area of search MIN6-15: Cove Farm is not capable of delivering enough to meet the projected S&G demand over the plan period, when noting the significant shortfall (2.1 Mt) in the existing reserves. With no additional S&G sites being allocated or areas of search promoted for the delivery of new resources the plan does not set out a proactive strategy for meeting the projected demand for the plan period. For crushed rock, no allocations have been made despite the plan noting a requirement for 8.6mt over the plan period and permitted reserves of around 5.7mt. However, the reserves figure is at odds with the site-specific detail provided in the plan which indicates there are substantial reserves in existing crushed rock sites which far exceed the projected shortfall. In respect of providing for new resources, minerals policies require proposals to demonstrate how they meet a proven need. Taking into account that the MPA has to rely on indicative information drawn from the work carried out on the Humber area joint LAA and acknowledging that information on sand and gravel landbanks in particular is very limited. It is difficult to see how an applicant could provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate a proven need. This requirement should therefore be reconsidered, otherwise it may become a barrier to the provision of new resources needed to meet aggregate demand and undermine the purpose of the plan from the outset. The lack of consistent supporting information and the development of a clear strategy for the delivery of aggregate provision for the whole of the plan period means the plan also does not give due regard to implications on potential demand from other MPAs. Lincolnshire has not been approached with any projections as to any likely level of increased demand that may be needed from Lincolnshire to meet this shortfall and as a consequence the overall approach taken by North Lincolnshire is not					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							considered to reflect a sound approach toward minerals provision.					
Natalie **Dear**, Natalie Dear Planning Consultancy on behalf of DDM Agriculture Ltd												
0779	Natalie Dear, Natalie Dear Planning Consultancy on behalf of DDM Agriculture Ltd	General	Object				In summary, this letter forms a series of objections to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft due to the omission of sites previously allocated at the Preferred Options Stage of the Plan, under references H1P-7p (land to the south of Barrow Road) and H1P-8p (land at Caistor Road). The removal of these allocations from the Publication Draft Plan has implications for a number of policies and it is requested that this letter is considered as objections to each of the policies SS6, SS11, H1, H1P-13, and the Policies Map, as set out below.			Yes		View PDF
0818	Natalie Dear, Natalie Dear Planning Consultancy on behalf of DDM Agriculture Ltd	Policies Map.					Object to the proposed Policies Map. The Publication Draft Plan is not sound. In relation to the soundness of the Publication Draft Plan, it is: - not positively prepared; - not justified; - not effective; and - not consistent with national policy. In relation to this matter I can confirm that DDM Agriculture Ltd wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions as it is necessary to explore the reasons for the proposed omission of the sites and explain why their inclusion is a key part of the sustainable growth of North Lincolnshire over the Plan period. Reasons for Objection: The development limit for Barton upon Humber shown on the Policies Map, drawn in line with Policy SS11: Development Limits, is objected to on the basis that it does not include the sites at land to the south of Barrow Road and land at Caistor Road, as included in the Preferred Options Stage Plan as allocated sites H1P-7p (land to the south of Barrow Road) and H1P-8p (land at Caistor Road) (and SLELAA site references 787LS and CKXMB respectively). Paragraph 7.41 of the Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Topic Paper describes Barton upon Humber as being the second largest settlement in North Lincolnshire in terms of population and number of dwellings, scoring the maximum available score for key services and facilities, as defined in the 2019 Sustainable Settlement Survey, as well as having significant employment opportunities. Barton upon Humber has a wide range of services and facilities, for example, a range of shops, a post office, GP surgery, dentists, primary and secondary schools, public houses and a leisure centre. The town has good public transport links to the nearby larger towns of Hull and Scunthorpe, with regular bus services running to both of these towns. Additionally, the town's train station provides services to Grimsby and Cleethorpes. Barton upon Humber is clearly a very sustainable settlement and should be a key focus for new development and growth. The approach taken to the development limits of Barton upon Humber is overly restrictive and would prevent the sustainable growth of this highly			Yes	In relation to this matter I can confirm that DDM Agriculture Ltd wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions as it is necessary to explore the reasons for the proposed omission of the sites and explain why their inclusion is a key part of the sustainable growth of North Lincolnshire over the Plan period.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							sustainable settlement. The land to the south of Barrow Road and the land at Caistor Road are logical extensions to the existing settlement, both sites are available and deliverable and the Policies Map should be amended to facilitate this. Change Sought: It is requested that the development limits, as shown on the Policies Map, for Barton upon Humber are amended to include the land south of Barrow Road and land at Caistor Road, as the Preferred Options Stage Plan allocated sites H1P-7p and H1P-8p (and SLELAA site references 787LS and CKXMB respectively). I trust that the above representations are clear. DDM Agriculture Ltd wish to work constructively with North Lincolnshire Council to secure the allocation of the sites at land to the south of Barrow Road and land at Caistor Road and would welcome discussions with the Council in this regard. If you have any queries regarding the above representations or require any issues clarifying, please do not hesitate to contact me.					
0578	Natalie Dear, Natalie Dear Planning Consultancy on behalf of DDM Agriculture Ltd	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	Object				Further to my letter dated 24th November 2021 regarding the above (a copy is attached for reference), which was submitted on behalf of DDM Agriculture Ltd, who represent the landowners of the sites at land to the south of Barrow Road and land at Caistor Road, Barton upon Humber (as allocated in the Preferred Options Local Plan as sites H1P-7p and H1P-8p, respectively), on Friday 26th November 2021 North Lincolnshire Council released two further documents as evidence to support the emerging local plan entitled “A1077 Corridor Improvements Technical Note” (May 2021) and “Barton Link Road Technical Note” (May 2021) and extended the consultation deadline on the above plan for an additional week, to Friday 3rd December 2021. These documents have been reviewed and DDM Agriculture Ltd’s Transport Consultant, ADC Infrastructure Ltd, has provided the attached letter as an initial response to these documents. This letter should be considered in addition to the representations submitted on 24th November 2021, as all of the issues raised previously are still relevant at this stage and none of the reasons for objecting to, or the changes sought to, the Publication Draft Local Plan have been overcome or addressed. Could I therefore please request that this further letter from ADC Infrastructure Ltd is added to the 24th November 2021 representations, specifically with respect to policies SS6, H1 and H1P-13? I trust that is clear and would reiterate that DDM Agriculture Ltd wish to work constructively with North Lincolnshire Council to secure the allocation of the sites at land to the south of Barrow Road and land at Caistor Road and would welcome discussions with the Council in this regard. If you have any queries regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0832	Natalie Dear, Natalie Dear Planning Consultancy on behalf of DDM Agriculture Ltd	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS					Policy H1: Site Allocations Object to this policy. The Publication Draft Plan is not sound. In relation to the soundness of the Publication Draft Plan, it is: - not positively prepared; - not justified; - not effective; and - not consistent with national policy. In relation to this matter I can confirm that DDM Agriculture Ltd wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions as it is necessary to explore the reasons for the proposed omission of the sites and explain why their inclusion is a key part of the sustainable growth of North Lincolnshire over the Plan period. Reasons for Objection: Policy H1: Site Allocations is objected to because it does not include the sites previously allocated in the Preferred Options Stage Plan under references H1P-7p (land to the south of Barrow Road) and H1P-8p (land at Caistor Road) within the sites to be allocated for the delivery of new houses. Paragraph 7.41 of the Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Topic Paper describes Barton upon Humber as being the second largest settlement in North Lincolnshire in terms of population and number of dwellings, scoring the maximum available score for key services and facilities, as defined in the 2019 Sustainable Settlement Survey, as well as having significant employment opportunities. Barton upon Humber has a wide range of services and facilities, for example, a range of shops, a post office, GP surgery, dentists, primary and secondary schools, public houses and a leisure centre. The town has good public transport links to the nearby larger towns of Hull and Scunthorpe, with regular bus services running to both of these towns. Additionally, the town's train station provides services to Grimsby and Cleethorpes. Barton upon Humber is clearly a very sustainable settlement and should be a key focus for new development and growth. The allocations made within Policy H1 should reflect the sustainable nature of the settlement and should be increased accordingly. It is noted that the evidence base documents, the Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Topic Paper (June 2021) and the Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper (undated), to support the Publication Draft Plan, refer to a transport study having being undertaken since the Preferred Options Stage which indicated that there were issues with highway network capacity in Barton upon Humber, however, no evidence to support this and no details of the study have been published. Having reviewed all of the transport-related evidence documents published by the Council, it appears that none of them contain references to significant issues with highway network capacity within Barton upon Humber and there is no evidence in any of those documents that the number of dwellings which are allocated to this settlement should be reduced from the levels proposed at the Preferred			Yes	In relation to this matter I can confirm that DDM Agriculture Ltd wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions as it is necessary to explore the reasons for the proposed omission of the sites and explain why their inclusion is a key part of the sustainable growth of North Lincolnshire over the Plan period.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Options Stage. The details of the highways study which led to the reduction in the proportion of housing to be allocated to Barton upon Humber have been requested from North Lincolnshire Council but at the time of writing this representation, this information has not been forthcoming. Once this highways information is made available to the public, it will be reviewed by DDM Agriculture Ltd's Transport Consultant, as detailed in the attached letter from ADC Infrastructure Ltd. However, at present it is not possible to deduce whether the Council has a well-founded concern in this respect. As such, the sites previously allocated in the Preferred Options Stage Plan under references H1P-7p (land to the south of Barrow Road) and H1P-8p (land at Caistor Road) should not be removed from the Publication Draft Plan and should be reinstated as allocations. The most recent Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), published in September 2021 assesses these sites (known under references 787LS and CKXMB respectively). Whilst reference is made within the SHELAA to the need for a junction improvement and consideration being required to be given to a Barton Relief Road, no significant highways constraints are identified in relation to either site and access to the site is given a score of "Green" in relation to both sites. Despite DDM Agriculture Ltd having positively supported the allocation of these sites at the Preferred Options Stage of the Plan, no communication has been had with North Lincolnshire Council prior to the Publication Draft Plan which indicated that these allocations were proposed to be removed from this most recent stage of the Plan. The plan has not been positively prepared in this respect and there is no justification, backed up by evidence, for the removal of these previously allocated sites. The issue raised regarding the alleged impacts of new development on the local highway network raises two further issues (in addition to the current lack of evidence to support this). The first is that the Publication Draft Plan safeguards the route of a proposed Barton Link Road in Policy T7, and reference to such a link road is made within the SHELAA assessments for the previously allocated sites H1P-7p and H1P-8p. If this road is to be realised, facilitating development, such as that proposed on these sites, will be a necessity. Given the existing constraints to the way in which Barton upon Humber might grow in the future, that is the River Humber and its associated high flood risk areas to the north and the A15 to the west, the key focus for the growth of this settlement will be in the southern and eastern parts of the town. If it is accepted that there is a need for a link road to serve the development in this part of the town, development in this area should be permitted to be delivered in a manner which allows for progressive growth and facilitates the delivery of the link road in the medium to longer term. Now is the time to commence this type of development through the reinstatement of the allocation of these sites in this highly sustainable settlement. The second issue in relation to the alleged highways impacts is that the					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and indeed other policies of the Publication Draft Plan, seek to reduce reliance on private cars and seek sustainable modes of transport. No evidence has been presented by the Council that prior to the reduction in the overall allocation of dwellings to Barton upon Humber, consideration was given to measures to address the alleged highways network impacts by exploring sustainable transport options. The previously allocated sites to the south-east of Barton, comprising allocations H1P-6p, H1P-7p and H1P-8p (of which it is acknowledged that H1P-6p has become proposed allocation H1P-13) collectively would have delivered approximately 800 new dwellings. Within a development, or series of developments of this size, there are ample opportunities for exploring and delivering active travel measures, together with options such as car / electric bicycle / electric scooter hire hubs, to discourage individual car ownership and encourage alternative modes of transport. These sites are all within walking distance of the wide range of services and facilities offered within Barton upon Humber and therefore the allocations should not be rejected on alleged highway impacts alone, without firstly fully exploring alternative options. The approach adopted in the Publication Draft Plan is not effective and is out of line with national planning policy as it pushes new development to settlements lower in the settlement hierarchy, which do not have the full range of services and facilities and are not as sustainable. The Publication Draft Plan, and the supporting evidential documents, have not explored the potential for the sites in Barton upon Humber to maximise opportunities for active and sustainable travel modes to overcome any alleged highways impacts, despite the SHELAA concluding that both sites are appropriate for new residential development. The land to the south of Barrow Road and the land at Caistor Road are logical extensions to the existing, highly sustainable settlement of Barton upon Humber, both sites are available and deliverable and policy H1 should be amended to facilitate this. Change Sought: It is requested that Policy H1 is amended to include the whole of the areas of land previously allocated in the Preferred Options Stage Plan as sites H1P-7p (land to the south of Barrow Road) and H1P-8p (land at Caistor Road) (and SLELAA site references 787LS and CKXMB respectively).					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0579	Natalie Dear, Natalie Dear Planning Consultancy on behalf of DDM Agriculture Ltd	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	Object				SECOND OBJECTION TO THE REMOVAL OF PREFERRED OPTIONS SITES H1P-7P and H1P-8P FROM THE PUBLICATION DRAFT (REGULATION 19) – ADC2867 We refer to our previous letter of objection, dated 23 November 2021, in which we objected to the removal of sites H1P-7P (land south of Barrow Road) and H1P-8P (land at Caistor Road) from the Stage 4 Publication Draft (Regulation 19). As noted in our previous letter, we were aware that NLC had undertaken transport and infrastructure studies that concluded that there were highway capacity constraints within Barton under Humber, which in turn, limit the amount of development that can be progressed until the relief road is constructed and operational. However, those studies were not in the public domain at the time of writing. The studies have since been released, in draft format. They comprise the NLC "A1077 Corridor Improvements Technical Note" (May 2021) and the "Barton Link Road Technical Note" (May 2021). We have reviewed both Technical Notes, and based on the content and conclusions of those reports, we maintain our objection to the removal of the two sites. Whilst the deadline to submit our objections has only been extended by one week, to Friday 3rd December 2021, we would like it to be noted that we intend to undertake our own further assessment work to demonstrate the impacts of the inclusion of sites H1P-7P and H1P-8P on the operation of the A1077/Holydyke/Hungate mini-roundabout, which appears to be the key limiting junction in the town and is the focus of both Technical Notes. Nevertheless, the conclusion is that in 2021, the existing junction is operating at 99% of capacity in the evening peak hour, with a maximum queue of 19 vehicles on the A1077 Ferriby Road. This would be exacerbated by general background growth and committed development, although no other future year background (without allocated development) scenarios are modelled. It is against the background scenario that the impact of the development needs to be compared, to demonstrate if the development of the sites would result in a severe impact. The Technical Notes propose an improvement scheme in the form of a traffic signal controlled crossroads. Across the Technical Notes, there are assessments of the signal controlled junction in 2026 (without any development), 2031 (with only some of the residential allocations), and 2038 (with all of the developments) and 2038 (with all of the developments and the link road). It demonstrates that by 2038, the improved junction would operate overcapacity, but that the link road would reduce the impacts. The assessment traffic flows and the LinSig junction model include a number of assumptions, and we wish to review these to determine what, if any, further capacity improvements could be made. The key conclusion is within the "A1077 Corridor Improvement Technical Note", which includes a sensitivity test to demonstrate that the signal controlled junction can accommodate only 587 dwellings before it reaches 90%					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							capacity. However, even at 90% capacity, there is 10% spare capacity before it reaches 100%. Furthermore, for there to be no severe impact, the junction must operate no worse, or not severely worse, than existing (i.e. 99% capacity). Therefore, our view is that there is capacity for the signal controlled junction arrangement to accommodate some or all of the dwellings proposed on sites H1P-7P and H1P-8P. The test in NPPF is whether the development would result in a severe cumulative impact. From the above, it is clear that with the improvement scheme in place, there is scope for sites H1P-7P and H1P8P to be reinstated. We trust that you will consider this letter of objection, and the reinstatement of the sites as allocations moving forwards.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0838	Natalie Dear, Natalie Dear Planning Consultancy on behalf of DDM Agriculture Ltd	POLICY H1P-13: LAND OFF BARROW ROAD					Policy H1P-13: Land off Barrow Road Object to this policy. The Publication Draft Plan is not sound. In relation to the soundness of the Publication Draft Plan, it is: - not positively prepared; - not justified; - not effective; and - not consistent with national policy. In relation to this matter I can confirm that DDM Agriculture Ltd wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions as it is necessary to explore the reasons for the proposed omission of the sites and explain why their inclusion is a key part of the sustainable growth of North Lincolnshire over the Plan period. Reasons for Objection: Whilst the allocation of the land included within Policy H1P-13 is supported, the policy is objected to as the allocation should also include the areas of land previously allocated in the Preferred Options Stage Plan as sites H1P-7p (land to the south of Barrow Road) and H1P-8p (land at Caistor Road) (and SLELAA site references 787LS and CKXMB respectively). Paragraph 7.41 of the Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Topic Paper describes Barton upon Humber as being the second largest settlement in North Lincolnshire in terms of population and number of dwellings, scoring the maximum available score for key services and facilities, as defined in the 2019 Sustainable Settlement Survey, as well as having significant employment opportunities. Barton upon Humber has a wide range of services and facilities, for example, a range of shops, a post office, GP surgery, dentists, primary and secondary schools, public houses and a leisure centre. The town has good public transport links to the nearby larger towns of Hull and Scunthorpe, with regular bus services running to both of these towns. Additionally, the town's train station provides services to Grimsby and Cleethorpes. Barton upon Humber is clearly a very sustainable settlement and should be a key focus for new development and growth. The allocations made within Policy H1P-13 should reflect the sustainable nature of the settlement and should be increased accordingly. It is noted that the evidence base documents, the Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Topic Paper (June 2021) and the Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper (undated), to support the Publication Draft Plan refer to a transport study having being undertaken since the Preferred Options Stage which indicated that there were issues with highway network capacity in Barton upon Humber, however, no evidence to support this and no details of the study have been published. Having reviewed all of the transport-related evidence documents published by the Council, it appears that none of them contain references to significant issues with highway network capacity within Barton upon Humber and there is no evidence in any of those documents that the number of dwellings which are allocated to this settlement should be reduced from the levels proposed at the Preferred			Yes	In relation to this matter I can confirm that DDM Agriculture Ltd wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions as it is necessary to explore the reasons for the proposed omission of the sites and explain why their inclusion is a key part of the sustainable growth of North Lincolnshire over the Plan period.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Options Stage. The details of the highways study which led to the reduction in the proportion of housing to be allocated to Barton upon Humber have been requested from North Lincolnshire Council but at the time of writing this representation, this information has not been forthcoming. Once this highways information is made available to the public, it will be reviewed by DDM Agriculture Ltd's Transport Consultant, as detailed in the attached letter from ADC Infrastructure Ltd. However, at present it is not possible to deduce whether the Council has a well-founded concern in this respect. As such, the sites previously allocated in the Preferred Options Stage Plan under references H1P-7p (land to the south of Barrow Road) and H1P-8p (land at Caistor Road) should not be removed from the Publication Draft Plan and should be reinstated as allocations. The most recent Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), published in September 2021 assesses these sites (known under references 787LS and CKXMB respectively). Whilst reference is made within the SHELAA to the need for a junction improvement and consideration being required to be given to a Barton Relief Road, no significant highways constraints are identified in relation to either site and access to the site is given a score of "Green" in relation to both sites. Despite DDM Agriculture Ltd having positively supported the allocation of these sites at the Preferred Options Stage of the Plan, no communication has been had with North Lincolnshire Council prior to the Publication Draft Plan which indicated that these allocations were proposed to be removed from this most recent stage of the Plan. The plan has not been positively prepared in this respect and there is no justification, backed up by evidence, for the removal of these previously allocated sites. The issue raised regarding the alleged impacts of new development on the local highway network raises two further issues (in addition to the current lack of evidence to support this). The first is that the Publication Draft Plan safeguards the route of a proposed Barton Link Road in Policy T7, and reference to such a link road is made within the SHELAA assessments for the previously allocated sites H1P-7p and H1P-8p. If this road is to be realised, facilitating development, such as that proposed on these sites, will be a necessity. Given the existing constraints to the way in which Barton upon Humber might grow in the future, that is the River Humber and its associated high flood risk areas to the north and the A15 to the west, the key focus for the growth of this settlement will be in the southern and eastern parts of the town. If it is accepted that there is a need for a link road to serve the development in this part of the town, development in this area should be permitted to be delivered in a manner which allows for progressive growth and facilitates the delivery of the link road in the medium to longer term. Now is the time to commence this type of development through the reinstatement of the allocation of these sites in this highly sustainable settlement. The second issue in relation to the alleged highways impacts is that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and indeed other policies of					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							the Publication Draft Plan, seek to reduce reliance on private cars and seek sustainable modes of transport. No evidence has been presented by the Council that prior to the reduction in the overall allocation of dwellings to Barton upon Humber, consideration was given to measures to address the alleged highways network impacts by exploring sustainable transport options. The previously allocated sites to the south-east of Barton, comprising allocations H1P-6p, H1P-7p and H1P-8p (of which it is acknowledged that H1P-6p has become proposed allocation H1P-13) collectively would have delivered approximately 800 new dwellings. Within a development, or series of developments of this size, there are ample opportunities for exploring and delivering active travel measures, together with options such as car / electric bicycle / electric scooter hire hubs, to discourage individual car ownership and encourage alternative modes of transport. These sites are all within walking distance of the wide range of services and facilities offered within Barton upon Humber and therefore the allocations should not be rejected on alleged highway impacts alone, without firstly fully exploring alternative options. The approach adopted in the Publication Draft Plan is not effective and is out of line with national planning policy as it pushes new development to settlements lower in the settlement hierarchy, which do not have the full range of services and facilities and are not as sustainable. The Publication Draft Plan, and the supporting evidential documents, have not explored the potential for the sites in Barton upon Humber to maximise opportunities for active and sustainable travel modes to overcome any alleged highways impacts, despite the SHELAA concluding that both sites are appropriate for new residential development. The land to the south of Barrow Road and the land at Caistor Road are logical extensions to the existing, highly sustainable settlement of Barton upon Humber, both sites are available and deliverable and policy H1P-13 should be amended to facilitate this. Change Sought: It is requested that Policy H1P-13 is amended to include the whole of the areas of land previously allocated in the Preferred Options Stage Plan as sites H1P-7p and H1P-8p (and SLELAA site references 787LS and CKXMB respectively).					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0851	Natalie Dear, Natalie Dear Planning Consultancy on behalf of DDM Agriculture Ltd	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS					Policy SS11: Development Limits Object to this policy. The Publication Draft Plan is not sound. In relation to the soundness of the Publication Draft Plan, it is: - not positively prepared; - not justified; - not effective; and - not consistent with national policy. In relation to this matter I can confirm that DDM Agriculture Ltd wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions as it is necessary to explore the reasons for the proposed omission of the sites and explain why their inclusion is a key part of the sustainable growth of North Lincolnshire over the Plan period. Reasons for Objection: The development limit for Barton upon Humber, drawn in line with Policy SS11: Development Limits, is objected to on the basis that it does not include the sites at land to the south of Barrow Road and land at Caistor Road, as included in the Preferred Options Stage Plan as allocated sites H1P-7p and H1P-8p (and SLELAA site references 787LS and CKXMB respectively). Paragraph 7.41 of the Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Topic Paper describes Barton upon Humber as being the second largest settlement in North Lincolnshire in terms of population and number of dwellings, scoring the maximum available score for key services and facilities, as defined in the 2019 Sustainable Settlement Survey, as well as having significant employment opportunities. Barton upon Humber has a wide range of services and facilities, for example, a range of shops, a post office, GP surgery, dentists, primary and secondary schools, public houses and a leisure centre. The town has good public transport links to the nearby larger towns of Hull and Scunthorpe, with regular bus services running to both of these towns. Additionally, the town's train station provides services to Grimsby and Cleethorpes. Barton upon Humber is clearly a very sustainable settlement and should be a key focus for new development and growth. The approach taken to the development limits of Barton upon Humber is overly restrictive and would prevent the sustainable growth of this highly sustainable settlement. The land to the south of Barrow Road and the land at Caistor Road are logical extensions to the existing settlement, both are available and deliverable and policy SS11 should be amended to facilitate this. Change Sought: It is requested that the development limits, as defined in policy SS11, for Barton upon Humber are amended to include the land south of Barrow Road and land at Caistor Road, as the Preferred Options Stage Plan allocated sites H1P-7p and H1P-8p (and SLELAA site references 787LS and CKXMB respectively).			Yes	In relation to this matter I can confirm that DDM Agriculture Ltd wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions as it is necessary to explore the reasons for the proposed omission of the sites and explain why their inclusion is a key part of the sustainable growth of North Lincolnshire over the Plan period.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0883	Natalie Dear, Natalie Dear Planning Consultancy on behalf of DDM Agriculture Ltd	Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites					Object to this policy.The Publication Draft Plan is not sound.In relation to the soundness of the Publication Draft Plan, it is:- not positively prepared;- not justified;- not effective; and- not consistent with national policy.In relation to this matter I can confirm that DDM Agriculture Ltd wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions as it is necessary to explore the reasons for the proposed omission of the sites and explain why their inclusion is a key part of the sustainable growth of North Lincolnshire over the Plan period.Reasons for Objection:Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites is objected to because it does not provide for sufficient housing to be delivered in the Principal Town of Barton upon Humber. Policy SS2: Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire sets out the settlement hierarchy for North Lincolnshire, of which the Scunthorpe and Bottesford Urban Area is at the top of the hierarchy, to reflect the settlement's status as a major sub-regional centre. Second within the hierarchy are the settlements of Barton upon Humber and Brigg, which are described as Principal Towns. Policy SS2 states that to "maintain and enhance their roles as key service centres for North Lincolnshire Barton upon Humber and Brigg will be a focus for growth including new housing. Most of this growth will be through site allocations in this plan."At the Preferred Options Stage of the Plan, 13% of the housing growth for North Lincolnshire was allocated to Barton upon Humber and 12% was allocated to Brigg (Policy SS6p). However, Policy SS6 of the Publication Draft Plan has significantly reduced the allocation of housing to Barton upon Humber to just 8% of the total, equating to just 583 new dwellings.It is noted that the evidence base documents, the Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Topic Paper (June 2021) and the Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper (undated), to support the Publication Draft Plan, refer to a transport study having being undertaken since the Preferred Options Stage which indicated that there were issues with highway network capacity in Barton upon Humber, however, no evidence to support this and no details of the study have been published. Having reviewed all of the transport-related evidence documents published by the Council, it appears that none of them contain references to significant issues with highway network capacity within Barton upon Humber and there is no evidence in any of those documents that the number of dwellings which are allocated to this settlement should be reduced from the levels proposed at the Preferred Options Stage. The details of the highways study which led to the reduction in the proportion of housing to be allocated to Barton upon Humber have been requested from North Lincolnshire Council but at the time of writing this representation, this information has not been forthcoming. Once this highways information is made available to the public, it will be reviewed by DDM Agriculture Ltd's Transport Consultant, as detailed in the attached letter from ADC Infrastructure Ltd. However, at present it is not possible to deduce whether the Council has a well-founded concern in this respect.As such, the sites previously allocated in the Preferred Options Stage Plan under references H1P-7p (land to the south of Barrow Road) and H1P-8p (land at Caistor Road) should not be removed from the Publication Draft Plan and should be reinstated as allocations.The most recent Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), published in September 2021 assesses these sites (known under references 787LS and CKXMB respectively). Whilst reference is made			Yes	In relation to this matter I can confirm that DDM Agriculture Ltd wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions as it is necessary to explore the reasons for the proposed omission of the sites and explain why their inclusion is a key part of the sustainable growth of North Lincolnshire over the Plan period.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							within the SHELAA to the need for a junction improvement and consideration being required to be given to a Barton Relief Road, no significant highways constraints are identified in relation to either site, and access to the site is given a score of “Green” in relation to both sites.Despite DDM Agriculture Ltd having positively supported the allocation of these sites at the Preferred Options Stage of the Plan, no communication has been had with North Lincolnshire Council prior to the Publication Draft Plan which indicated that these allocations were proposed to be removed from this most recent stage of the Plan.The plan has not been positively prepared in this respect and there is no justification, backed up by evidence, for the removal of these previously allocated sites.The impact of the removal of these allocations on the spatial distribution of housing across North Lincolnshire has been to require settlements lower down the settlement hierarchy to accommodate a higher level of growth. It is noted and accepted that Brigg is proposed to be allocated 39 more dwellings than at the last stage of the Local Plan, but the remaining 467 dwellings, previously proposed to be allocated for delivery in Barton upon Humber, have been reallocated to settlements lower in the settlement hierarchy. The Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Topic Paper notes at paragraph 6.5 that the majority of respondents to the Preferred Options Plan “agreed with the proposed approach to the Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire set out in Policy SS2p” which was developed into Policy SS6p and allocated 13% of new dwellings to Barton upon Humber. The significant reduction in the proportion and quantity of new dwellings allocated to Barton upon Humber in the Publication Draft Plan is not in line with this positive support to the previous stage of the Plan. Paragraph 7.41 of the Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Topic Paper describes Barton upon Humber as being the second largest settlement in North Lincolnshire in terms of population and number of dwellings, scoring the maximum available score for key services and facilities, as defined in the 2019 Sustainable Settlement Survey, as well as having significant employment opportunities. Barton upon Humber has a wide range of services and facilities, for example, a range of shops, a post office, GP surgery, dentists, primary and secondary schools, public houses and a leisure centre. The town has good public transport links to the nearby larger towns of Hull and Scunthorpe, with regular bus services running to both of these towns. Additionally, the town’s train station provides services to Grimsby and Cleethorpes. Barton upon Humber is clearly a very sustainable settlement and should be a key focus for new development and growth. The level of growth allocated to this settlement should be at least as much as was proposed in the Preferred Options Stage of the Local Plan.The issue raised regarding the alleged impacts of new development on the local highway network raises two further issues (in addition to the current lack of evidence to support this). The first is that the Publication Draft Plan safeguards the route of a proposed Barton Link Road in Policy T7, and reference to such a link road is made within the SHELAA assessments for the previously allocated sites H1P-7p and H1P-8p. If this road is to be realised, facilitating development, such as that proposed on these sites, will be a necessity. Given the existing constraints to the way in which Barton upon Humber might grow in the future, that is the River Humber and its associated high flood risk areas to the north and the A15 to the					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							west, the key focus for the growth of this settlement will be in the southern and eastern parts of the town. If it is accepted that there is a need for a link road to serve the development in this part of the town, development in this area should be permitted to be delivered in a manner which allows for progressive growth and facilitates the delivery of the link road in the medium to longer term. Now is the time to commence this type of development through the reinstatement of the allocation of these sites in this highly sustainable settlement.The second issue in relation to the alleged highways impacts is that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and indeed other policies of the Publication Draft Plan, seek to reduce reliance on private cars and seek sustainable modes of transport. No evidence has been presented by the Council that prior to the reduction in the overall allocation of dwellings to Barton upon Humber, consideration was given to measures to address the alleged highways network impacts by exploring sustainable transport options. The previously allocated sites to the south-east of Barton, comprising allocations H1P-6p, H1P-7p and H1P-8p (of which it is acknowledged that H1P-6p has become proposed allocation H1P-13) collectively would have delivered approximately 800 new dwellings. Within a development, or series of developments, of this size, there are ample opportunities for exploring and delivering comprehensive active travel measures, together with options such as car / electric bicycle / electric scooter hire hubs, to discourage individual car ownership and encourage alternative modes of transport. These sites are all within walking distance of the wide range of services and facilities offered within Barton upon Humber and therefore the allocations should not be rejected on alleged highway impacts alone, without firstly fully exploring alternative options. The approach adopted in the Publication Draft Plan is not effective and is out of line with national planning policy as it pushes new development to settlements lower in the settlement hierarchy, which do not have the full range of services and facilities and are not as sustainable. The Publication Draft Plan, and the supporting evidential documents, have not explored the potential for the sites in Barton upon Humber to maximise opportunities for active and sustainable travel modes to overcome any alleged highways impacts, despite the SHELAA concluding that both sites are appropriate for new residential development.Barton upon Humber should be a focus for new residential development, in light of it being a highly sustainable settlement with land available and deliverable to accommodate growth and the spatial distribution of housing specified in policy SS6 should be amended to fully reflect this. Change Sought:It is requested that Policy SS6 is amended such that at least 13% of the new dwellings proposed in North Lincolnshire are allocated to Barton upon Humber.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Corinna **Dietz** on behalf of Marine Management Organisation												
0777	Corinna Dietz on behalf of Marine Management Organisation	General					Dear Place, Planning and Housing Team, I am writing to you regarding the Regulation 19 consultation on the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2020 to 2038). 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). The engagement in previous plan stages included a response to the Issues and Options stage on the 12 March 2018 and the Preferred Options stage on the 26 March 2020. Furthermore, the MMO has provided a response to the Duty to Cooperate on the 06 April 2020 and signed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Statement of Common Ground on the 26 November 2020. The MMO 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 referred to the MMO or the East Marine Plans in the next stage of the plan development and has not provided a reasoning. 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. We recommend the inclusion of the East Marine Plans when discussing any themes with coastal or marine elements. Please find attached further information on marine planning. 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. Many thanks for the opportunity to comment,					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Robert **Doughty**, RDC Consultancy on behalf of RM and EF Davey												
0782	Robert Doughty, RDC Consultancy on behalf of RM and EF Davey	Inset Map 83 Thornton Curtis	object	Yes	No	Yes	The Inset Map 82 has been amended from the previous version to include 28, 30, 32 and 34 Main Street, Thornton Curtis, DN39 6XW. When consulted, the Thornton Parish Council indicated to the Local Planning Authority that the community did not wish to see the village curtilage extended and the subsequent decision to change the Inset Map in direct conflict with the community's wishes is unexplained, without justification and perverse. Despite the Thornton Curtis Parish Council clearly indicating the village did not wish to see the village envelope shown on the adopted 2016 Housing and Employment Land Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) Inset Map for Thornton Curtis extended to the north, without further consultation or any explanation, the Inset Map is changed in the current consultation to include the properties 28, 30, 32 and 34 Main Street. The decision to include these properties will invite potential planning applications for new dwellings to the detriment of the village character. This concern is well placed when one considers planning decisions made in respect of the properties to the south on land associated with the Vicarage and Old Vicarage (immediately adjacent to the Church and the subject cottages), where planning permission was granted for infill plots that undermine the character and appearance of the village built form. The 2003 Local Plan Inset Map shows the now deleted Thornton Curtis Conservation Area, which illustrates that the subject properties form part of the heritage of the village. The potential for infill proposals will only serve to undermine the village character and this is one of the primary reasons why the Parish Council asked for the village envelope to stay as it is shown on the 2016 Housing and Employment Land DPD. The village envelope shown on the Inset Map 92 adopted in 2016 is the preferred option. The decision to unilaterally extend the village envelope is likely to invite planning applications for further development without consideration as to the ability of the village to accommodate additional dwellings in terms of local infrastructure, such as foul drainage that is already unable to cope. In addition to this, our clients, as local farmers, do not wish to see further ingress into their land and its pastoral setting. We request the Inset Map be corrected to exclude 28, 30, 32 and 34 Main Street, Thornton Curtis, DN39 6XW and return to that shown on Inset Map 92 of the adopted Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD. The email has supporting maps also attached.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Philip **Drury**												
0605	Philip Drury	POLICY H1P-30: LAND SOUTH OF MAIN STREET	Object plus 50 signatures objecting also	Yes	No	Yes	The following statement is supported by a number of residents of who I shall detail on a separate email complete with 50 signatories as proof of their support. The plan is not sound as its inclusion of land parcel H1P-30 is contra to paragraph 35(D) of the NPPF. NPPF paragraph 127 C specifically states that planning policies should be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. Inclusion of land H1P-30 is contra to this guidance as it would lead to an of villages footprint into greenfield land. There is a number of other reasons why this plan is not consistent with national policy. There is a number of other reasons why this plan is not sound. From a highways perspective the road is poorly maintained and of insufficient width to cope with the additional traffic arising from development of this land. The road is known to struggle to cope with surface water during storm events which seem to be more frequent. This is supported by the councils own Strategic Flood Risk Assessment online mapping which shows the highway is at risk. A large increase in impermeable surface area brought about by new development of this magnitude would only exacerbate existing problems. The NPPF provides policy to preserve Green Belt land and states under paragraph 134c that one of the purposes of this policy is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Inclusion of land H1P-30 is contrary to this policy as development of this land serves to encroach into the countryside. This land forms a distinct part of the character of this settlement and development of it would alter the intrinsic appearance of the area to its detriment. There are other brownfield sites which should be developed ahead of this greenfield site and as such inclusion of this parcel of land is contra to NPPF para 8c Protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity. loss of this natural habitat not only alters the character of the setting but will deplete Biodiversity in the area. It is for these reasons that we feel that the plan is not sound. Inclusion of land H1P-30 is clearly contra to National policy. The modification required to address this would be removal of this land from the plan. This rep was supported by a number of signatures from the Scawby and Sturton Preservation Group in which 50 people signed.			No	No	View PDF
James **Durham** on behalf of East Riding Council												
0822	James Durham on behalf of East Riding Council	POLICY DQE3: BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY					Biodiversity North Lincolnshire and the East Riding are both well related to the Thorne Moor Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Special Protection Area (SPA) and the Humber Estuary SAC, SPA & Ramsar Site. The North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment recognises and considers the likely significant effects on these designations, which may arise cumulatively with other plans or projects. The document should consider the effects in-combination with the most up to date East Riding Local Plan HRA if it doesn't already. The Council is currently preparing the East Riding Local Plan Update, which reached its regulation 18 draft plan consultation earlier in the year. The HRA					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							associated with this is dated April 2021. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information regarding this response.					
0784	James Durham on behalf of East Riding Council	POLICY MIN6: MINERAL SITES					Dear Sir/Madam, Thank you for consulting East Riding of Yorkshire Council on the North Lincolnshire Local Plan – Publication Plan. East Riding of Yorkshire Council is committed to engaging positively and proactively with neighbouring authorities to satisfy the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate. Therefore, it is necessary to continue to focus on those cross boundary planning issues that are of strategic importance for both authorities. 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 to its examination process. Minerals The East Riding of Yorkshire Council have worked closely with North Lincolnshire Council in maintaining the Humber Area's Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) to identify future requirements and demand for aggregates. This will require continued collaboration between the two authorities to ensure the LAA is up to date and provides robust evidence for monitoring the adopted East Riding and Hull Joint Minerals Local Plan (Nov 2019) and adopting the new North Lincolnshire Local Plan. It is likely this will continue to recognise that there are distinct and separate markets for the supply and demand for aggregates operating north and south of the Humber. Within policy MIN1 the plan has recognised the need for North Lincolnshire to make provision for 0.18 million tonnes of sand and gravel per annum and 0.43 million tonnes of crushed rock per annum. This differs from the indicative figures in the LAA but has been shown to be appropriate through analysis in a bespoke Aggregates Apportionment Background Paper for the Authority.					View PDF
Mark **Eagland**, Peacock and Smith on behalf of Gleeson Regeneration												
0678	Mark Eagland, Peacock and Smith on behalf of Gleeson Regeneration	Policy SS5: Overall Housing Provision	Object		No		Gleeson considers that the proposed annual housing requirement of 396 dwellings per annum is too low. Whilst it is based on the Standard Housing Methodology, Planning Practice Guidance explains that may be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than the Standard Method indicates. In our client's view there is compelling case for a greater housing need than provided for by the Standard Method, for the following reasons: 1. The North Lincolnshire Housing and Economic Needs Assessment 2020 states at Section 6.5 that delivery of sufficient new dwellings to meet previous Local Plan housing targets in North Lincolnshire over the last decade has proved difficult. There is no explanation provided within the		The housing requirement of the Local Plan should be increased to provide for greater affordable housing supply and support the economic objectives of the Local Plan. There should be a greater flexibility of housing supply within the Local Plan to ensure that the identified housing needs of North Lincolnshire are	Yes	To articulate the reasons for the representation in more detail in the context of the discussion that takes place at the Examination.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Assessment why that is the case, but in Gleeson's experience the attractiveness and viability of many housing sites in North Lincolnshire can be a challenge, and these are likely to be problems also experienced by the new Local Plan. Whilst we appreciate that they are issues that can be addressed by greater flexibility of 'supply' (please see comments below), a more ambitious housing requirement could also build in an element of a buffer relative to need, in anticipation of potential delivery issues. 2. The North Lincolnshire Housing and Economic Needs Assessment 2020 identifies an annual need for 115 affordable homes over the plan period (net). Based on the proposed affordable requirement of 10% for schemes of 10 dwellings or more, it can be seen that there will be a considerable shortfall of affordable supply to meet identified needs. By way of example, even if 10% of all new homes were provided as affordable units, then this would only provide for approximately 40 dwellings a year. A higher housing requirement would provide for a greater level of affordable supply and in our view this should be given due consideration. 3. The inadequacy of the affordable housing provision in the Publication Draft Local Plan is compounded given that it is unlikely to be viable to provide for 10% affordable housing on a significant proportion of sites once CIL and essential S106 planning obligations are taken into account. House values across much of North Lincolnshire are generally low and in Gleeson's experience a reasonable proportion of the larger sites have ground, flooding and access constraints that create abnormal costs. In such circumstances it is usually affordable housing that is reduced when applicants secure agreement with the Council that delivery of a site is constrained by viability. 4. The Spatial Vision for the Local Plan seeks to create 11,500 new and highly skilled jobs over the plan period, and it states that North Lincolnshire will be a competitive, diverse and high value economy with increased levels of prosperity and higher employment levels. However, there is no explanation as to how this ambitious level of economic and employment growth will be sustained by the annual housing growth provided for by the Standard Method. The North Lincolnshire Housing and Economic Needs Assessment 2020 states that Oxford Economics were commissioned by the Council to review the implications of job growth for housing need, but details of this assessment are not provided. In the absence of such justification we are therefore concerned that the economic objectives of the Local Plan will be undermined by the level of housing that has been proposed. In the light of above, we consider that the proposed housing requirement of the Local Plan is not positively prepared, justified or effective. A higher level of housing provision is required. Gleeson is also concerned about the proposed housing supply of the Local Plan, both in terms of quantum and composition. In respect of quantum of supply, the requirement is 7,128 dwellings and the supply is 7,326 dwellings. This represents less than 3% flexibility and in our view is neither positively prepared or effective to ensure that the housing requirements of North Lincolnshire are met over the plan period		met over the plan period			

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							given the poor track record of delivery of housing identified by the North Lincolnshire Housing and Economic Needs Assessment 2020 (and the issues noted by Gleeson above in respect of the attractiveness and viability of housing sites in North Lincolnshire). The Standard Method housing requirement is a 'minimum' requirement and there is no reason why the Local Plan should not provide for a greater margin of flexibility. Regarding composition of the supply, Gleeson has the following specific concerns: • Of the proposed supply, a significant proportion – 2,150 dwellings (30%) is envisaged to be provided for within the strategic site allocation at Lincolnshire Lakes (Policy SS7). Gleeson is of the view that this level of housing provision is not achievable within the plan period, and it is risky relying on a single allocation to provide for such a large element of the Plan's supply. Lincolnshire Lakes is a very significant proposal that does not have planning permission; that has no housebuilder associated within it; and that will require substantial infrastructure to be provided for before new homes can be provided. • A number of proposed allocations appear to be sites that have been carried over from the current development plan, and in some cases the 2003 Local Plan. This indicates that there may be issues with the developability of these sites. Where sites have been carried over from previous plans this should be made clear and justification provided why it is appropriate to roll them forward into the new Local Plan. • There are a significant number of smaller housing sites of less than 30 dwellings in the Plan's committed and allocated supply. Gleeson is of the view that there is a finite demand for sites of this scale by the house building industry and many of these small sites are in locations where market demand is weak. Whilst it is appreciated that there needs to be a mix of size and type of sites in the Local Plan, sites suitable for 50 dwellings and above are more likely to be attractive to volume housebuilders, and this will provide for greater certainty of delivery. The above points further support Gleeson's view that there needs to be a greater margin of flexibility in the supply of housing provided for by the Local Plan in order to increase the certainty that the identified housing needs of North Lincolnshire will be met.					
0714	Mark Eagland, Peacock and Smith on behalf of Gleeson Regeneration	Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites	Object		no		Para 4.43 of the Plan explains that residential development will be commensurate with the scale of individual settlements and their position in the settlement hierarchy. Gleeson broadly supports the proposed distribution of the housing supply in terms of the 'overall' settlement hierarchy. However, there are a number of instances where quite different levels of housing are proposed for settlements within the same tier of the hierarchy (e.g. Barton and Brigg). It is not clear from the Plan why this has occurred. In our view this requires greater justification within the text of the Plan. Where there are significant variations in the level of housing proposed for the same tier of the settlement hierarchy this should be justified within the text of the Local Plan.			Yes	To articulate the reasons for the representation in more detail in the context of the discussion that takes place at the Examination.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0624	Mark Eagland, Peacock and Smith on behalf of Gleeson Regeneration	POLICY H2: HOUSING MIX AND DENSITY	Object		No		Policy H2 requires the mix of housing on sites to take account of (inter-alia) the North Lincolnshire Housing and Economic Needs Assessment 2020 housing mix information, which is set out at Table 5.2 of the Local Plan. Whilst Gleeson has no concerns about the 2/3/4+ bed mix required by this table, our client considers that the requirement to provide 8.1% 1 bed dwellings will be difficult to achieve on many sites in North Lincolnshire, and this requires greater justification if it is an expectation that is to be applied across the board. Gleeson's experience is that following the Covid pandemic many of its customers are seeking more bedroom space (for example to provide a room to allow working from home) and this is increasing demand for 3 and 4 bed homes in particular. In addition, 1 bed homes are likely to place greater pressures on site viability and site density because they are a less efficient way of developing land for housing compared to 2 bed homes in terms of building footprint. Policy H2 also sets out density ranges that should be achieved with residential development. Whilst it is agreed that the NPPF seeks an efficient use of land, Gleeson is concerned that the proposed density ranges for sites within the Scunthorpe Urban Area (40 to 45 dwellings per hectare) and Principal Towns (40 to 45 dwellings per hectare) may not be achievable once other requirements such as Biodiversity Net Gain and the need to achieve a balanced housing mix are taken into account. Para 5.163 of the Plan states that the SHELAA provides an indication of the dwelling densities that have been achieved over the past 10 years, but detailed information does not appear to be available in that document. Furthermore, Biodiversity Net Gain is a recent concept and it remains to be seen how this will affect housing site densities. The proposed requirement for 8.1% 1 bed dwellings requires greater justification, as do the proposed density ranges for sites within the Scunthorpe Urban Area (40 to 45 dwellings per hectare) and Principal Towns (40 to 45 dwellings per hectare).		The proposed requirement for 8.1% 1 bed dwellings requires greater justification, as do the proposed density ranges for sites within the Scunthorpe Urban Area (40 to 45 dwellings per hectare) and Principal Towns (40 to 45 dwellings per hectare).	Yes		View PDF
0632	Mark Eagland, Peacock and Smith on behalf of Gleeson Regeneration	POLICY H3: AFFORDABLE HOUSING	object		no		Policy H3 requires at least 10% affordable housing to be delivered on sites of 10 dwellings or more. However, Gleeson has concerns that it may not be possible to achieve this given that the attractiveness and viability of many housing sites in North Lincolnshire can be a challenge. The Local Plan CIL and Viability Assessment (2021) indicates that the 10% requirement may be marginal in terms of viability, particularly on brownfield sites in lower value areas. Although Policy H3 incorporates a viability caveat, it states that economic viability constraints will only be favourably considered in 'exceptional circumstances'. In our view that is not an appropriate approach to take if at the outset the evidence base of the Local Plan indicates that viability may be a legitimate development constraint. In the circumstances we consider that the 10% affordable housing requirement requires further justification for all market areas of North Lincolnshire. The 10% affordable housing requirement requires further justification for all market areas of North Lincolnshire.			Yes	To articulate the reasons for the representation in more detail in the context of the discussion that takes place at the Examination.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Amie **Easey**												
0771	Amie Easey	Evidence Base	Object				The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0793	Amie Easey	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0811	Amie Easey	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0870	Amie Easey	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Mrs M. **Easton**												
0053	Mrs M. Easton	POLICY SS11: 1.	support	yes	yes	yes	COS0300011 - We support the proposed development limit at Eastoft as included in Inset 16. Our interest is that we may in the future wish to build residential properties on this brownfield site. (Previously submitted in 2018)					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Brian **Edwards**												
0418	Brian Edwards	General					I would firstly like to congratulate the team who have worked diligently to put this massive document together. I imagine it ticks all the boxes required with a few bells and whistles added for good measure. Sadly as is always with these plans the devil is in the detail, I highlighted this during the presentation at Baysgarth school on 3rd November 2021. The staff present were well briefed and excellent when in discussion and were almost totally in agreement with my comments. These were both positive but with some grave concerns. I don't wish to comment too much on the plans for further vanity projects in and around Church Square in Scunthorpe. I also smirk at the supposed efforts to try regeneration of the High Street at great expense. This after allowing and encouraging out of town shopping at too many locations around the town.					View PDF
0457	Brian Edwards	Paragraph 14.47					The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: “To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation.” (5) Let me be clear, the NLC plan appears to maximise the opportunity to increase housing and industrial development around BUH to increase revenue for NLC with scant regard for the environment, the health and the well being of the residents or the infrastructure to support it. The relief road is required and has been since it was first discussed in 1993. However the proposed route is more to do with land grab by stealth than for any other reason. I very much look forward to further consultation regarding the BRR where the feelings of the residents of BUH can be taken fully into consideration. I would appreciate a return email to indicate my email has been received. I thank you in advance.					View PDF
0497	Brian Edwards	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS					Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g. It is difficult to understand why it would ever even be considered until I saw the proposed route of the Barton Relief Road (BRR). We all know that development almost always follows inside of roads around villages and towns.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0689	Brian Edwards	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES					My interests are for the future of Barton Upon Humber as this is where I live. The last few years in and around Barton Upon Humber (BUH) The new plan appears to make BUH a growth area along with Brigg. These being desirable locations within the NLC area. The plan also makes various statements regarding Health, Fitness and well being. I am all for that and remain a keen walker and member of the Leisure Centre in Baysgarth park. However, recent large scale residential developments particularly Clipson Crest and Falkland Way suggest Health and well being isn't that important. 600 plus houses have been added yet the gym and Cardio suites have been reduced in size to accommodate the library and Wellness Hub to enable the sale of the buildings by the NLC on Tofts road and Ferriby Road. The schools remain the same size, the doctors surgeries haven't expanded and the infrastructure generally including the very poor condition of the roads and pavements. This suggests to me BUH is and will continue to be used as a cash cow (before it becomes the goose that laid the golden egg). The future until 2038 (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for “up to 400 homes” on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage. If history repeats itself BUH will potentially become a soulless town where people travel to other areas to work. This is already evident from the queues on the approach roads to the Humber Bridge during the morning 'rush hour'. (2) I regard the Banks Property proposed site as an easy option when Boris Johnson and his party wanted to build almost anywhere until there was a backlash in many areas to ripping up green fields to satisfy the greed of the Party Sponsors.					View PDF
Jay **Everett** on behalf of Addison Planning Consultants Ltd												
0351	Jay Everett on behalf of Addison Planning Consultants Ltd	Paragraph 3.10	object	yes	no	yes	Spatial Vision for North Lincolnshire: The objective of creating a network of attractive, thriving, and vibrant sustainable communities and ensuring the sustainability of the Principal Towns, Large Service Centre and rural communities is broadly supported. However, the Vision does not recognise the importance of the unique character of much of the district which is dominated by smaller villages, with ageing populations and which have had little sustainable growth over the last few decades due to a combination of economic circumstances and restrictive land-use policies. The Vision should recognise that the sustainability of the Market Towns and smaller villages can be enhanced by housing and economic growth to ensure that the subsequent Spatial Strategy achieves the correct balance of allocations to smaller villages.	effective	The Vision should recognise that the sustainability of the Market Towns and smaller villages can be enhanced by housing and economic growth to ensure that the subsequent Spatial Strategy achieves the correct balance of allocations to smaller villages.	yes	To contribute to debate and test evidence	View PDF
0350	Jay Everett on behalf of Addison Planning	Paragraph 3.11	object	yes	no	yes	Spatial Objective 5: Supporting Our Rural Areas and Countryside: This should expand on the Spatial Vision by clarifying that an appropriate level of growth in the rural villages can assist to deliver both infrastructure, economic and social community benefits thereby improving the overall	effective	This should expand on the Spatial Vision by clarifying that an appropriate level of growth in the rural villages can assist to	yes	To contribute to debate and test evidence	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	Consultants Ltd						sustainability of those rural communities.		deliver both infrastructure, economic and social community benefits thereby improving the overall sustainability of those rural communities.			
0355	Jay Robert Everett	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object	yes	no	yes	Policy H1: Site Allocations A new Allocation should be included at Wootton where a proposed development of 38 dwellings would enhance the sustainability of the village and help to deliver the stated objective of providing high quality homes in places where people want to live and in proximity to the emerging high quality employment opportunities around Barton on Humber and the south bank. Details of the proposed Allocation are set out in a comprehensive Representation for an Omission site under reference Rep CFS0300120.	effective	Policy H1: Site Allocations A new Allocation should be included at Wootton where a proposed development of 38 dwellings would enhance the sustainability of the village and help to deliver the stated objective of providing high quality homes in places where people want to live and in proximity to the emerging high quality employment opportunities around Barton on Humber and the south bank. Details of the proposed Allocation are set out in a comprehensive Representation for an Omission site under reference Rep CFS0300120.	yes	Contribute to debate and test evidence	View PDF
0352	Jay Everett on behalf of Addison Planning Consultants Ltd	POLICY SS2: 1.	object	yes	no	yes	Policy SS2: Spatial Strategy for North LincolnshireThe settlement hierarchy is broadly supported but underplays the role of the market towns and rural villages in supporting the rural communities around them. The market towns and villages (and specifically the smaller rural villages) are also more desirable places to live than the inner urban areas alluded to within the main sub-regional centre and an appropriate scale of development is needed to achieve the stated objectives for economic growth. Delivering high quality jobs means providing high quality homes in places where people want to live.Criterion 2(f) of the Policy is in effect a protectionist policy that seeks to prevent the erosion of rural services but fails to recognise that it is an appropriate level of housing and economic development that is the means to achieve that objective.Criterion 3(f) similarly fails to recognise this fundamental issue as it is an old school type Development Plan policy that is restrictive of any meaningful level of development that would support an improvement to the sustainability of the rural villages. The network of rural villages requires, and can sustain, a more appropriate level of growth that would enhance their sustainability, vitality, and viability. Restricting growth in the smaller rural villages to minor/small scale infill will stagnate those settlements particularly given the demographic trend of an ageing population. Whilst the hierarchy is broadly supported, it is interpreted in the subsequent policies as severely restricting growth opportunities in the market towns and smaller villages. In short the Vision make all the right noises about the preferred approach having an area-wide focus and spreading development across the area's towns and villages beyond Scunthorpe, the Principal Towns and Larger	effective	Should positively promote growth within rural villages	yes	To contribute to debate and test evidence	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Service Centres. It shies away from this objective, particularly in its approach to the identification of housing allocations within the rural villages.					
0353	Jay Everett on behalf of Addison Planning Consultants Ltd	POLICY SS5: 1.	object	yes	no	yes	Policy SS5: Overall Housing Provision The Policy seeks to introduce flexibility and choice by allocating just an additional 198 dwellings for the early part of the Plan Period. However, the Council's trajectory for the delivery of housing through the Lincolnshire Lakes project is unrealistic. Problems over delivery in the short-term are compounded by the over reliance on a major strategic urban extension which relies on the resolution and delivery of major infrastructure. These problems are compounded by the historical rates of delivery as borne out by the Housing Delivery Test; and by the over reliance on a small number of allocations delivering the bulk of the housing growth. To illustrate, Policy H1: Site Allocations identifies just 33 new housing allocations for the Plan Period. Of these, there are 12 sites more than 100 dwellings (per Allocation) delivering a total of 4438 dwellings out a proposed 5301 or put another way 12 sites are supposed to deliver over 83% of the requirement through new allocations. There is clearly an insufficient number of new allocations of smaller sites under 100 dwellings identified, particularly in the short term. These smaller sites (as recognised in the NPPF) are the sites that can have the greatest economic impact (local sub-regional builders), and which can realistically boost housing supply in the short term. Indeed, the Government is currently stressing the importance of Local Authorities assisting small builders (Chancellors Budget speech) recognising the importance they need to play in diversifying the housing market players. In short, the Policy needs to provide for an even greater increase in housing numbers in the short term to provide more flexibility and choice in the face of such a considerable proportion of growth dependent on the delivery of a strategic new settlement and such a small number of larger sites. This can be achieved through the identification of a range of smaller sites under 100 dwellings which can play a vital role in boosting supply and which proportionately can have a greater economic impact in the short term. This is because smaller sites can be delivered by local and sub-regional builders.	effective	The Policy needs to provide for an even greater increase in housing numbers in the short term to provide more flexibility and choice in the face of such a considerable proportion of growth dependent on the delivery of a strategic new settlement and such a small number of larger sites. This can be achieved through the identification of a range of smaller sites under 100 dwellings which can play a vital role in boosting supply and which proportionately can have a greater economic impact in the short term. This is because smaller sites can be delivered by local and sub-regional builders.	yes	To contribute to debate and test evidence	View PDF
0354	Jay Everett on behalf of Addison Planning Consultants Ltd	POLICY SS6: 1.	object	yes	no	yes	Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites Fundamentally, the proposed distribution of growth fails to reflect the spatial objectives set out in the Plan. Specifically: The level of growth for the Sub-Regional Centre is too large at 51.3% of the housing requirement. This level of growth unbalances the ability to achieve a meaningful spread of development across the area's towns and villages beyond Scunthorpe, the Principal Towns and Larger Service Centres. Indeed, it completely undermines the ability to achieve a meaningful level of growth within the 2nd and 3rd tier of settlements and restricts	justified	Additional allocations should be included in Wootten	yes	Contribute to debate and test evidence	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							development in the smaller rural villages. The level of growth anticipated in the Sub-Regional Centre is also unrealistic given it is predicated on the delivery of new village settlements through the Lincolnshire Lakes project. The level of growth directed to the Large Service Centres is far too low and the lack of any allocations in the smaller rural villages will stagnate those settlements and prejudice the sustainability of the services they do have such as a local primary school and village pub. In total, just 23% of the housing requirement is being distributed to the Large Service Centres which, by definition, are highly sustainable settlements. This level of distribution will have the opposite effect to the stated objective by hindering the growth of those settlements, dampening their viability, and reducing their sustainability over the Plan Period. Similarly, the lack of any growth at all within the smaller rural villages will undermine the future vitality and viability of those settlements and prejudice the future of any existing key services they have at the present time. A case in point is Wootton. This village scores 38th in the settlement survey and no allocations are proposed. The village has a primary school and a pub, and those key services will come under increasing pressure re a viable future as the local population ages and insufficient new housing is provided for local people to access the market and stay in the village. The lack of any allocation also fails to recognise the proximity of the village to key employment opportunities within 20-minute travel time and therefore fails to deliver the stated objective of providing high quality homes close to key employment opportunities. The fundamental problem with the Spatial Strategy as drafted is therefore that it fails to consider how the sustainability of the smaller rural villages could be enhanced through an element of housing growth, particularly in those villages that are well placed to serve the new employment opportunities around Barton and the south bank. A separate Representation has been submitted for an Omission Site to promote the inclusion of a housing allocation in Wootton. The proposal provides an opportunity to enhance the overall sustainability of the village. The Settlement Survey 2019 undertakes an empirical assessment of settlements based on the presence of key services and transport facilities. It classifies Wootton as 38th out of 76 settlements. The summary of that assessment at p94 states: A proposed Allocation at Wootton (as set out in the Representation for an Omission site reference Rep CFS0300120) would significantly improve the overall sustainability rating of Wootton by: Providing two new shops Providing a new playground, public garden/public open space, and leisure pursuit Improving the quality of the living environment The existing settlement score for Wootton also ignores the proximity of Ulceby railway station (which falls within established cycle distance) and which provides good connectivity from the proposed allocation site to the					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							major employment hubs of Grimsby and Barton on Humber.					
David **Fallowfiled**												
0772	David Fallowfiled	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0456	David Fallowfiled	Paragraph 14.47					The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation. I request that the text should be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0496	David Fallowfiled	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS					Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any different and request that this is added as Item g					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0573	David Fallowfiled	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS					have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: I object to Banks Property pursuing a very speculative, developer-led Outline Planning Application for “up to 400 homes” on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15, on the grounds that it is: outside of the current development line not required as current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded likely to cause further demand on already stretched local infrastructure and services and will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Debra **Fallowfield**												
0462	Debra Fallowfield	Paragraph 14.47	object				The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation. I request that the text should be revised to: “To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation.”					View PDF
0502	Debra Fallowfield	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any different and request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0693	Debra Fallowfield	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: I object to Banks Property pursuing a very speculative, developer-led Outline Planning Application for “up to 400 homes” on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15, on the grounds that it is:outside of the current development line not required as current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded likely to cause further demand on already stretched local infrastructure and services and will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Nicola **Farr** on behalf of Environment Agency												
0410	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	Evidence Base Infrastructure Delivery Plan					Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) Flood risk and drainage section: While policy SS10.2n of the Local Plan notes: 'Land to the north of the Humber Sea Terminal will require a flood defence enhancement scheme to be agreed with the Environment Agency, Natural England and landowners in relation to the existing flood defences and proposed development behind these flood defences', such infrastructure is not identified in the IDP. Indeed the IDP (p22) says 'No other major schemes have been identified at this stage as requiring major flood management interventions.' The section includes a considerable amount of background text that does not appear to relate to infrastructure. Water supply and wastewater section: P23: We note that 'The council are working with Anglian Water to ensure any future growth does have a negative impact on the local network': however, no detail of the outcome of this work is given (contrasting with the paragraph on Severn Trent Water). The Infrastructure Delivery Schedule includes a section on utilities, including sewerage networks but does not identify any specific sites or growth areas dependent on new or improved water recycling centres. We are aware that Anglian Water have submitted comments on the Regulation 19 Local Plan; the Plan also notes in relation to housing allocations H1P-12 and H1P-13 that 'Anglian Water has stated that the sewage treatment works has limited capacity and infrastructure improvements are required to cater for this development'. End 2 Please refer also to our comments submitted with reference to policy WAS5. Darl Sweetland of Anglian Water has suggested to us that you may wish to draft a joint statement of common ground for North Lincolnshire Council, the Environment Agency and Anglian Water relating to this issue.					View PDF
0413	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	Evidence Base Sequential and Exceptions Test					Sequential and Exception Tests Document Although this is not the clearest of documents, the amendments we requested to an earlier version have been made and there is evidence the sites can pass the second part of the exceptions test. The Council state that their area of search has been the whole planning authority area, although alternative sites have only been listed at settlement level. However, based on earlier discussion and the small number of additional sites allocated in (or partly in) Flood Zone 2/3a, we are satisfied that the Council has aimed to direct growth to areas at the lowest risk of flooding while supporting existing communities. We have not reviewed the 'alternative sites' in detail as it is not the Environment Agency's role to do this.					View PDF
0415	Nicola Farr on	Evidence Base					Strategic Flood Risk Assessment					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	behalf of Environment Agency	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment					As this is still to be updated with the Lincolnshire Lakes hazard mapping we have not carried out a final review at this point. We are aware from earlier correspondence that many of our suggested amendments have been made.					
0296	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	Paragraph 6.90	object	yes	no	yes	Paragraph 6.90 references policy DQE6p, which is no longer a policy in this document. (DQE6p was the flood risk policy in the Preferred Options draft.)	effective	Correct DQE6p to DQE5.	no		
0297	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY CSC17: 1.	object	yes	no	yes	Occupants of caravan and camping facilities are particularly vulnerable to flood risk and we consider this should be highlighted here, as in section 3.	Consistent with national policy	Repeat paragraph 3.d in paragraph 1 as an additional point.	no		
0096	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY CSC17: 3c.	support	yes	yes	yes	This highlights the importance of adequate sewerage infrastructure; we welcome the requirement for site owners to consider connection to the main sewerage network as sites grow: it may become financially and practically viable to do so.					
0097	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY CSC17: 3d.	support	yes	yes	yes	Although flood risk is covered elsewhere in the Plan and NPPF, it is helpful to developers to highlight its relevance in this policy as caravans are particularly vulnerable to flood risk.					
0104	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY DM3: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	object	yes	no	yes	The Policy and supporting text in respect of Environmental Protection covering the topic of the water environment needs to be more explicit in terms of what needs to be protected and the requirements for assessments, as well as encouraging opportunities for environmental improvement. Accordingly, it is the Environment Agency's view that the policy as currently drafted is not sound.	effective	We suggest the following amendments to address these issues: 1. Include the following supporting paragraph after 15.37: WATER ENVIRONMENT Development has the potential to cause negative impacts on the water environment through direct or indirect pollution or overuse of water resources. Potentially polluting industrial or agricultural uses should not be located in the most sensitive locations for groundwater, while runoff and discharges from such sites must be carefully managed in all locations. The capacity to effectively and sustainably manage foul water from both domestic and commercial developments must be investigated and where			

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									necessary provided. The availability of water to support proposed developments, particularly those requiring large quantities, should be considered at an early stage, with reference to the appropriate Environment Agency Abstraction Licensing Strategy for non-mains supply. In addition to the NPPF guidance regarding water pollution, the requirements of the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 must be met. 2. Amend Policy DM3 point 10 to read: 10. Development will not be permitted where it would have an adverse effect on the quality or quantity of groundwater resources or watercourses and water bodies. Opportunities for environmental improvement are encouraged and should be considered at an early stage. Development proposals should include an assessment to demonstrate that: a. there is adequate water available to support the development (making reference to the appropriate Environment Agency Abstraction Licensing Strategy for non-mains supply); b. capacity to effectively and sustainably manage foul and surface water exists or can be provided within an appropriate timescale to serve the development; c. sustainable drainage systems are included (in accordance with Policy DQE6) unless there			

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									is evidence to demonstrate these are inappropriate; d. water efficiency measures are incorporated (including that the higher standard of water efficiency of 110 litres/person/day is met, as required by Policy DQE7); e. access to infrastructure and water environments for the purpose of maintenance and monitoring is not impeded; f. aquifers and groundwater in sensitive locations are protected by preventing potentially polluting activities being located in the most sensitive locations for groundwater; and, g. the requirements of the Water Framework Regulations can be satisfied. 3. We suggest the title 'Water Environment' in policy DM3 should be above point 9, which also relates to water.			
0094	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY DQE11: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK	support	yes	yes	yes	We welcome the inclusion of this policy, reflecting the growing understanding of the importance of networks and corridors to biodiversity and people. We are pleased to see the inclusion of text highlighting blue infrastructure.					
0091	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY DQE3: BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY	support	yes	yes	yes	It is essential that the planning system contributes positively to nature recovery in England. The requirement for developments to provide 10% net gain in biodiversity was added following representations from the Environment Agency and other wildlife organisations in expectation of the Environment Bill becoming law, which has recently happened. We welcome the highlighting of the mitigation hierarchy and pointers to relevant background documents (existing, such as Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping, and expected, such as the Local Nature Recovery Network). Point 9 confirms a positive pro-active attitude on the part of North Lincolnshire Council (although it's not clear how the sentence 'Provision will be made for the creation of new wildlife habitats in both rural and urban areas' fits in relation to the remaining parts of this sub-policy).					
0295	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment	POLICY SS7: 3.	support	yes	yes	yes	The Environment Agency supports all the principles of section 3. However, we would like to offer the following comments and suggestions for improvement.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	Agency						The policy refers to the site wide Lincolnshire Lakes Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). Although close to completion at the time of the Regulation 19 consultation, this FRA has not yet been finalised or approved by the Environment Agency. Updated modelling has been carried out by North Lincolnshire Council's consultants in order to produce hazard mapping. The modelling is currently under review by the Environment Agency and, subject to approval, will inform the updated FRA and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. It may be advisable to omit the following text from the policy, such that it simply requires a Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment in accordance with the site-wide Lincolnshire Lakes FRA and Lincolnshire Lakes Drainage Strategy: In order to meet the minimum acceptable flood risk standard, the minimum floor level of proposed new development should be no lower than the 0.5% AEP plus Climate change flood level, plus 300mm freeboard allowance. Minimum floor levels for proposed new development should be checked against updated flood levels for the 0.1% AEP plus climate change event. The criteria are not entirely clear and without reading the FRA itself, the above summary could be misleading. The Lincolnshire Lakes area is at risk from the River Trent, a source of both fluvial and tidal flood risk. The policy does not specify which 0.5% AEP event is referred to: this is clarified in the FRA. The policy also does not mention the breach event. The site-wide FRA covers this, although we have previously asked that it makes more explicit that mitigation must be based on the 0.5% AEP plus climate change breach flood level (our letter of 27 May 2020). The purpose of the requirement for floor levels to be checked against flood levels for the 0.1% AEP plus climate change event is also unclear. Again, we have previously advised that this be addressed in the final version of the site-wide FRA. Following the outcome of the model review we will work with the Council to assist them in finalising the site-wide FRA and the wording of this policy.					
0093	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY DQE4: LOCAL NATURE RESERVES	support	yes	yes	yes	We welcome the Council's commitment to declare and arrange management of new local nature reserves, and specifically the intention to prioritise sites which would contribute to a Nature Recovery Network (paragraph 9.39).					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0099	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY DQE5: MANAGING FLOOD RISK	support	yes	yes	yes	We support this policy overall. The Council have made several amendments that we suggested at the Reg. 18 stage to improved clarity and consistency with national policy.However, point g (ongoing management) appears to have been merged with a point about drainage hierarchy. We suggest it should be split at follows:g: there is a management and maintenance plan for drainage and flood risk management infrastructure (where appropriate) for the lifetime of the development, which includes the implementation arrangements for adoption by any public authority, statutory undertaker or management company and any other arrangements to secure the operation and mitigation measures of the scheme throughout its lifetimeh: the final destination of the discharge complies with the following priority order:I. water re-use at point of run-off; ii. ground via infiltration; iii. a water body;iv. surface water sewerWith regard to point 4, the Lincolnshire Lakes Flood Risk Assessment, although close to completion at the time of the Reg. 18 consultation, has not yet been finalised as updated modelling has been carried out by North Lincolnshire Council's consultants. The modelling is currently under review by the Environment Agency and, subject to approval, will inform the updated Flood Risk Assessment and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. At this point the outputs of the updated modelling have raised no concerns.					
0092	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY DQE7: CLIMATE CHANGE & LOW CARBON LIVING	support	yes	yes	yes	We support the policy, in particular parts 1 to 3. Part 2.b, requiring development to meet the Building Regulations optional higher water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day, has been included based on evidence from the Environment Agency and Anglian Water regarding North Lincolnshire's location in an area of water stress. The potential for increased water scarcity as a result of climate change, as well as the carbon cost of providing and recycling water, are relevant here.					
0102	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY EC4: SOUTH HUMBER BANK - LANDSCAPE INITIATIVE	support	yes	yes	yes	We welcome this partnership initiative which will benefit people and wildlife and contribute to mitigating the impact of growing industry on the Humber. There is a typo to be corrected: 'neutral capital' should be 'natural capital'.					
0089	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY H12: 1i.	support	yes	yes	yes	Where the ground floor of a residential property is at risk of flooding, including bedrooms at ground floor when converting the property to an HMO results in an increased risk to occupants of those rooms. Free access to a safe space at first floor level is likely to be more restricted and such rooms are often largely self-contained.			no		
0090	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY SS10: STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION - SOUTH HUMBER BANK	support	yes	yes	yes	We welcome the policy, which seeks to ensure that the site is developed in a strategic fashion with high quality development of sufficient economic scale to fund the required drainage / water and other infrastructure. We note that the Environment Agency has been added to point (l) as a relevant organisation following our earlier request.					
0413	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY SS3: 1.	support	yes	yes	yes	In particular we support sections c, d, e, g, h, i, k. m, o. We note that several suggestions made by the Environment Agency at the Regulation 18 stage have been incorporated.			no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0291	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY SS7: 10.	support	yes	yes	yes	We support points d to h - biodiversity and blue/green infrastructure: these are essential if the policy is to adequately replace the Lincolnshire Lakes Area Action Plan.					
0292	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY SS7-2: 12.	support	yes	yes	yes	We support points c to g - biodiversity and blue/green infrastructure: these are essential if the policy is to adequately replace the Lincolnshire Lakes Area Action Plan.					
0293	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY SS7-3: 14.	support	yes	yes	yes	We support points k to p - biodiversity and blue/green infrastructure: these are essential if the policy is to adequately replace the Lincolnshire Lakes Area Action Plan.					
0298	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY SS7-3: 15.	object	yes	no	yes	We think this may be a legacy from the time when Scunthorpe United were hoping to deliver this site ahead of the Trent Banks Improvement Scheme; if so it is no longer necessary or justified.	justified	We wish only to bring this to the attention of North Lincolnshire Council in order that they can consider whether this is the case and if so make appropriate amendments.	no		
0100	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	POLICY WAS5: WASTE WATER TREATMENT	support	yes	yes	yes	New and expanded wastewater treatment facilities will require an environmental permit or variation to a permit under the Environmental Permitting (England & Wales) Regulations 2016, from the Environment Agency. Permits will not be granted where there would be an unacceptable impact on the watercourse receiving the treated discharge. We agree that the potential environmental impacts listed should be considered adequately at the planning application stage, preferably in parallel with, or following, a permit application or pre-application enquiry. 13.21: We welcome the acknowledgement that due consideration will need to be given in the Local Plan to the impact that growth and development will have and commitment to work with the water companies to identify future needs resulting from growth and development. There is some evidence of such consideration and work in the Plan, Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Statement of Common Ground but this will need to continue in order for solutions to be identified, to allow allocated sites to come forward safely.					
0413	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	Statement of Common Ground					Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) The SoCG reflects co-operation with the Environment Agency up to September 2021. Sections 3.20 and 3.21 summarise the position with regard to the Environment Agency but appears unfinished. 3.32: We think the reference to the Environment Agency should be either Severn Trent Water or Anglian Water. We note the outstanding agreements identified in the September 2021 SoCG were: 5 (infrastructure) pending provision of the infrastructure delivery plan					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							10 (flood risk) pending final strategic flood risk assessment 16 (water quality and resources) We will continue to work with the Council regarding these matters.					
Kevin **Farrow**												
0398	Kevin Farrow	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0789	Kevin Farrow	Paragraph 14.47	object				(3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers an NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV's, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0807	Kevin Farrow	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				(2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0899	Kevin Farrow	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Yvonne **Farrow**												
0405	Yvonne Farrow	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0788	Yvonne Farrow	Paragraph 14.47	object				(3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation." Kind Regards,					View PDF
0806	Yvonne Farrow	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				(2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0865	Yvonne Farrow	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I strongly object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Kerry **Fawcett**												
0621	Kerry Fawcett	POLICY H1P-4: LAND AT FORMER SOUTH LEYS SCHOOL ENDERBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object				Hi I am writing to object to the plan for housing on the old south leys school site on r derby road in Scunthorpe. My children have attended Kimberley performing arts centre located on this site for the last 12 years and the experience they have had has been invaluable. The sense of belonging, discipline and friendships they have gained are second to none and I would hate for this to not be available to many future generations to come. Further more the excellent use of the building within the community is such an asset to an otherwise deprived area. This centre is perfectly located to serve both deprived areas of Scunthorpe and surrounding areas. This centre put the needs of the community and the children it serves above all else and to move it would be a distinct loss to the area.					View PDF
Steven **Field**												
0391	Steven Field	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process. Appreciate your review and feedback on the above					View PDF
0471	Steven Field	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: “To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation.”					View PDF
0511	Steven Field	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				(2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0703	Steven Field	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for “up to 400 homes” on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Mrs **Fisher**												
0048	Mrs Fisher	Paragraph 5.123	object	no	no	no	We feel that this development has been hidden away from residents, I came across this news by pure luck and after going to the meeting this evening it seems to be the same for others that attended. The advisers gave me a card with the web address/QR code on it, but you need to know the location of the document and where to find these points to submit comments about them. It would be more helpful if you had a link to that document to make it more user friendly. I searched on the council website for 'Haxey planning', Google and Facebook to find out information about it and nothing relevant came up, there's no notices around the village it seems like it's been hidden away on purpose, there will be a lot of Haxey residents that are not aware of this development. Why didn't you put notices on lamp posts on Graizelound Fields road as all those residents will be highly affected by this, you would do this for single planning applications which have less affect on all residents. Other options would have been to put up posters in the shops and the library but there was nothing put up at all, why is that? 5.123 The farm buildings and land are currently in use for agricultural purposes, The proposed land has just been farmed for corn I'm not sure why this point says that they are redundant, can you please advise? I'm not against growing the village but things feel a little odd with this proposal.			yes	So that we have a further understanding on this matter.	
0049	Mrs Fisher	Paragraph 5.125	object	no	no	no	Why not spread 75 dwellings across the village rather than all in one area? Have you considered adding dwellings in gaps where there are properties on one side of the road but not the other? At the meeting the map displayed quite a large green area off the bridleway at the back of the school, we were incorrectly informed by one of your advisors that the land there is owned by the church and needs to be kept as green open space so it cannot be developed, it is actually privately owned so I'm not sure why it's marked down as a green open space, there's no public benefit to having that space and it's a much better site for development as it's on higher ground and is accessible from the A161, it's also not historic landscape. Why hasn't this been considered for development? The Haxey park looks out over the fields and its a lovely location to take the children and enjoy that open space, if this development goes ahead you will not see views of open fields, just housing estates and that will have a big impact on everyone.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Why will you put a block on all other development until 2038 it seems unfair to other land owners to choose one block of land only. What will be done to ensure that services such as doctors, schools etc can cope with the additional people? At the moment it is nearly impossible to get a doctors appointment and the phone line is constantly engaged so something needs to be done asap.					
0050	Mrs Fisher	Paragraph 5.125	object	no	no	no	Graizelound Fields Road is a single track road, one end has just had a house built on the corner which means the road can't be made wider, it would be much better for vehicle access to be from Haxey Lane only, is that an option? The road is busy enough with the Hopgarth estate					
0051	Mrs Fisher	Paragraph 5.126	object	no	no	no	This area of Haxey is the lowest part of the village and already has significant flooding issues on that side of the road with properties being flooded with sewerage, what will be done to ensure the drainage is adequate? With sea levels rising and climate change this is a serious major concern.					
0052	Mrs Fisher	Paragraph 5.127	support	no	no	no	This site and all the surrounding fields of Haxey are within the Area of Special Historic Landscape, if this can go for planning then other areas also need to be given that opportunity without the historic landscape blocking it. Can you please advise on the logic of how and why this site was chosen?					
Simon **Fisher** on behalf of NFU East Midlands Region												
0731	Simon Fisher on behalf of NFU East Midlands Region	Paragraph 9.5	object	no	no	no	The NFU notes in Paragraph 9.5 and 9.6 the desire of North Lincolnshire Council and others to extend the northern boundary of the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB. In para 9.5 the draft local plan states that designation will provide the same level of protection as that afforded to National Parks. We question that paragraph because although afforded the same level of protection as National Parks, AONBs do not share the same planning control powers (they do not have the authority to make planning decisions) and are involved in the planning process in a completely different way. We feel this paragraph ought to reflect those differences more accurately. We would also like to state that many local farmers in the North Lincolnshire Council area do not share the same desire as the local authority regarding extending the AONB designation. They are concerned that AONB status will bring tougher planning controls and costs for the agriculture sector and keystone of the rural economy. The local plan ought to acknowledge that the AONB extension is not universally accepted.		The plan needs to more accurately state that AONB and National Park powers do differ. The plan needs to more accurately reflect local opinion is not universal and that differences of opinion exist.	no		
Mirjam **Fogarty** on behalf of Pipers Crisps												
0338	Mirjam Fogarty on behalf of Pipers Crisps	Paragraph 6.66	support	yes	yes	yes	Our business is on Elsham Wold Industrial Estate, not far from the proposed site. We have an issue with the number of lorries that use our industrial estate as a car park/ truck stop, especially overnight. It creates a safety issue (lorries parked on road blocking entrance to the factory, poor visibility at junctions) and lots of rubbish is left around the estate. Having a	effective				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							dedicated lorry park nearby will reduce the pressure on the industrial estate and be a very positive development.					
Paul **Foster**, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited												
0375	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	Appendix 1: Mineral Site Details	Object	Yes	No	Yes	Wressle is a production well which has been producing oil since early 2021. It is missing from the list of mineral sites.		Include the Wressle well in Appendix 1.	No		
0411	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	Evidence Base North Lincolnshire Landscape Character Assessment – 17. Lincolnshire Edge – Healthy Woodland	Object	Yes	No	Yes	There is no reference to the Wressle well site at Lodge Farm, Appleby. There is no clear justification as to why this LCT should be considered as an Area of High Landscape Value. Locally designated areas should only be made where it is justified and that normal landscape protection policies are insufficient to manage new development and change to the landscape. Where a AHLV is proposed, it should take full account of existing development in the countryside and should acknowledge the likelihood of further development taking place in the future. It should not be used as a blanket for preventing future development such as mineral extraction.	Justified	Include a specific reference to the Wressle wellsite in LCT 17. Acknowledge that further development of the wellsite can be accommodated within the landscape character, owing to the temporary nature of the development. Provide a clear methodology as to how Areas of High Landscape Value have been determined.	Yes	To seek to expand upon my client's concerns about the lack of justification for designating this part of North Lincolnshire as a AHLV.	View PDF
0412	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	Evidence Base North Lincolnshire Landscape Character Assessment – Section 3.3 (Pressures and Opportunities)	Object	Yes	No	Yes	There is no reference to the Wressle wellsite which is an active hydrocarbon producing well and is currently the second largest onshore producing well in the UK. Whilst it is noted that there are reserves of oil and gas in North Lincolnshire, only Crosby Warren is specifically referenced. The text acknowledges that there may be pressure to extend the number of boreholes and develop oil production wells at this site. This will be a factor in assessing the landscape character. However, no account of the Wressle wellsite and the likelihood of future drilling of boreholes at this site, either in the main body of the text or in the section covering the landscape character area in which Wressle falls. The statement that "oil spillages are an ongoing threat and pressures for oil and gas exploration could be harmful to the environment" is unsupported by any evidence. Any form of development can have potential impacts upon the environment. It is inappropriate to apply this statement to oil and gas exploration.	Justified	Include a reference to Wressle wellsite. Delete the reference to oil spillages.	No		View PDF
0439	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	Paragraph 1.17	Object	Yes	No	Yes	Para 1.17 states that all evidence base documents have been updated to support the new plan period from 2020 to 2038. However, the Mineral Sites Selection Methodology Paper, dated July 2018, has not been updated to include the operational hydrocarbon production site at Wressle. Planning permission was granted for long term hydrogen production in January 2020 and the site became a production site in early 2021. In addition, the draft Statement of Common Ground, dated September 2021, states that there is only one operational oil well in North Lincolnshire (Crosby Warren) which is incorrect.	Justified	The Minerals Site Selection Methodology Paper needs to be updated to include the Wressle wellsite.	No		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0441	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	Paragraph 1.32	Object	Yes	No	Yes	Paragraph 20(b) of the NPPF states that "strategic policies should set out an overall strategy" for making "sufficient provision of minerals and energy". Policy MIN5 (Energy Minerals) is not identified as a strategic policy, contrary to the advice in the NPPF. In contrast MIN3 (Mineral Extraction), which excludes energy minerals, is identified as a strategic policy. This approach is inconsistent.		MIN5 should be identified as a strategic policy.	No		View PDF
0443	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	Paragraph 12.2	Object	Yes	No	Yes	Paragraph 12.2 is incorrect in stating that there is one operational well.	Justified	The paragraph should be amended to make clear that Wressle wellsite is an operational production well.	No		View PDF
0444	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	Paragraph 12.29	Object	Yes	No	Yes	Section 12.29 incorrectly refers to Crosby Warren as the only operational oil well within North Lincolnshire. No specific reference is made to the Wressle wellsite despite it being included on the interactive Policy Map.	Justified	Include a reference to the Wressle production site.	No		View PDF
0482	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	Paragraph 2.72	Object	Yes	No	Yes	The paragraph needs to be updated to reflect the fact that there is more than one operational hydrocarbon producing well in North Lincolnshire. Wressle was granted planning permission in January 2020 and went into production in summer 2021.		Amend to include Wressle wellsite.	No		View PDF
0529	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	POLICY DM1: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS	Object	Yes	No	Yes	The Policy as currently worded applies to all new developments. However, some forms of development, such as hydrocarbon extraction, are functional in design and layout. It would be inappropriate and impractical for these forms of development to be expected to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of an area and create a sense of place. The policy as currently worded is inconsistent with the approach taken in Policy DM3 which states clearly that the policy will be applied to development proposals "as appropriate to their nature and scale".		Both the policy and the supporting text should state clearly that the policy will be applied pragmatically. The words "where applicable" or that similar to Policy DM3, should be inserted at the beginning of parts 1 and 3 of the policy.	No		View PDF
0531	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	POLICY DM3: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	Object	Yes	No	Yes	Part 5 (Light Pollution) is ambiguous and unclear and inconsistent with the other parts of the policy. It refers to both individual and cumulative adverse impacts but does not clarify what is meant by cumulative impacts. It is also unclear why this only applies to lighting. Secondly, whilst the threshold for noise and odour adverse impacts are specified as "significant", the threshold for air quality, lighting and water environment is simply "adverse effects".		The policy should be amended to simplify the requirements for applicants and worded positively in accordance with paragraph 11 of the NPPF. We would wish to see the policy replaced by one similar in nature to Policy DM1 (Protecting Local Amenity) in the 2021 adopted Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan. This states that proposals will be supported as along as any adverse impacts on amenity are avoided or mitigated to an acceptable	No		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									level.			
0534	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	Object	Yes	No	Yes	Part 7 of Policy DQE1 states that priority will be given to the protection and enhancement of the landscape character, natural beauty and setting of the proposed extension to the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB. However, paragraph 9.6 acknowledges that the Council are engaging Natural England to prepare a case for the boundary extension. The Proposals Map does not indicate even a proposed extension of the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB. Consequently, Part 7 of the policy applies to an area of North Lincolnshire for which there is no defined boundary. As a result, landowners, developers and those with an interest in a site have no understanding as whether the draft policy will apply. It is possible that the AONB will not be extended into North Lincolnshire.	Justified	Part 7 of Policy DQE1 should be deleted until the extension of the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB has been confirmed.		No	View PDF
0534	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	Object	Yes	No	Yes	Part 8 of Policy DQE1 proposes that six Areas of High Landscape Value are protected. These include (d.) Healthy Woodland near Wrawby Moor. This is based on a review of Areas of High Landscape Value undertaken in the North Lincolnshire Character Assessment. However, the Character Assessment does not provide sufficient detailed justification for why the area as defined should be given this additional level of protection. There is concern that the proposed designation has not taken account of the existing and future hydrocarbon extraction activities within the area at Wressle. Part 9 of the policy raises concerns that proposals associated with future hydrocarbon extraction which have a potential impact on the local landscape area, albeit for a temporary period, will be refused planning permission.	Justified	Part 8d of Policy DQE1 should be deleted as there is insufficient evidence to justify this Area of High Landscape Value. Part 9 of Policy DQE1 should be deleted and replaced with practical mitigation measures such as appropriate design principles and visual screening for Areas of High Landscape Value.	No		View PDF
0643	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	POLICY MIN5: ENERGY MINERALS (OIL & GAS/HYDROCARBONS)	Object	Yes	No	Yes	The acknowledgement that hydrocarbons are vital to the UK economy is welcome, as is the general support for the exploration, appraisal and production of hydrocarbons. However, we have concerns about the soundness of this policy as currently worded: 1(a) replicates paragraphs 104 and the first bullet point of paragraph 106 of the Minerals PPG. It is therefore unnecessary. 1(b) is inconsistent with Spatial Objective 13 which seeks to ensure "a steady and adequate supply of … energy minerals to meet national, regional and local needs in the most appropriate way…" The requirement that applications for energy minerals significantly benefit the economy (MIN5 1b) is not justified and is not consistent with national planning policy guidance, the Minerals PPG and the written ministerial statements. There is no clear definition as to what constitutes applications that "significantly benefit the economy." National policy is that "great weight should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction, including to the economy." The Government fully supports indigenous supplies of oil and gas in order to reduce imports and manage security of supply. The Committee on Climate Change report of May 2019 on Net Zero Emissions acknowledges that the UK will continue to require oil and gas up to 2050.	Justified, Effective and Consistent with national policy	We wish to see MIN5 1(a) deleted. Part 1b should be amended to be consistent with national policy, as it is currently not justified. The policy should provide support for hydrocarbon exploration, appraisal and production without the need to prove that the application significantly benefits the economy. We consider that Policy MIN5 is a strategic policy which addresses strategic priorities in accordance with Section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. There is a strong case for adopting a similar policy to that in the recently adopted in the	Yes	To put forward the case in greater detail why Policy MIN5 is not in accordance with national policy and is not justified.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Cumulative impacts are formally assessed when there is a requirement for an Environmental Statement to accompany an application. Much of the remaining text at 1(b) duplicates other policies in the Plan: 1. The reference to adverse impacts on the environment in 1(b) duplicates other policies, notably Policies DM1 and DM3. 2. The reference to providing benefits to the natural environment duplicates Policy DQE3. 3. The reference to contamination requiring remediation duplicates Policy DM3. 4. The reference to adequate separation between residential buildings and other sensitive receptors duplicates Policy DM3. Part 1c) ii replicates the advice at paragraph 115 of the Minerals PPG and is not necessary. Part 2 is contrary to national planning policy guidance as there is no requirement to include a complete appraisal of the hydrocarbon resource field at the production stage of development. It is also unclear what the appraisal of the hydrocarbon resource field should comprise. Part 2c is unnecessarily onerous and is practically difficult to achieve. Policy MIN5 is unnecessarily complicated and duplicates the wording of other development management policies in the Plan. The Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan was adopted by Nottinghamshire County Council in March 2021. It includes a concise, specific policy, Policy MP12, which deals with oil and gas applications which was agreed with the Planning Inspectorate earlier this year. Nottinghamshire is an adjoining authority to North Lincolnshire. Indeed, a number of PEDL Licence Areas in Nottinghamshire adjoin the boundary with North Lincolnshire.		Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan. We wish to see MIN5 simplified to the following: 1. Support for exploration, appraisal and commercial production of oil and gas, subject to no unacceptable environmental impact; and 2. A requirement for restoration and subsequent aftercare.			
0644	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	POLICY MIN6: MINERAL SITES	Object	Yes	No	Yes	There is a typo in part 1 in respect of the year. National policy outlines that existing hydrocarbon extraction sites should be identified in local plans. However, the Sites with Planning Permission/Operational Sites section within MIN6 1 does not include the Wressle wellsite as an operational site. This is despite it being visible on the interactive Policy Map. The details of the Wressle wellsite are also absent from Appendix 1: Mineral Site Details. Part 3 should not apply to hydrocarbon sites with planning permission. National planning policy does not restrict the number of exploratory, appraisal and production sites. Operators should therefore not be restricted in the number of well sites developed for hydrocarbon extraction. Part 4 duplicates other development management policies in the Plan, notably Policies DM1, DM3 and DQE3. Part 5 is unnecessary and does not need to be included in the Policy.	Justified Effective	Part 1 of Policy MIN6 should be amended to include the Wressle wellsite, and the details of the site included in Appendix 1: Mineral Site Details. Amend Part 3 to exclude energy minerals. Delete Parts 4 and 5.	Yes	To challenge the reasons why the Council considers the policy is justified in its current form.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0646	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	POLICY RD1: SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE	Object	Yes	No	Yes	Part 1 sets out those forms of development (listed a-l) which are acceptable and will be supported in the countryside. Part 1(l) refers to mineral extraction in accordance with Policy MIN3. Part 1 of MIN3 (Mineral Extraction) states that "development for mineral extraction, except for energy mineral extraction, must demonstrate the extent, quality, significance and need for the resources to be extracted." On the presumption that MIN3 does not include energy minerals, policy RD1 appears as currently drafted to not support energy mineral extraction in the countryside. This is contrary to the NPPF and the Minerals PPG which states that minerals can only worked where they are found. Policy RD1 as currently worded is also inconsistent with Part 3 of Policy SS11 (Development Limits). This states that development outside defined limits will be restricted to uses which meet a special need associated with the countryside. This will include uses such as … minerals extraction. There is no distinction between energy minerals and other forms of minerals in Policy SS11.	Justified Consistent with National Policy	Policy RD1 should be amended to refer to Policy MIN5 at 1(l).	Yes	To explore the reasons why NLC considers that energy minerals is not an appropriate form of development in the countryside.	View PDF
0668	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	POLICY SS3: DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES	Object	Yes	No	Yes	The policy as currently worded applies to all forms of development. However, many of the criteria are not directly applicable to proposals for new infrastructure including applications for energy minerals. Creating places, designing new spaces and buildings are not relevant for temporary mineral extraction. A separate policy should be included which specially applies to these forms of development. It is acknowledged at para 4.16 that the criteria may not be appropriate for minerals development. However, this should not be dependent upon a case officer (i.e. a pre-application process) to decide but should be informed by a policy which is appropriately worded for infrastructure and minerals proposals. There should be a consistent policy approach to the information required to support an application so that all applicants have clarity about what is likely to be required.	Justified	There should be a separate policy covering Development Principles that applies to all infrastructure and minerals applications.	No		View PDF
0728	Paul Foster, AECOM on behalf of Egdon Resources UK Limited	Policy T3: New Development and Transport	Object	Yes	No	Yes	Under the heading "New Developments and Transport", the supporting text for Policy T3, notably paragraphs 14.28-14.30, focuses exclusively on the details of what the Council will expect to see included in a Travel Plan to accompany a new development which generates significant amount of transport movements. However, there is just a single reference to a Travel Plan in the Policy itself. The policy sets out what the Council expects proposals for all forms of development should include in respect of transport. Neither the supporting text nor the Policy itself recognises that many forms of development outside urban areas, such as proposals for hydrocarbon extraction, are not suitable for sustainable travel options owing to their remote location, the nature of the development and the need for flexible working arrangements during construction and operations.	Justified	The supporting text and the Policy should recognise that some proposals for new development will not be able to be supported by sustainable transport options. The inclusion of the words "where appropriate" in the policy would acknowledge that there will be some forms of development for which the policy or parts of the policy are not justified.	No		View PDF
Suzanne **Fysh** on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust												
0123	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	FIGURE 2.8 OUR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSETS	support	yes	yes	yes	Key Challenge Natural Environment Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of the Natural Environment as a Key Challenge, including reference to the wider ecological network and mandatory biodiversity net gain within the	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							wording of that key challenge. LWT understands that all planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity (for example those in NPPF paragraphs 8c, 20d, 174 and 179). As required by the NPPF in paragraphs 174d and 179b which state: 174d Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures; 179b To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should: promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.					
0203	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 12.26	object	yes	yes	yes	Energy Minerals Paragraph 12.26 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust objects to there not being any mention in this section about reducing and phasing out exploration and development of fossils fuels or energy minerals as an unsustainable source of energy as outlined in COP26: UN Climate Change Conference 2021: The Global Climate Pact Nov 2021 We delivered the first negotiated references to phasing-down coal power and ending fossil fuel subsidies in the UNFCCCs 26-year history. We cannot stop at coal. We need to phase down the use of all fossil fuels across the energy sector. The North Lincolnshire Council A Green Future: Our Plan for Positive Change 2021 states:Theme 1 - Net Zero and Sustainable Energy Aim 2: Clean Growth working together for net zero industry and commerce and good air quality. Tackling Climate Change is more than just the council. Carbon emissions from industry and commerce across North Lincolnshire are around 6.6 million tonnes. Total carbon emissions are over 7.4 million tonnes. North Lincolnshire Councils own direct emissions are only small part of the total carbon emissions for the area. We need to do more than being a net zero council.	Consistent with national policy	Energy Minerals Paragraph 12.26 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust objects to there not being any mention in this section about reducing and phasing out exploration and development of fossils fuels or energy minerals as an unsustainable source of energy as outlined in COP26: UN Climate Change Conference 2021: The Global Climate Pact Nov 2021 We delivered the first negotiated references to phasing-down coal power and ending fossil fuel subsidies in the UNFCCC's 26-year history. We cannot stop at coal. We need to phase down the use of all fossil fuels across the energy sector. The North Lincolnshire Council A Green Future: Our Plan for Positive Change 2021 states: Theme 1 - Net Zero and	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									Sustainable Energy Aim 2: Clean Growth working together for net zero industry and commerce and good air quality. Tackling Climate Change is more than just the council. Carbon emissions from industry and commerce across North Lincolnshire are around 6.6 million tonnes. Total carbon emissions are over 7.4 million tonnes. North Lincolnshire Council's own direct emissions are only small part of the total carbon emissions for the area. We need to do more than being a net zero council.			
0208	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 12.50	support	yes	yes	yes	Restoration and Aftercare Paragraph 12.50 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by establishing coherent ecological networks, (174d) safeguarding wider ecological networks (179a) and promoting the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks (179b).	Consistent with national policy				
0209	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 12.51	support	yes	yes	yes	Restoration and Aftercare Paragraph 12.51 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by establishing coherent ecological networks, (174d) safeguarding wider ecological networks (179a) and promoting the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks (179b).	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0211	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 13.41	support	yes	yes	yes	Sustainable Waste Management: Restoration and Aftercare Paragraph 13.41 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by establishing coherent ecological networks, (174d) safeguarding wider ecological networks (179a) and promoting the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks (179b).	Consistent with national policy				
0213	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 15.24	support	yes	yes	yes	Air Quality Paragraph 15.24 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				
0214	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 15.25	support	yes	yes	yes	Air Quality Paragraph 15.25 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. However the wording needs to change from Environmental Net Gain to Biodiversity Net Gain. The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.	Consistent with national policy				
0215	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 15.28	support	yes	yes	yes	Light Paragraph 15.28 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				
0121	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 2.36	support	yes	yes	yes	North Lincolnshire: Facts and Figures Paragraph 2.36 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the recognition of the value of natural landscapes and nature tourism to the visitor economy and that it is protected and enhanced. The NPPF (paragraph 174b) requires that the planning system contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services.	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0122	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 2.45	support	yes	yes	yes	North Lincolnshire: Facts and Figures Paragraph 2.45 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the recognition of access to quality green space. It is in line with the Governments commitment to connect people with the environment to improve health and wellbeing by Working with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to see how our commitments on green infrastructure can be incorporated into national planning guidance and policy. (25 year plan for the environment, pg77), The NPPF paragraph 92c also states: Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which: c) enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs " for example through the provision of safe and accessible green infrastructure	Consistent with national policy				
0124	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 2.53	support	yes	yes	yes	Key Challenge Natural Environment Paragraph 2.53 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the strong wording in this paragraph which is in line with the LWT response to the preferred options consultation. It makes reference to the Environment Bill which now needs to be amended to the Environment Act 2021.	Consistent with national policy				
0126	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 2.56	support	yes	yes	yes	Key Challenge Natural Environment Paragraph 2.56 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the wording in this paragraph that the need for schemes to actively reduce flood risk should be acknowledged as it is in line with the response to the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				
0128	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 2.73	object	yes	yes	yes	Key Challenge – Minerals Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust objects to there not being any mention in this section about reducing and phasing out exploration and development of fossils fuels as an unsustainable source of energy as outlined in COP26: UN Climate Change Conference 2021: The Global Climate Pact Nov 2021 We delivered the first negotiated references to phasing-down coal power and ending fossil fuel subsidies in the UNFCCCs 26-year history. We cannot stop at coal. We need to phase down the use of all fossil fuels across the energy sector. The North Lincolnshire Council A Green Future: Our Plan for Positive Change 2021 states: Theme 1 - Net Zero and Sustainable Energy Aim 2: Clean Growth " working together for net zero industry and commerce and good air quality. Tackling Climate Change is more than just the council.	Consistent with national policy		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Carbon emissions from industry and commerce across North Lincolnshire are around 6.6 million tonnes. Total carbon emissions are over 7.4 million tonnes. North Lincolnshire Councils own direct emissions are only small part of the total carbon emissions for the area. We need to do more than being a net zero council.					
0129	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 3.10	support	yes	yes	yes	A Spatial Vision and for North Lincolnshire North Lincolnshire The Best Place for our residents and businesses Paragraph 9 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports most of the wording in this paragraph but would like to see it strengthened to include access to the natural environment using the wording from the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership's response. It is felt that the use of countryside alone is not enough as it does not necessarily include truly natural space. The GLNP therefore feels that there should be specific mention of green spaces or green infrastructure and the natural environment. Wording could be as follows: Local people will have good access to quality open spaces (including greenspace), play and sporting facilities, better access to the countryside and the natural environment, increased opportunities for cycling and walking, and good quality health facilities. The Governments 25 year Environment Plan states that: urban greenspace is unequally distributed. The provision of more and better quality green infrastructure, including urban trees, will make towns and cities attractive places to live and work, and bring about key long-term improvements in people's healthy (Pg. 76). The plan also pledges to Help people improve their health and wellbeing by using green spaces (Pg. 71). Equally, the NPPF includes reference to safe and accessible green infrastructure as an example of how to enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs (paragraph 92c).	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0130	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 3.10	support	yes	yes	yes	A Spatial Vision and Objectives for North Lincolnshire Paragraph 10 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the recognition of risks to wildlife and the commitment to avoid these risks when considering renewable and low carbon energy. Planning authorities must recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, as required by the NPPF (including paragraphs 8c, 174, 179 and 180). Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust requires an additional sentence about the reduction and phasing out of developments that require unsustainable fossils fuels as a source of energy to strengthen North Lincolnshire's commitment to net zero as outlined in: The North Lincolnshire Council A Green Future: Our Plan for Positive Change 2021 states: Theme 1 - Net Zero and Sustainable Energy Aim 2: Clean Growth working together for net zero industry and commerce and good air quality. Tackling Climate Change is more than just the council. Carbon emissions from industry and commerce across North Lincolnshire are around 6.6 million tonnes. Total carbon emissions are over 7.4 million tonnes. North Lincolnshire Councils own direct emissions are only small part of the total carbon emissions for the area. We need to do more than being a net zero council.	Consistent with national policy				
0131	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 3.10	support	yes	yes	yes	A Spatial Vision and Objectives for North Lincolnshire Paragraph 12 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph and its commitment to safeguarding the natural environment within this Spatial Vision. It also welcomes the requirement for Biodiversity Net Gain and the enhancement of ecological networks as proposed in the response to the preferred option consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity. This paragraph contributes towards requirements of the NPPF regarding sustainability and protecting and enhancing the natural environment as covered in paragraphs 8c, 174, 175, 179, and 180 and the Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0132	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 3.11	support	yes	yes	yes	Spatial Objectives Spatial Objective 4: Delivering Infrastructure for Growth (A Connected North Lincolnshire) Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of green infrastructure, however feels it could be strengthened in line with the NPPF to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services (paragraph 174b) as well as paragraphs 20c which requires that Strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and design quality of places, and make sufficient provision for: community facilities (such as health, education and cultural infrastructure) and 20d which requires that the same is required in regards to conservation and enhancement of the natural, built and historic environment, including landscapes and green infrastructure, and planning measures to address climate change mitigation and adaptation. It is suggested that the wording from the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership could be used: We will also seek to deliver the necessary community infrastructure/facilities and green infrastructure to support the creation of sustainable communities and cleaner and greener spaces, providing multiple benefits such as improved health and wellbeing, climate mitigation and flood resilience. This additional sentence would serve to evidence the need for green infrastructure and support its inclusion within the policy meeting the NPPF (Paragraph 31) requirement for policy to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence.	Consistent with national policy				
0135	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 3.11	support	yes	yes	yes	Spatial Objective 6: Protecting and Enhancing Our Natural, Built and Historic Environment Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of Biodiversity Net Gain in this Objective which reflects comments provided during the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity meeting requirements presented within paragraphs 174d and 179b of the NPPF.	Consistent with national policy				
0137	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 3.11	support	yes	yes	yes	Spatial Objective 9: Improved Enabling Quality of Life Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the recognition of the value of Greater Lincolnshire's natural environment to public health and wellbeing, contributing to requirements set out by the NPPF (paragraph 174b) which states that plans should recognise the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services It is also in line with the Governments commitment, in the 25 Year Plan for the Environment to connect people with the environment to improve health and wellbeing.	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0138	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 3.11	support	yes	yes	yes	Spatial Objective 10: Developing Our Visitor Economy Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the recognition of nature as an asset to the visitor economy and welcomes the commitment that its impact on the natural environment will be mitigated to reduce negative effects on biodiversity and natural resources which reflects comments provided during the preferred options consultation. There is a responsibility on Local Authorities to ensure the appropriate use and management of the natural environment. The NPPF calls for a sustainable approach which includes making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution (paragraph 8c).	Consistent with national policy				
0139	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 3.11	support	yes	yes	yes	Spatial Objective 11: Planning for Climate Change Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the commitment to enhancing biodiversity within this objective and the inclusion of nature based solutions to climate change and the impacts of climate change, the creation of new habitats, biodiversity net gain and the Nature Recovery Network. This reflects comments provided during the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity. The NPPF requires Planning Policy to take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for flood risk, coastal change, water supply, biodiversity and landscapes, and the risk of overheating from rising temperatures (paragraph 153) and for Plans to protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity by promoting the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity. (179b) The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust also supports the commitment to an ambitious tree and hedge planting strategy, however it should include the principle of the right tree/hedge in the right place.	Consistent with national policy				
0142	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 4.2	support	yes	yes	yes	A Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire Paragraph 4.20 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph as incorporates the comments provided in the preferred options consultation. The planning system should recognise the concept of natural capital and the wider benefits of the natural environment, integrating these within planning aspirations and seeking to deliver multiple benefits. The NPPF requires the planning system to contribute to and enhance the natural	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							and local environment by recognising the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services (paragraph 174b).					
0148	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 6.84	support	yes	yes	yes	6. Delivering Jobs & Supporting Our EconomyParagraph 6.84Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph however would like to see that the partnership includes specific reference to environmental stakeholders as the partnership proposed relates directly to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment.	Consistent with national policy	6. Delivering Jobs & Supporting Our Economy Paragraph 6.84 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph however would like to see that the partnership includes specific reference to environmental stakeholders as the partnership proposed relates directly to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment.	no		
0156	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 8.4	support	yes	yes	yes	Supporting Sustainable Development in the Countryside Paragraph 8.4 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the wording of this paragraph as it is in line with the response provided as part of the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity and the natural environment. The paragraph contributes to requirements of the NPPF (paragraphs 8c, 174d, 179b and 180d).	Consistent with national policy				
0181	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 9.100	support	yes	yes	yes	Provision of Green Infrastructure Paragraph 9.100 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph however it could be made stronger by including the term Nature Recovery Networks as used in the Environment Act 2021.	Consistent with national policy	Provision of Green Infrastructure Paragraph 9.100 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph however it could be made stronger by including the term Nature Recovery Networks as used in the Environment Act 2021.	no		
0182	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 9.103	support	yes	yes	yes	Provision of Green Infrastructure Paragraph 9.103 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph and the development of a North Lincolnshire Biodiversity SPD. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity... (180d). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.					
0186	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 9.106	support	yes	yes	yes	Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows Paragraph 9.106 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				
0163	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 9.19	support	yes	yes	yes	Biodiversity and Geodiversity Paragraph 9.19 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph whilst recognising that it needs updating in line with the Environment Act Nov 2021. The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.	Consistent with national policy	Biodiversity and Geodiversity Paragraph 9.19 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph whilst recognising that it needs updating in line with the Environment Act Nov 2021. The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.	no		
0164	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 9.20	support	yes	yes	yes	Paragraph 9.20 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph whilst recognising that it needs updating in line with the Environment Act Nov 2021.	Consistent with national policy	Paragraph 9.20 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph whilst recognising that it needs updating in line with the Environment Act Nov 2021.	no		
0165	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 9.26	support	yes	yes	yes	Paragraph 9.26 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph whilst recognising that it needs updating in line with the Environment Act Nov 2021 and Defra Metric 3.0.	Consistent with national policy	Paragraph 9.26 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph whilst recognising that it needs updating in line with the Environment Act Nov 2021 and Defra Metric 3.0.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0168	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 9.57	support	yes	yes	yes	Sustainable Drainage Systems Paragraph 9.57 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph as it is in line with the response provided as part of the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				
0175	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 9.72	support	yes	yes	yes	Climate Change and Low Carbon Living Paragraph 9.72 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph and the need for a SPD that takes into account current best practice. We welcome the strong focus on the role of natural solution to climate change. It contributes to the targets as set out in the Environment Act 2021 and the 25 year Environment Plan.	Consistent with national policy				
0178	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 9.95	support	yes	yes	yes	Provision of Green Infrastructure Paragraph 9.95 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				
0179	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 9.97	support	yes	yes	yes	Provision of Green Infrastructure Paragraph 9.97 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. We strongly support North Lincolnshire Council adopting the Natural Capital Workbook approach	Consistent with national policy				
0180	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 9.99	support	yes	yes	yes	Provision of Green Infrastructure Paragraph 9.99 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph however it could be made stronger by including the point that they will be vital in creating Nature Recovery Networks as required in the Environment Act 2021.	Consistent with national policy	Provision of Green Infrastructure Paragraph 9.99 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this paragraph however it could be made stronger by including the point that they will be vital in creating Nature Recovery Networks as required in the Environment Act 2021.	no		
0189	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY CSC1: 1b.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy CSC1: Health and Wellbeing Principle 1.b. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. Local Plan policies must recognise the value of Greater Lincolnshire's natural environment to public health and wellbeing and that interaction with nature is beneficial to both physical and mental health and wellbeing. This is supported by the Governments commitment to connect people	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							with the environment to improve health and wellbeing by Working with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to see how our commitments on green infrastructure can be incorporated into national planning guidance and policy. (25 year plan for the environment, pg77).					
0190	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY CSC1: 1c.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy CSC1: Health and Wellbeing Principle 1.c. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. Local Plan policies must recognise the value of Greater Lincolnshire's natural environment to public health and wellbeing and that interaction with nature is beneficial to both physical and mental health and wellbeing. This is supported by the Governments commitment to connect people with the environment to improve health and wellbeing by Working with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to see how our commitments on green infrastructure can be incorporated into national planning guidance and policy. (25 year plan for the environment, pg77).	Consistent with national policy				
0199	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY CSC15: 1c.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy CSC15: Tourism and Visitor Attractions Principle 1.c. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.	Consistent with national policy				
0200	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY CSC16: 3.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy CSC16: Hotel and Guest House Accommodation Principle 3. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0201	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY CSC17: 1b.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy CSC17: Camping and Caravan Sites Principle 1.b. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.	Consistent with national policy				
0194	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY CSC3: 13.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy CSC3: Protection and Provision of Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities Principle 13. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle however it could be made stronger by adding the wording water environment through the use of the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping to maximise contribution to Nature Recovery Networks as required in the Environment Act 2021.	Consistent with national policy	Policy CSC3: Protection and Provision of Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities Principle 13. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle however it could be made stronger by adding the wording water environment through the use of the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping to maximise contribution to Nature Recovery Networks as required in the Environment Act 2021.	no		
0191	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY CSC3: 4a.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy CSC3: Protection and Provision of Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities Principle 4.a. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity and the natural environment. The paragraph contributes to requirements of the NPPF (paragraphs 8c, 174d, 179b and 180d).	Consistent with national policy				
0192	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire	POLICY CSC3: 4c.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy CSC3: Protection and Provision of Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities	Consistent with national				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	Wildlife Trust						Principle 4.c. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d). Therefore, the GLNP supports principle 6.b. which requires development resulting in the loss of natural greenspace or open space will be required to achieve biodiversity net gain and principle 6.d. that requires such development to protect or enhance the ecological network. The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.	policy				
0193	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY CSC3: 4d.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy CSC3: Protection and Provision of Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities Principle 4.d. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity and the natural environment. The paragraph contributes to requirements of the NPPF (paragraphs 8c, 174d, 179b and 180d).	Consistent with national policy				
0195	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY CSC5: 1f.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy CSC5: Golf Courses Principle 1.f. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.					
0196	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY CSC6: WATER BASED LEISURE	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy CSC6: Water Based Leisure Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this policy as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity and the natural environment. The policy contributes to requirements of the NPPF (paragraphs 8c, 174d, 179b and 180d).	Consistent with national policy				
0197	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY CSC7: COMMERCIAL HORSE RIDING ESTABLISHMENTS	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy CSC7: Commercial Horse Riding Establishments Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this policy as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity and the natural environment. The policy contributes to requirements of the NPPF (paragraphs 8c, 174d, 179b and 180d).	Consistent with national policy				
0212	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DM1: 3n.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DM1: General Requirements Principle 3.n. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity(180d). Therefore, in line with representations to previous consultations, the GLNP supports the inclusion of principle 3.n. within the policy, which reads Enhance the natural environment through the provision of measurable net gains to biodiversity and contribute to natures recovery through establishment of Nature Recovery Networks, as appropriate to their nature and scale. The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0217	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DM3: 10.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DM3: Environmental Protection Principle 10 Water Environment Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				
0218	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DM3: 11.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DM3: Environmental Protection Principle 11 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				
0216	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DM3: 5.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DM3: Environmental Protection Principle 5 Light Pollution Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				
0157	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE1: 3b.	support	yes	yes	yes	Delivering a Quality Environment Policy DQE1: Protection of Landscape, Townscape and Views Principle 3.b. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports principle 3.b. as it is in line with the response provided as part of the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity and therefore this policy should include a paragraph which requires development to protect and enhance biodiversity as required by the NPPF paragraphs 8c, 170d, 174b and 175d. The NPPF also requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (170d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (174b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (175d). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission.	Consistent with national policy				
0158	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE1: 3d.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE1: Protection of Landscape, Townscape and Views Principle 3.d. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports principle 3.d. as it is in line with the response provided as part of the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity and therefore this policy should include a paragraph which requires development to protect and enhance biodiversity as required by the NPPF paragraphs 8c, 170d, 174b and 175d. The NPPF also requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (170d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (174b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (175d). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission.					
0159	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE1: 3e.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE1: Protection of Landscape, Townscape and Views Principle 3.e. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports principle 3.e. as it is in line with the response provided as part of the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity and therefore this policy should include a paragraph which requires development to protect and enhance biodiversity as required by the NPPF paragraphs 8c, 170d, 174b and 175d. The NPPF also requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (170d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (174b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (175d). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission.	Consistent with national policy				
0160	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE1: 6.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE1: Protection of Landscape, Townscape and Views Principle 6 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports principle 6 as it is in line with the response provided as part of the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity and therefore this policy should include a paragraph which requires development to protect and enhance biodiversity as required by the NPPF paragraphs 8c, 170d, 174b and 175d. The NPPF also requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (170d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (174b). All development is an opportunity for	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (175d). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission.					
0177	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE10: 5.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE10: Important Open Space Principle 5. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports reference to Policy DQE3: Biodiversity and Geology. This will ensure that the content of this and NPPF requirements met by it are not overlooked, specifically in regards to biodiversity net gain and the enhancement of ecological networks (NPPF paragraphs 174d, 179b and 180d).	Consistent with national policy				
0183	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE11: 1.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE11: Green Infrastructure Network Principle 1. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				
0184	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE11: 4.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE11: Green Infrastructure Network Principle 4. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				
0185	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE11: 8.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE11: Green Infrastructure Network Principle 8. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				
0187	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE12: 4.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE12: Protection of Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows Principle 4. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d).	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0188	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE12: 5.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE12: Protection of Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows Principle 5. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.	Consistent with national policy				
0161	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE2: 4.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE2: Landscape Enhancement Principle 4 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports principle 4 as it is in line with the response provided as part of the preferred options consultation. However we would like to see it strengthened to include reference to the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping for the area and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy to ensure that they maximize the creation of priority habitats and assist with the establishment of Nature Recovery Networks. The above additions would then contribute to meeting the NPPF (Paragraph 31) requirement for policy to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence.	Consistent with national policy	Policy DQE2: Landscape Enhancement Principle 4 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports principle 4 as it is in line with the response provided as part of the preferred options consultation. However we would like to see it strengthened to include reference to the Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping for the area and the Local Nature Recovery Strategy to ensure that they maximize the creation of priority habitats and assist with the establishment of Nature Recovery Networks. The above additions would then contribute to meeting the NPPF (Paragraph 31) requirement for policy to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0166	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE3: 1c.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE3: Biodiversity and Geodiversity Principle 1.b. Lincolnshire Wildlife trust supports this principle however requests that the word avoid is added avoid, minimise, mitigate and compensate against impacts on natural capital, ecosystem services, biodiversity and geodiversity where adverse effects are unavoidable as this is part of the full Mitigation Hierarchy.	Consistent with national policy	Policy DQE3: Biodiversity and Geodiversity Principle 1.b. Lincolnshire Wildlife trust supports this principle however requests that the word avoid is added avoid, minimise, mitigate and compensate against impacts on natural capital, ecosystem services, biodiversity and geodiversity where adverse effects are unavoidable as this is part of the full Mitigation Hierarchy.	no		
0167	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE3: 1c.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE3: Biodiversity and Geodiversity Principle 1.c. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust, in line with its previous response to the preferred options consultation supports the inclusion of principle 1.c. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.	Consistent with national policy				
0169	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE6: 3b.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE6: Sustainable Drainage Systems Principle 3.b. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it is in line with the response provided as part of the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				
0170	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE6: 3g.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE6: Sustainable Drainage Systems Principle 3.g. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it is in line with the response provided as part of the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0171	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE7: 2e.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE7: Climate Change and Low Carbon Living Principle 2.e. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle which recognises the benefits that habitats and green spaces can bring to climate change adaptation as set out in the Environment Act 2021 and the 25 year Environment Plan.	Consistent with national policy				
0172	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE7: 3e.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE7: Climate Change and Low Carbon Living Principle 3.e. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle which recognises the benefits that habitats and green spaces can bring to climate change adaptation and carbon sequestration as set out in the Environment Act 2021 and the 25 year Environment Plan.	Consistent with national policy				
0173	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE7: 3f.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE7: Climate Change and Low Carbon Living Principle 3.f. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle which recognises the benefits that habitats and green spaces can bring to climate change adaptation as set out in the Environment Act 2021 and the 25 year Environment Plan. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d).	Consistent with national policy				
0174	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE7: 7.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE7: Climate Change and Low Carbon Living Principle 7. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports reference to Policy DQE3: Biodiversity and Geology. This will ensure that the content of this policy and NPPF requirements met by it are not overlooked, specifically in regards to biodiversity net gain and the enhancement of ecological networks (NPPF paragraphs 174d, 179b and 180d).	Consistent with national policy				
0176	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY DQE8: RENEWABLE ENERGY PROPOSALS	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy DQE8: Renewable Energy Proposals Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this policy and reference to other Delivering Quality Environment Policies. This will ensure that the content of these policies and NPPF requirements met by them are not overlooked. An additional point is necessary in this policy requiring provision of Biodiversity Net Gain as made mandatory in the Environment Act 2021. The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6	Consistent with national policy	Policy DQE8: Renewable Energy Proposals Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this policy and reference to other Delivering Quality Environment Policies. This will ensure that the content of these policies and NPPF requirements met by	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.		them are not overlooked. An additional point is necessary in this policy requiring provision of Biodiversity Net Gain as made mandatory in the Environment Act 2021. The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.			
0149	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY EC4: SOUTH HUMBER BANK - LANDSCAPE INITIATIVE	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy EC4: South Humber Bank Landscape Initiative Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this policy as far as it goes however it needs significant strengthening to reflect the Environment Act 2021 and the 25 Year Environment Plan to include the potential opportunities to consider and incorporate natural capital accounting, carbon sequestration, flood mitigation, pollution mitigation and recreational access through habitat provision.	Consistent with national policy	Policy EC4: South Humber Bank Landscape Initiative Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this policy as far as it goes however it needs significant strengthening to reflect the Environment Act 2021 and the 25 Year Environment Plan to include the potential opportunities to consider and incorporate natural capital accounting, carbon sequestration, flood mitigation, pollution mitigation and recreational access through habitat provision.	no		
0150	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY EC4: SOUTH HUMBER BANK - LANDSCAPE INITIATIVE	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy EC4: South Humber Bank Landscape Initiative Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this policy as far as it goes however it needs significant strengthening to reflect the Environment Act 2021 and the 25 Year Environment Plan to include the potential opportunities to consider and incorporate natural capital accounting, carbon sequestration, flood mitigation, pollution mitigation and recreational access through habitat provision. It should be led by the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping and Nature Recovery Networks and involve ecological professionals. It should also address measurable Biodiversity Net Gain. All of this would then contribute to meeting the NPPF (Paragraph 31)	Consistent with national policy	Policy EC4: South Humber Bank Landscape Initiative Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this policy as far as it goes however it needs significant strengthening to reflect the Environment Act 2021 and the 25 Year Environment Plan to include the potential opportunities to consider and incorporate natural capital accounting, carbon sequestration, flood	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							requirement for policy to be ¦underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence.		mitigation, pollution mitigation and recreational access through habitat provision. It should be led by the Local Nature Recovery Strategy, Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping and Nature Recovery Networks and involve ecological professionals. It should also address measurable Biodiversity Net Gain. All of this would then contribute to meeting the NPPF (Paragraph 31) requirement for policy to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence.			
0151	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY EC5: 1a.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy EC5: Wharves Principle 1.a. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it is in line with the response to the preferred option consultation.	Consistent with national policy				
0152	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY EC6: 1h.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy EC6: Supporting the Rural Economy Principle 1.h. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the addition of principle 1.h. enhance the natural environment through the provision of measurable net gains to biodiversity. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (180d). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission.	Consistent with national policy				
0153	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY EC7: 2c.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy EC7: A Sustainable Visitor Economy Principle 2.c. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle which is in line with the consultation response to the preferred options consultation.	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0154	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY EC7: 2f.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy EC7: A Sustainable Visitor Economy Principle 2.f. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the addition of principle 2.f. enhance the natural environment through the provision of measurable net gains to biodiversity. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity... (180d). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission.	Consistent with national policy				
0147	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY H8: 1f.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy H8: Replacement, alteration and extensions to dwellings in the open countryside. Principle 1.f. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle which is in line with the response to the preferred options consultation. It contributes to the requirements of the NPPF (179b).	Consistent with national policy				
0202	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY MIN3: 1b.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy MIN3: Mineral Extraction Principle 1.b. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity. (180d). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0204	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY MIN7: 2.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy MIN7: Borrow Pits and Ancillary Extraction Principle 2. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to improve biodiversity in and around developments should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity.. (180d). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.	Consistent with national policy				
0205	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY MIN8: 3b.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy MIN8: Restoration, Aftercare and After use of Mineral Extraction Sites Principle 3.b Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by establishing coherent ecological networks, (174d) safeguarding wider ecological networks (179a) and promoting the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks (179b).	Consistent with national policy				
0206	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY MIN8: 4.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy MIN8: Restoration, Aftercare and After use of Mineral Extraction Sites Principle 4 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. The NPPF requires policies to enhance the natural environment by protecting and enhancing soils (174a)	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0207	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY MIN8: 5.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy MIN8: Restoration, Aftercare and After use of Mineral Extraction Sites Principle 5. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by establishing coherent ecological networks, (174d) safeguarding wider ecological networks (179a) and promoting the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks (179b).	Consistent with national policy				
0155	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY RD1: 3.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy RD1: Supporting Sustainable Development in the Countryside Principle 3 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust, in line with its response to the preferred options consultation the GLNP supports the wording of principle 3 of the policy, which states that development is to be only permitted where it safeguards and enhances the natural environment and considers biodiversity through the provision of measurable net gains to biodiversity and links to coherent ecological networks. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity and therefore this policy should include a paragraph which requires development to protect and enhance biodiversity as required by the NPPF paragraphs 8c, 170d, 174b and 175d. The NPPF also requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (170d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (174b). All development is an opportunity for securing biodiversity net gain and the NPPF states that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity (175d). Equally, sustainable rural development is also a prime opportunity for establishing coherent ecological networks as required by the NPPF (paragraph 170d). Inclusion of this within the policy would also evidence a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change, taking into account the long-term implications for biodiversity and landscapes as required by the NPPF (paragraph 149). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission.	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0141	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY SS3: 1i.	support	yes	yes	yes	SS3: Development Principles Principle 1.i. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it is in line with our response regarding strengthening the wording referring to biodiversity net gain in the preferred options consultations. It supports measurable net gains for biodiversity as identified in NPPF requirements set out in paragraphs 174d, 179b and 180d and the Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 which states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects.	Consistent with national policy				
0146	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY SS10: 2j.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy SS10: Strategic Allocation " South Humber Bank Principle 2.j. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle which is in line with the response to the preferred options consultation. It contributes to requirements of the NPPF which calls for planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by providing net gains for biodiversity (174d) and requires plans to pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity (179b). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 which states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission and Schedule 15 biodiversity gain in nationally significant infrastructure projects. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust also supports reference to Local Nature Recovery Strategies and Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping which contributes to meeting the NPPF (Paragraph 31) requirement for policy to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence.	Consistent with national policy				
0140	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY SS2: 2g.	support	yes	yes	yes	SS2 Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire Principle 2.g. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of securing natures recovery which reflects comments provided during the preferred options consultation. SS3: Development Principles Principle 1.h. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the commitment that development should protect and enhance natural capital and also the consideration of impacts on natural capital and open space. This contributes to requirements set by the NPPF which requires Plans to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services (paragraph 174b).	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0143	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY SS6: 2.	object	yes	yes	yes	SS6 Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites 2. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust objects to the last sentence All development should not have an adverse impact on the environment or landscape which should be replaced with All development must contribute to biodiversity net gain and positively contribute to the natural capital of the area. The NPPF requires the planning system to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services (paragraph 174b). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission.	Consistent with national policy	SS6 Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites 2. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust objects to the last sentence All development should not have an adverse impact on the environment or landscape which should be replaced with All development must contribute to biodiversity net gain and positively contribute to the natural capital of the area. The NPPF requires the planning system to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services (paragraph 174b). The Environment Act 2021 introduces a statutory requirement that new development achieves a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG). Part 6 states: Schedule 14 provision for biodiversity gain to be a condition of planning permission.	no		
0144	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY SS7: 5.	support	yes	yes	yes	SS7 Strategic site allocation " Lincolnshire Lakes 5. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports these sections as they include responses from the preferred option consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity. This contributes to requirements set out within the NPPF (paragraphs 174d, 179b and 180d) while reference to Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping contributes to meeting the NPPF (Paragraph 31) requirement for policy to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence.	Consistent with national policy				
0145	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY SS7: 6.	support	yes	yes	yes	SS7 Strategic site allocation " Lincolnshire Lakes 6.Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports these sections as they include responses from the preferred option consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity.	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							This contributes to requirements set out within the NPPF (paragraphs 174d, 179b and 180d) while reference to Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping contributes to meeting the NPPF (Paragraph 31) requirement for policy to be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence.					
0210	Suzanne Fysh on behalf of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	POLICY WAS7: 2b.	support	yes	yes	yes	Policy WAS7: Restoration and Aftercare Principle 2.b. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports this principle as it incorporates comments provided at the preferred options consultation. All planning authorities should recognise and implement their legal and policy duties to protect and enhance biodiversity, the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to enhance the natural environment by establishing coherent ecological networks, (174d) safeguarding wider ecological networks (179a) and promoting the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks (179b).	Consistent with national policy				
Jayne **Gale** on behalf of South Killingholme Parish Council												
0228	Jayne Gale on behalf of South Killingholme Parish Council	Paragraph 14.25	object	no	no	no	The Just Go service is woefully inadequate and discriminatory. A reliable timetabled service would be better. Just Go does not allow under 12's unaccompanied, it requires credit and debit card bookings and will not permit mobility scooter users to access it. Given South Killingholme is 3 miles from their nearest town of Immingham many of its occupants cannot access the service for GP, leisure, Dentist, retail and the allocated job centre. It costs them £18 return for a taxi. Here in South Killingholme when a timetable bus route by-passes the village on the A160 it seems wholly unnecessary to discriminate against these residents. It is inadequate and discriminatory therefore not legally compliant.		Bus services will pass through villages with buses that can adequately hold the disabled passenger. Accepts cash for the passenger with no debit card or low economic funds. Encourages older children to participate in sports and leisure facilities in the closest towns with amenities.	no		
0225	Jayne Gale on behalf of South Killingholme Parish Council	Paragraph 2.30	object	no	no	no	It is the South Killingholme Parish Council position that the 'Just Go' service promoted in the documents does not provide adequate public transport in Nth Lincolnshire upon which we are highly dependent for business, health care, retail and economic support. In South Killingholme Children under 12 cannot use the service independently, children under 18 usually without a credit or debit card are unable to use the service independently to access either leisure facilities in Immingham or Scunthorpe. Disabled people using mobility scooters to access local GP, Dentist, shopping facilities or the allocated job centre in Immingham are unable to access the service. If you wish to use cash or have a poor credit facility you cannot access the service. We would like it changed to a regular public bus service so that all residents can access business, leisure, retail and medical facilities in their closest neighbouring towns. Presently the bus detours this village when it could easily pass through. The ward councillors have been aware of this for over 3 years and have not co-operated or represented our views in a sound way. It is not legally compliant because it is discriminatory to disabled, young people and people in lower economic groups, by its omission and inability		We would like it changed to North Lincolnshire is highly dependent on public transport and will provide a regular public bus service so that 'all' residents can access business, leisure, retail and medical facilities in their closest neighbouring towns.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							to meet those basic needs with its public transportation.					
Joanne **Gander**												
0047	Joanne Gander	POLICY H1P-30: LAND SOUTH OF MAIN STREET	object	no	no	no	This is outside the legal settlement boundary(the building line) Main Street is inadequate for the extra traffic Increased risk of flooding from run off from more tarmacked land Density of housing is out of character with the houses in the area Loss of Green space, Wildlife and Ecology Loss of ancient history and archaeology	Consistent with national policy		no		
George **Gladwin**												
0804	George Gladwin	Paragraph 5.64	object				I am the owner of the sites H1P-7P (Cornhill Farm yard and Grass field) and H1P-8P (Caistor Road field) and I am writing to you with my objection to the removal of the preferred options sites from the publication draft (regulation 19). Had more time been available, a professional would have been commissioned to present a polished representation. At 5.64 in your plan documents you have written, and I quote “at present vehicles travelling through Barton upon Humber can suffer from congestion at peak times. To reduce this impact, a new link road will be constructed as part of this allocation to provide the first phase of the link road between A1077 and Caistor Road.” This is a great statement to make, as we can all agree on this. However, a new link road cannot be created without including my site H1P-8P (Caistor Road field). Looking at your plans the first stage of the proposed link road will end up going into the Caistor Road field hedge bottom only, so there will be a relief road built with a dead end, therefore defeating the whole purpose. I feel we can work together to get an alternative outcome for this, as I would be willing to let North Lincolnshire Council have this land to complete the first stage of the relief road if my other land is put back into the development plans. If H1P-8P (Caistor Road field) were to be put back into the plan then I could be persuaded to complete and pay for the second part of your first stage of the relief road. I know the route across my land is subject to change but if the road were to be built to join up with the Caistor Road and Deepdale fork adjacent to Lodge Planting, this would give NLC the opportunity to do improvements to the existing Caistor Road that passed the Barrow Pumping Station entrance and up to the second crossroads to make the road more HGV friendly. I am sure this route would be used by a lot of the Wren traffic travelling South and due to their recent expansion, this truly is needed. I suspect it would cost NLC significantly less to upgrade the existing Caistor road, with the majority of the money required to build the first stage would be coming from H1P-13 225 Dwellings (Stephenson’s) and H1P-8P (Caistor Road field). It would be a far cheaper alternative than to build the proposed relief road and a lot more time efficient, as I’m sure you are aware the traffic in Barton is a huge issue for all residents and workers in the area, that needs to be addressed immediately. The relief road could			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							still be in the initial stages for years to come due to not only the huge financial aspect of it but also the vast amount of work needed to go into making this happen. This in itself would cause more disruption to the town than necessary. I am not aware that any of the local farmers have been contacted to see if they are for or against the proposed new relief road, but I can tell you that the majority of farmers are against it and therefore the battle would be further prolonged. If the first part of the relief road were to be built across H1P-13 (Stephenson's) and H1P-8P (Caistor Road field) and if the Caistor Road was improved, this would help the A1077 to cope with the extra traffic generated from H1P-7P (Land to the South of Barrow Road or Cornhill Farm and Grass field), meaning there is no reason for it not to be added back into the plan. There is a developer led demand for this site. In short, in the current plans the relief road does not reach Caistor Road and the first part of the relief road that the developers of H1P-13 225 Dwellings (Stephenson's) will have to pay for will be a road to my Caistor Road field hedge bottom only. Lastly, I would like to make you aware that from the initial plans and all of our discussions with developers of the H1P-8P (Caistor Road field) site, we had earmarked a 5-acre site for a medical centre and Central Surgery. The residents of Barton are showing interest in this opportunity, and I think it would be a huge disadvantage to Barton to not go ahead with this. I am aware that these proposals do not completely eliminate the traffic problems that Barton faces, but I am sure they will be drastically reduced. More importantly, the proposals are achievable, affordable and would give Barton the growth it is crying out for, if H1P-7P (Cornhill Farmyard and Grass field) and H1P-8P (Caistor Road field) were to be included back in the plan. I say this proposal is what North Lincolnshire Council are looking for. I look forward to your response.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0834	George Gladwin	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object				I am the owner of the sites H1P-7P (Cornhill Farm yard and Grass field) and H1P-8P (Caistor Road field) and I am writing to you with my objection to the removal of the preferred options sites from the publication draft (regulation 19). Had more time been available, a professional would have been commissioned to present a polished representation. At 5.64 in your plan documents you have written, and I quote “at present vehicles travelling through Barton upon Humber can suffer from congestion at peak times. To reduce this impact, a new link road will be constructed as part of this allocation to provide the first phase of the link road between A1077 and Caistor Road.” This is a great statement to make, as we can all agree on this. However, a new link road cannot be created without including my site H1P-8P (Caistor Road field). Looking at your plans the first stage of the proposed link road will end up going into the Caistor Road field hedge bottom only, so there will be a relief road built with a dead end, therefore defeating the whole purpose. I feel we can work together to get an alternative outcome for this, as I would be willing to let North Lincolnshire Council have this land to complete the first stage of the relief road if my other land is put back into the development plans. If H1P-8P (Caistor Road field) were to be put back into the plan then I could be persuaded to complete and pay for the second part of your first stage of the relief road. I know the route across my land is subject to change but if the road were to be built to join up with the Caistor Road and Deepdale fork adjacent to Lodge Planting, this would give NLC the opportunity to do improvements to the existing Caistor Road that passed the Barrow Pumping Station entrance and up to the second crossroads to make the road more HGV friendly. I am sure this route would be used by a lot of the Wren traffic travelling South and due to their recent expansion, this truly is needed. I suspect it would cost NLC significantly less to upgrade the existing Caistor road, with the majority of the money required to build the first stage would be coming from H1P-13 225 Dwellings (Stephenson’s) and H1P-8P (Caistor Road field). It would be a far cheaper alternative than to build the proposed relief road and a lot more time efficient, as I’m sure you are aware the traffic in Barton is a huge issue for all residents and workers in the area, that needs to be addressed immediately. The relief road could still be in the initial stages for years to come due to not only the huge financial aspect of it but also the vast amount of work needed to go into making this happen. This in itself would cause more disruption to the town than necessary. I am not aware that any of the local farmers have been contacted to see if they are for or against the proposed new relief road, but I can tell you that the majority of farmers are against it and therefore the battle would be further prolonged. If the first part of the relief road were to be built across H1P-13 (Stephenson’s) and H1P-8P (Caistor Road field) and if the Caistor Road was improved, this would help the A1077 to cope with the extra traffic generated from H1P-7P (Land to the South of Barrow Road or Cornhill			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Farm and Grass field), meaning there is no reason for it not to be added back into the plan. There is a developer led demand for this site. In short, in the current plans the relief road does not reach Caistor Road and the first part of the relief road that the developers of H1P-13 225 Dwellings (Stephenson's) will have to pay for will be a road to my Caistor Road field hedge bottom only. Lastly, I would like to make you aware that from the initial plans and all of our discussions with developers of the H1P-8P (Caistor Road field) site, we had earmarked a 5-acre site for a medical centre and Central Surgery. The residents of Barton are showing interest in this opportunity, and I think it would be a huge disadvantage to Barton to not go ahead with this. I am aware that these proposals do not completely eliminate the traffic problems that Barton faces, but I am sure they will be drastically reduced. More importantly, the proposals are achievable, affordable and would give Barton the growth it is crying out for, if H1P-7P (Cornhill Farmyard and Grass field) and H1P-8P (Caistor Road field) were to be included back in the plan. I say this proposal is what North Lincolnshire Council are looking for. I look forward to your response.					
Joanne **Gladwin**												
0449	Joanne Gladwin	Paragraph 14.47	object				I am emailing to register my objection to the inclusion of paragraph 14.47 in the local plan, as it states that the Barton upon Humber relief road will run via the B1218 (Brigg Road). The route of the relief road is still under discussion, and there is a far shorter, more ecologically friendly route which crosses to Caistor Road and then joins the A15 via an existing Road running from New Holland to the A15					View PDF
0797	Joanne Gladwin	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0815	Joanne Gladwin	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0450	Joanne Gladwin	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Tony **Goss**												
0072	tony goss	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	support	yes	yes	yes	Ref East Halton. Support the current proposals, we note 26 units proposed on land at Mill Lane, it does not say types of property considered suitable, nor if any will be for low cost /shared ownership/rent.	Consistent with national policy				
Eleanor **Gribben**												
0610	Eleanor Gribben	POLICY H1P-4: LAND AT FORMER SOUTH LEYS SCHOOL ENDERBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object				To whom it may concern, I have taught at KPAC for the last 7 years and I am emailing you to object the plan of action regarding the allocation of Kimberley Performing Arts Centre at South Leys Campus on Enderby Road for housing. The centre creates a warm welcoming community for children and young adults in Scunthorpe and the surrounding areas and aims to inspire them to be the best dancers and performers they can be. The building and location itself is not only hugely important to the growth of the individuals who attend it, but also to the growth and longevity of the business. The reception area enables a warm and welcoming atmosphere and the number and size of studios themselves enables large class sizes and the ability for students to be encouraged to grow to their full potential. In particular, the stage area in our main studio is a massive asset to the school. Members can perform to an audience of 200 and experience theatre etiquette which is greatly important for those who would like to pursue a career in the performing arts industry. In the gym, we can facilitate aerial and circus skills through silks and hoop training. The nearest one like us here in Scunthorpe is Leeds, making this class a great asset to not only the school but also the town. We have used the other spaces to create a staff office which is used by up to 8 members of staff, a costume cupboard to store all our costumes and accessories and a sewing room where "Classically Kay" makes costumes from scratch. The storage facilities are also well used throughout the centre. The gym is also used to hire out to a local football group and our drama studio is equipped for another community group - the camera club. In the space at the back of the centre, another community group Men In Sheds have chosen our facility to create their own workshop space. Men in Sheds aim is to bring men together to provide a safe space to talk as well as work. We also provide gentle fitness and bingo classes for the elderly. KPAC is so much more than just a performing arts school. Four of the					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							teachers, including myself, have all been taught personally by Miss Kim when we were younger. After leaving Scunthorpe to attend and train at professional dance conservatoires and performing professionally around the world we have all returned to Scunthorpe to pursue teaching careers and pass on our knowledge to the next generation. I have friends from the industry who have also opened their own dance schools in Liverpool, Norwich and Milton Kenes who have all contacted me to request information on how the KPAC business is run. In the performing arts world, this centre is a great example and pioneer to other schools in the country, another reason why I strongly feel we need a building which reflects our work. Alongside our teaching at KPAC we also partner with John Leggott College to deliver the single and triple BTEC in dance. This has been an amazing opportunity for the centre, not only from a business point of view but also from a community point of view and to enable us to build our relationships with other local establishments. The location of KPAC is vital to reaching pupils who would not otherwise have the opportunity to experience performing arts on their doorstep. Not only are we the most affordable dance school in the area, we are also the only dance school in the region which offer such a wide variety of classes and performance opportunities. This in itself speaks volumes as to why we feel so passionately about being in this area and reaching the young people that we do. A lot of the members refer to us as their "KPAC Family" a place where they feel safe, included and where they make memories to last a lifetime. The lessons learnt in the studio can be taken with the children no matter what career pathway they choose in life. Teamwork, commitment, drive, ambition, confidence, discipline are just a few of these skills. One of our members who attended Willoughby Road School was scouted by Miss Kim and given a scholarship for KPAC. She has gone on to be 3rd in the world at the Dance World Cup and is currently training with one of the most prestigious performing arts colleges in the country. This is just one success story of many who have attended KPAC. Our social media following has grown to over 2360 proving that there is great interest from the web community to follow and support what we do too. With the plan to develop new housing on the field behind us, I strongly believe that our centre will be an asset to the development rather than a hindrance and give the families in this ever-growing community a chance to experience performing arts. Miss Kim opened the dance school almost 40 years ago and it has gone from strength to strength and grown to almost 320 pupils as well as all the other community groups who use our centre. The business caters for all ages and there are few places I can think of that do such a thing from a creative aspect. The centre creates a space for people to be artistic, expressive, sociable and much more! We want to support children who come as a hobby, to build their confidence and to make friends whilst also pushing the ones who want to pursue performing arts as their career path to be the best they can possibly be. Please consider my objection with the thought that this centre is so much more than just a building with walls and floor where people come to dance. The centre is a community hub for all ages to come together and celebrate successes and achievements of the local youngsters. Where that					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							shy little child thrived and found their self-belief up on the stage and the elderly pensioner rediscovered their passions and made new friends. This centre means so much to so many and I for one would be devastated to see it go, along with the HUNDREDS of families and children who attend. Thank you for your consideration.					
Kim **Gribben** on behalf of Kimberley Performing Arts Centre												
0107	Kim Gribben on behalf of Kimberley Performing Arts Centre	Paragraph 5.32	object	no	no	no	Kimberley Performing Arts Centre have only just been notified that this site is to be allocated for housing. The Centre has a 15 year lease remaining. Therefore on that basis, this proposal is not sound or compliant.		The allocation of our site for housing needs to be removed from the plan, we have at least 15 years lease on this site and want to remain within this locality here after. We have sent a letter in with our objections which will expand on our proposals.	yes	We are integral to our community and do not wish to be moved from our site. The Council have not provided any substantial alternatives.	
0612	Kim Gribben on behalf of Kimberley Performing Arts Centre	POLICY H1P-4: LAND AT FORMER SOUTH LEYS SCHOOL ENDERBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object				To whom it may concern, Kimberley Performing Arts Centre (KPAC) is a community hub, home to various groups and located on the South Leys site. It is important and fundamental to our business that we serve our local residents within the Brumby Ward and we remain accessible and affordable to all. Our Centre is currently home to 319 pupils, a ping pong group, Scunthorpe Camera Club, a football team, a photographer, a seam mistress and Scunthorpe Men in Shed. We firmly believe that every child deserves the opportunity to learn Performing Arts, so our location is key to delivering our aims. There are so many life skills learnt through Performing Arts: confidence, discipline, teamwork, improves physical and mental well-being, developing problem solving skills and enhances creative thinking. Our pupils at our Centre feel safe, happy and think of this as their second home. Some of these pupils would not have had this opportunity if we were not on their doorstep, for example, one pupil has gone onto full time vocational training and achieved 3rd in the Dance World Cup, representing England, whilst another is currently dancing with the Birmingham Royal Ballet, both of whom received a scholarship after being noticed at Willoughby Road Primary School, KPAC totally reshaped their lives. We understand that the site has been allocated for housing, however, would urge you to reconsider this proposal, with a view to reducing the housing allocation on this site, to accommodate a long-term proposal for our Centre. There are already a number of nearby planning applications which have either been allocated or are in abeyance including the Darby glass site PA/2015/0728, Scotter Road PA/2021/1330, Moorwell Road PA/2019/1782, and the South Leys situated behind us, which will allocate 120 dwellings PA/2015/1101, which are within close proximity in order for these to meet the required allocation of future housing needs to secure your targets. With the Lincolnshire Lakes project back on track is it necessary to sacrifice South leys site for yet more housing and relinquish good quality community facilities to support both present and future residents.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Furthermore, having attended the consultation it was disappointing to hear officers inform us that the centre was relocating, which is incorrect, the Council have not managed to find a suitable alternative that meets our requirements. I write this objection and speak on behalf of our vast number of pupils, their immediate families, our adults who attend classes, our Directors and every single group that is currently homed here and their members. We are integral part of our community and want this continue for a long time to come.					
Michael **Griffiths**												
0076	Michael griffiths	POLICY H1P-33: 1.	object	no	no	no	Ref : 09860 (H1P33) I am writing to you to strongly object to the above planning application 09860. I am opposed to this development for the following reasons:- 1. This is Green Belt Land. This land has been farmed for hundreds of years and I have read consistently in the newspapers, and directive from Central Government that protection of the Green Belt land must be paramount. The loss of natural open countryside and views our detrimental to our future generations. There are plenty of Brown field sites more suitable . 2 Lack of Suitable Infrastructure: The roads around Wroot cannot take more traffic. They are single track roads with a weight limit , that have already substantially subsided under the weight of traffic. Construction traffic and an extra 20-30 cars would accelerate, and escalate the problem. Connection to the main sewerage system is non-viable , which means septic tanks or cesspits for another 13-15 houses. Wroot already has a number of property's with septic tanks, and lack of consistent maintenance or ground movement, even the smallest nudge could have a big impact. You, as our local authority is responsible for ensuring a safe and pleasant local environment. Can that many septic tanks be fitted in this space? The electricity supply is very low in the early evening and we suffer voltage fluctuations, power surges and spikes. Subsequently it will be very difficult to support 13-15 more houses until the electrical infrastructure is upgraded. Wroot is in desperate need of upgrading before New housing developments should be considered. 3 Lack of Social Infrastructure: Wroot has, No shop No Bus service No Doctor No dentist No playgroups No nursery	justified	New infrastructure needed all around Wroot due to subsidence Better power supply to many power cuts No drainage	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							No school places- only 10 pupils per year is allowed as a consequence always full. Poor infrastructure is a serious obstacle in the development of communities and must be improved before considering New housing developments. I trust that the above objections will be taken fully into account in determining this application. Your sincerely , Mr M Griffiths and Mrs M Griffiths.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Mr and Mrs **Griffiths**												
0587	Mr and Mrs Griffiths	POLICY H1P-33: LAND AT FIELD LANE	object				I am writing to you to strongly object to the above planning application 09860. I am opposed to this development for the following reasons:- 1. This is Green Belt Land. This land has been farmed for hundreds of years and I have read consistently in the newspapers, and directive from Central Government that protection of the Green Belt land must be paramount. The loss of natural open countryside and views our detrimental to our future generations. There are plenty of Brown field sites more suitable . 2 Lack of Suitable Infrastructure: The roads around Wroot cannot take more traffic. They are single track roads with a weight limit , that have already substantially subsided under the weight of traffic. Construction traffic and an extra 20-30 cars would accelerate, and escalate the problem. Connection to the main sewerage system is non-viable , which means septic tanks or cesspits for another 13-15 houses. Wroot already has a number of property's with septic tanks, and lack of consistent maintenance or ground movement, even the smallest nudge could have a big impact. You, as our local authority is responsible for ensuring a safe and pleasant local environment. Can that many septic tanks be fitted in this space? The electricity supply is very low in the early evening and we suffer voltage fluctuations, power surges and spikes. Subsequently it will be very difficult to support 13-15 more houses until the electrical infrastructure is upgraded. Wroot is in desperate need of upgrading before New housing developments should be considered. 3 Lack of Social Infrastructure: Wroot has, No shop No Bus service No Doctor No dentist No playgroups No nursery No school places- only 10 pupils per year is allowed as a consequence always full. Poor infrastructure is a serious obstacle in the development of communities and must be improved before considering New housing developments. I trust that the above objections will be taken fully into account in determining this application.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Elizabeth **Hackney**												
0271	Elizabeth Hackney	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	object	yes	no	yes	The development limit line applied to the garden of Leaden House DN19 7AX This is not in line and consistent with the adjoining properties both to the west and east. The plan line around Leaden House deviates from the line drawn around the adjacent properties to exclude all the established garden area. Whereas garden area is included in other properties situated on Cherry Lane with an outlook onto agricultural buildings and land. The Policy SS11 paragraph 2d stipulates " Large rear gardens or paddocks stretching well outside of the villages built form will also be excluded" The garden area of Leaden House does not extend well outside the villages built form	justified	The development limit line should extend around the curtilage of the garden at least in line, as it does in the properties to the east and west	yes	I wish to attend a hearing to ensure my objection is fully understood, acknowledged and valued.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Jim **Hackney** on behalf of Barrow upon Humber Parish Council Neighbourhood Planning												
0246	Jim Hackney on behalf of Barrow upon Humber Parish Council Neighbourhood Planning	Paragraph 3	object	yes	no	no	This representation is made by two separate groups. Barrow Parish Council consisting of 12 elected members have consulted, contributed to and have authorised this representation. Barrow upon Humber Neighbourhood plan committee consists of 2 parish councillors and a further 10 active members of the community. The group have formulated this response by face to face meetings. The draft response has been circulated, amended following consultation and contributed to, in the form of this final representation. We wish to place a representation to the local plan for the following reasons. The local plan introduction opening statement is that North lincs,1.0, should be the best place for residents and business. The plan also states at 1.6 that the plan supports the wellbeing of residents, A place that is cleaner, greener and safer. 1.10 explains how the Local plan will set, out a clear vision for housing, economy, community facilities infrastructure. Barrow upon Humber will be identified as a Larger Service Centre in the local plan. The key challenges of the plan are described as Health and Well-being The plan identifies The Spatial Vision and Objectives, identifying 3 key priorities; Key Priority. Grow the economy Key priority. Keeping people safe and well Key priority. Enabling communities to flourish Enabling communities to flourish These priorities should enable communities to be better connected. Strong communities create neighbourhoods where people are proud to live, get on well together and support each other. So people experience improved well being This spatial vison priority creates the opportunity To enable our communities to be more involved in community life and to engage in new conversations about things that matter. The local plan describes the North Lincolnshire Spatial Vision and it states, New housing will be accompanied by a range of services, community facilities and infrastructure and meet the needs of all residents. All developments will be expected to contribute positively to local distinctiveness and quality of life of those living and working as well as the	effective	We challenge the plan on the following basis; This emerging plan is not sound, based on the evidence we have experienced, and requires modification to demonstrate the means by which it will enable communities to achieve the spatial aims identified This plan does not reflect the past performance of supporting communities of North Lincs despite present policy. In terms of housing numbers and allocations for the emerging plan has not looked forward with the emerging plan, to practise what it preaches, has not taken steps or been aware in the past to promote the infrastructure or create a workable plan to develop the neighbourhood of Barrow, despite policy seemingly to aspire to this aim. To be able to support the Barrow community as a Larger service centre to achieve the spatial objectives set out in the emerging plan, the plan needs to state how and to show intention through a mechanism to achieve the aims.	yes	We wish to participate in hearing sessions to make the point really understood that the spatial aims identified in our submission and our issues with the implementation are clearly communicated. We need to be able to emphasise how the lack of implementation has led to inability for our neighbourhoods and communities to flourish and how the plan has failed to contribute positively to the quality of life of those living within it.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							creation of safer places. These are detailed in the local plan as Spatial objectives 2, 4 and 9. The plan also states that it is the role of planning to; Create sustainable communities and better places. These are worthy Aims and Objectives of a local plan. They are fully supported by this representation however, the current Local Development strategy 2006 to 2026 identifies many of these spatial priorities. They are not in as much detail or as focussed on the proposed category of larger service centres as in the proposed document. Residents of Barrow as a Larger Service Centre see a very different reality achieved by the council through the local plan over the past decade of planning and have little confidence of the future situation through this process. The evidence base that these objectives have been acted upon or worked towards is difficult to find. The Barrow upon Humber community has had planning granted on several sites over the last year totalling some approx. 124 homes. Current applications for another 18 and the identified HIP 20 to contribute a further 40 homes in the near future. By studying the approved planning applications, they identify S106 monies to be contributed to; the community through health and wellbeing, enabling communities to flourish (key priorities) and infrastructure, play and sports facilities. Collecting the evidence of the planning applications, referred to above, and the investment in spatial objectives 2,4 and 9 for Barrow upon Humber as a larger service centre this has not occurred. Money from development approvals in Barrow has been allocated to the Major regional centres and Principal market towns, not to the Barrow community where the development is to occur. These centres already have housing allocated to them and surely the contributions to the local infrastructure should be allocated locally. If the emerging local plan includes these housing allocations in the 178 houses for Barrow therefore, the spatial objectives of the emerging plan are relevant to these unbuilt houses yet the proposed developers contributions identified tell a completely different story and are unsound. If this is the evidence base of the past year, where the previous local plan has been out of date and a new plan being developed, North Lincs have shown no commitment to their own Spatial aims for communities in which they designate development to take place. We challenge the plan on the following basis; This emerging plan is not sound, based on the evidence we have experienced, and requires modification to demonstrate the means by which it will enable communities to achieve the spatial aims identified					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							This plan does not reflect the past performance of supporting communities of North Lincs despite present policy. In terms of housing numbers and allocations for the emerging plan has not looked forward with the emerging plan, to practise what it preaches, has not taken steps or been aware in the past to promote the infrastructure or create a workable plan to develop the neighbourhood of Barrow, despite policy seemingly to aspire to this aim. To be able to support the Barrow community as a Larger service centre to achieve the spatial objectives set out in the emerging plan, the plan needs to state how and to show intention through a mechanism to achieve the aims.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0256	Jim Hackney on behalf of Barrow upon Humber Parish Council Neighbourhood Planning	POLICY SS11: 1.	object	no	no	yes	This representation is made through the Barrow Neighbourhood plan group. It consists of 2 parish councillors and 10 active members. These issues were discussed at a face to face recent Local plan meeting This policy SS11has sections 1. 2. a,b,c,d. We have attached a plan of the 06 Barrow upon Humber map which has the areas where we consider the plan does not follow the policy can be identified. Area1. applying SS11 2,a This area does not comply. it is an area of undeveloped land and a post industrial area. it should not be included in the development limits. Area2. applying SS11 2,a This area is not separated, sporadic or dispersed from the main settlement. It clearly adjoins the proposed development limit amendments made following the granting of nine houses to the east HIC35 (previously outside the development limit). Area3. applying SS11 2,a This area is not separated, sporadic or dispersed from the main settlement. It clearly adjoins the proposed development limit following the permission granted HIC 34 for 75 homes directly opposite and the proposed designation of HIP20 for a further 40 homes. We feel the development limits plan for barrow has not been prepared with due reference to the policy. I have emailed the plan and referenced it this representation number	positively prepared	The SS11 plan 06 Barrow should be amended to reflect the policy and in particular paragraph 2a. This should be done with reference to the plan submitted with this application.	yes	We wish to put forward our case in person to ensure our viewpoints are heard and valued	View PDF
John **Hancock**												
0622	John Hancock	POLICY H1P-4: LAND AT FORMER SOUTH LEYS SCHOOL ENDERBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object				To Whom It May Concern. Please accept this notice as a formal objection to the above. Any proposal that would jeopardize the continued use of the old school premises used by Kimberley Performing Arts Centre would be a terrible outcome. This building provides a self funding facilities to so many pupils of all ages (300 plus) It is considered to be outstanding to all who enjoy the building's wonderful facilities. It is open to all in the community with the staff and many volunteers supporting pupils thro their formative years. It is home to many other clubs including : camera club: jazz club; Men In Sheds; Pensioners bingo: and many events enjoyed by the local communities. Many Thanks					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Joanne **Harding** on behalf of Home Builders Federation												
0431	Joanne Harding on behalf of Home Builders Federation	General			No		NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN: PUBLICATION PLAN 1. Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation (HBF) on the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Plan. 2. The HBF is the principal representative body of the house-building industry in England and Wales. Our representations reflect the views of our membership, which includes multi-national PLC's, regional developers and small, local builders. In any one year, our members account for over 80% of all new "for sale" market housing built in England and Wales as well as a large proportion of newly built affordable housing. Future Engagement 39. I trust that the Council will find these comments useful as it continues to progress its Local Plan. I would be happy to discuss these issues in greater detail or assist in facilitating discussions with the wider house building industry. 40. The HBF would like to be kept informed of all forthcoming consultations upon the Local Plan and associated documents. Please use the contact details provided below for future correspondence.					View PDF
0553	Joanne Harding on behalf of Home Builders Federation	POLICY DQE7: CLIMATE CHANGE & LOW CARBON LIVING			No		Policy DQE7: Climate Change and Low Carbon Living Policy DQE7 is not considered to be sound as it is not positively prepared, justified or consistent with national policy for the following reasons: 31. This policy looks for all development proposals to meet the Building Regulations optional higher water efficiency standard of 110 litre per person per day. 32. Under Building Regulations, all new dwellings must achieve a mandatory level of water efficiency of 125 litres per day per person, which is a higher standard than that achieved by much of the existing housing stock. This mandatory standard represents an effective demand management measure. If the Council wish to adopt the optional standard for water efficiency of 110 litres per person per day then the Council should justify doing so by applying the criteria set out in the PPG. The PPG states that where there is a clear local need, LPA can set out Local Plan Policies requiring new dwellings to meet tighter Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 litres per person per day. The PPG also states it will be for a LPA to establish a clear need based on existing sources of evidence, consultations with the local water and sewerage company, the Environment Agency and catchment partnerships and consideration of the impact on viability and housing supply of such a requirement. 33. A clear local need has not been demonstrated. It is noted that Anglian Water has plans for a pipeline to address a water shortage in the East of England, the pipeline will move water from wetter areas such as North Lincolnshire to drier areas. 34. The DCLG Housing Standards Review Cost Impact, September 2014 by EC Harris identified an extra-over cost of £10 per unit for optional water					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							efficiency standard. However, this figure is now somewhat dated and should be increased to reflect 2021 prices. The extra-over cost of the optional water efficiency standard may be considered de minims, but all costs should be included in the Council's viability assessment so that the cumulative impact of compliance with all policy requirements set out in the Local Plan is tested. 35. This policy also requires that major residential developments meet at least 10% of their energy needs from renewable and / or other low carbon energy sources. 36. The HBF considers a national and standardised approach to improving such issues as the energy efficiency of buildings and the provision of renewable energy to be the most effective approach that balances improvements with continued delivery of housing and infrastructure.					
0583	Joanne Harding on behalf of Home Builders Federation	Policy H1: Site Allocations			No		Policy H1: Site Allocations Policy H1 is not considered to be sound as it is not positively prepared, justified or consistent with national policy for the following reasons: 11. This policy identifies the housing allocations, these include 2,189 on Committed Sites and 5,301 on Proposed Sites. The HBF does not wish to comment upon the acceptability or otherwise of individual sites. It is, however, important that all the sites contained within the plan are deliverable over the plan period and planned to an appropriate strategy. The Council's assumptions on sites in relation to delivery and capacity should be realistic based on evidence supported by the parties responsible for housing delivery and sense checked by the Council based on local knowledge and historical empirical data. 12. The Local Plan should ensure that suitable sites are available for a wide range of types of development across a wide choice of appropriate locations. NPPF is clear that the Council need to assess and reflect in their planning policies the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community. The HBF consider that a diversified portfolio of housing sites offers the widest possible range of products to households to access different types of dwellings to meet their housing needs. Housing delivery can be maximised where a wide mix of sites provides choice for consumers, allows places to grow in sustainable ways and creates opportunities to diversify the construction sector. 13. The Plan should ensure the availability of a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land to deliver the Council's housing requirement. This sufficiency of housing land supply (HLS) should meet the housing requirement, ensure the maintenance of a 5 Year Housing Land Supply (YHLS), and achieve Housing Delivery Test (HDT) performance measurements. The HBF also strongly recommends that the plan allocates more sites than required to meet the housing requirement as a buffer. This buffer should be sufficient to deal with any under-delivery which is likely to occur from some sites. Such an approach would be consistent with the NPPF requirements for the plan to be positively prepared and flexible.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0626	Joanne Harding on behalf of Home Builders Federation	Policy H2: Housing Mix and Density			No		Policy H2: Housing Mix and Density Policy H2 is not considered to be sound as it is not positively prepared, justified or consistent with national policy for the following reasons: 14. This policy looks for new housing to deliver a mix of house types, tenures and sizes to create a mixed and balanced community, it states the mix should take account of the market conditions, the housing need and economic viability and the site specific circumstances.15. The HBF supports an appropriate mix of housing, but it is important that any policy is workable and ensures that housing delivery will not be compromised or stalled due to: overly prescriptive requirements; requiring a mix that does not consider the scale of the site; or the need to provide additional evidence. The HBF is concerned how this policy will apply, for example how will small schemes deliver a mix of house types, tenures and size to balance the current housing offer. Whilst the HBF acknowledges the list of elements that the mix should take into consideration it is considered that it should not be a closed list and should allow for further information or evidence to be considered. The HBF also recommends that the Council acknowledge that what is considered an appropriate mix can vary both geographically and over the plan period. 16. The policy also states that new housing development should make effective use of land and be built at a density appropriate to the character, location and setting of the area, it goes on to set density ranges from 45-70dwellings per hectare (dph) in Scunthorpe town centre to 20-30dph in rural hamlets and villages. 17. The flexibility provided by this policy in relation to certain exceptions is noted, this will allow developers to react to some site-specific issues. However, further amendments could be made to create greater flexibility to allow developers to take account of the evidence in relation to market aspirations and demands. The Council will also need to consider its approach to density in relation to other policies in the plan and those set nationally, policies in relation to open space provision, housing design and space standards, SuDs, biodiversity, future homes standard, trees and parking provision can all impact upon the density which can delivered upon site.					View PDF
0631	Joanne Harding on behalf of Home Builders Federation	Policy H3: Affordable Housing			No		Policy H3: Affordable Housing Policy H3 is not considered to be sound as it is not justified or consistent with national policy for the following reasons: 18. This policy states that new housing development of 10 or more dwellings must make provision for 10% affordable housing provision. The policy states that the exact tenure mix should be determine following discussions with the LPA and that as an initial basis for discussion 25% of all affordable housing should be First Homes, after which priority will be for the delivery of affordable rent. However, the policy also states that this will be subject to satisfying national policy requirements for 10% of all housing being for affordable home ownership. 19. The HBF considers this policy is not entirely clear. The NPPF states that where major development involving the provision of housing is					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the total number of homes to be available for affordable home ownership. This suggests that all of the homes provided by the policy should be for affordable home ownership unless the Council has evidence to demonstrate why that is not appropriate. This 10% affordable home ownership would also include the provision of First Homes which are considered to be a form of affordable home ownership. 20. The HBF supports the need to address the affordable housing requirements of the borough. However, the NPPF is clear that the levels and types of affordable housing provision set out within policies should not undermine the deliverability of the plan. The Council should be mindful of the impact of an overly aspirational policy requirement or combination of policies that is set too high as this will jeopardise future housing delivery. The Local Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment (October 2021) highlights that at 10% affordable housing greenfield development in low and medium areas would be viable at a S106 contribution levels up to £5,000 per dwelling, however, brownfield development would have viability issues with any S106 contribution tested in the low value areas.					
0635	Joanne Harding on behalf of Home Builders Federation	Policy H5: Housing for Older People			No		Policy H5: Housing for Older People Policy H5 is not considered to be sound as it is not justified or consistent with national policy for the following reasons: 21. Part 2 of this policy states that all new specialist homes designed for older people shall be built to M4(2) and M4(3) of the Building Regulations as a minimum. The HBF considers that the clarity of this policy requires improvement, it is not clear if part 2 of the policy is requiring all homes to meet M4(2) or M4(3a) or M4(3b) standards, or whether it is suggesting all homes should meet M4(2) and M4(3a) or M4(3b) standards as it currently states. Paragraph 5.197 suggests that the policy should state M4(2) OR M4(3). There are significant differences in the costs of provision of these different standards, and this lack of clarity could have significant implications for the viability of these developments. 22. Part 3a of this policy states that on large strategic sites developers will be required to deliver specific provision to meet older people's needs including bungalows, level access flats and supported homes. Part 3b of this policy also requires large strategic sites to deliver specific provision to meet older people's needs including bungalows. This appears to be unnecessary repetition and should be deleted. Part 4 then sets out allocations where a number of dwellings for older people will be required. 23. The policy does not define what is considered to be a large strategic site, and it is not clear if the policy is expected to apply to more sites than those currently listed in part 4. The policy also does not provide clarity of what level of specific provision may be expected from the large strategic sites. This policy lacks the level of detail required for a developer to consider the potential implications it may have on the viability of their development. 24. The PPG identifies the type of evidence required to introduce a policy requiring the M4 standards, including the likely future need; the size,					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							location, type and quality of dwellings needed; the accessibility and adaptability of the existing stock; how the needs vary across different housing tenures; and the overall viability. The HBF does not consider that the Council have provided sufficient evidence for this policy to be considered justified or consistent with national policy. The HBF also does not consider that the Council has produced sufficient evidence to justify the requirement for developers to provide bungalows, level access flats or supported homes within large strategic sites.					
0636	Joanne Harding on behalf of Home Builders Federation	POLICY H9: SELF-BUILD AND CUSTOM BUILD			No		Policy H9: Self-Build and Custom-Build Policy H9 is not considered to be sound as it is not justified or consistent with national policy for the following reasons: 25. This policy looks for residential development for 10 or more homes to consider making appropriate provision for plots as self-build or custom-build wherever viable and achievable, based on the number of entries on the self-build register. Paragraph 5.210 suggests that to date there are 23 entries on the local register for those who want to build their own homes. 26. The HBF does not consider that Policy H9 is appropriate, justified or consistent with national policy. The HBF is not opposed to the idea of increasing the self-build and custom build sector for its potential contribution to the overall housing supply. In fact, some of our members will be able to assist the custom build sector either through the physical building of dwellings on behalf of the homeowner or through the provision of plots for sale to custom builders. However, the HBF has concerns in relation to this policy approach which only changes the house building delivery mechanism from one form of house building company to another without any consequential additional contribution to boosting housing supply and with limited detail as to how and when developers will be encouraged to make these plots available and at what level. 27. Under the Self Build & Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 and 2021 NPPF , it is the Council's responsibility, not the landowner's or developer's, to ensure that sufficient permissions are given to meet demand. The Council is not empowered to restrict the use of land to deliver self & custom build housing. The PPG sets out ways in which the Council should consider supporting self & custom build by "engaging" with developers and landowners and "encouraging" them to consider self & custom build "where they are interested" . 28. The Council should ensure that the Local Plan will result in a wide range of different self & custom build housing opportunities. It is unlikely that self & custom build serviced plots on larger residential sites will appeal to those wishing to build their own home. The HBF considers that the provision of a certain percentage self-build plots on schemes above a certain size adds to the complexity and logistics of development and may lead to the slower delivery of homes. The provision of self-build plots on new housing developments cannot be co-ordinated with the development of the wider site. At any one time, there are often multiple contractors and large machinery operating on-site, from both a practical and health & safety perspective, it is difficult to envisage the development of single plots by individuals operating alongside this construction activity.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Furthermore, any differential between the lead-in times / build out rates of self-build plots and the development of the wider site will result in construction work outside of specified working hours, building materials stored outside of designated compound areas, etc and unfinished plots next to completed / occupied dwellings causing customer dissatisfaction. 29. Where plots are not sold, these plots should not be left empty to the detriment of neighbouring properties or the whole development. The timescale for reversion of these plots to the original developer should be as short as possible because consequential delay presents further practical difficulties in terms of co-ordinating their development with construction activity on the wider site. There are even greater logistical problems created if the original developer has completed the development and is forced to return to site to build out plots, which have not been sold to self-builders. 30. As well as on-site practicalities, any impacts on viability should be tested and additional costs should be fully accounted for in the Council's viability assessment. The inclusion of self-build plots will have a fundamental bearing on the development economics of the scheme. Site externals, site overheads, and enabling infrastructure costs are fixed and borne by the site developer. The developer will also have borne up front site promotion costs, including planning and acquisition costs. It is unlikely that these costs will be recouped because the plot price a self-builder is able to pay is constrained by much higher build costs for self-build. Profit obtainable if the house was built and sold on the open market by the site developer is foregone.					
0663	Joanne Harding on behalf of Home Builders Federation	Policy SS2: Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire			No		Policy SS2: Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire Policy SS2 is not considered to be sound as it is not positively prepared, justified or consistent with national policy for the following reasons: 3. This policy states that the strategy will deliver at least 7,128 new homes (396 dwellings per annum (dpa)) to meet the needs of the existing and future population in sustainable and balanced communities. It also sets out the settlement hierarchy, with Scunthorpe and Bottesford identified as major sub-regional centres, Barton upon Humber and Brigg as Principal Towns. 4. The proposed housing requirement is a significant decrease from the housing requirement of 12,063 new dwellings between 2010 and 2026 (754 new dwellings per year) set out in the adopted 2011 Core Strategy. Although it is marginally above the local housing need identified by the standard method. 5. The HBF generally supports the Council in using the standard method as the starting point to assess the housing need for the area. However, the HBF considers that the housing need is likely to be higher than the housing requirement currently identified. The PPG sets out that there may be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether the actual housing need is higher than the standard method indicates. These include growth strategies for the area, strategic infrastructure improvements, meeting an unmet need from neighbouring authorities and where previous levels of delivery or previous assessments of need are					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							significantly greater than the outcome of the standard method. The HBF recommends that the Council investigate these circumstances and consider if a further increase in the proposed housing requirement is required. 6. The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment 2020 identifies the minimum annual local housing need figure for North Lincolnshire as 396dpa, based on the standard method. It also identifies a net annual affordable housing need of 115dpa, and a scenario jobs forecast of 8,531 between 2020 and 2038.					
0671	Joanne Harding on behalf of Home Builders Federation	Policy SS3: Development Principles			No		Policy SS3: Development Principles Policy SS3 is not considered to be sound as it is not justified or consistent with national policy for the following reasons: 7. This policy seeks to promote and encourage the effective use of previously developed (brownfield) land (providing it's not of high environmental value), whilst demonstrating the efficient use of land and resources by ensuring development is built at appropriate densities. Whilst the HBF considers that the re-use of previously developed land is generally a positive way to contribute to sustainability, it should not limit the development of other sustainable sites or compromise the delivery of housing to meet local needs.					View PDF
0680	Joanne Harding on behalf of Home Builders Federation	Policy SS5: Overall Housing Provision			No		Policy SS5: Overall Housing Provision Policy SS5 is not considered to be sound as it is not positively prepared, justified or consistent with national policy for the following reasons: 8. This policy sets out the housing requirement of 7,128 new dwellings, and states that around 2,379 dwellings are on sites that already have planning permission or are under construction. As set out previously, the HBF considers that the housing requirement should be further investigated to ensure that it is sufficient to meet the local housing need. 9. The policy also states that a rolling five-year supply of deliverable housing sites will be maintained. The HBF generally supports the Council in seeking to maintain a rolling five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. The HBF considers that providing additional allocations to provide flexibility in supply is appropriate, however, an additional 198 homes is only a very small level of flexibility and the HBF considers that the Council should seek to provide further flexibility in the supply. The HBF does not consider that the housing provision is sufficient to support the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of homes.					View PDF
0717	Joanne Harding on behalf of Home Builders Federation	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES			No		Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites Policy SS6 is not considered to be sound as it is not positively prepared, justified or consistent with national policy for the following reasons: 10. This policy sets out the distribution of housing growth and the number of dwellings expected to be delivered in each settlement. The HBF considers that it is important that the spatial distribution of sites follows a logical hierarchy, provides an appropriate development pattern and supports sustainable development within all market areas. The NPPF sets					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							out how important it is that a sufficient amount and variety of land comes forward where it is needed and to meet the needs of groups with specific housing requirements.					
0730	Joanne Harding on behalf of Home Builders Federation	Policy T4: Parking			No		Policy T4: Parking Policy T4 is not considered to be sound as it is not positively prepared, justified or consistent with national policy for the following reasons: 37. This policy states that for residential developments dwellings with secure parking should provide 1 electric vehicle charging point per dwelling and for dwellings with private allocated off curtilage parking 1 electric vehicle charging point should be provided per 10 parking spaces. 38. The Council will be aware that the Government has consulted on Electric Vehicle Charging in Residential and Non-Residential Buildings . This consultation set out the Government's preferred option to introduce a new functional requirement under Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. The inclusion of Electric Vehicle Charging Point (EVCP) requirements within the Building Regulations 2010 will introduce a standardised consistent approach to EVCP in new buildings across the country. It is proposed that charging points must be at least Mode 3 or equivalent with a minimum power rating output of 7kW (expected increases in battery sizes and technology developments may make charge points less than 7 kW obsolete for future car models, 7 kW is considered a sufficiently future-proofed standard for home charging) fitted with a universal socket to charge all types of electric vehicle currently on the market and meet relevant safety requirements. All charge points installed under the Building Regulations should be un-tethered and the location must comply with the Equality Act 2010 and the accessibility requirements set out in the Building Regulations Part M. The Government has estimated installation of such charging points add on an additional cost of approximately £976. The government had planned to implement Approved Document Part S in relation to EV Charging Points in Spring 2021 this was delayed, but is now expected December 2021 according to DULHC. The HBF therefore considers that this policy is unnecessary.					View PDF
Sally **Hare**												
0347	Sally Hare	Paragraph 8.1	support	yes	yes	yes	It is vital that we maintain and encourage the historical landscape of North Lincolnshire with vibrant market towns and scattered settlements. This is crucial in ensuring first class farming lands to provide for the nation as a whole. It is also important for the well being of the residents and provides the charming back drop that brings tourism to the area.	Consistent with national policy		no		
0349	Sally Hare	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	support	yes	yes	yes	I support the local plan - INSET 45 WOOTTON in particularly Policy RD1, Supporting Sustainable Development in the Countryside. Low growth, smaller rural settlements should remain as such. They are part of the intrinsic character of North Lincolnshire. Excessive development in these areas is not sustainable and contrary to climatic issues that need to be addressed both now and in the future. Wootton is in an area that supports grade 1 agricultural land, which is vital and rare in these parts. It should be protected and used as such for	Consistent with national policy		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							cropping and also be noted for it's important (vital) role in the health and well being in the rural way of life [Wootton is not supported by public footpaths and is a village mostly built around field edges (an historic feature of small Lincolnshire villages), as such the fields become an intrinsic part and value of the community.] All developments should be small sites only - in a scale that is sustainable within the development, they should enhance the character of the settlement (nothing "out of place") and within the defined settlement boundaries.					
Dave **Harford** on behalf of West Stockwith Parish Council												
0425	Dave Harford on behalf of West Stockwith Parish Council	General	Support				Dear Sir or Madam Following a recent meeting, I have been authorised by West Stockwith Parish Council to state that they have no major comments to make on this consultation.					View PDF
Jennifer **Harrison**												
0394	Jennifer Harrison	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0460	Jennifer Harrison	Paragraph 14.47	object				The current text of item 14.47 offers an NLC opinion that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion and I request this is revised to: “To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton-upon-Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended. This should commence at the A1077/Falkland way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Rd route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGVs through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation”					View PDF
0500	Jennifer Harrison	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				Section 9.4.8 (Item F) refers to Deepdale as an area of high landscape value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern gateway shouldn’t be included or added as item G,					View PDF
0692	Jennifer Harrison	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF	object				I have recently reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (regulation 19) document and would like to make the following comments in relation to					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
		HOUSING SITES					Barton-Upon-Humber: 1) I object to Banks property pursuing a developer led outline Planning application for up to 400 homes on Greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15.Reasons include that it is outside the development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					
Roger **Harrison**												
0393	Roger Harrison	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0461	Roger Harrison	Paragraph 14.47	object				The current text of item 14.47 offers an NLC opinion that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion and I request this is revised to: “To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton-upon-Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended. This should commence at the A1077/Falkland way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Rd route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGVs through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation”					View PDF
0501	Roger Harrison	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				Section 9.4.8 (Item F) refers to Deepdale as an area of high landscape value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern gateway shouldn’t be included or added as item G,					View PDF
0576	Roger Harrison	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object				I have recently reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (regulation 19) document and would like to make the following comments in relation to Barton-Upon-Humber: 1) I object to Banks property pursuing a developer led outline Planning application for up to 400 homes on Greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15.Reasons include that it is outside the development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Maxine **Harvey**												
0620	Maxine Harvey	POLICY H1P-4: LAND AT FORMER SOUTH LEYS SCHOOL ENDERBY ROADPHASE 1	Object				Ref Policy H1P-4 Land at the former south leys school at Enderby Road Phase 1 I cannot object strongly enough to this proposal as it includes the Kimberley Performing Arts Centre.You would be destroying something that over the years has developed into the most amazing centre open for all. Its' location makes it extra special. All children and young people are made welcome especially from the immediate area. These youngsters only have access to these facilities as they are there, on their doorstep. By bulldozing over KPAC, you will bulldoze over many, many children for whom this centre has become a major part of their lives.It is not just a performing arts centre either. Events are held through the year for the whole community, workshops for children through the summer holidays, bingo for the elderly. There is a photographers' studio, a camera club, football club, men with sheds! All clubs open to all and all there for the community. My children began their KPAC story as 2 year olds. We were lucky. We could drive to the centre and afford the lessons. But over the years, we have watched youngsters who didn't have this luxury and to see them thrive, dance, have fun with their friends and for those few hours feel safe with their 'alternative' family has been wonderful. Please think carefully before you destroy something so incredibly valuable to this community					View PDF
Anna **Hearfield**												
0519	Anna Hearfield	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0880	Anna Hearfield	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				Having reviewed the document I would like to make the following comments/complaints with regards to Barton on Humber, I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I strongly object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. My reasons are that this is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage and also cause an insidious erosion of the quality of life of Barton residents. Leisure facilities in the town which have recently been built i.e. swimming pool and library were developed in line to service the population of Barton and immediate surrounding village. Demand on the local Health care facilities, doctors and dentists is already saturated. I also remember the prime minister speaking at his recent Party conference stating he was against building on green belt land.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0881	Anna Hearfield	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Callum **Hearfield**												
0466	Callum Hearfield	Paragraph 14.47	object				The current text of item 14.47 offers an NLC opinion that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion and I request this is revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton-upon-Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended. This should commence at the A1077/Falkland way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Rd route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGVs through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation"					View PDF
0506	Callum Hearfield	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				Section 9.4.8 (Item F) refers to Deepdale as an area of high landscape value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern gateway shouldn't be included or added as item G, particularly as I believe this area is still under application for being considered an area of outstanding natural beauty					View PDF
0697	Callum Hearfield	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have recently reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (regulation 19) document and would like to make the following comments in relation to Barton-Upon-Humber: 1) I object to Banks property pursuing a developer led outline Planning application for up to 400 homes on Greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. I believe this is a shocking get rich quick pyramid scheme, whereby Banks offer the landowner to turn greenbelt land in to gold, who then sell it on to one of the top 10 housebuilding national companies to further profit, the suggested proposal is outside of the current development line, it will cause unwarranted ecological damage and is unnecessary given NLC have a structured plan in place to meet housing targets based on demand profile.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Tori **Heaton** on behalf of DDM Agriculture												
0817	Tori Heaton on behalf of DDM Agriculture	Policies Map.					NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN – PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 2021 LAND OFF DARBY ROAD, BURTON-UPON-STATHER (H1P-26P) We write on behalf of the owner of the land identified as site H1P-26P within Stage 3: Preferred Options of the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan, previously proposed to be allocated as a housing site at Burton upon Stather. This site has been removed from the emerging plan and as a result, Stage 4 includes no housing site allocations in Burton-upon-Stather. The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper states that the proposal for 63 homes generated a significant amount of public objections and as such, no housing proposals have been made in the settlement. This letter objects to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and de-allocation of the above site. We confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the re-allocation of site H1P-26P. The Publication Draft Plan is not sound in relation to this site and we object to the following policies:- · Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites; · Policy H1: Site Allocations; · Policy SS11: Development Limits; · Policy SS2: Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire; and · Policies Map. In relation to the soundness of the Publication Draft Plan, it is:_ · not positively prepared; · not justified; · not effective; and · not consistent with national policy. Reasons for Objection:- The removal of site H1P-26P is not justified without sufficient information available for a transparent and fair reasoning for de-allocation. As such, we request copies of the studies undertaken to substantiate the objectivity of the public's concerns and the subsequent de-allocation. Once these are available, we intend to review them to determine whether there are any mitigation measures that can be implemented to make the development acceptable. We also intend to provide further studies to show that the site is deliverable, including details in relation to SUDS, drainage, ecology and heritage & archaeology. Policy SS2, Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire, details Burton-upon-Stater as a Larger Rural Settlement in the settlement hierarchy, however, policy SS6 fails to allocate Burton-upon-Stater a housing growth percentage or total dwelling capacity number. It is therefore contended that the Plan is inconsistent and not effective. At the preferred options stage, Burton-upon-Stather was allocated a					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							0.75% housing growth, equating to 63 dwellings. However, in the draft Local Plan, policy SS6 fails to allocate Burton-upon-Stather a housing growth percentage or total dwelling capacity number. It is argued that Burton-upon-Stather has capacity for growth and is a sustainable settlement, however, there are limited infill opportunities for development, so without any allocation, Policy SS6 is not effective. We are in the process of preparing a sequential test detailing the limited infill opportunities in the settlement of Burton-upon-Stather. In accordance with policy SS2 and SS6, it is argued that Burton-upon-Stater should be afforded an appropriately sized allocation. It is noted that The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper states that concerns were raised regarding development of site H1P-26P but no evidence to substantiate the objectivity of the public's claims has been published. Therefore, it is not possible to deduce if these are justified or well-founded concerns. It is therefore argued that the removal of this allocation is not justified. Furthermore, the NPPF states that the preparation of policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. As such, removal of this site from the draft Plan is not consistent with policy and the allocation should be reinstated, especially given the site has previously been deemed acceptable. The site was assessed in September 2019's Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) under reference 7JNXA. This assessment concluded that the site may be suitable for residential development if all the site constraints could be addressed. Site H1P-26P was included in the preferred options. Since this time, no further communication has been had with North Lincolnshire Council, prior to the Publication Draft Plan which indicated that this allocation was proposed to be removed from the Plan. It is held that the Plan has not been positively prepared in this respect and there is no justification backed up by any evidence, for the removal of this previously allocated site. The allocation should not correctly be removed simply due to local public opposition. We object to Policy SS11: Development Limits, on the basis that it does not include site H1P-26P as included in the Preferred Options Stage Plan. The approach taken to the development limits of Burton upon-Stather is overly restrictive. Burton-upon–Stather is a sustainable settlement and should be a focus for some growth in appropriately allocated sites. Burton-upon-Stather has capacity for growth and is a sustainable settlement, however, there are only very limited infill opportunities for development and as such Burton-upon-Stather should be afforded an appropriately-sized allocation. The land to the south Darby Road is a logical extension to the existing settlement, it is available and deliverable and policy SS11 should be amended to recognise this. We object to Policy H1: Site Allocations as it does not include the site previously allocated in the Preferred Options Stage Plan under references H1P-26. The land to the south of Darby Road should not be removed from the Publication Draft Plan and should remain as an allocation. Furthermore, we object to the policies map. Site H1P-26P is a logical extension to the existing settlement. The site is available and deliverable					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							over the plan period. The Policies Map should be amended to facilitate this. In summary, the plan has not been positively prepared in this respect and there is no justification, backed up by evidence, for the removal of this previously allocated site. The Landowner is committed to delivery of a successful development of site H1P-26P and therefore, we trust that you will consider this letter of objection and the request for reinstatement of an allocation for the site.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0819	Tori Heaton on behalf of DDM Agriculture	Policies Map.					We write on behalf of the owner of the land identified as site EC1-2 within Stage 4: Publication Draft (Regulation 19) of the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan, proposed to be allocated as an employment site at Scunthorpe. We support the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and allocation of the above site. We can confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the allocation of this site. We confirm we are supportive of policies:- Policy SS8: Employment Land Requirements; Policy EC1: Employment land supply, specifically allocation EC1-2: Land at north of Doncaster Road; Policy SS11: Development limits; and Policies Map. The Plan is sound as the above polices have been:- - positively prepared; - justified; - effective; and - consistent with national policy. The Plan has been positively prepared, as allocation of EC1-2 is the appropriate strategy when considered against the alternative sites in the town. The Plan is justified, as allocation of this land has been positively supported by the local community as evidenced by the public consultation events. The Plan is effective as site EC1-2 is deliverable over the plan period. The site has had significant interest from developers. The site is currently being actively marketed with the aim of signing a developer to assist in delivering the site. The site has no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery and it has previously been assessed in the SHLAA (Reference ELR35) as having no constraints. The Plan is consistent with national policy, as allocation of EC1-2 will enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF. Our client is committed to delivery of a successful development of the current allocation. We will be pleased to provide any further information required, upon request.					
0824	Tori Heaton on behalf of DDM Agriculture	POLICY EC1: EMPLOYMENT LAND SUPPLY					We write on behalf of the owner of the land identified as site EC1-2 within Stage 4: Publication Draft (Regulation 19) of the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan, proposed to be allocated as an employment site at Scunthorpe. We support the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and allocation of the above site. We can confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the allocation of this site.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							We confirm we are supportive of policies:- Policy SS8: Employment Land Requirements; Policy EC1: Employment land supply, specifically allocation EC1-2: Land at north of Doncaster Road; Policy SS11: Development limits; and Policies Map. The Plan is sound as the above polices have been:- - positively prepared; - justified; - effective; and - consistent with national policy. The Plan has been positively prepared, as allocation of EC1-2 is the appropriate strategy when considered against the alternative sites in the town. The Plan is justified, as allocation of this land has been positively supported by the local community as evidenced by the public consultation events. The Plan is effective as site EC1-2 is deliverable over the plan period. The site has had significant interest from developers. The site is currently being actively marketed with the aim of signing a developer to assist in delivering the site. The site has no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery and it has previously been assessed in the SHLAA (Reference ELR35) as having no constraints. The Plan is consistent with national policy, as allocation of EC1-2 will enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF. Our client is committed to delivery of a successful development of the current allocation. We will be pleased to provide any further information required, upon request.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0826	Tori Heaton on behalf of DDM Agriculture	POLICY EC1-2: LAND AT NORTH OF DONCASTER ROAD	Support				We write on behalf of the owner of the land identified as site EC1-2 within Stage 4: Publication Draft (Regulation 19) of the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan, proposed to be allocated as an employment site at Scunthorpe. We support the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and allocation of the above site. We can confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the allocation of this site. We confirm we are supportive of policies:- Policy SS8: Employment Land Requirements; Policy EC1: Employment land supply, specifically allocation EC1-2: Land at north of Doncaster Road; Policy SS11: Development limits; and Policies Map. The Plan is sound as the above polices have been:- - positively prepared; - justified; - effective; and - consistent with national policy. The Plan has been positively prepared, as allocation of EC1-2 is the appropriate strategy when considered against the alternative sites in the town. The Plan is justified, as allocation of this land has been positively supported by the local community as evidenced by the public consultation events. The Plan is effective as site EC1-2 is deliverable over the plan period. The site has had significant interest from developers. The site is currently being actively marketed with the aim of signing a developer to assist in delivering the site. The site has no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery and it has previously been assessed in the SHLAA (Reference ELR35) as having no constraints. The Plan is consistent with national policy, as allocation of EC1-2 will enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF. Our client is committed to delivery of a successful development of the current allocation. We will be pleased to provide any further information required, upon request.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0560	Tori Heaton on behalf of DDM Agriculture	POLICY EC1-6: LAND AT NORTH WEST OF THE A15 BARTON INTERCHANGE					NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN – PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 2021 LAND TO THE NORTH WEST OF THE A15 BARTON INTERCHANGE (EC1-6) We write on behalf of the owner of the land identified as site EC1-6 within Stage 4: Publication Draft (Regulation 19) of the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan, proposed to be allocated as an employment site at Barton-upon-Humber. This letter supports the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and allocation of the above site. We can confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the allocation of this site. We confirm we are supportive of policies:- · Policy SS8: Employment Land Requirements; · Policy EC1: Employment land supply, specifically allocation EC1-6. Land to the north west of the A15 Barton Interchange;· Policy SS11: Development limits; and Policies Map. The Plan is sound as the above polices have been:-positively prepared; The Plan has been positively prepared as allocation of EC1-6 is the appropriate strategy when considered against the alternative sites in the town. The Plan is justified, as allocation of this land has been positively supported by the local community as evidenced by the public consultation events. The Plan is effective as site EC1-6 is deliverable over the plan period. The site has had significant interest from several developers and is available to be marketed. The site has no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery and it has previously been assessed in the SHLAA (Reference ELR36) as having no constraints. The Plan is consistent with national policy as allocation of EC1-6 will enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF. Our client is committed to delivery of a successful development of the current allocation. We will be pleased to provide any further information required, upon request - justified; - effective; and - consistent with national policy.			Yes	This letter supports the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and allocation of the above site. We can confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the allocation of this site.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0837	Tori Heaton on behalf of DDM Agriculture	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS					NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN – PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 2021 LAND OFF DARBY ROAD, BURTON-UPON-STATHER (H1P-26P) We write on behalf of the owner of the land identified as site H1P-26P within Stage 3: Preferred Options of the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan, previously proposed to be allocated as a housing site at Burton upon Stather. This site has been removed from the emerging plan and as a result, Stage 4 includes no housing site allocations in Burton-upon-Stather. The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper states that the proposal for 63 homes generated a significant amount of public objections and as such, no housing proposals have been made in the settlement. This letter objects to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and de-allocation of the above site. We confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the re-allocation of site H1P-26P. The Publication Draft Plan is not sound in relation to this site and we object to the following policies:- Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites; Policy H1: Site Allocations; Policy SS11: Development Limits; Policy SS2: Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire; and Policies Map. In relation to the soundness of the Publication Draft Plan, it is:_ not positively prepared; not justified; not effective; and not consistent with national policy. Reasons for Objection:- The removal of site H1P-26P is not justified without sufficient information available for a transparent and fair reasoning for de-allocation. As such, we request copies of the studies undertaken to substantiate the objectivity of the public's concerns and the subsequent de-allocation. Once these are available, we intend to review them to determine whether there are any mitigation measures that can be implemented to make the development acceptable. We also intend to provide further studies to show that the site is deliverable, including details in relation to SUDS, drainage, ecology and heritage & archaeology. Policy SS2, Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire, details Burton-upon-Stater as a Larger Rural Settlement in the settlement hierarchy, however, policy SS6 fails to allocate Burton-upon-Stater a housing growth percentage or total dwelling capacity number. It is therefore contended that the Plan is inconsistent and not effective. At the preferred options stage, Burton-upon-Stather was allocated a 0.75% housing growth, equating to 63 dwellings. However, in the draft Local Plan, policy SS6 fails to allocate Burton-upon-Stather a housing					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							growth percentage or total dwelling capacity number. It is argued that Burton-upon-Stather has capacity for growth and is a sustainable settlement, however, there are limited infill opportunities for development, so without any allocation, Policy SS6 is not effective. We are in the process of preparing a sequential test detailing the limited infill opportunities in the settlement of Burton-upon-Stather. In accordance with policy SS2 and SS6, it is argued that Burton-upon-Stater should be afforded an appropriately sized allocation. It is noted that The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper states that concerns were raised regarding development of site H1P-26P but no evidence to substantiate the objectivity of the public's claims has been published. Therefore, it is not possible to deduce if these are justified or well-founded concerns. It is therefore argued that the removal of this allocation is not justified. Furthermore, the NPPF states that the preparation of policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. As such, removal of this site from the draft Plan is not consistent with policy and the allocation should be reinstated, especially given the site has previously been deemed acceptable. The site was assessed in September 2019's Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) under reference 7JNXA. This assessment concluded that the site may be suitable for residential development if all the site constraints could be addressed. Site H1P-26P was included in the preferred options. Since this time, no further communication has been had with North Lincolnshire Council, prior to the Publication Draft Plan which indicated that this allocation was proposed to be removed from the Plan. It is held that the Plan has not been positively prepared in this respect and there is no justification backed up by any evidence, for the removal of this previously allocated site. The allocation should not correctly be removed simply due to local public opposition. We object to Policy SS11: Development Limits, on the basis that it does not include site H1P-26P as included in the Preferred Options Stage Plan. The approach taken to the development limits of Burton upon-Stather is overly restrictive. Burton-upon–Stather is a sustainable settlement and should be a focus for some growth in appropriately allocated sites. Burton-upon-Stather has capacity for growth and is a sustainable settlement, however, there are only very limited infill opportunities for development and as such Burton-upon-Stather should be afforded an appropriately-sized allocation. The land to the south Darby Road is a logical extension to the existing settlement, it is available and deliverable and policy SS11 should be amended to recognise this. We object to Policy H1: Site Allocations as it does not include the site previously allocated in the Preferred Options Stage Plan under references H1P-26. The land to the south of Darby Road should not be removed from the Publication Draft Plan and should remain as an allocation. Furthermore, we object to the policies map. Site H1P-26P is a logical extension to the existing settlement. The site is available and deliverable over the plan period. The Policies Map should be amended to facilitate					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							this. In summary, the plan has not been positively prepared in this respect and there is no justification, backed up by evidence, for the removal of this previously allocated site. The Landowner is committed to delivery of a successful development of site H1P-26P and therefore, we trust that you will consider this letter of objection and the request for reinstatement of an allocation for the site.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0591	Tori Heaton on behalf of DDM Agriculture	POLICY H1P-13: LAND OFF BARROW ROAD		Yes	Yes	Yes	NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN – PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 2021 LAND OFF BARROW ROAD, BARTON UPON HUMBER (H1P-13) We write on behalf of the owner of the land identified as site H1P-13 within Stage 4: Publication Draft (Regulation 19) of the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan, proposed to be allocated as a housing site at Barton upon Humber. This letter is to confirm support of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and allocation of the above site. We can confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the allocation of this site. We confirm we are supportive of:- Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites; Policy H1: Site Allocations, specifically allocation H1P-13: LAND OFF BARROW ROAD; Policy SS11: Development limits; and Policies Map. The Plan is sound as the above polices have been:- positively prepared; justified; effective; and consistent with national policy The Plan has been positively prepared as allocation of H1P-13 is the appropriate strategy when considered against the alternative sites in the town. The Plan is justified, as allocation of this land has been positively supported by the local community as evidenced by the public consultation events. The plan is effective as site H1P-13 is deliverable over the plan period. The site has had significant interest from developers. The site is currently being actively marketed, with the aim of agreeing terms for a developer to assist in delivering the site. The site has no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery and it has previously been assessed in the SHLAA as having no constraints. The Plan is consistent with national policy as allocation of H1P-13 will enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies of the NPPF. Our client is committed to delivery of a successful development of the current allocation along with the link road and roundabout, as detailed in the policy criteria. We will be pleased to provide any further information required, upon request.			Yes	This letter supports the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and allocation of the above site. We can confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the allocation of this site.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0602	Tori Heaton on behalf of DDM Agriculture	POLICY H1P-26: LAND AT FIELD HOUSE	Support				NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN – PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 2021 LAND AT FIELD HOUSE (H1P-26) We write on behalf of the owner of the land identified as site H1P-26 within Stage 4: Publication Draft (Regulation 19) of the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan, proposed to be allocated as a housing site at Haxey. This letter supports the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and allocation of the above site. We can confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the allocation of this site. We confirm we are supportive of policies:- Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites; Policy H1: Site Allocations, specifically allocation H1P-26 Land at Field House.; Policy SS11: Development limits; and Policies Map. The Plan is sound as the above polices have been:- - positively prepared; - justified; - effective; and - consistent with national policy The Plan has been positively prepared as allocation of H1P-26 is the appropriate strategy when considered against the alternative sites within Haxey. The Plan is justified, as allocation of this land has been positively supported by the local community as evidenced by the public consultation events. The Plan is effective as site H1P-26 is deliverable over the plan period. The site has had significant interest from several developers. The site is available to be actively marketed, with the aim of signing a developer to assist in delivering the site. The site has no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery, it has previously been assessed in the SHLAA (SPDKT & CFS0300086) as having no constraints. The Plan is consistent with national policy as allocation of H1P-26 will enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF. Our client is committed to delivery of a successful development of the current allocation as detailed in the policy criteria. We will be pleased to provide any further information required, upon request.			Yes	This letter supports the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and allocation of the above site. We can confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the allocation of this site.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0606	Tori Heaton on behalf of DDM Agriculture	POLICY H1P-31: LAND AT SCHOOL ROAD	Support				NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN – PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 2021 LAND AT SCHOOL ROAD (H1P-31) We write on behalf of the owner of the land identified as site H1P-31 within Stage 4: Publication Draft (Regulation 19) of the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan, proposed to be allocated as a housing site at South Killingholme. This letter supports the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and allocation of the above site. We can confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the allocation of this site. We confirm we are supportive of policies:- Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites; Policy H1: Site Allocations, specifically allocation H1P-31: LAND AT SCHOOL ROAD Policy SS11: Development limits; and Policies Map. The Plan is sound as the above polices have been:- - positively prepared; - justified; - effective; and - consistent with national policy. The Plan has been positively prepared as allocation of H1P-31 is the appropriate strategy when considered against the alternative sites within South Killingholme. The Plan is justified, as allocation of this land has been positively supported by the local community as evidenced by the public consultation events. The Plan is effective as site H1P-31 is deliverable over the plan period. The site has had significant interest from several developers. The site is available to be actively marketed, with the aim of signing a developer to assist in delivering the site. The site has no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery, it has previously been assessed in the SHLAA (EB4JS) as having no constraints. The Plan is consistent with national policy as allocation of H1P-31 will enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF. Our client is committed to delivery of a successful development of the current allocation as detailed in the policy criteria. We will be pleased to provide any further information required, upon request			Yes	This letter supports the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and allocation of the above site. We can confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the allocation of this site.	View PDF
0608	Tori Heaton on behalf of DDM	POLICY H1P-33: LAND AT FIELD LANE					NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN – PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 2021			Yes	This letter supports the North Lincolnshire Local	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	Agriculture						LAND AT FIELD LANE (H1P-33) We write on behalf of the owner of the land identified as site H1P-33 within Stage 4: Publication Draft (Regulation 19) of the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan, proposed to be allocated as a housing site at Wroot. This letter supports the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and allocation of the above site. We can confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the allocation of this site. We confirm we are supportive of policies:- Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites; Policy H1: Site Allocations, specifically allocation H1P-33 Land at Field Lane; Policy SS11: Development limits; and Policies Map. The Plan is sound as the above polices have been:- - positively prepared; - justified; - effective; and - consistent with national policy. The Plan has been positively prepared as allocation of H1P-33 is the appropriate strategy when considered against the alternative sites within Wroot. The Plan is justified, as allocation of this land has been positively supported by the local community as evidenced in the public consultation events. The Plan is effective as site H1P-33 is deliverable over the plan period. The site has had significant interest from several developers and the site is available to be actively marketed with the aim of signing a developer to assist in delivering the site. The site has no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery, it has previously been assessed in the SHLAA (0986O) as having no constraints. The Plan is consistent with national policy as allocation of H1P-33 will enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF. Our client is committed to delivery of a successful development of the current allocation as detailed in the policy criteria. We will be pleased to provide any further information required, upon request.				Plan Publication Draft and allocation of the above site. We can confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the allocation of this site.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0852	Tori Heaton on behalf of DDM Agriculture	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS					We write on behalf of the owner of the land identified as site EC1-2 within Stage 4: Publication Draft (Regulation 19) of the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan, proposed to be allocated as an employment site at Scunthorpe. We support the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and allocation of the above site. We can confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the allocation of this site. We confirm we are supportive of policies:- Policy SS8: Employment Land Requirements; Policy EC1: Employment land supply, specifically allocation EC1-2: Land at north of Doncaster Road; Policy SS11: Development limits; and Policies Map. The Plan is sound as the above polices have been:- - positively prepared; - justified; - effective; and - consistent with national policy. The Plan has been positively prepared, as allocation of EC1-2 is the appropriate strategy when considered against the alternative sites in the town. The Plan is justified, as allocation of this land has been positively supported by the local community as evidenced by the public consultation events. The Plan is effective as site EC1-2 is deliverable over the plan period. The site has had significant interest from developers. The site is currently being actively marketed with the aim of signing a developer to assist in delivering the site. The site has no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery and it has previously been assessed in the SHLAA (Reference ELR35) as having no constraints. The Plan is consistent with national policy, as allocation of EC1-2 will enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF. Our client is committed to delivery of a successful development of the current allocation. We will be pleased to provide any further information required, upon request.					View PDF
0855	Tori Heaton on behalf of DDM Agriculture	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS					NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN – PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 2021 LAND OFF DARBY ROAD, BURTON-UPON-STATHER (H1P-26P) We write on behalf of the owner of the land identified as site H1P-26P within Stage 3: Preferred Options of the emerging North Lincolnshire Local					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Plan, previously proposed to be allocated as a housing site at Burton upon Stather. This site has been removed from the emerging plan and as a result, Stage 4 includes no housing site allocations in Burton-upon-Stather. The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper states that the proposal for 63 homes generated a significant amount of public objections and as such, no housing proposals have been made in the settlement. This letter objects to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and de-allocation of the above site. We confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the re-allocation of site H1P-26P. The Publication Draft Plan is not sound in relation to this site and we object to the following policies:- Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites; Policy H1: Site Allocations; Policy SS11: Development Limits; Policy SS2: Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire; and Policies Map. In relation to the soundness of the Publication Draft Plan, it is:_ not positively prepared; not justified; not effective; and not consistent with national policy. Reasons for Objection:- The removal of site H1P-26P is not justified without sufficient information available for a transparent and fair reasoning for de-allocation. As such, we request copies of the studies undertaken to substantiate the objectivity of the public's concerns and the subsequent de-allocation. Once these are available, we intend to review them to determine whether there are any mitigation measures that can be implemented to make the development acceptable. We also intend to provide further studies to show that the site is deliverable, including details in relation to SUDS, drainage, ecology and heritage & archaeology. Policy SS2, Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire, details Burton-upon-Stater as a Larger Rural Settlement in the settlement hierarchy, however, policy SS6 fails to allocate Burton-upon-Stater a housing growth percentage or total dwelling capacity number. It is therefore contended that the Plan is inconsistent and not effective. At the preferred options stage, Burton-upon-Stather was allocated a 0.75% housing growth, equating to 63 dwellings. However, in the draft Local Plan, policy SS6 fails to allocate Burton-upon-Stather a housing growth percentage or total dwelling capacity number. It is argued that Burton-upon-Stather has capacity for growth and is a sustainable settlement, however, there are limited infill opportunities for development, so without any allocation, Policy SS6 is not effective. We are in the process of preparing a sequential test detailing the limited infill opportunities in the settlement of Burton-upon-Stather. In accordance					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							with policy SS2 and SS6, it is argued that Burton-upon-Stater should be afforded an appropriately sized allocation. It is noted that The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper states that concerns were raised regarding development of site H1P-26P but no evidence to substantiate the objectivity of the public's claims has been published. Therefore, it is not possible to deduce if these are justified or well-founded concerns. It is therefore argued that the removal of this allocation is not justified. Furthermore, the NPPF states that the preparation of policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. As such, removal of this site from the draft Plan is not consistent with policy and the allocation should be reinstated, especially given the site has previously been deemed acceptable. The site was assessed in September 2019's Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) under reference 7JNXA. This assessment concluded that the site may be suitable for residential development if all the site constraints could be addressed. Site H1P-26P was included in the preferred options. Since this time, no further communication has been had with North Lincolnshire Council, prior to the Publication Draft Plan which indicated that this allocation was proposed to be removed from the Plan. It is held that the Plan has not been positively prepared in this respect and there is no justification backed up by any evidence, for the removal of this previously allocated site. The allocation should not correctly be removed simply due to local public opposition. We object to Policy SS11: Development Limits, on the basis that it does not include site H1P-26P as included in the Preferred Options Stage Plan. The approach taken to the development limits of Burton upon Stather is overly restrictive. Burton-upon–Stather is a sustainable settlement and should be a focus for some growth in appropriately allocated sites. Burton-upon-Stather has capacity for growth and is a sustainable settlement, however, there are only very limited infill opportunities for development and as such Burton-upon-Stather should be afforded an appropriately-sized allocation. The land to the south Darby Road is a logical extension to the existing settlement, it is available and deliverable and policy SS11 should be amended to recognise this. We object to Policy H1: Site Allocations as it does not include the site previously allocated in the Preferred Options Stage Plan under references H1P-26. The land to the south of Darby Road should not be removed from the Publication Draft Plan and should remain as an allocation. Furthermore, we object to the policies map. Site H1P-26P is a logical extension to the existing settlement. The site is available and deliverable over the plan period. The Policies Map should be amended to facilitate this. In summary, the plan has not been positively prepared in this respect and there is no justification, backed up by evidence, for the removal of this previously allocated site. The Landowner is committed to delivery of a successful development of site H1P-26P and therefore, we trust that you will consider this letter of objection and the request for reinstatement of					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							an allocation for the site.					
0858	Tori Heaton on behalf of DDM Agriculture	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE					NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN – PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 2021 LAND OFF DARBY ROAD, BURTON-UPON-STATHER (H1P-26P) We write on behalf of the owner of the land identified as site H1P-26P within Stage 3: Preferred Options of the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan, previously proposed to be allocated as a housing site at Burton upon Stather. This site has been removed from the emerging plan and as a result, Stage 4 includes no housing site allocations in Burton-upon-Stather. The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper states that the proposal for 63 homes generated a significant amount of public objections and as such, no housing proposals have been made in the settlement. This letter objects to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and de-allocation of the above site. We confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the re-allocation of site H1P-26P. The Publication Draft Plan is not sound in relation to this site and we object to the following policies:- Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites; Policy H1: Site Allocations; Policy SS11: Development Limits; Policy SS2: Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire; and Policies Map. In relation to the soundness of the Publication Draft Plan, it is:_ not positively prepared; not justified; not effective; and not consistent with national policy. Reasons for Objection:-The removal of site H1P-26P is not justified without sufficient information available for a transparent and fair reasoning for de-allocation. As such, we request copies of the studies undertaken to substantiate the objectivity of the public's concerns and the subsequent de-allocation. Once these are available, we intend to review them to determine whether there are any mitigation measures that can be implemented to make the development acceptable. We also intend to provide further studies to show that the site is deliverable, including details in relation to SUDS, drainage, ecology and heritage & archaeology. Policy SS2, Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire, details Burton-upon-Stater as a Larger Rural Settlement in the settlement hierarchy, however, policy SS6 fails to allocate Burton-upon-Stater a housing growth percentage or total dwelling capacity number. It is therefore contended that the Plan is inconsistent and not effective. At the preferred options stage, Burton-upon-Stather was allocated a 0.75% housing growth, equating to 63 dwellings. However, in the draft Local Plan, policy SS6 fails to allocate Burton-upon-Stather a housing					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							growth percentage or total dwelling capacity number. It is argued that Burton-upon-Stather has capacity for growth and is a sustainable settlement, however, there are limited infill opportunities for development, so without any allocation, Policy SS6 is not effective. We are in the process of preparing a sequential test detailing the limited infill opportunities in the settlement of Burton-upon-Stather. In accordance with policy SS2 and SS6, it is argued that Burton-upon-Stater should be afforded an appropriately sized allocation. It is noted that The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper states that concerns were raised regarding development of site H1P-26P but no evidence to substantiate the objectivity of the public's claims has been published. Therefore, it is not possible to deduce if these are justified or well-founded concerns. It is therefore argued that the removal of this allocation is not justified. Furthermore, the NPPF states that the preparation of policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. As such, removal of this site from the draft Plan is not consistent with policy and the allocation should be reinstated, especially given the site has previously been deemed acceptable. The site was assessed in September 2019's Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) under reference 7JNXA. This assessment concluded that the site may be suitable for residential development if all the site constraints could be addressed. Site H1P-26P was included in the preferred options. Since this time, no further communication has been had with North Lincolnshire Council, prior to the Publication Draft Plan which indicated that this allocation was proposed to be removed from the Plan. It is held that the Plan has not been positively prepared in this respect and there is no justification backed up by any evidence, for the removal of this previously allocated site. The allocation should not correctly be removed simply due to local public opposition. We object to Policy SS11: Development Limits, on the basis that it does not include site H1P-26P as included in the Preferred Options Stage Plan. The approach taken to the development limits of Burton upon-Stather is overly restrictive. Burton-upon–Stather is a sustainable settlement and should be a focus for some growth in appropriately allocated sites. Burton-upon-Stather has capacity for growth and is a sustainable settlement, however, there are only very limited infill opportunities for development and as such Burton-upon-Stather should be afforded an appropriately-sized allocation. The land to the south Darby Road is a logical extension to the existing settlement, it is available and deliverable and policy SS11 should be amended to recognise this. We object to Policy H1: Site Allocations as it does not include the site previously allocated in the Preferred Options Stage Plan under references H1P-26. The land to the south of Darby Road should not be removed from the Publication Draft Plan and should remain as an allocation. Furthermore, we object to the policies map. Site H1P-26P is a logical extension to the existing settlement. The site is available and deliverable over the plan period. The Policies Map should be					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							amended to facilitate this. In summary, the plan has not been positively prepared in this respect and there is no justification, backed up by evidence, for the removal of this previously allocated site. The Landowner is committed to delivery of a successful development of site H1P-26P and therefore, we trust that you will consider this letter of objection and the request for reinstatement of an allocation for the site.					
0885	Tori Heaton on behalf of DDM Agriculture	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES					NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN – PUBLICATION DRAFT CONSULTATION 2021 LAND OFF DARBY ROAD, BURTON-UPON-STATHER (H1P-26P) We write on behalf of the owner of the land identified as site H1P-26P within Stage 3: Preferred Options of the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan, previously proposed to be allocated as a housing site at Burton upon Stather. This site has been removed from the emerging plan and as a result, Stage 4 includes no housing site allocations in Burton-upon-Stather. The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper states that the proposal for 63 homes generated a significant amount of public objections and as such, no housing proposals have been made in the settlement. This letter objects to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and de-allocation of the above site. We confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the re-allocation of site H1P-26P. The Publication Draft Plan is not sound in relation to this site and we object to the following policies:- Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites; Policy H1: Site Allocations; Policy SS11: Development Limits; Policy SS2: Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire; and Policies Map. In relation to the soundness of the Publication Draft Plan, it is:_ not positively prepared; not justified; not effective; and not consistent with national policy. Reasons for Objection:- The removal of site H1P-26P is not justified without sufficient information available for a transparent and fair reasoning for de-allocation. As such, we request copies of the studies undertaken to substantiate the objectivity of the public's concerns and the subsequent de-allocation. Once these are available, we intend to review them to determine whether there are any mitigation measures that can be implemented to make the development acceptable. We also intend to provide further studies to show that the site is deliverable, including details in relation to SUDS,					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							drainage, ecology and heritage & archaeology. Policy SS2, Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire, details Burton-upon-Stater as a Larger Rural Settlement in the settlement hierarchy, however, policy SS6 fails to allocate Burton-upon-Stater a housing growth percentage or total dwelling capacity number. It is therefore contended that the Plan is inconsistent and not effective. At the preferred options stage, Burton-upon-Stather was allocated a 0.75% housing growth, equating to 63 dwellings. However, in the draft Local Plan, policy SS6 fails to allocate Burton-upon-Stather a housing growth percentage or total dwelling capacity number. It is argued that Burton-upon-Stater has capacity for growth and is a sustainable settlement, however, there are limited infill opportunities for development, so without any allocation, Policy SS6 is not effective. We are in the process of preparing a sequential test detailing the limited infill opportunities in the settlement of Burton-upon-Stather. In accordance with policy SS2 and SS6, it is argued that Burton-upon-Stater should be afforded an appropriately sized allocation. It is noted that The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper states that concerns were raised regarding development of site H1P-26P but no evidence to substantiate the objectivity of the public's claims has been published. Therefore, it is not possible to deduce if these are justified or well-founded concerns. It is therefore argued that the removal of this allocation is not justified. Furthermore, the NPPF states that the preparation of policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. As such, removal of this site from the draft Plan is not consistent with policy and the allocation should be reinstated, especially given the site has previously been deemed acceptable. The site was assessed in September 2019's Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) under reference 7JNXA. This assessment concluded that the site may be suitable for residential development if all the site constraints could be addressed. Site H1P-26P was included in the preferred options. Since this time, no further communication has been had with North Lincolnshire Council, prior to the Publication Draft Plan which indicated that this allocation was proposed to be removed from the Plan. It is held that the Plan has not been positively prepared in this respect and there is no justification backed up by any evidence, for the removal of this previously allocated site. The allocation should not correctly be removed simply due to local public opposition. We object to Policy SS11: Development Limits, on the basis that it does not include site H1P-26P as included in the Preferred Options Stage Plan. The approach taken to the development limits of Burton upon- Stather is overly restrictive. Burton-upon–Stather is a sustainable settlement and should be a focus for some growth in appropriately allocated sites. Burton-upon-Stather has capacity for growth and is a sustainable settlement, however, there are only very limited infill opportunities for development and as such Burton-upon-Stather should be afforded an appropriately-sized allocation. The land to the south Darby Road is a logical extension to the existing					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							settlement, it is available and deliverable and policy SS11 should be amended to recognise this. We object to Policy H1: Site Allocations as it does not include the site previously allocated in the Preferred Options Stage Plan under references H1P-26. The land to the south of Darby Road should not be removed from the Publication Draft Plan and should remain as an allocation. Furthermore, we object to the policies map. Site H1P-26P is a logical extension to the existing settlement. The site is available and deliverable over the plan period. The Policies Map should be amended to facilitate this. In summary, the plan has not been positively prepared in this respect and there is no justification, backed up by evidence, for the removal of this previously allocated site. The Landowner is committed to delivery of a successful development of site H1P-26P and therefore, we trust that you will consider this letter of objection and the request for reinstatement of an allocation for the site.					
0887	Tori Heaton on behalf of DDM Agriculture	POLICY SS8: EMPLOYMENT LAND REQUIREMENT (INCLUDING STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT SITES)					We write on behalf of the owner of the land identified as site EC1-2 within Stage 4: Publication Draft (Regulation 19) of the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan, proposed to be allocated as an employment site at Scunthorpe. We support the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft and allocation of the above site. We can confirm that DDM Agriculture wish to participate in the examination hearing sessions to support and justify the reasons for the allocation of this site. We confirm we are supportive of policies:- Policy SS8: Employment Land Requirements; Policy EC1: Employment land supply, specifically allocation EC1-2: Land at north of Doncaster Road; Policy SS11: Development limits; and Policies Map. The Plan is sound as the above polices have been:- - positively prepared; - justified; - effective; and - consistent with national policy. The Plan has been positively prepared, as allocation of EC1-2 is the appropriate strategy when considered against the alternative sites in the town. The Plan is justified, as allocation of this land has been positively supported by the local community as evidenced by the public consultation events. The Plan is effective as site EC1-2 is deliverable over the plan period. The site has had significant interest from developers. The site is currently being actively marketed with the aim of signing a developer to assist in delivering the site. The site has no regulatory or national planning barriers to delivery and it has previously been assessed in the SHLAA (Reference ELR35) as having no constraints. The Plan is consistent with national policy, as allocation of EC1-2 will					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF. Our client is committed to delivery of a successful development of the current allocation. We will be pleased to provide any further information required, upon request.					
Mrs Pauline **Hepworth**												
0232	Mrs Pauline Hepworth	POLICY H1P-26: LAND AT FIELD HOUSE	object	no	no	no	The stretch of Graiselound Fields Road from Field House towards the junction at the War Memorial has a 30 mph speed limit. Unfortunately most drivers using this road do not adhere to this limit. A letter I have from the Local Highways Dept states " Speed monitoring in the 30mph limit of Graiselound Fields Road was carried out in 2016 and whilst the percentage of offending vehicles was HIGH the actual number of vehicles recorded using the road was low" This was over 5 years ago and the volume of traffic has greatly increased since then. The building of 75 houses on this site will have a huge impact on the amount of vehicles using this road and I consider that this will have a detrimental affect on the environment and the existing residents. The impact on the drainage system is also of concern should this development go ahead. The type of housing to be built will attract families with children therefore putting extra strain on the local schools and also the extra traffic at Haxey Primary School on The Nooking which is already a very busy and congested road at school drop off and pick up times.					
Ann **Hindley**												
0763	Ann Hindley	General	Object				I am concerned that too few people attended the local plan roadshow, that there were no notices in local or community press, no posters and no indication outside the building that it was taking place. There has therefore been too little attempt to seek the views of the local residents. In terms of soundness I identify issues of planning to build more houses in areas prone to flooding and that more roads are being constructed while no mention is made of improving rail services. The plans are based on some false premises e.g. that plans are rail links with Manchester Airport (not nay more). That there are good rail services (apart from any hourly train Pennine and an hourly northern service. There is little else and that building more housing will reinvigorate shopping centres such as that in Crowle. The Evidence this far is that the centre has been declined as housing has grown.	I am struggling to know what is required here.			I am not clear about the purpose of a hearing further information would have been useful	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
James **Hobson**, JEH Planning on behalf of Jalapeno Ventures Ltd and Mr Day												
0592	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Jalapeno Ventures Ltd and Mr Day	POLICY H1P-15: LAND AT WESTERN AVENUE					Background. 1.1 JEH Planning Ltd are instructed on behalf of two landowners Jalapeño Ventures Ltd and Mr Day to make representations on the Publication Version of the Draft Local Plan. Between them, the two landowners control land to the north and north east of Brigg in particular they own housing site allocations: • H1P-15 Land at Western Avenue H1P • H1P-16 Land at Wrawby Road Phase 2 • H1P-17 Land at Wrawby Road Phase 11.2 These three sites also featured in the adopted North Lincolnshire's Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD (HAELADPD).as Housing Allocations known as Policies BRIH-2, BRIH-3 and BRIH-4 1.3 The two landowners continue to actively work together to ensure the delivery of these three sites and they both support the continued inclusion of these housing allocations in the new Local Plan. 1.4 We have been consistent in our approach in terms of supporting a coordinated delivery approach to bringing forward and release these allocations. The central thrust of the case has been that a well planned urban extension for these three allocations would not only help deliver important planning, and sustainability objectives for the district in terms of delivering much needed housing but they would also provide anopportunity to introduce supporting infrastructure provision and community benefits. 1.5 More specifically, we note the Council seek to promote a proposed Link Road around Brigg connecting Wrawby Road in the east to Atherton Way to the north of Brigg. Reference to the delivery of this infrastructure provision is referred to in connection with the proposed site allocations. We are also aware that the Link Road has been identified by the Council as a funding priority within the Humber LEP Programme, as well as through Homes England initiatives and as part of a Levelling Up bid which we understand has been successful in terms of the first round of bidannouncements. Whilst promoting the three allocations, key supporting technical evidence has been undertaken to demonstrate the overall soundness of the approach and ensure they are suitable, achievable and deliverable. We conclude there are no insurmountable difficulties that would prevent their early delivery. 1.7 Furthermore, we consider that these three allocations can come forward independent to the provision of the proposed Link Road and so the delivery of phases are not reliant on the full completion of this piece of infrastructure. Nevertheless, we can demonstrate that these three sites would not prejudice the creation of a Link Road between Atherton Way and Wrawby Road. 1.8 Whilst we support the general principles of continuing to allocate these three sites for housing purposes, we set out below our comments,			Yes	We support certain aspects of the Local plan in particularly the inclusion of the three housing allocations know as H1P-15, H1P-16 and H1P-17 but as highlighted in our representations, proposed modifications are required to make the plan 'sound' in the context of it being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy. Given the key issues we have raised, and our suggested modifications go to the heart of whether the Plan can be considered sound and we would consider our involvement in the examination hearing sessions to be necessary. We look forward to receiving an acknowledgement that our representations have been duly made.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							objections, and recommended changes to key policies to ensure the schemes can be development in a suitable and deliverable manner. 1.9 We support certain aspects of the Local plan in particularly the inclusion of the three housing allocations but as highlight in our representations below, proposed modifications are required to make the plan 'sound' in the context of it being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy. H1P-15 Land at Western Avenue 2.1 We welcome and support the principle of this proposed housing allocation which will contribute to the future housing requirements of the borough. However, we object to specific aspects of the draft policy wording and the draft Proposal Map.Development Site Boundary 2.2 In terms of the extent of the northern boundary of site allocation H1P 15 as identified on the Proposals Map, there is an inconsistency compared to the proposed allocation H1P-14 immediately to the west of Grammar School Road. For allocation H1P-14, the Development Limits Boundary has been drawn so that the line immediately abuts and runs in parallel with the M180 Motorway. In contrast, to east of Grammar School Road the Development Limits for Allocation H1P- 15 do not follow a definitive physical feature on the ground. 2.3 We object to this inconsistency and recommend that the Development Limit adopts the same principles and alignment as allocation H1P-14 so that its northernboundary closely follows the line of the physical boundary formed by the M180 motorway between Grammar School Road and Brick Yard Lane further to the east. 2.4 Within this context and reflecting the same assumptions associated with allocation H1P-14 in terms of its relationship to the M180, the proposed standoff distance to create an appropriate noise buffer between the northern boundary of allocation H1P-15 and the M180 should be reduced. Indeed, it should be noted that in terms of the existing northern boundary features, allocation H1P-15 not only has mature and established vegetation along its boundary, it is also further enhanced with an existing earth bund that is over 1 meter in height along the full extent of the allocation. 2.5 We consider that these physical site features already provide a strong basis for creating an appropriate level of acoustic screening mitigation. Together with carefullyorientation of the houses and providing enhanced acoustic measures to specific dwellings, we consider the extent of the allocation can be drawn closer to the M180 Motorway. Whilst the extent of allocation H1P-14 has a much closer relationship to the M180 Motorway, compared to allocation H1P-15, it does not have the benefit of an existing earth mound neither does it have the level of vegetation boundary cover. 2.6 Another advantage of adopting a more consistent approach to the northern boundary alignment with allocation H1P-14, is that the development area of allocation H1P-15 would marginally increase in size thereby potentially delivering more houses in a recognised key sustainable settlement thereby reducing the pressure to release new housing allocations elsewhere within the district to meet the future requirement.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Housing Mix and Tenure 2.7 We refer to our objection to Policy H2 (see below). We also consider that a density of between 40 – 45 dwelling is too high given the site's suburban characteristicand the housing market interest that has been expressed. A more flexible approach to density should be adopted driven by design principles.Masterplan Approach 2.8 We consider the site's delivery needs to be coordinated in the context of adjoining housing allocations H1P-16 and H1P-17 in order to deliver and maximise the community infrastructure and sustainability benefits associated with the collection of adjoining sites controlled by Jalapeño Ventures Ltd and Mr Day. We are therefore not against the principle behind the production of a masterplan as identified in the draft policy but we recommend that wording is introduced in the explanatory text that explains this should be undertaken on a proportionate basis and the contents be carefully scoped out and agreed with the Council.Access and Highways 2.9 We object to the first sentence in Criterion d as it duplicates with the first sentence of criterion e. We therefore recommend it is deleted: A new link road to be constructed between Atherton Way, Grammar School Road and Wrawby Road including new roundabouts and associated junctions connecting to the existing local highway network. 2.10 Furthermore, we consider that reference in criterion d to 'new roundabouts' is too specific as there could be a range of different junction designs that may be appropriate as suggested in the Brigg Link Road Highway Masterplan 2021 prepared by Local Transport Projects for the Council. 2.11 We maintain that subject to there being no significant increase in traffic that would impact severely on the highway network from the benchmark position created as a result of recent changes as to how schools in the local area are accessed by cars and buses (i.e. away from Grammar School Road), an appropriate interim access arrangement can be allowed onto Grammar School Road to serve a first phase of allocation H1P-15 prior to the link road eventually connecting to both Atherton Way and Wrawby Road. This approach has been confirmed in the Brigg Link Road Highway Masterplan 2021 prepared by Local Transport Projects for the Council which concludes that 115 additional dwellings can be accommodated on Grammar School Road without a link road in place. 2.12 We have concerns as to how the following sentence in Criterion d would be interpreted in relation to implementing the link road:'Developers will be required to enter into a legal agreement to implement this proposal or make an appropriate financial contribution towards its completion'. 2.13 There are many factors to consider in terms of the design, costs, funding, and timescales for implementation of the link road many of which may not be fully resolved at the time when the first phases of development are considered. 2.14 We consider the above policy wording is unreasonable as is places					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							the onus on the developer of this allocation to deliver this key strategic piece of infrastructure. Instead, we recommend that provided land is safeguarded to create the alignment of the link road and it can be demonstrated that the housing development would not prejudice the delivery of the link road, then the proposal should be deemed to be acceptable. 2.15 We also object to the requirement for the developer to pay a financial contribution towards the completion of the link road as the developer would be already providing a section of link road that runs through the site as part of a standard internal access arrangement. A further financial contribution over and above the costs of providing this on site highway infrastructure would be unreasonable and not meet the tests of Section 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 in terms of the contribution must be: • necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; • directly related to the development; and • fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. 2.16 On this basis, the last sentence of Criterion d should be amended to read as follows:'Developers will be required to protect a route and safeguard land for the alignment and creation of the link road to a suitable standard.'Biodiversity and Landscape 2.17 To ensure some flexibility we request the following amendment to the sentence of criterion i:Existing boundary features should be retained where possible to protect existing habitats, including hedgerows and mature trees 2.18 Given the site's relationship with the exist built up framework to the south and the proposed housing allocation H1p-14 to the west we object to the wording of the second sentence of criterion I. and instead suggest the wording is revised as follows: At the southern, western, and northern boundaries new landscaping should be provided to strengthen the existing retained vegetation and soften the edges of the site. 2.19 In light of the Environmental Act recently receiving Royal Assent and we notethere is reference in draft Policy DQE 3 to requiring a minimum of 10% net gain for biodiversity, this percentage figure should be specifically included within criterion j for the avoidance of doubt.Contamination, Noise and Odour 2.20 We object to Criterion m as it is not required and should be deleted. The requirement to achieve the desired level of mitigation to overcome noise constraintsrelating to the site would in our view be adequately covered by Criterion n which not only requests a noise assessment be undertaken but that mitigation measures be considered. The requirement of Criterion m would therefore pre-empt the conclusionsand recommendations of the noise assessment. It is also noted that Criterion m does not feature in Policies Allocations H1P-16 and H1P-17 which provides further justification that it is not necessary. 2.21 Criterion n also refers to carrying out an assessment of land contaminationwhich is not only out of context with the noise issue but					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							also the site is greenfield in nature so we do not expect to find any contamination. 2.22 Based on the above we recommend the following amendments:m. Significant landscape and noise buffering will be required to the northern and western boundaries.n. This site is subject to environmental constraints including potential adverse noise impact associated with road traffic. Prior to submission of a planning application for residential development it will be necessary to carry out assessment of land contamination and noise, so that appropriate design criteria and mitigation measures can be considered. Implementation 2.23 We confirm that the two landowners are in the process of progressing a disposalstrategy to ensure delivery is achieved in the short term and are entering into a collaboration agreement to increase the level of certainty to make the site attractive to prospective housebuilders. 2.24 A land disposal transaction is currently being discussed with a number of national and regional housebuilder and it is anticipated that the preparation of a planning application will progress in the short term following the conclusions of these discussions.					
0595	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Jalapeno Ventures Ltd and Mr Day	POLICY H1P-16: LAND AT WRAWBY ROAD PHASE 2					Background. 1.1 JEH Planning Ltd are instructed on behalf of two landowners Jalapeño Ventures Ltd and Mr Day to make representations on the Publication Version of the Draft Local Plan. Between them, the two landowners control land to the north and north east of Brigg in particular they own housing site allocations: • H1P-15 Land at Western Avenue H1P • H1P-16 Land at Wrawby Road Phase 2 • H1P-17 Land at Wrawby Road Phase 1 1.2 These three sites also featured in the adopted North Lincolnshire's Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD (HAELADPD).as Housing Allocations known as Policies BRIH-2, BRIH-3 and BRIH-4 1.3 The two landowners continue to actively work together to ensure the delivery of these three sites and they both support the continued inclusion of these housing allocations in the new Local Plan. 1.4 We have been consistent in our approach in terms of supporting a coordinated delivery approach to bringing forward and release these allocations. The central thrust of the case has been that a well planned urban extension for these three allocations would not only help deliver important planning, and sustainability objectives for the district in terms of delivering much needed housing but they would also provide an opportunity to introduce supporting infrastructure provision and community benefits. 1.5 More specifically, we note the Council seek to promote a proposed Link Road around Brigg connecting Wrawby Road in the east to Atherton Way to the north of Brigg. Reference to the delivery of this infrastructure provision is referred to in connection with the proposed site allocations.			Yes	We support certain aspects of the Local plan in particularly the inclusion of the three housing allocations know as H1P-15, H1P-16 and H1P-17 but as highlighted in our representations, proposed modifications are required to make the plan 'sound' in the context of it being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy. Given the key issues we have raised, and our suggested modifications go to the heart of whether the Plan can be considered sound and we would consider	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							We are also aware that the Link Road has been identified by the Council as a funding priority within the Humber LEP Programme, as well as through Homes England initiatives and as part of a Levelling Up bid which we understand has been successful in terms of the first round of bid announcements. Whilst promoting the three allocations, key supporting technical evidence has been undertaken to demonstrate the overall soundness of the approach and ensure they are suitable, achievable and deliverable. We conclude there are no insurmountable difficulties that would prevent their early delivery. 1.7 Furthermore, we consider that these three allocations can come forward independent to the provision of the proposed Link Road and so the delivery of phases are not reliant on the full completion of this piece of infrastructure. Nevertheless, we can demonstrate that these three sites would not prejudice the creation of a Link Road between Atherton Way and Wrawby Road. 1.8 Whilst we support the general principles of continuing to allocate these three sites for housing purposes, we set out below our comments, objections, and recommended changes to key policies to ensure the schemes can be development in a suitable and deliverable manner. 1.9 We support certain aspects of the Local plan in particularly the inclusion of the three housing allocations but as highlight in our representations below, proposed modifications are required to make the plan 'sound' in the context of it being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy. 2.25 We welcome and support the principle of this proposed housing allocation which will contribute to the future housing requirements of the borough. However, we object to specific aspects of the draft policy wording and the draft Proposal Map. Development Site Boundary 2.26 Since the eastern line of the allocation is not delineated by existing field boundaries or physical features, we consider there is an opportunity for a more design led approach to defining the new settlement edge of Brigg, so that it can sensitively incorporate visual and landscape issues. 2.27 There is also the opportunity to provide formal and informal public open space, as well as areas to accommodate drainage features such as balancing ponds/dry detention basins as part of a sustainable urban drainage system (SuDs) beyond the defined eastern boundary. 2.28 As such, we would recommend that the allocation is drawn more extensively up to the boundary defined by Brick Lane (see also our comments regarding amendments to the northern boundary of housing allocation H1P-15 above), but with a proviso within the policy which would explain that the proposed location of the none development components (drainage basins, POS etc.) would be positioned within the eastern area. Housing Mix and Tenure 2.29 We refer to our objection to Policy H2 (see below). We also consider that a density of between 40 – 45 dwelling is too high given the site's suburban characteristic and urban fringe location as well as the housing				our involvement in the examination hearing sessions to be necessary. We look forward to receiving an acknowledgement that our representations have been duly made.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							market interest that has been expressed. A more flexible approach to density should be adopted driven by design principles. Masterplan Approach 2.30 We agree that the site needs to be coordinated in the context of adjoining housing allocations H1P-15 and H1P-17 in order to deliver and maximise the community infrastructure and sustainability benefits associated with the collection of adjoining sites controlled by Jalapeño Ventures Ltd and Mr Day. We are therefore not against the principle behind the production of a masterplan as identified in the draft policy, but we recommend that wording is introduced in the explanatory text that explains this should be undertaken on a proportionate basis and the contents be carefully scoped out and agreed with the Council. Access and Highways 2.31 We object to the first sentence in Criterion d as it duplicates with the first sentence of criterion e. We therefore recommend the following is deleted: d. A new link road to be constructed between Atherton Way, Grammar School Road and Wrawby Road including new roundabouts and associated junctions connecting to the existing local highway network. 2.32 Furthermore, we consider that reference in criterion d to 'new roundabouts' is too prescriptive as there could be a range of different junction designs that may be appropriate as suggested in the Brigg Link Road Highway Masterplan 2021 prepared by Local Transport Projects for the Council 2.33 We welcome recognition on the Proposals Map that shows an independent access directly on to Wrawby Road rather than relying on a combined single access arrangement with Allocation H1P-17. However, confirmation of the principle that two access points along Wrawby to deliver both allocations and facilitate the delivery of the link road should by explicitly referred to in the wording of the policy. 2.34 We have concerns as to how the following sentence in Criterion d would be interpreted in relation to implementing the link road: 'Developers will be required to enter into a legal agreement to implement this proposal or make an appropriate financial contribution towards its completion'. 2.35 There are a range of factors to consider in terms of the design, costs, funding,and timescales for implementation of the link road many of which may not be fully resolved at the time when the first phases of development are considered. 2.36 We consider the above policy wording is unreasonable as is places the onus on the developer of this allocation to deliver this strategic piece of infrastructure. Instead, we recommend that provided land is safeguarded to create the alignment of the link road and it can be demonstrated that the housing development would not prejudice the delivery of the link road then the proposal should be deemed to be					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							acceptable. 2.37 We also object to the requirement for the developer to pay a financial contribution towards the completion of the link road as the developer would be already providing a section of link road that runs through the site as part of a standard internal access arrangement. A further financial contribution over and above the costs of providing this on site highway infrastructure would be unreasonable and not meet the tests of Section 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 in terms of a contribution must be: • necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; • directly related to the development; and • fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. 2.38 On this basis, the last sentence of Criterion d should be amended to read as follows: 'Developers will be required to protect a route and safeguard land for the alignment and creation of the link road to a suitable standard.' Biodiversity and Landscape 2.39 In order not to pre-empt the possible landscape mitigation measures requirements we consider the wording of criterion I should be amended to read as follows: I. A landscape and visual impact assessment Significant landscaping will need to be provided around the boundary in order to mitigate the visual impact that this proposal will create along its eastern boundary. 2.40 In light of the Environmental Act recently receiving Royal Assent and we note there is reference in draft Policy DQE 3 to requiring a minimum of 10% net gain for biodiversity, this percentage figure should be specifically included within criterion j for the avoidance of doubt. Contamination, Noise and Odour 2.41 Criterion n refers to carrying out an assessment of land contamination which is not only out of context with the noise issue but also the site is greenfield in nature, so we do not expect to find any contamination. 2.42 Based on the above we recommend the following amendments: n. This site is subject to environmental constraints including potential adverse noise impact associated with road traffic. Prior to submission of a planning application for residential development it will be necessary to carry out assessment of land contamination and noise, so that appropriate design criteria and mitigation measures can be considered. Implementation 2.43 We can confirm that the two landowners are in the process of progressing a disposal strategy to ensure delivery is achieved in the short term and they are entering into a collaboration agreement to increase the level of certainty to make all three allocations attractive to prospective housebuilders.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							2.44 A land disposal transaction is currently being discussed with a number of national and regional housebuilder and it is anticipated that the preparation of a planning application will progress in the short term following the conclusions of these discussions					
0597	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Jalapeno Ventures Ltd and Mr Day	Policy H1P-17: Land at Wrawby Road Phase 1					Background. 1.1 JEH Planning Ltd are instructed on behalf of two landowners Jalapeño Ventures Ltd and Mr Day to make representations on the Publication Version of the Draft Local Plan. Between them, the two landowners control land to the north and north east of Brigg in particular they own housing site allocations: • H1P-15 Land at Western Avenue H1P • H1P-16 Land at Wrawby Road Phase 2 • H1P-17 Land at Wrawby Road Phase 1 1.2 These three sites also featured in the adopted North Lincolnshire's Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD (HAELADPD).as Housing Allocations known as Policies BRIH-2, BRIH-3 and BRIH-4 1.3 The two landowners continue to actively work together to ensure the delivery of these three sites and they both support the continued inclusion of these housing allocations in the new Local Plan. 1.4 We have been consistent in our approach in terms of supporting a coordinated delivery approach to bringing forward and release these allocations. The central thrust of the case has been that a well planned urban extension for these three allocations would not only help deliver important planning, and sustainability objectives for the district in terms of delivering much needed housing but they would also provide an opportunity to introduce supporting infrastructure provision and community benefits. 1.5 More specifically, we note the Council seek to promote a proposed Link Road around Brigg connecting Wrawby Road in the east to Atherton Way to the north of Brigg. Reference to the delivery of this infrastructure provision is referred to in connection with the proposed site allocations. We are also aware that the Link Road has been identified by the Council as a funding priority within the Humber LEP Programme, as well as through Homes England initiatives and as part of a Levelling Up bid which we understand has been successful in terms of the first round of bid announcements. Whilst promoting the three allocations, key supporting technical evidence has been undertaken to demonstrate the overall soundness of the approach and ensure they are suitable, achievable and deliverable. We conclude there are no insurmountable difficulties that would prevent their early delivery. 1.7 Furthermore, we consider that these three allocations can come forward independent to the provision of the proposed Link Road and so the delivery of phases are not reliant on the full completion of this piece of infrastructure. Nevertheless, we can demonstrate that these three sites would not prejudice the creation of a Link Road between Atherton Way and Wrawby Road.			Yes	We support certain aspects of the Local plan in particularly the inclusion of the three housing allocations know as H1P-15, H1P-16 and H1P-17 but as highlighted in our representations, proposed modifications are required to make the plan 'sound' in the context of it being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy. Given the key issues we have raised, and our suggested modifications go to the heart of whether the Plan can be considered sound and we would consider our involvement in the examination hearing sessions to be necessary. We look forward to receiving an acknowledgement that our representations have been duly made.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							1.8 Whilst we support the general principles of continuing to allocate these three sites for housing purposes, we set out below our comments, objections, and recommended changes to key policies to ensure the schemes can be development in a suitable and deliverable manner. 1.9 We support certain aspects of the Local plan in particularly the inclusion of the three housing allocations but as highlight in our representations below, proposed modifications are required to make the plan 'sound' in the context of it being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy. Policy H1P-17: Land at Wrawby Road Phase 1 2.45 We welcome and support the principle of this proposed housing allocation which will contribute to the future housing requirements of the borough. However, we object to specific aspects of the policy wording. Housing Mix and Tenure 2.46 We refer to our objection to Policy H2 (see below). We consider that a density of between 40 – 45 dwelling is too high given the site's suburban characteristic and the housing market interest that has been expressed. A more flexible approach to density should be adopted driven by design principles. Masterplan Approach 2.47 We consider the site needs to be coordinated in the context of adjoining housing allocations H1P-15 and H1P-16 in order to deliver and maximise the community infrastructure and sustainability benefits associated with the collection of adjoining sites controlled by Jalapeño Ventures Ltd and Mr Day. We are therefore not against the principle behind the production of a masterplan as identified in the draft policy, but we recommend that wording is introduced in the explanatory text that explains this should be undertaken on a proportionate basis and the contents be carefully scoped out and agreed with the Council. Access and Highways 2.48 We object to the first sentence in Criterion d as it duplicates with the first sentence of criterion e. We therefore recommend it is deleted: d. A new link road to be constructed between Atherton Way, Grammar School Road and Wrawby Road including new roundabouts and associated junctions connecting to the existing local highway network. 2.49 Furthermore, we consider that reference in criterion d to 'new roundabouts' is too prescriptive as there could be a range of different junction designs that may be appropriate as suggested in the Brigg Link Road Highway Masterplan 2021 prepared by Local Transport Projects for the Council. 2.50 We welcome recognition on the Proposals Map that shows an independent access directly on Wrawby Road rather than relying on a combined single access arrangement with Allocation H1P-16. However, confirmation of the principle that two access points along Wrawby to deliver both allocations and facilitate the delivery of the link road should					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							by explicitly referred to in the wording of the policy. 2.51 We have concerns as to how the following sentence in Criterion d would be interpreted in relation to implementing the link road: 'Developers will be required to enter into a legal agreement to implement this proposal or make an appropriate financial contribution towards its completion'. 2.52 There are a range of factors to consider in terms of the design, costs, funding, and timescales for implementation of the link road many of which may not be fully resolved at the time when the first phases of development are considered. 2.53 We consider the above policy wording is unreasonable as is places the onus on the developer of this allocation to deliver this strategic piece of infrastructure. Instead, we recommend that provided land is safeguarded to create the alignment of the link road and it can be demonstrated that the housing development would not prejudice the delivery of the link road then the proposal should be deemed to be acceptable. 2.54 We also object to the requirement for the developer to pay a financial contribution towards the completion of the link road as the developer would be already providing a section of link road that runs through the site as part of a standard internal access arrangement. A further financial contribution over and above the costs of providing this on site highway infrastructure would be unreasonable and not meet the tests of Section 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 in terms of the contribution must be: • necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; • directly related to the development; and • fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. 2.55 On this basis, the last sentence of Criterion d should be amended to read as follows: 'Developers will be required to protect a route and safeguard land for the alignment and creation of the link road to a suitable standard.' Biodiversity and Landscape 2.56 As the site will be enclosed by existing and proposed development, we do not consider significant landscaping will need to be provided around the boundary. We therefore recommend that Criterion I is deleted. 2.57 In light of the Environmental Act recently receiving Royal Assent and we note there is reference in draft Policy DQE 3 to requiring a minimum of 10% net gain for biodiversity, this percentage figure should be specifically included within criterion j for the avoidance of doubt. Contamination, Noise and Odour 2.58 Criterion n refers to carrying out an assessment of land contamination which is not only out of context with the noise issue but					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							also the site is greenfield in nature, so we do not expect to find any contamination. 2.59 Based on the above we recommend the following amendments'. This site is subject to environmental constraints including potential adverse noise impact associated with road traffic. Prior to submission of a planning application for residential development it will be necessary to carry out assessment of land contamination and noise, so that appropriate design criteria and mitigation measures can be considered. Implementation 2.60 We can confirm that the two landowners are in the process of progressing a disposal strategy to ensure delivery is achieved in the short term and are entering into a collaboration agreement to increase the level of certainty to make all three allocations attractive to prospective housebuilders. 2.61 A land disposal transaction is currently being discussed with a number of national and regional housebuilder and it is anticipated that the preparation of a planning application will progress in the short term following the conclusions of these discussions.					
0627	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Jalapeno Ventures Ltd and Mr Day	POLICY H2: HOUSING MIX AND DENSITY					We would express caution of seeking to tie the mix of housing types, sizes and tenure to the findings of the HENA 2021. Instead, it is important to recognise an appropriate level of flexibility is required that has regard to the demand and needs of certain areas of the district as well as viability considerations. It is important that the policies are workable and create a housing market that will attract developers as well as being sufficiently aspirational to retain working people and families. 2.63 We think housing density should be considered in two respects: First it can be used as a tool for estimating capacity at a high level to justify the delivery of the housing requirement; and secondly as part of the development management process. 2.64 In terms of the former, the Council will need to consider an approach to density in relation to determining the likely capacity of site allocations, but this should be not confused with the principle of applying a policy requirement for determining housing density on specific sites to guide future planning applications. In this regard, housing density should be seen as the by-product of a range of factors such as the accessibility - distance and travel times to key facilities, the character of the area, the need to address the constraints of the site, market aspirations and viability. It should therefore be a used only as a sense check and guide rather than something that is a policy threshold level that needs to be achieved. 2.65 It should also be recognised that dwellings per hectare, used in isolation, can encourage particular building forms over others, in ways that may not fully address therange of local housing needs. (See NPPG Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 66-005-20190722). 2.66 The policy should recognise that there may be circumstances where variation from these guideline densities may be appropriate where this is			Yes	We support certain aspects of the Local plan in particularly the inclusion of the three housing allocations know as H1P-15, H1P-16 and H1P-17 but as highlighted in our representations, proposed modifications are required to make the plan 'sound' in the context of it being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy. Given the key issues we have raised, and our suggested modifications go to the heart of whether the Plan can be considered sound and we would consider our involvement in	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							justified by individual site circumstances. We suggest that the policy refers to the design and access statement as the basis for determining the appropriate density influenced by local form character topography etc. In tandem with this approach, we recommend the density range should form part of the justification text rather than be given prominence within the policy itself.				the examination hearing sessions to be necessary. We look forward to receiving an acknowledgement that our representations have been duly made.	
0841	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Jalapeno Ventures Ltd and Mr Day	POLICY H2: HOUSING MIX AND DENSITY					Policy H2 – We recommend that the policy refers to the design and access statement as the basis for determining the appropriate density influenced by local form character topography etc. In tandem with this approach, we recommend the density range should form part of the justification text rather than be given prominence within the policy itself.			Yes	Yes	View PDF
0641	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Jalapeno Ventures Ltd and Mr Day	POLICY ID1: DELIVERING INFRASTRUCTURE					2.67 It is recognised that planning obligations are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. These should be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.2.68 We welcome the Council's acknowledgement that some development proposals may be unable to meet all of the relevant policy and planning obligation requirements while remaining economically viable and deliverable, either in whole or in part. In such circumstances we support the Council's approach of considering requests to reduce the level of planning obligations to a level which ensures that a scheme remains viable. In these instances, we note the Council's preference being given to the needs and priorities of an area and the wider benefits of development, such as, for example, regeneration and meeting housing need			Yes	We support certain aspects of the Local plan in particularly the inclusion of the three housing allocations know as H1P-15, H1P-16 and H1P-17 but as highlighted in our representations, proposed modifications are required to make the plan 'sound' in the context of it being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy. Given the key issues we have raised, and our suggested modifications go to the heart of whether the Plan can be considered sound and we would consider our involvement in the examination hearing sessions to	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
											be necessary. We look forward to receiving an acknowledgement that our representations have been duly made.	
James **Hobson**, JEH Planning on behalf of Moorwalk Ltd												
0780	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Moorwalk Ltd	General					JEH Planning are instructed on behalf of Moorwalk Limited to review andprepare representations to the Publication consultation draft of the Local Plan whichwe consider to be unsound based on the requirements and tests set out in Paragraph35 of the NPPF. 1.2 As background, Moorwalk Limited have a landholding interest at Yaddlethorpethe site of which is located off High Street and amounts to an area of approximately11.5Ha in size. This site features in the Strategic Housing Employment LandAvailability Assessment (SHELAA 2021), 'Reference ZFED9 & CFS0300122 - Land offHigh Street, Yaddlethorpe'. It also featured in previous versions of the SHELAA andthe SHLAA 2014 (Reference 36-86) and the Sustainability Appraisal used as evidenceto support the emerging Housing and Employment Allocations DPD. These twodocuments are attached and identified as Appendix 1 and 2 respectively. 1.3 We have confirmed in previous representations that there are no constraintsthat would affect the site's availability and as part of the justification for promoting thesite through the Housing and Employment Land Allocation DPD, a significant body oftechnical evidence relating to transportation, drainage and ecology, together withurban design and masterplanning work has already been prepared. 1.4 The northern part of the site (3.77Ha) was the subject of an outline applicationfor residential development (LPA PA/2020/1207) with all matters reserved apart frommeans of assess. The extent of the site can be found at appendix 3.and the applicationwas refused planning permission on 15th January 2021 on the grounds of highwaysafety and insufficient information regarding noise impact.RepresentationsProject N Lincs Local Plan Oct 2021Client: Moorwalk LtdReport date: Nov 2021Reference: JEH0252. 1.5 Whilst we consider the release of the larger site for housing purposes wouldconform with the objectives and vision of emerging Local Plan, we would also beprepared to consider as a compromise position, a residential allocation on the smallernorthern parcel of land as we consider the reasons for refusal relate to detailedtechnical concerns dealing with highway matters and noise impact which can be easilyresolved. These aspects are addressed in Section 2 of our representations based onto the omission of this site from draft Policy H1. 1.6 In our view the technical assessment work we have undertaken to			Yes	Yes	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							support boththe promotion of the smaller site through the planning application and the larger sitethrough local plan processes continues to remain relevant and we rely upon this workas part of our justification and overall case. 1.7 Moorwalk Ltd remain firmly committed to actively promoting the site through theLocal Plan process to demonstrate that it is both suitable and deliverable, and it willcontribute to delivering the housing requirement within the Local Plan period. 1.8 It is also important to note that Moorwalk have received a strong expression ofinterest to purchase the smaller northern parcel from Gleeson. As such, thedevelopment would not be speculative in nature as it would be delivered by a widelyrespected housebuilder. This is an important consideration as there is anacknowledged need to boost housing land supply and delivery rates. Indeed, Gleesonhave a proven track record in delivering sites in these types of housing market areas.					
0891	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Moorwalk Ltd	Paragraph 3.1					The overall vision seems positive towards growth within the district, and we support this approach. It is noted that Scunthorpe's role as a Major Sub-Regional Centre for housing, employment and services will be supported and strengthened, and we agree with this approach as well. 2.2 It is also noted that the vision ensures a strong alignment between growing the economy and the location of sustainable housing growth. This is also important to achieve when developing a strategy to deal with the amount and distribution of growth.			Yes	Yes	View PDF
0640	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of the Partners T A White & Sons	POLICY EC1-5: LAND AT SANDTOFT AIRFIELD					Introduction. 1.1 JEH Planning are instructed on behalf of the partners of T A White & Sons (Our Clients) to review and prepare representations to the Publication consultation draft of the Local Plan. 1.2 As background T A White and Sons have a landholding interest at Sandtoft Airfield, the site of which was allocated through the LDF's Core Strategy (58.5 Ha) and the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD (HELADPD) as the 55.3 Ha Strategic Employment site known as SANE-1, suitable for a B1 and B8 logistics park use. 1.3 The HELADPD was adopted in April 2016 and since then the site has been re appraised through the evidence base of the emerging Local Plan namely the Employment Land Review Update 2020 (ELA) which is contained within the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availably Assessment (SHELAA) September 2021 (Site Ref ELR26). 1.4 The site continues to feature as an allocated employment allocation within the Publication Draft Local Plan with the following details: Sandtoft EC1-5 Sandtoft Park Business E(g) B8 55.3 ha On behalf of our clients, we have previously confirmed that there are no constraints that would affect the site's availability and as part of the justification for promoting the site through the Housing and Employment Land Allocation DPD, a significant body of technical evidence relating to transportation; drainage; landscape; market demand appraisal; and ecology has already been prepared. In our view this assessment work continues to remain relevant and can be re			Yes	We support certain aspects of the Local plan in particularly the inclusion of the employment allocation known as EC1-5 but as highlight in our representations, proposed modifications are required to make the plan 'sound' in the context of it being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy. Given the key issues we have raised, and our suggested modifications go	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							submitted as part of this new process if required by the Council. 1.6 T A White and Sons remain firmly committed to actively promoting this site through the Local Plan process to demonstrate that it is both suitable and deliverable and it will contribute towards delivering the employment requirement set out within the Local Plan period.				to the heart of whether the Plan can be considered sound and we would consider our involvement in the examination hearing sessions to be necessary. We look forward to receiving an acknowledgement that our representations have been duly made.	
0558	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of the Partners T A White & Sons	POLICY EC1-5: LAND AT SANDTOFT AIRFIELD					POLICY EC1: EMPLOYMENT LAND SUPPLY - EC1-5 (Sandtoft Business Park) Background 2.15 The Council places strong emphasis on driving the economic vitality of the district and as part of previous consultation drafts there was broad support for continuation of the existing strategic locational approach taken in the adopted Core Strategy. In terms of identifying additional employment land, main transport corridors were highlighted as the preferred strategic locations for future growth outside of Scunthorpe and the market towns. In a North Lincolnshire context this relates to land alongside or near to the M180/M181. Paragraph 6.16 of the draft Plan acknowledges that the 55.3ha land allocation at Sandtoft Airfield would maximise its proximity to the M180 motorway, subject to satisfactory access arrangements being met. We would support the continued inclusion of this allocation as EC1-5 although as set out in relation to our representation to draft Policy SS8 its status should be elevated to have a strategic importance. 2.17 Sandtoft Airfield is located in the Isle of Axholme to the west of the village of Belton and to the north west of Epworth. This flat expanse of land is a former World War II airfield that, like North Killingholme Airfield, has subsequently been promoted as a suitable location for industrial and business development. Within the ELR 2020 it continues to be considered as a significant employment site with the potential to support the economies of both the South Humber Bank and Doncaster/Humberside Airports, promoting North Lincolnshire's aspiration to become the north of England's 'Global Gateway'. 2.18 Presently, almost half the airfield is developed with businesses generally clustered along the Sandtoft Road/Beltoft Road frontage and on the surviving runways and taxiways of the former airfield. The development that has accrued on this site over the years has taken place in an unplanned and piecemeal way. 2.19 The strategic importance of the site and the inadequacy of existing access to the site for the scale of future development envisaged resulted		Policy EC1 - We would support the continued inclusion of the Sandtoft Business Park allocation as EC1-5 although as set out in relation to our representation to draft Policy SS8 its status should be elevated to have a strategic importance and included within Policy SS8. 3.5 The Publication Draft Local Plan shows the site (EC1-5) as being suitable for Class E(g) and B8 Uses only and so there is no reference to allowing Class B2 (general industrial) Uses. We recommend that Class B2 (general industry) Use should also be identified as appropriate land uses for the Sandtoft policy designation. 3.6 The Partners of T A White & Sons remain firmly committed to delivering the Allocation identified as EC1-5 and there is strong short term interest in developing the site from commercial end uses. These lines of enquiries are currently being assessed as part of a focused marketing campaign which is being coordinated by a national commercial agent	Yes	We support certain aspects of the Local plan in particularly the inclusion of the employment allocation known as EC1-5 but as highlight in our representations, proposed modifications are required to make the plan 'sound' in the context of it being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy. Given the key issues we have raised, and our suggested modifications go to the heart of whether the Plan can be considered sound and we would consider our involvement in the examination hearing sessions to	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							in a study commissioned by the North Lincolnshire Highway Alliance (NLHA) and along with other detailed justification subsequently led to its allocation in the adopted Core Strategy Development Plan. Evidence Assessment Work 2.20 The was a raft of evidence produced at the time of the Core Strategy's examination included: • Evidence base (Pell Frischmann, July2009) • Planning Evidence Base (WYG Planning and Design, 2010) • Ecological Walkover Survey (WYG Environmental, 2010) • Geo-Environmental Desk Study (WYG Environmental, 2010) • Highways Evidence Base (WYG Transport Planning, 2010) • Framework Travel Plan (WYG Transport Planning, 2010) • Flood Risk Assessment (WYG Engineering, 2010) • Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Statement (WYG Environmental, 2010) • Landscape Appraisal (WYG Environmental, 2010) • Market Demand Appraisal (CB Richard Ellis, 2010) 2.21 Research presented in the evidence base considers the merits of the site from a variety of perspectives, including: • Consistency with national, regional and local transport and planning policy; • The options for improving access to the site; • Competing development in the area; • The local economy; • Sustainable access; • Employment land demand; • The views of potential operators and business; The benefits in economic terms; and, • Opportunities for funding. 2.22 It has been demonstrated that the location and amount of land offered are of a sufficient size that is likely to attract a wide range of potential businesses and creating a number of jobs for local people. Indeed, an appraisal of the costs of potential transport infrastructure improvements against the resultant economic benefits in terms of job creation has shown that the development has the potential to deliver the access options considered. Updated Assessment Work 2.23 The strategic employment allocation SANE-1 has been re-assessed within the ELA 2020 document and the key conclusion for this site states as follows: 'Despite the fact that existing development on this site lacks coherence, there is still a considerable amount of market interest in this area as a business location.' 2.24 Based on the views expressed by our Commercial Agent we would		commissioned by the land owner. 3.7 We look forward to entering ongoing engagement with the Council to not only test key planning and delivery assumptions but also refining the wording of the requirements associated with the draft allocation to allow a broader range and types of commercial uses that should be acceptable on the site.		be necessary. We look forward to receiving an acknowledgement that our representations have been duly made.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							agree with this finding. 2.25 The ELA then goes on to say that: 'Sandtoft Airfield is considered to be a valuable economic development opportunity that will subsequently help to underpin other sectors both in North Lincolnshire and in neighbouring local authorities. It is envisaged that in the future the location of this site should be exploited, and the airfield comprehensively developed as a logistics/business park, thereby broadening the economic diversity of the area. Therefore, it is proposed that the 55.3ha SANE-1 allocation in the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD is retained.' (Our emphasis) 2.26 We would agree with these conclusions, in particular the recognition in the text that there is an opportunity for more flexibility in terms of the proposed business park uses that would be allowed compared to the more restrictive wording of the SANE-1 allocation found within the HELADPD. In this adopted plan, the emphasis is on delivering a logistics park development, but a broader interpretation of appropriate uses should be given to ensure it can also deliver a range of new business park uses, including the expansion of existing local industrial uses, provided that these are brought forward in a well planned and coordinated manner through a masterplan framework. Broadening the Commercial Uses 2.27 The Publication draft Local Plan shows the site as being suitable for Class E(g) and B8 Uses only and so there is no reference to allowing Class B2 (general industrial) Uses which we consider to be an oversight of the policy. It is important to appreciate that the site should be able to maintain an appropriate level of flexibility so that it can be adaptable to the changing demands and needs of the various commercial sectors over the plan period. 2.28 Therefore, in addition to the identified Class E(g) and B8 uses identified in the draft policy table, the site at Sandtoft represents a key employment opportunity that should provide the potential for a well planned strategic Business Park to maximise the delivery of the widest possible range of employment uses. Given its location in close proximity to a variety of existing businesses as well as to the strategic road network, we recommend that there should be an opportunity for the proposed mix of uses to diversify and respond to the market. We recommend that Class B2 (general industry) Use should also be identified as appropriate land uses for the Sandtoft policy designation. Ongoing Commitment 2.29 Since the site was previously promoted through both the Core Strategy and HELADPD we consider it is important to outline the work and major investment that has been undertaken as well as consider the delivery strategy our clients are progressing in order to give them the level of assurance there are reasonable prospects that the allocation can be delivered during the plan period. 2.30 Our client is the sole owner of the site and so there are no land					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							ownership constraints associated with its release. Since the start of the Core Strategy consultation process our client has remained firmly committed to actively promoting the site as a strategic employment opportunity. As outlined above, the site has already been subject to rigorous technical and environmental assessment work to demonstrate its suitability and achievability during both the emerging Core Strategy and the HELADPD consultation processes. 2.31 Following the certainty that was created by the adoption of the HELADPD in March 2016, our client has been fully engaged with senior officers at North Lincolnshire Council regarding discussing a delivery strategy for the site. Indeed, a detailed pre application meeting has progressed to discuss the preparation and submission of an outline planning application for the whole site. This involved scoping out the key areas of assessment that would be required in order to process and validate an EIA compliant proposal that also acknowledged the requirements set out within policy SANE 1. Arising from this meeting a key set of action points was identified including an acceptance that a Planning Performance Agreement could be a suitable mechanism to help ensure transparency and fairness in terms of dealing with complex technical issues. 2.32 Following the preapplication meeting, we subsequently coordinated the scope of works from all members of the technical consultancy team whilst waiting feedback from the Council to certain issues that were raised. 2.33 We accept that progress relating to the preparation of a planning application has been slower than intended but there has been a number of contributory factors that have delayed our client's decision to move forward and instruct the work required to support an outline planning application. These key factors include the following: • The challenging and uncertain economic issues surrounding Brexit and the Covid pandemic. • Uncertainty as to whether the site would continue to be a strong contender as strategic allocation in the emerging local plan. Our clients wanted to make sure the Council remained fully committed to pursuing the allocation. 2.34 Irrespective of these uncertainties the client has continued to commission detailed ecological assessments as this work is season dependent. Comprehensive surveys have now been undertaken of endangered species including newts, water voles, bats, badges and aquatic invertebrates. 2.35 The factors that contributed towards the delays in delivery have now been addressed. Our client is ready to resume progress and over the past year they have made a serious commitment towards marketing the site. 2.36 The clients are already in detailed discussions with a number of blue chip business operators who have expressed serious interest in structuring a land contract to allow them to progress a planning application for their commercial proposals. At the same time, the client					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							has recently instructed a national commercial agent who is experienced in actively marketing strategic employment site. A detailed marketing strategy and campaign is about to commence, and it is anticipated that over the next few months a delivery and disposal strategy will be agreed with a preferred developer (or end users) that aligns closely with the aspirations and objectives of the land owner and your policy requirements (although as stated above widening the flexibility of uses in the proposed allocation to include Class B2 uses would also help in marketing the site and facilitating its delivery). 2.37 Given the character and location of the site and the current strong market conditions we are confident that it will be commercially attractive, and a well-conceived strategic business park proposal will start to be advance in the short term that aligns with the Council's economic growth aspirations. 2.38 We are aware that there is emphasis within the Revised National Planning Policy Framework that proposed allocations that feature within emerging plans should be deliverable over the Plan Period. Through the commitment we have explained we remain confident that a planning application will be submitted in the near future linked to the market requirements of an end operator.					
0836	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Moorwalk Ltd	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS					Background 2.43 Moorwalk Ltd are promoting a site for residential development at Yaddlethorpe on the southern side of Scunthorpe as an urban extension identified as Ref ZFED9 within the SHELAA 2020, which we consider will complement the Lincolnshire Lakescheme and indeed assist in terms of spreading the responsibility for achieving thelevels of housing completion for Scunthorpe and Bottesford. In the context of Scunthorpe continuing to be the main housing growth areawithin North Lincolnshire, it is important to ensure that there is a wide range of allocatedsites that support the Lincolnshire Lakes scheme to deliver the annual housing deliveryrates required and align closely with the economic growth ambitions of the district. Ifthe emerging Local Plan seeks to limit the sites allocated within Scunthorpe, therewould be an over-reliance on the Lincolnshire Lake scheme, and consequently thiscould create an inflexible and undeliverable housing strategy. 2.45 The site has been identified as a 'Discounted housing site' in the SHELAA 2020and it has been given the reference 'ZFED9 - Land off High Street, Yaddlethorpe'. Thereasons given for discounting the site are stated as follows:'The site is within 250m of a former land fill. A Phase1 and site investigationwill be required.Highways would not support any additional development from YaddlethorpeHigh Street without improvements to High Street (widening) and junction of Moorwell Road/High Street.There is a ransom strip at the end of Gardenia Drive and no direct access toGardenia Drive, the intervening land is in third party ownerships.Existing infrastructure is unable to support such a large area of development. 2.46 Through the consultation stages of the HELADPD a substantial andcomprehensive case was submitted to support this site as being a suitable anddeliverable proposed housing allocation justified with sound			Yes	Yes	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							technical andenvironmental evidence-based works. 2.47 A key issue to bear in mind is that immediately prior to the release of the revisedsubmission draft HEDPD in 2014, there was strong evidence to suggest that theCouncil viewed this site as a suitable and strong candidate for housing, as it featuredwithin a previous version of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Site Allocation (SCUH-14) Land off High Street, Yaddlethorpe. We provide an extract of this SA assessmentfor your information, as well as an extract of the former SHLAA 2014, and thesedocuments are attached as Appendix 1 and 2. It was therefore comprehensivelyassessed at that time and from the SA scores the site performed extremely well. Thedecision to remove it as a proposed allocation appears to be as a direct result ofpolitical intervention by a Ward Councillor, although the decision-making process isunclear. 2.48 We consider the removal of the site as a potential allocation at a late stage inthe previous local plan process was a short-sighted approach to adopt given thesustainability qualities and planning merits this site has to offer. It is also available inthe short term, suitable for development and deliverable. Indeed, from the SHELAAcomments it would seem the only issues that are holding the site back are technicalhighway concerns, but we consider these can be adequately addressed. 2.49 Also, it will be noted that at the same time as promoting this site through theLocal Plan process, Moorwalk Ltd submitted an outline application on the north part ofthe site which extends to 3.77ha for up to 110 dwellings. This was refused in January2021.on the grounds that:• the development 'would present an unacceptable safety risk to both the existingand future users of the highway network.' (This relates to the Local Highway Authority (LHA) request for development to widen High Street and improve itsjunction with Moorwell Road)• The absence of sufficient information in terms of noise and therefore the inabilityto assess the impacts properly that the motocross facility would have upon futureresidents.' 2.50 Our noise expert has reviewed the reasons for refusal and remains confidentthat further details can be submitted to adequately address the noise issue. In termsof the highway concerns, we set out below and overview of the suitability for both thewhole site and the smaller parcel of land that formed the outline planning application. Highway Context 2.51 The acceptability of this site and the adjacent highways for residentialdevelopment have been confirmed through three separate Transport Assessments bythree different transport consultants over the past 12 years. 2.52 In 2009, a Transport Assessment was produced by Steer Davies Leave (SDG)to support a planning application (2010) for up to 150 dwellings on the northern parcelof the site. The TA considered the impacts of the proposal on High Street and the HighStreet / Moorwell Road / High Leys Road junction and concluded that the short sectionof High Street less than 4.8m wide (just to the north of its junction with EndcliffeAvenue) should be widened to 4.8m, and that no mitigation is necessary at the HighStreet					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							/ Moorwell Road / High Leys Road junction on the basis that the achievablevisibility is above the minimum requirements, and that the accidents statistics do notsuggest the junction has a road safety issue. The Highway Authority considered thisapplication and identified that the on-site layout did not conform to design guidanceand the application was refused on that basis. Importantly, there was no criticism ofoff-site highway shortcomings. 2.53 In 2013, a Transport Assessment was produced by Northern Transport Planning(NTP) in correspondence with North Lincolnshire Council to support the allocation ofthe site through the emerging Local Plan. The proposed allocation which is also thesubject of the SHELAA assessment was over twice the size of the refused applicationin 2009 and was for up to 350-dwellings. 2.54 The 2013 TA considered the impacts of the proposal on High Street and theHigh Street / Moorwell Road / High Leys Road junction and concluded that the short30m section of High Street less than 4.8m wide (just to the north of its junction withEndcliffe Avenue) should be widened to 5m, and that no mitigation was necessary atthe High Street / Moorwell Road / High Leys Road junction on the basis that theachievable visibility is above the minimum requirements, and that the accidentsstatistics do not suggest the junction has a road safety issue. 2.55 Local widening of a 30-metre section High Street, north of the junction withEndcliffe Avenue where the carriageway width is locally restricted to 4.65 metres. Thiswould include a scheme to widen High Street to 5.5m adjacent to Endcliffe Avenue withthe possibility of a third passing place to the south. With the exception of this shortsection of High Street, a carriageway width of 5.0 metres is generally available, whichwas deemed to be satisfactory. 2.56 The layout of the junction of High Street with Moorwell Road to be improved canbe found on Drawing Number 12003/12 identified as Appendix 4 and shows localwidening of Moorwell Road on the approaches to the Junction with High Street toenable Ghost Island Turning Lanes to be provided. The scheme also realigned theHigh Street approach to the Junction so that vehicles turning right onto High Streetwere not directly opposed by vehicles turning right into High Leys Road. 2.57 In 2020, a Transport Assessment was produced by WYG (now Tetra Tech) tosupport a planning application for up to 110-dwellings on the northern parcel of the sitebeing promoted through the local plan process – the same area as the 2009 outlineapplication. 2.58 The TA considered the impacts of the proposal on High Street and the HighStreet / Moorwell Road / High Leys Road junction and concluded that no mitigationworks were necessary on the basis that the pinch point on High Street is likely actingas a traffic calming measure, that the High Street / Moorwell Road / High Leys Roadjunction achieves visibility greater than the minimum requirements, and that theaccidents statistics do not suggest the junction has a road safety issue. 2.59 During the scoping of the 2020 TA, the highway authority advised that theywould require improvements at Moorwell Road / High Street					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							junction and the wideningof High Street to 5.5m. They could offer no justification for those requests but simplystated that they had identified those measures a number of years ago and alwayswanted to secure them. 2.60 Tetra Tech provided recent guidance references, passing traffic analyses androad safety statistics, all demonstrating that the highway network should be deemedacceptable. The applicant Moorwalk decided to take a pragmatic view and offered toundertake the Moorwell Road junction works and a number of 5.5m wide passingopportunities to ensure that no material delay or conflict would exist on High Street. 2.61 Despite apparently making progress towards agreement, the planningapplication was abruptly determined under delegated powers with the refusal. 2.62 Following the refusal, Tetra Tech (transport consultants), JEH Planning andMoorwalk met with the Council's Strategic Board in February 2021, (a collection ofplanning authority and highway authority officers) to discuss the best route forward.As per the 2020 TA, Tetra Tech continued to consider that no off-site mitigation worksare necessary as the impact of the development is not considered to be significant.Nonetheless the applicant maintained their agreement to provide the previously offeredworks. 2.63 Planning Officers on the Strategic Board expressed concerns that the localresidents had not been specifically consulted on the offsite highway works associatedwith the development proposals, namely:• Proposal 1 - Localised widening of High Street just to the north of its junction withEndcliffe Avenue: from 4.65m to 4.8m wide – Allows a car to pass an HGVthroughout the extent of High Street.• Proposal 2 to 5 – Localised highway works to High Street to create 5.5m passingopportunities allowing two HGV's to pass.• Proposal 6 – Potential speed actuated sign• Proposal 7 – Potential kerb build out 2.64 These proposals can be found Appendix 5. 2.65 To that end, a community engagement was held during the summer of 2021 tounderstand the local views specifically focused on these proposed mitigation works.58 responses to the consultation were received, with 52 objections and 6 commentsraising questions or seeking further clarity. Whilst it is acknowledged that some of thecommunity have strong concerns regarding highway safety, our transport consultantsmaintain that the proposal for the north part of the site are acceptable in highway termswithout the offsite highway works which have been fully demonstrated through theTransport Statement that accompanied the outline planning application. However,taking a pragmatic approach we continue to propose the highway mitigation measuresidentified above to appease both the Council's highway team and the local community. 2.66 Base on technical TA evidence we remain firmly of the view that the highwaysconcerned can be satisfied and overcome either in relation to the larger SHELAA sitewe are promoting through the Local Plan review, or the smaller northern parcel whichhas been the subject of two outline planning applications, subject to the offer of offsitemitigation measures					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							we have outlined. As a consequence, reference to an alternativeaccess arrangement from Gardenia Drive being required, as identified within the SHELAA2020, is not a relevant or material consideration issue for discounting the site. 2.67 Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposed scale ofdevelopment on this Yaddlethorpe Site is acceptable in principle from a transport pointof view.Sustainability and Other Technical Considerations 2.68 Based on the technical work undertaken, overwhelming evidence exists withinthe initial Sustainability Appraisal prepared by the Council (see Appendix 2) andbacked up with further supporting technical documents of our own to demonstrate thatin rational terms, the Yaddlethorpe site should be chosen. It is one of the most suitablehousing allocations to deliver the objectives of the plan, particularly when compared toother housing allocations being promoted in the Publication Draft Local Plan. 2.69 A significant amount of detailed assessment work has been undertaken toinvestigate the development potential of the site for housing purposes by thelandowner. This has included other technical work having regard to flood risk anddrainage as well as an ecological assessment. The identified issues, constraints andopportunities have been filtered through an initial masterplan process culminating inthe preparation of a concept layout framework plan which can be found at Appendix 6.This shows residential development set within a well-designed framework of greencorridors. There would also be the opportunity to create a well-planned developmentwith softer urban edges and respond to the relationship between the existing built form. 2.70 Our examination of the site is at such a detailed level that we are able to providea high degree of certainty and assurance that it is achievable, suitable and available inaccordance with the guidance found in NPPF. This site could therefore contribute todelivering housing units in the short-term to boost a much-needed increase in housingsupply. 2.71 The concerns that have been raised at a political level during the previousconsultation process should be outweighed in favour of the more rational assessmentwork identified undertaken by the Council's SA and supported by our own technicalstudy work produced for the local plans process and the planning application on thesmaller northern parcel of land. 2.72 In discounting the site, the SHELAA 2020 also refers to the request for a phase1 Site investigation. A Geo – Environmental Desk Study was prepared for the outlineapplication on the smaller site, and it concluded that a former landfill site is locatedapproximately 180m southeast of the site. However, based on the conceptual model,migration of ground gas from the landfill to the site is considered unlikely. 2.73 The SHELAA also expressed concern regarding existing infrastructure beingunable to support such a large area of development. We consider there is someexisting capacity of services in the local area to support the development. However,we would expect to make appropriate contributions towards necessary improvementsor additional provision for					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							community services and facilities arising from thedevelopment proposals.RepresentationsProject N Lincs Local Plan Oct 2021Client: Moorwalk LtdReport date: Nov 2021Reference: JEH02520 2.74 This evidenced based work provides a strong foundation to demonstrate keyplanning, technical and environmental aspect for developing have already beenaddressed. There is the comfort that a well-conceived masterplan approach has beenundertaken which draws together the identified opportunities, constraints, andmitigation options that can be achieved. It provides a realistic development opportunitythat will contribute to delivering the overall spatial objectives of the Local Plan in theshort term.					
0833	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Moorwalk Ltd	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS					Policy H1 - Moorwalk Ltd recommend that based on the detailed sustainability and technical assessment work undertaken as well as the interest that has been expressed by Gleeson, the site at Yaddlethorpe (Ref ZFED9 within the SHELAA 2020) on the southern side of Scunthorpe should be included as a proposed residential urban extension. This site will complement the Lincolnshire Lake scheme and indeed assist in terms of spreading the responsibility for achieving the levels of housing completion for Scunthorpe and Bottesford to achieve the economic potential of the District. 3.8 We would also consider as a compromise position a residential allocation on the smaller northern parcel of land that has been the subject of an outline planning application for up to 110 dwellings. We consider the reasons for refusal for this proposal related to detailed technical concerns only dealing with highway matters and noise impact which can be easily resolved and mitigated as we have outlined in our representations.			Yes	Yes	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0842	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Moorwalk Ltd	POLICY H2: HOUSING MIX AND DENSITY					We would express caution of seeking to tie the mix of housing types, sizes and tenure to the findings of the HENA 2021. Instead, it is important to recognise an appropriate level of flexibility is required that has regard to the demand and needs of certain areas of the district as well as viability considerations. It is also important that the policies are workable and create a housing market that will attract investors as well as being sufficiently aspirational to retain working people and families. 2.76 We think housing density should be considered in two respects: first it can be used as a tool for estimating capacity at a high level to justify the delivery of the housing requirement; and secondly as part of the development management process. 2.77 In terms of the former, the Council will need to consider an approach to density in relation to determining the likely capacity of site allocations, but this should be not confused with the principle of applying a policy requirement for determining housing density on specific sites to guide future planning applications. In this regard, housing density should be seen as the by-product of a range of factors such as the accessibility - distance and travel times to key facilities, the character of the area, the need to address the constraints of the site, market aspirations and viability. It should therefore be a used only as a sense check and guide, rather than something that is a policy threshold level that needs to be achieved. 2.78 It should also be recognised that dwellings per hectare, used in isolation, can encourage particular building forms over others, in ways that may not fully address the range of local housing needs. (See NPPG Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 66-005-20190722). 2.79 The policy should recognise that there may be circumstances where variation from these guideline densities may be appropriate where this is justified by individual site circumstances. We suggest that the policy refers to the design and access statement as the basis for determining the appropriate density influenced by local form character topography etc. In tandem with this approach, we recommend the density range should form part of the justification text rather than be given prominence within the policy itself.			Yes	Yes	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0857	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Moorwalk Ltd	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE					We support the principles of Policy SS2 in terms of defining Scunthorpe & Bottesford Urban Area as a Major Sub-Regional Centre in order to maintain and strengthen its role, and this will be the priority focus for growth in North Lincolnshire. We also welcome the policy's focus for large-scale residential development through the provision of allocations in this plan including sustainable urban extensions to the Scunthorpe and Bottesford Area. 2.4 The range of services that Scunthorpe can offer and the population that it supports means that it is the main town in North Lincolnshire. The size of the other towns and villages are much lower in the hierarchy. Scunthorpe is already an established Sub Regional town and therefore should continue to be seen for expansion of its role for housing, employment and other services of the scale previously envisaged in the adopted Plan. 2.5 We consider that the most sustainable option, taking into account economic growth and environmental considerations, is to continue to concentrate significant growth in Scunthorpe and Bottesford combined with development to a lesser extent in the market towns and rural settlements, within defined development limits. Allocating more housing to less sustainable rural locations would also risk eroding the character of these settlements. However, compared to the adopted local plan, the Council's emerging position through Policy SS2 will create a more dispersed pattern of growth within the rural areas and this would not achieve the desired level of sustainability that would be forthcoming from a more focused approach on the higher order towns within the settlement hierarchy. 2.7 We recommend that the proportion of housing growth to Scunthorpe should increase from 51.3% as set out in Table 4.2 of Policy SS6 to at least a figure of 70% which is still considerably less than the proportion set out within the adopted Core Strategy (82%).			Yes	Yes	View PDF
0861	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Moorwalk Ltd	POLICY SS5: OVERALL HOUSING PROVISION					Planning positively and the Standard Methodology 2.8 Paragraph 60 of the NPPF aimed to 'significantly boost the supply of homes. Paragraph 61 recommends that to determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment conducted using the standard methodology in national planning guidance, unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends signals. 2.9 Given this context, Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAs) primarily inform the production of the Local Plan and their key objective is to provide the robust and strategic evidence base required to establish the full Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) for housing and provide information on the appropriate mix of housing and range of tenures needed. The NPPG clearly states that they do not set a 'housing target' for the planning authority. 2.10 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets a presumption in favour of sustainable			Yes	Yes	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							development whereby local plans should meet the development needs of their area and align growth and infrastructure. The standard method uses a formula to identify the minimum number of homes expected to be planned for, in a way which addresses projected household growth and historic under-supply. It identifies a minimum annual housing need figure, but guidance in the NPPG clearly states the figure does not produce a housing requirement figure. (NPPG Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 2a-002-20190220) 2.12 Indeed, the use of the standard method for strategic policy making is not mandatory. If it is felt that circumstances warrant an alternative approach the NPPG guidance allows for this to take place. (NPPG Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 2a-003- 20190220) 2.13 The NPPG specifically asks when it might be appropriate to plan for a higher housing need figure than the standard method indicates. It reconfirms that the government is committed to ensuring that more homes are built and supports ambitious authorities who want to plan for growth. As stated above, the standard method for assessing local housing need provides a minimum starting point in determining the number of homes needed in an area. It does not attempt to predict the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour. Therefore, there is a clear acceptance that there will be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than the standard method indicates. 2.14 Circumstances where this may be appropriate include, but are not limited to, situations where increases in housing need are likely to exceed past trends because of growth strategies for the area that are likely to be deliverable. Given the Council's ambitious employment growth plans for the area, we considered North Lincolnshire's housing need is far greater than is proposed within the Publication Draft Local Plan. Government advice authorities that it will need to take this into account when considering whether it is appropriate to plan for a higher level of need than the standard model suggests. (NPPG Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 2a-010-20190220).We refer to the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (HENA) 2020 (figure 29) which focuses on housing completions in North Lincolnshire over the past 10 years with the annual average number of dwellings completed over this period being 368. It confirms that the district has struggled to deliver new housing at the levels required by the Core Strategy 754 dwellings per annum. The HENA compares the average completion figure over the past 10 years with the minimal annual local housing need figure for the district calculated using the standard method, which equates to 396 dwellings. The study simply compares the two figures and confirms at section 7.3 that 'the delivery of 396 new homes per year is a realistic and achievable minimum target on which to base future housing allocation policies.' We consider this is a too simplistic approach to adopt and no weight is given to the area's significant potential and continued aspiration for economic growth as promoted within the draft Local Plan.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Aligning Housing Need with Economic Growth 2.16 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear that housing and economic strategies should be aligned. The NPPF also requires plans to be positively prepared and aspirational (paragraph 16). 2.17 Paragraph 81 states planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. The approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses and address the challenges of the future. 2.18 To ensure that the plan is based upon a sound footing it is therefore essential that the Council seek to align its housing requirement with a positive growth strategy. Given the economic potential within the area, the housing growth strategy proposed by the Council is not considered to adequately fulfil these criteria. 2.19 There is a pressing need to boost the supply of new homes to attract and retain the skills and flexible workforce needed to fill jobs and continue to drive productivity and growth. Having regard to the employment land requirement, it is clear that the Council take a somewhat conservative approach through the identification of at least 131.7 Ha of employment land between 2020 to 2038 which includes an additional buffer of 50% of the total requirement on the basis of ensuring appropriate flexibility and choice to deliver approximately 10,300 jobs over the plan period. We appreciated this is an increase from the previous Local Plan draft of 91.5 hectares of land proposed between 2017 to 2036 but it is unclear how the predicted numbers of jobs estimated has reduced from the previous draft of 11,500 even though the proposed employment requirement has actually increased. 2.21 It should be recognised that this employment requirement is a minimum amount and not a target. Clearly the draft plan has significant ambitions for economic growth beyond the minimum requirement as it identifies 190 hectares of employment land allocations in connection with Policy EC1 and a further 1063 hectares of strategic employment allocations relating to South Humber Bank, North Killingholme and Lincolnshire Lakes. Indeed, at section 10.4.1 of the HENA if confirms that North Lincolnshire is unique in that it includes large areas of strategically important employment land with the South Humber Bank being a key sub regional employment site. Similarly, North Killingholme Airfield is well located for businesses and facilities that support the estuary/port-related industries sites at the South Humber Bank. However, Section 13.2 of the HENA concludes that neither the Baseline nor the Inward Investment scenarios take to account the major opportunities that the renewable energy sector presents. It goes on to state: ‘The expansion of electricity generation from offshore wind in particular					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							represents a massive long term investment opportunity which has the potential to generate thousands of jobs in the local area and the UK, as well as securing a marine renewable electricity source. Indeed, the SHG is of strategic economic importance not only for the Humber but also for the whole country. The SHG has the potential to attract major wind turbine manufacturers and their supply chain which would create thousands of jobs in the manufacture, installation and maintenance of Round 3 Offshore Wind farms.'2.22 Delivery this ambition is an important aspect to the evidence base which has been understated in the modelling work. 2.23 In contrast, the only proposed increase by the Council above the standard housing need figure of 396 dwellings pa is an additional modest 198 dwellings within the first 5 years and so the overall requirement for the plan period equates to 7,326 dwellings. The Council have taken a very cautious view by not significantly deviating from the standard method for calculating the objectively assessed housing need. However, it is clear from the advice within the NPPF that it should be considered as a baseline minimum figure which local plans should seek to exceed. 2.24 It is also clear that areas which seek to exceed the baseline objectively assessed housing need will be supported in doing so by the Government. It is considered that a sound plan for North Lincolnshire which is positively prepared and aspirational that matches the economic growth ambitions will need to go significantly beyond any standard calculation. 2.25 By failing to provide a necessary number of new housing for envisaged new employees, the economic strategy would not be realised unless there are significant increased rates of commuting into the area which is neither sustainable nor desirable. Providing Sufficient Headroom Flexibility 2.26 Table 5.1 in the draft Local Plan entitled Housing Delivery indicates that there is potential to deliver 7,932 homes over the plan period which includes housing completions, extant planning permissions and housing allocations. However, paragraph 5.7 of the draft local plan also confirms that the SHLEAA identifies over the plan period there is sufficient 'developable' land to provide approximately 11,000 new dwellings on a range of sites, but from studying this document it is unclear as to how this figure has been derived and which potential housing sites have been included in the calculation as they can only be identified and brought forward through the draft local plan. Given the lack of transparency in this figure, we have assumed for the proposes of our calculations an overall proposed housing supply of 7,932 dwellings over the plan period. The difference between this figure and the proposed housing requirement of 7,138 homes (not including the additional 198 dwellings proposed by the Council for 'flexibility') amount to a percentage buffer or headroom of approximately 11%. In terms of housing supply, and in the context of the employment strategy, we do not consider there is enough headroom in					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							the supply to ensure that the plan remains robust if there is slippage in the delivery of housing sites from the proposed allocations or committed sites. 2.28 Increasing this supply headroom, particular through the allocation of a variety of sites in sustainable locations that accord with the settlement growth distribution, would ensure that: an adequate rolling five-year supply of housing land would be maintained; the plan is robust; and it would deliver sufficient housing to help address the pressing issues of affordability and affordable housing needs. 2.29 Interestingly, the proposed employment strategy adopts the principles of a headroom approach to introduce the desired level of flexibility to response to rapid changes in commercial demand and respond by offering a range and choice of site. The employment headroom amounts to over 100% of the identified employment provision and this doesn't include the two allocated strategic sites which would take the headroom figure to well over 1,000% of the proposed requirement, even though they featured as firm allocations in the adopted local plan. 2.30 There needs to be some recognition in the plan that a similar approach should apply to the housing growth strategy to reflect the growth ambitions of the District and introduce sound contingency measures. We considered it would not be unreasonable to have a housing supply headroom that was around 50% of the proposed minimum housing requirement figure. This approach is in accordance with the NPPF (paragraph 82) which says that plans should have sufficient flexibility to adapt to change. Based on the current limited headroom available between the housing requirement and the committed and proposed allocations as well as the continued reliance on the delivery of Lincolnshire Lakes, we are not convinced that the policies demonstrate a flexible integrated and forward looking approach towards meeting present and future needs in the district.					
0860	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Moorwalk Ltd	POLICY SS5: OVERALL HOUSING PROVISION					Policy SS5 - Rather than progress on the basis as 'business as usual' housingneed scenario, which is influenced by past low growth trends, recognition should begiven to the desired level of growth and aspirational stepped change in the economy.We therefore recommend the following approaches: 3.2 Provide a substantial housing land supply headroom or buffer above theproposed housing requirement to create sufficient flexibility to respond to the changesas well as offer a choice and range of sites; 3.3 That the Council consider a similar approach adopted by North EastLincolnshire District Council for their housing growth strategy. NEDLC have plannedfor a successful economic growth strategy by identifying an ambitious housing targetto reflect economic growth aspiration above past trends but the annual housingrequirement is stepped up across the plan period so that there is a strong alignmentbetween delivering the two strategies. 3.4 These same principles should be adopted as part of the plan to ensure			Yes	Yes	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							thatcommunities make land sufficiently available to deliver homes in the right places andbe consistent with Government guidance regarding a positive approach to planningmaking. As things stand the level of housing requirement proposed would stifle thegrowth ambition of the district and this would be a backward step particularly in thecontext of the previous growth targets as set out in the adopt local plan.					
0862	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Moorwalk Ltd	POLICY SS5: OVERALL HOUSING PROVISION					Housing Trajectory 2.32 The plan needs to be robust and capable of meeting unexpected contingencies such as delivery failure or slippage on one or more sites. As stated above, it needs to be borne in mind the housing requirement is a minimum figure not a target. A robust strategy is particularly relevant for North Lincolnshire where longer term housing delivery is largely by means of a single large strategic housing site at Lincolnshire Lakes. An increase in the supply provides greater flexibility over timing and ensures that if a degree of slippage does occur, the plan is not vulnerable to challenge. 2.33 The plan needs to be effective over its life span and have regard to potential changes in circumstances. To that end, it needs to contain a balance of short- and long-term sites. The permitted and commenced sites together with smaller allocations will need to deliver and address the immediate five-year supply issues. Large scale strategic sites notoriously have long leading times and development periods. Indeed, the time span will cover a number of plan reviews and housing requirement recalculations. 2.34 Evidence that the Lincolnshire Lake site has not come forward as quickly as anticipated can be seen from reviewing the delivery assumptions within previous draft versions of the Core Strategy and the Housing and Employment Sites DPD through to their adoption. In addition, for the evidence found in the Litchfield Start to Finish: What Factors Affect the Build-Out Rates of Large Scale Housing Sites? Report dated February 2020, it confirms that large schemes of over 2,000 dwellings can take up to 8.4 years from the date at which an outline application is validated for the first home to be delivered. With this evidence in mind, it is important that the Council aim to future proof the plan and review the housing trajectory rates. Reference is also made to Appendix 7: Housing Trajectory which seeks to identify the projected net additional dwellings over the lifetime of the plan. It is difficult to understand this table as there are no key assumptions as to how these rates will be achieved. Conclusion 2.36 In conclusion we consider that the significantly lower housing requirement put forward by the Council compared to the adopted development plan would not have regard to the reality of North Lincolnshire's characteristics or its aspirations. The approach would pose a risk to local economic prospects and would potentially increase the rate of commuting.			Yes	Yes	View PDF
0884	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES					2.37 As we have set out in our response to Preferred Policy SS2: Spatial Strategy we consider that Scunthorpe and Bottesford should continue to be the main focus for the majority of new development and growth but at a higher level than identified within policy SS6. We consider that the most			Yes	Yes	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	Moorwalk Ltd						sustainable option taking into account economic growth and environmental considerations, is to continue to concentrate growth in Scunthorpe and Bottesford on similar proportions to those identified in the previously adopted Local Plan. combined with development to a lesser extent in the market towns and rural settlements within development limits. 2.38 Within the Core Strategy, Policy SC1 identified Scunthorpe Urban Area as contributing to 82% of the overall housing requirement. In contrast, Policy SS2 significantly reduces the percentage directed to Scunthorpe and Bottesford Urban Area to 51.3% of the overall proposed housing requirement. With the proposal to reduce the overall housing requirement generally within the district, this leads to a substantial reduction in the total number of dwellings proposed for this settlement compared to the Core Strategy from a housing provision of 9,892 dwellings between 2011 to 2026 to 3,758 dwellings between 2020 to 2038. In other words, a change in growth strategy from 659 dwelling per annum in the adopted plan compared to 209 dwellings per annum. This new approach is a dramatic and stepped change reduction in growth of over 68% for the Scunthorpe and Bottesford Urban Area which fundamentally contradicts and undermines the previous policy objectives and principles that had been accepted and judged to be sound. 2.40 The Council's approach will create a dispersed pattern of growth within the rural areas, and this would not achieve the desired level of sustainability that would be forthcoming from a more focused approach on the higher order towns within the settlement hierarchy. 2.41 It is also noted that of the 3758 dwellings proposed for Scunthorpe and Bottesford urban area 2150 would relate to the Lincolnshire lakes development. This equates to nearly 57% of the housing provision proposed to be directed to this settlement and this will place a significant over reliance on the delivery of a single strategic opportunity particularly in terms of the early stages of the local plan period. 2.42 A better approach would be to also introduce a wider range of smaller sites to offer a choice of opportunities for house builders. This approach would not only increase the housing provision for Scunthorpe and Bottesford but also assist in orchestrating a smoother and coordinated housing trajectory in the context of achieving an ongoing five year housing land supply position, without relying upon Lincolnshire Lakes coming forward early in the plan period.					
0863	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of Moorwalk Ltd	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES					Policy SS6 – We recommend that the proportion of housing growth to Scunthorpe should increase from 51.3% as set out in Table 4.2 of Policy SS6 to at least a figure of 70% which is still considerably less than the proportion set out within the adopted Core Strategy. A better approach would be to also introduce a wider range of smaller sites to offer a choice of opportunities for housebuilders. This approach would not only increase the housing provision for Scunthorpe and Bottesford but also assist in orchestrating a smoother and coordinated housing trajectory in the context of achieving an ongoing five year housing land supply position, without relying upon Lincolnshire Lakes coming forward early in the plan			Yes	Yes	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							period					
James **Hobson**, JEH Planning on behalf of the Partners T A White & Sons												
0640	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of the Partners T A White & Sons	POLICY ID1: DELIVERING INFRASTRUCTURE	Support				2.39 It is recognised that planning obligations are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. These should be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. 2.40 We welcome the Council's acknowledgement that some development proposals may be unable to meet all of the relevant policy and planning obligation requirements while remaining economically viable and deliverable, either in whole or in part. In such circumstances we support the Council's approach of considering requests to reduce the level of planning obligations to a level which ensures that a scheme remains viable. In these instances, we note the Council's preference being given to the needs and priorities of an area and the wider benefits of development, such as, for example, regeneration and meeting housing need.			Yes	We support certain aspects of the Local plan in particularly the inclusion of the employment allocation known as EC1-5 but as highlight in our representations, proposed modifications are required to make the plan 'sound' in the context of it being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy. Given the key issues we have raised, and our suggested modifications go to the heart of whether the Plan can be considered sound and we would consider our involvement in the examination hearing sessions to be necessary. We look forward to receiving an acknowledgement that our representations have been duly made.	View PDF
0724	James Hobson, JEH Planning on behalf of the Partners T A	POLICY SS8: EMPLOYMENT LAND REQUIREMENT (INCLUDING STRATEGIC					It is noted that the latest application of the model forecasts approximately 10,300 jobs being generated over the plan period which equates to an increase of 12.7% for the period 2017 - 2038. From this calculation it is forecast that 5000 jobs will be created up to 2038 under the traditional Use Class E (former use B1a, B1b and B1c only), B2 and B8 categories		Policy SS8 - To achieve the economic prosperity as required, it is essential that sufficient employment land is identified that can bring about	Yes	We support certain aspects of the Local plan in particularly the inclusion of the	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	White & Sons	EMPLOYMENT SITES)					which relates to 48% of the total jobs growth for North Lincolnshire. 2.2 The job forecast has then been applied to standard employment densities as used within the Employment Land Review to generate a land area calculation of the requirement. In order to ensure appropriate flexibility and choice, the Employment Land Review report recommended the use of an additional buffer of 50% of the total requirement to ensure appropriate flexibility and choice is available for operators. This results in a land requirement as identified in the Publication Draft Local Plan of at least 131.7 Ha. 2.3 The Government also recommends that a range of procedures are used to compare projected employment land demand, including the use of past employment land monitoring returns to predict future demand. Historic take up of employment land over the last 10 years has shown an average of approx. 5 ha per year over the traditional B1, B2 and B8 employment uses. The Employment Land Review confirms that if past trends were used to forecast future employment land requirements, North Lincolnshire would require an allocation of approximately 105 ha of land up to 2038. 2.4 We note that the previous draft of the Local Plan proposed a requirement of 91.5Ha over the plan period and so we welcome the increase in provision to 'at least 131.7Ha'. However, we continue to question whether this new requirement would enable North Lincolnshire to provide a sufficient level of flexibility to maximise its economic offer whilst at the same time seeking to bolstering and broadening its economic base. 2.5 We maintain that the employment figure should at least include all the allocations that are included as an allocated Employment Site which amounts to 190.07 Ha. This figure would also acknowledge that part of the Strategic Employment Sites at South Humber Bank and North Killingholme could contribute during the plan period even though they have been excluded from the future employment land take up projections 2.6 We support the concept of continuing to over-allocate employment land in North Lincolnshire. In doing so this would help to deliver the plan's economic growth aspirations, highlighted in the draft spatial vision, as well as allowing some flexibility for new employment developments and opportunities to come forward. Furthermore, it would help to maximise prospects of attracting new investment to the area alongside meeting the demands of new and developing industries. Having a wide range and choice of sites is therefore a necessary requirement. 2.7 In summary, we would agree with the underlying draft Plans objective that to achieve the economic prosperity as required, it is essential that sufficient employment land is identified that can bring about the required growth and in order to provide a range and choice of opportunities 190 Ha should be recognised as the target requirement figure. The alternative of allocating less land than has been identified would not be a reasonable approach to adopt as this would be inconsistent with national policy, nor would it achieve the aspirational vision and objectives of the Plan. Furthermore, it would not offer the range of sites, particularly within the		the required growth. In order to provide a range and choice of opportunities, 190 Ha of employment land should be recognised as the target requirement figure. 3.2 From the strategic allocations table found within Policy SS8, Sandtoft Business Park has not been recognised as a strategic employment site. We considered this is an oversight of the draft Plan given the scale of the site and its importance and status. 3.3 We therefore request that Sandtoft Business Park is included as a strategic allocation as part of Policy SS8 to recognise its essential value in terms of the significant contribution it would make to the Council's economic growth strategy.		employment allocation known as EC1-5 but as highlight in our representations, proposed modifications are required to make the plan 'sound' in the context of it being positively prepared, effective and consistent with national policy. Given the key issues we have raised, and our suggested modifications go to the heart of whether the Plan can be considered sound and we would consider our involvement in the examination hearing sessions to be necessary. We look forward to receiving an acknowledgement that our representations have been duly made.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							context of the NPPF's requirement to plan positively for growth and to ensure the borough's indigenous growth potential is not constrained by a lack of spatial capacity in future. 2.9 Policy SS8 includes two Strategic Employment Allocations as part of the considering the employment land requirement. 2.10 In terms of the South Humber Bank (SHB) allocation is concerned, paragraph 9.5 of the ELR confirms that any approaches to North Lincolnshire Council to develop land here for any use other than port related development and energy generation uses have and will continue to be discouraged and refused if necessary. 2.11 Similarly, paragraph 9.6 of the ELR states that North Killingholme Airfield employment site has a significant role to play in terms of accommodating development that supports the continued development of land at the SHB. The 2016 Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD allocated this airfield site for employment uses which supported the port related activities at the SHB and therefore has also been classified as a special site. 2.12 However, both sites have been excluded from the future employment land take up projections in the ELR and the new Local Plan. Given the restrictions placed on these two sites, we consider there are mixed messages and a lack of clarity between the evidence base and the draft policies as to whether these sites should be seen as contributing to the economic growth of the district during the plan period. Indeed, at paragraph 4.77 of the Local Plan it confirms that for North Killingholme 'The delivery of the site is expected throughout the plan period and to be completed by 2038' This statement would suggest that the sites or at least part of the allocation should be included in the employment need provision. 2.13 In accordance with the adopted Core Strategy's spatial strategy, Sandtoft Airfield was identified as a strategic employment site within the HELADPD (SANE-1) to support the growing logistics and distribution sector in North Lincolnshire. From the strategic allocations table found within Policy SS8, Sandtoft Airfield has not been recognised as a strategic employment site. 2.14 We considered this is an oversight of the draft Plan given the scale of the site and its importance and status as an opportunity to take advantage of its strategically accessible location both to the nearby ports and airports through strong connections along the M180 corridor. We therefore specifically request that Sandtoft Airfield is included as a strategic allocation as part of Policy SS8 to recognise its essential value in terms of the significant contribution it would make to the Council's economic growth strategy.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Janet **Hodson**, JVH Planning on behalf of Scawby Estate												
0370	Janet Hodson, JVH Planning on behalf of Scawby Estate	Appendix 7: Housing Trajectory	object	no	no	no	We object to the housing trajectory shown in appendix 7. The trajectory is unrealistic .There is insufficient detail to demonstrate that the sites relied on to deliver as shown in the Trajectory will actually come forward within the timescales anticipated. It is considered that the Trajectory may have to show sites delivering after the end of the Plan period, with a subsequent reduction in delivery in the Plan period, which will need to be made up by the provision of alternative sites that are deliverable.	no	Provide provision of alternative sites that are deliverable	Yes	We act for the estate who are major land owners in the area, we have detailed knowledge of the sites and the planning history. We have been involved with the Plan throughout its process. Our knowledge of the various land parcels, ownerships, the strategic land position and other site specific details ,means that we have information to inform the debate regarding the specific allocation of sites and the drafting of the relevant development management policies which will assist the examination.	View PDF
0373	Janet Hodson, JVH Planning on behalf of Scawby Estate	Inset Map 35 Scawby	object	no	no	no	We object to Inset 35 of the proposals map, that indicates both the development boundary for Scawby, and the allocation of important open space.The Development Boundary should be amended to include land to the west as shown on the attached plan. The Inset should be amended to delete the allocation of Important open space on the area outside the Conservation Area	no	The Development Boundary should be amended to include land to the west as shown on the attached plan. Appendix 2 The Inset should be amended to delete the allocation of Important open space on the area outside the Conservation Area.	Yes	We act for the estate who are major land owners in the area, we have detailed knowledge of the sites and the planning history. We have been involved with the Plan throughout its process. Our knowledge of the various land parcels, ownerships, the strategic land	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
											position and other site specific details ,means that we have information to inform the debate regarding the specific allocation of sites and the drafting of the relevant development management policies which will assist the examination.	
0371	Janet Hodson, JVH Planning on behalf of Scawby Estate	POLICY DQE10: IMPORTANT OPEN SPACE	object	no	no	no	We object to this Policy on the basis that there is no requirement for the large area allocated as Important Open space within Scawby. The area shown within Inset 35 allocates a large area to the east of the High Street as important open space. The area is not all needed to remain open to safeguard the character of Scawby and that of the Conservation area. This is an unnecessary allocation which is aimed at limiting development rather than any character safeguarding or other objective. It is the case that most of this area has little intrinsic value as open area, area for wildlife or for active recreation. This objection seeks the removal of this allocation from the majority of the site that lies outside the Conservation Area. This area has been the subject of an undetermined planning application that demonstrates that development at this location will improve amenity for recreational pursuit and cause no harm to the character and appearance of the settlement as well as improving access to the central village facilities. In this application the northern area of open land was proposed to be dedicated as open space. The evidence base that supports the plan contains no detailed assessments of the sites that are allocated as important open spaces. There are only generic commentaries on the role of this type of open space in Documents ref Important Open Space Methodology, Site Assessment & Open Space Study (formerly known as PPG17). There is no justification whatsoever that this allocation is necessary or justified. The plan should be amended to remove the important open space allocation on the area outside the Conservation Area as shown on the attached plan. We object to Inset 35 of the proposals map, that indicates both the development boundary for Scawby, and the allocation of important open space. The Development Boundary should be amended to include land to the west as shown on the attached plan. The Inset should be amended to delete the allocation of Important open space on the area outside the Conservation Area.	no	The plan should be amended to remove the important open space allocation on the area outside the Conservation Area as shown on the attached plan.	Yes	We act for the estate who are major land owners in the area, we have detailed knowledge of the sites and the planning history. We have been involved with the Plan throughout its process. Our knowledge of the various land parcels, ownerships, the strategic land position and other site specific details ,means that we have information to inform the debate regarding the specific allocation of sites and the drafting of the relevant development management policies which will assist the examination.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0372	Janet Hodson, JVH Planning on behalf of Scawby Estate	POLICY EC1: EMPLOYMENT LAND SUPPLY	object	no	no	no	We object to the table of employment allocations . there is no new provision new employment in Brigg which is major settlement in the Plan. Sites are available to meet the requirement of employment land in that settlement. The Location for new employment sites should be revisited to include additional land in Brigg. Land available for employment is shown on the attached plan. See appendix 3	no	The Location for new employment sites should be revisited to include additional land in Brigg. Land available for employment is shown on the attached plan see appendix 3.	Yes	We act for the estate who are major land owners in the area, we have detailed knowledge of the sites and the planning history. We have been involved with the Plan throughout its process. Our knowledge of the various land parcels, ownerships, the strategic land position and other site specific details ,means that we have information to inform the debate regarding the specific allocation of sites and the drafting of the relevant development management policies which will assist the examination.	View PDF
0368	Janet Hodson, JVH Planning on behalf of Scawby Estate	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object	no	no	no	We object to Policy SS6 on the basis that insufficient land is allocated in the large villages such as Scawby, the total for this level of settlement is only 3.8 % of the overall requirement . Too much emphasis is placed on the delivery of Lincolnshire Lakes in Scunthorpe and an Action Plan has been in place for this major site since 2016, some six years ago. The lack of delivery in this location and reliance on this site coming forward is skewing the strategy and resulting in insufficient homes being located in other sustainable settlements. The Plan contains no provision to allow for non delivery of strategic sites or additional delays in them coming forward. This is a fundamental flaw of the Plan. Policies should be included to provide additional flexibility for the housing supply. We object to this strategic allocation at Lincolnshire Lakes. We do not consider that it will deliver new homes of over 2,000 units in the predicted timescales. This allocation has been around for 6 years in an Action plan, and no significant housing has been delivered. To base the new Local Plan on this as a fundamental housing delivery allocation is not justified and could prejudice the delivery of the number of homes required over the Plan period. It is clear that this proposal is dependant on detailed Flood risk assessments, raised floor levels and	no		Yes	We act for the estate who are major land owners in the area, we have detailed knowledge of the sites and the planning history. We have been involved with the Plan throughout its process. Our knowledge of the various land parcels, ownerships, the strategic land position and other site specific details	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							evacuation procedures. There are places to allocated development in the Plan area that are not as such serious risk of flood, that lie within flood zone 1 and where the Local Planning Authority could be focusing their attention, when considering the location of new growth and flood risk. It is not clear from the drafted Policy if the parameters related to flood risk are future proof taking into account accelerated climate change and sea level changes. Clearly such requirements associated with mitigating against flooding will place an extra burden on developers in construction and there is no surety that the development will be viable in any event. The Plan should be amended to reduce the reliance on this site and make alternative residential provision in non flood risk areas.				means that we have information to inform the debate regarding the specific allocation of sites and the drafting of the relevant development management policies which will assist the examination.	
0369	Janet Hodson, JVH Planning on behalf of Scawby Estate	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	object	no	no	no	We object to the Policy regarding development limits. The development limit proposed for Scawby allows for little new development over the Plan period. There are sites available on the edge of the existing settlement that can be developed without impairing of the character and appearance of the settlement. The development limits are too restrictive to apply for the entire Plan period. Our comments on the overall distribution, indicate that development limits in the Large villages should allow for additional development in these locations. The development limits should be revisited to include areas adjacent to development boundaries that can come forward for development. At Scawby this should be as shown on the attached Plan and include the land off St Martins Close. Appendix 1 to this document	no	The development limits should be revisited to include areas adjacent to development boundaries that can come forward for development. At Scawby this should be as shown on the attached Plan and include the land off St Martins Close. (See Appendix 1).	Yes	We act for the estate who are major land owners in the area, we have detailed knowledge of the sites and the planning history. We have been involved with the Plan throughout its process. Our knowledge of the various land parcels, ownerships, the strategic land position and other site specific details ,means that we have information to inform the debate regarding the specific allocation of sites and the drafting of the relevant development management policies which will assist the examination.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0364	Janet Hodson, JVH Planning on behalf of Scawby Estate	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	object	no	no	no	We object to the spatial strategy and the settlement hierarchy contained therein. We consider that insufficient growth is proposed in the Large Villages which include Scawby. These settlements have a range of facility that enables growth to be located in them in excess of what is proposed in the Plan. Although the Policy indicates that non allocated sites within the settlements can be developed, other policies in the plan have been imposed to restrict those opportunities. At Scawby for example the land Off Oak Avenue is designated as Important Open Space thereby limiting any development opportunity. This level of settlement is capable of providing growth in places where people want to live and which will support the local service base to the benefit of the existing and future populations. The focus of new housing development in Scunthorpe at Lincolnshire Lakes is misguided. This project has been ongoing for years and will not deliver as proposed in the Plan. Smaller well located sites in the large villages are both a sustainable and deliverable form of meeting the housing requirement. The Spatial Strategy should be amended to provide more development in the larger villages to ensure that there will be deliverable housing land early in the plan period. A strategy that focusses major development in an area of flood risk is out of step with national policy, sites in low flood risk zones should be the first place to accommodate residential development.	no	The Spatial Strategy should be amended to provide more development in the larger villages to ensure that there will be deliverable housing land early in the plan period. A strategy that focusses major development in an area of flood risk is out of step with national policy, sites in low flood risk zones should be the first place to accommodate residential development.	Yes	We act for the estate who are major land owners in the area, we have detailed knowledge of the sites and the planning history. We have been involved with the Plan throughout its process. Our knowledge of the various land parcels, ownerships, the strategic land position and other site specific details ,means that we have information to inform the debate regarding the specific allocation of sites and the drafting of the relevant development management policies which will assist the examination.	View PDF
0365	Janet Hodson, JVH Planning on behalf of Scawby Estate	POLICY SS5: OVERALL HOUSING PROVISION	object	no	no	no	We object to the Policy as drafted. The Plan relies on 2,179 permissions being delivered, in addition to the new allocations of 5,301. It is unclear from the plan itself if there is any uplift to the Housing Requirement as a result of economic activity and regeneration that requires an additional amount of new homes to support employment. The employment chapters of the Plan explain how the economic profile of the area will be lifted to increase economic activity, yet there is no addition to the housing requirement to support increased economic activity. The overall housing requirement should be increased to allow for economic growth, and also to ensure flexibility if major allocations fail to materialise in the Plan period . This could be done by having sites that could deliver beyond the Plan period but do not form part of the requirement relied upon. This would ensure flexibility in the Plan. Alternatively reserve sites could be identified that are suitable locations, that could come forward if major developments are stalled. This would ensure proper planned growth in the situation where the allocations may be delayed or derailed in some way.	no	The overall housing requirement should be increased to allow for economic growth, and also to ensure flexibility if major allocations fail to materialise in the Plan period . This could be done by having sites that could deliver beyond the Plan period but do not form part of the requirement relied upon. This would ensure flexibility in the Plan. Alternatively reserve sites could be identified that are suitable locations, that could come forward if major developments are stalled. This would ensure proper planned growth in the situation where	Yes	We act for the estate who are major land owners in the area, we have detailed knowledge of the sites and the planning history. We have been involved with the Plan throughout its process. Our knowledge of the various land parcels, ownerships, the strategic land position and other	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									the allocations may be delayed or derailed in some way.		site specific details ,means that we have information to inform the debate regarding the specific allocation of sites and the drafting of the relevant development management policies which will assist the examination.	
0366	Janet Hodson, JVH Planning on behalf of Scawby Estate	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object	no	no	no	We object to Policy SS6 on the basis that insufficient land is allocated in the large villages such as Scawby, the total for this level of settlement is only 3.8 % of the overall requirement . Too much emphasis is placed on the delivery of Lincolnshire Lakes in Scunthorpe and an Action Plan has been in place for this major site since 2016, some six years ago. The lack of delivery in this location and reliance on this site coming forward is skewing the strategy and resulting in insufficient homes being located in other sustainable settlements. The Plan contains no provision to allow for non delivery of strategic sites or additional delays in them coming forward. This is a fundamental flaw of the Plan. Policies should be included to provide additional flexibility for the housing supply.	no	The Plan contains no provision to allow for non delivery of strategic sites or additional delays in them coming forward. This is a fundamental flaw of the Plan. Policies should be included to provide additional flexibility for the housing supply	Yes	We act for the estate who are major land owners in the area, we have detailed knowledge of the sites and the planning history. We have been involved with the Plan throughout its process. Our knowledge of the various land parcels, ownerships, the strategic land position and other site specific details ,means that we have information to inform the debate regarding the specific allocation of sites and the drafting of the relevant development management policies which will assist the examination.	View PDF
0367	Janet Hodson, JVH Planning on behalf of Scawby Estate	POLICY SS7: STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION – LINCOLNSHIRE LAKES	object	no	no	no	We object to this strategic allocation at Lincolnshire Lakes. We do not consider that it will deliver new homes of over 2,000 units in the predicted timescales. This allocation has been around for 6 years in an Action plan, and no significant housing has been delivered. To base the new Local Plan on this as a fundamental housing delivery allocation is not justified and	no	The Plan should be amended to reduce the reliance on this site and make alternative residential provision in non	Yes	We act for the estate who are major land owners in the area, we have detailed	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							could prejudice the delivery of the number of homes required over the Plan period. It is clear that this proposal is dependant on detailed Flood risk assessments, raised floor levels and evacuation procedures. There are places to allocated development in the Plan area that are not as such serious risk of flood, that lie within flood zone 1 and where the Local Planning Authority could be focusing their attention, when considering the location of new growth and flood risk. It is not clear from the drafted Policy if the parameters related to flood risk are future proof taking into account accelerated climate change and sea level changes. Clearly such requirements associated with mitigating against flooding will place an extra burden on developers in construction and there is no surety that the development will be viable in any event. The Plan should be amended to reduce the reliance on this site and make alternative residential provision in non flood risk areas.		flood risk areas.		knowledge of the sites and the planning history. We have been involved with the Plan throughout its process. Our knowledge of the various land parcels, ownerships, the strategic land position and other site specific details, means that we have information to inform the debate regarding the specific allocation of sites and the drafting of the relevant development management policies which will assist the examination.	
Kevin **Holmes**												
0453	Kevin Holmes	Paragraph 14.47					The current text of item 14.47 offers an NLC opinion that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion and I request this is revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton-upon-Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended. This should commence at the A1077/Falkland way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Rd route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGVs through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation"					View PDF
0493	Kevin Holmes	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS					Section 9.4.8 (Item F) refers to Deepdale as an area of high landscape value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern gateway shouldn't be included or added as item G, particularly as I believe this area is still under application for being considered an area of outstanding natural beauty					View PDF
0687	Kevin Holmes	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF					I have recently reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (regulation 19) document and would like to make the following comments in relation to					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
		HOUSING SITES					Barton-Upon-Humber: 1) I object to Banks property pursuing a developer led outline Planning application for up to 400 homes on Greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. I believe this is a shocking get rich quick pyramid scheme, whereby Banks offer the landowner to turn greenbelt land in to gold, who then sell it on to one of the top 10 housebuilding national companies to further profit, the suggested proposal is outside of the current development line, it will cause unwarranted ecological damage and is unnecessary given NLC have a structured plan in place to meet housing targets based on demand profile.					
Michelle **Holt**												
0613	Michelle Holt	POLICY H1P-4: LAND AT FORMER SOUTH LEYS SCHOOL ENDERBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object				Good afternoon I am emailing with relation to the land at the former south leys school at Enderby road. I would like to object to future housing on the site as the dance school is the heart of the community and offers so many different opportunities to everyone in the surrounding area. Kimberley performing arts centre has been a home for my children and a place of enjoyment and safety for many years and I hope for many years to come too. They do a lot of community work for young and elderly and it would be devastating if this was taken away from the community. Please take all this in to consideration and think about the feelings of the community and what effect it will have on them and their children.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Amy **Hordon**, Avison Young on behalf of National Grid												
0419	Amy Hordon, Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	General					National Grid has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to local planning authority Development Plan Document consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document. About National Grid National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales. The energy is then distributed to the electricity distribution network operators, so it can reach homes and businesses. National Grid Gas plc (NGG) owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use. National Grid Ventures (NGV) is separate from National Grid's core regulated businesses. NGV develop, operate and invest in energy projects, technologies, and partnerships to help accelerate the development of a clean energy future for consumers across the UK, Europe and the United States. Further Advice National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us. To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect their assets. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect National Grid's assets. We would be grateful if you could check that our details as shown below are included on your consultation database: Matt Verlander, Director Spencer Jefferies, Town Planner nationalgrid.uk@avisonyoung.com box.landandacquisitions@nationalgrid.com Avison Young Central Square South Orchard Street Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 3AZ National Grid National Grid House Warwick Technology Park Gallows Hill Warwick, CV34 6DA					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0744	Amy Hordon, Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	POLICY SS10: STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION - SOUTH HUMBER BANK					Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets: Following a review of the above Development Plan Document, we have identified that one or more proposed development sites are crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets. Details of the sites affecting National Grid assets are provided below. 2AJ RO-UTE TWR (001 - 009): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: CREYKE BECK - HUMBER REFINERY – KEADBY 2AD ROUTE TWR (001 - 014): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: KEADBY – KILLINGHOLME 2AC ROUTE TWR (001 - 020A): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: CREYKE BECK - HUMBER REFINERY – KEADBY Electrical Substation: KILLINGHOLME 400KV Electrical Substation: HUMBER REFINERY 400KV A plan showing details of the site locations and details of National Grid's assets is attached to this letter. Please note that this plan is illustrative only. Without appropriate acknowledgement of the National Grid assets present within the site, these policies should not be considered effective as they cannot be delivered as proposed; unencumbered by the constraints posed by the presence of National Grid infrastructure. We propose modifications to the above site allocations and/or policies to include wording to the following effect:SS10 – Strategic Allocation South Humber Bank "2. The development will be developed with the following site-specific criteria: p. a strategy for responding to the National Grid overhead transmission lines and electrical substations present within the site which demonstrates how the National Grid Design Guide and Principles have been applied at the master planning stage and how the impact of the assets has been reduced through good design. "Accompanying maps were submitted and saved at G:\Spatial Planning\NEW NORTH LINCS LOCAL PLAN\Publication Reg 19 NLLP\Consultation\Consultation Responses\National Grid					
0752	Amy Hordon, Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	POLICY SS3: DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES					Utilities Design Guidance The increasing pressure for development is leading to more development sites being brought forward through the planning process on land that is crossed by National Grid infrastructure. National Grid advocates the high standards of design and sustainable development forms promoted through national planning policy and understands that contemporary planning and urban design agenda require a creative approach to new development around high voltage overhead lines, underground gas transmission pipelines, and other National Grid assets. Therefore, to ensure that Policy SS3 Development Principles is consistent					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							with national policy we would request the inclusion of a policy strand such as: p. take a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to development including respecting existing site constraints including utilities situated within sites.					
0757	Amy Hordon, Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	POLICY SS9: LAND AT NORTH KILLINGHOLME AIRFIELD					Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets: Following a review of the above Development Plan Document, we have identified that one or more proposed development sites are crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets. SS9 – Strategic Employment Site - Land at North Killingholme Airfield 2AD ROUTE TWR (001 - 014): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: KEADBY – KILLINGHOLME (see attached maps) 2AC ROUTE TWR (001 - 020A): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: CREYKE BECK - HUMBER REFINERY – KEADBY A plan showing details of the site locations and details of National Grid's assets is attached to this letter. Please note that this plan is illustrative only. Without appropriate acknowledgement of the National Grid assets present within the site, these policies should not be considered effective as they cannot be delivered as proposed; unencumbered by the constraints posed by the presence of National Grid infrastructure. We propose modifications to the above site allocations and/or policies to include wording to the following effect: SS9 – Land at North Killingholme Airfield "Existing Utility Provision: j. a strategy for responding to the National Grid overhead transmission lines present within the site which demonstrates how the National Grid Design Guide and Principles have been applied at the master planning stage and how the impact of the assets has been reduced through good design." Accompanying maps were submitted and saved at G:\Spatial Planning\NEW NORTH LINCS LOCAL PLAN\Publication Reg 19 NLLP\Consultation\Consultation Responses\National Grid					View PDF
Andrew **Horner**												
0034	Andrew Horner	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	support	yes	yes	yes	I support the proposed development limits	Consistent with national policy	None needed	no		
0033	Andrew Horner	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	support	yes	yes	yes	I support the spatial strategy	Consistent with national policy	None needed	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Dian **Horner**												
0035	Dian Horner	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	support	yes	yes	yes	I support the proposed development limits	Consistent with national policy	None needed	no		
0036	Dian Horner	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	support	yes	yes	yes	I support the spatial strategy	Consistent with national policy	None needed	no		
Deb **Hotson** on behalf of Elsham Parish Council												
0652	Deb Hotson on behalf of Elsham Parish Council	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	support				Elsham Parish Council fully support the proposed plan, specifically Policy SS2 Spatial Strategy for North Lincs and Policy SS11 Development Limits relating to Elsham parish.					View PDF
0659	Deb Hotson on behalf of Elsham Parish Council	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	Support				Elsham Parish Council fully support the proposed plan, specifically Policy SS2 Spatial Strategy for North Lincs and Policy SS11 Development Limits relating to Elsham parish.					View PDF
Deb **Hotson** on behalf of Haxey Parish Council												
0426	Deb Hotson on behalf of Haxey Parish Council	General					HAXEY PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION OF NOVEMBER 2021 – TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE DETAILED RESPONSE SUBMITTED ON 26 MARCH 2020 AND RESUBMITTED UNDER OMISSION GUIDELINES WITH THIS REPORT 1. Haxey Parish Council (HPC) submitted its proposals, suggestions and comments on 26 March 2020 (for the avoidance of doubt and for ease of reference attached to this response by HPC to the 2021 consultation). For reasons best known to North Lincolnshire Council (NLC) the March 2020 response by HPC was not considered in the local plan production process. Accordingly HPC is now re-submitting its March 2020 response as an omission. Please note that any reference in this letter to previous proposals is because at the time of producing its current response, HPC was unaware that NLC had not considered the proposals submitted over 19 months ago. HPC is anxious that in his review the Inspector takes great regard of the opinions and any comments of HPC which in substantial part are in direct conflict with those of NLC. 2. HPC has studied the new NLC Local Plan proposals. HPC welcomes the plan policy proposals and believes that the current progress relating to a neighbourhood plan will enhance the policies' plans towards meeting some of the needs of the Parish. HPC views with concern the proposed policy of development limits, as such appear no more enforceable than the current limits which have been flawed by legal loopholes. It is believed that proper protection of limits is absolutely essential to safeguard the Area of Historic Interest - LC14! Protection of the LC14 is of vital and fundamental importance for the current and future generations,					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							a fact which NLC have not fully appreciated. 3. In Westwoodside in particular the proposal fails to recognise the development sites identified and submitted by the Parish Council, based on local knowledge, which essentially protect the Open Countryside. 4. HPC is hugely disappointed that our earlier submission relating to land allocation has not been adopted and consider that the current proposals for land allocation lacks vision for the future and do not recognise fully some of the historic problems in such terms as: a. Enhancing facilities to improve sustainability, by including proposals that would see increased emphasis on the development of business opportunities and local community projects. Current proposals do little to provide a meaningful overview designed to develop rural village identities, in terms of key facilities including opportunity for relocation of the GP Surgery, library/public building, shops and a Post Office with adequate adjacent parking in conjunction with major housing development. NLC proposals suggest two simple housing sites with no other rationale taken into account. b. Fails to address enhancing infrastructure relating to parking and other transport problems. c. With regard to the 'Land at Field House, Haxey, there appears a lack of consideration and account towards avoiding exacerbation of existing infrastructure issues e.g. (1) Local traffic will potentially increase by over 150%, the road is single track in places. The entrances both north and south are difficult, unsafe junctions. (2) The location is currently designated Flood Risk 1, meaning costly surface water drainage and sewerage will be required. The current system for provision of sewage infrastructure, is made based on dry weather conditions and therefore potentially may not take into account the future effects of climate change on what is already an area designated as being in Flood Zone 1. (3) HPC have further concern over the impact of the development in an area designated as an Area of Special Historic Interest and the locality of historic retting pits, particularly given that historically, planning permission has been refused for minor development in the same area. Additionally, a large housing development adjacent to a busy and often crowded Playing Field is inappropriate, particularly as there is a perceived need for such Playing Field itself to be extended to cater for growing use by sports clubs and others. d. The Westwoodside proposal does have good connection to transport infrastructure of Doncaster Road, it is considered the drainage/sewage problems in this area will need further upgrading to avoid the problems of the past and future climate change. 5. While the Local Plan proposals sites, extensively covers housing in general. It fails to offer, the more specific needs, including social or affordable housing or single level housing for rural areas. HPC has					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							concerns that only more market housing of a type that will not provide for either the young first-time buyer or elderly retired at both proposed sites. 6. Whilst acknowledgement of the raised concerns is mentioned in the Site-Specific Criteria for the proposed development, it is hoped all proposed criteria would be addressed stringently by the Authority prior to any final approval. 7. The proposal sites address only the current housing crisis and would almost certainly be developed immediately but does little for the long-term development of the area, nor does it address protecting the important historic and in many ways unique rural character of the area. The two proposed sites are for housing only and appear based on securing development with single owners prepared to offer for sale their sites, rather than the possible more difficult route of multiple landowners. NLC thus appears currently to take the "easy way out". 8. In conclusion, in providing the above response to the proposals for the NLC Local Plan, HPC wish to make it clear that its rationale is to provide development land without expanding the overall footprint of the villages into the LC14 and where this is not achievable to provide development land with the least possible impact on the LC14 and which will promote thriving community and provide suitable accommodation for both the young and old with a sustainable infrastructure and facilities for future generations.					
0427	Deb Hotson on behalf of Haxey Parish Council	General		Yes	No	Yes	The NLC Local Plan covering Haxey parish makes recommendations that are not agreed with by the parish council. Consideration of Haxey parish recommendations made in their report dated 26th march 2020 and re-submitted on 26th November 2021 as part of the consultation on the latest version of the NLC Local plan.					View PDF
Rebecca **Housam** on behalf of Savills												
0325	Rebecca Housam on behalf of Savills	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object	no	no	yes	This policy states there are 7,932 dwellings expected to be completed in the Local Plan Period. This includes: housing completions (447 dwellings); committed housing sites (2,189 dwellings); and, proposed housing sites (5,301 dwellings). To reiterate, Land within our clients ownership, consisting of three sites should be allocated for residential development through Policy H1 'Site Allocations' given their sustainable location and close spatial relationship to the remainder of the settlement which is identified as a Large Service Centre: a. Land to the south of School Lane, Goxhill; b. Wider site to include Land to the South of School Lane and the adjacent site to the rear of Abbeygarth Villas, Goxhill; and c. Land to the South of Thorn Lane, Goxhill. Furthermore, it is evident the gross to net ratio and the densities attributed to sites not appropriate. The Housing Site Selection Topic Paper sets out the methodology for the development potential for each site as:	positively prepared	To use the industry recognised gross to net ratios when considering a proposed site's capacity. Reassess sites not considered for allocation to ensure sufficient amount of dwellings are provided across the plan period.	no		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Gross Site Area Gross to net ratio on sites Less than 1ha is stated as 100% ; it is stated as 85% on sites between 1-5ha; and on sites over 5 hectares it is given as 60% Our main concern relates to the net to gross density ratio applied. The definition generally used by the industry when discussing with developers is that Net Developable means land developed for residential dwellings and including; private garden space; and on plot car parking areas, all other areas such as roads with no frontage development, landscaping, play areas, areas for drainage should be excluded. The approach is confirmed through the RICS Measurement of Land for Development and Planning Purposes (1st edition) (2021). Taking the industry standard definition the developable area ratios quoted appear too high with smaller sites of under 1 Ha in experience achieving 70% net to gross but medium sites typically achieving 60% net to gross at most, and large sites over 5ha typically achieving 50% gross to net ratio. The application of a 100% net to gross ratio for sites under 1ha, the 85% net to gross ratio on sites between 1ha-5a, and 60% for sites over 5ha, within the Housing Site Selection Topic Paper, is unrealistic and unachievable. There is no evidence or justification for the use of these figures. The application of a more realistic density ratio of 70% on small sites, 60% on medium sites and 50% on large sites, will significantly reduce the number of dwellings and sites identified as available. Density Within the Housing Site Selection Topic Paper it states: The following net density ranges have been used for all residential development sites, or the residential element of a mixed use site: Scunthorpe town centre: 45-70 dwellings per hectare Within Scunthorpe and Market Towns development limits: 40-45 dwellings per hectare Within Rural Settlements and the Countryside: 30-35 dwellings per hectare The densities quoted do not match those contained in Policy H2, quoted below: Scunthorpe town centre: 45-70 dwellings per hectare. Within Scunthorpe Urban Area: 40-45 dwellings per hectare. Strategic Site Allocation Lincolnshire Lakes: 30-35 dwellings per hectare. Principal Towns: 40-45 dwellings per hectare. Larger Service Centre: 30-40 dwellings per hectare.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Larger Rural Settlements, Smaller Rural Settlements: 30-35 dwellings per hectare. Rural Hamlets and Villages and in the Open Countryside: 20-30 dwellings per hectare. As such, the council should use their own density figures from the Emerging Local Plan. Overall, neither the gross site area, nor the densities used in calculating the development potential of allocated sites are justified. Subsequently, the next section will demonstrate this with examples. Site Assessments of Allocated Sites As aforementioned neither the density or net developable area of sites has been correctly calculated. Therefore, Savills has calculated the correct dwelling capacity, across all appropriate sites, which should be applied as per RICS guidelines. This can be found in the representations submitted by Savills to localplan@northlincs.gov.uk at 16:02 on November 26th 2021. In total North Lincolnshire has estimated a deliverable supply of 2,444 dwellings on Proposed Sites, whereas Savills have suggested it is in fact 1,794 dwellings on such sites. Therefore, the Publication Draft has over-stated its residential developable capacity by 650 dwellings. This is especially acute in anywhere other than the largest three settlements which have large strategic sites whereby a greater detail of assessment has been given to the sites, giving a more accurate estimate for the site capacity. Therefore, allocations in medium-small settlements, such as Large Service Centres, is considered to be insufficient to meet the assessed needs of the settlements. Therefore, the total amount of deliverable dwellings in the North Lincolnshire plan would be 7,282. This is below the 7,326 dwellings of the minimum supply required, plus the extra 198 dwellings to provide flexibility over the Five Year Housing Land Supply. Consequently, the Local Plan cannot provide enough housing to satisfy its minimum housing requirement. As such the Publication Draft cannot be considered sound.					
0327	Rebecca Housam on behalf of Savills	POLICY H3: AFFORDABLE HOUSING	object	yes	no	yes	North Lincolnshire council identifies an annual need of 115 affordable homes per annum (2,070 across the plan period) in the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment 2020. The Publication Draft notes this has not been achieved in the last five years with an average delivery of 81 dwellings each year. There is no evidence of how the council seeks to increase this supply, with a minimum of 10% of affordable dwellings applied across all sites in the authority. With a deliverable supply of homes being 7,282, this is clearly not attainable at current build out rates. Delivery of affordable housing carries significant weight in the planning system. North Lincolnshire Council should be maximising the opportunity to develop and deliver affordable housing.	positively prepared	Increase total housing supply to help deliver more affordable housing	no		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Assuming each site would provide at policy compliant levels of affordable housing (10% across all sites excluding rural exceptions), there would be just 728 affordable homes provided across the authority, far below the 2,070 required.					
0311	Rebecca Housam on behalf of Savills	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	object	yes	no	yes	Draft Policy SS11 directly relates to the Spatial Strategy outlined within Policy SS2. This draft policy outlines the method used to applying development limits across the district. Inset Map 21 relates to Goxhill. The Inset map demonstrates the residential allocation located off Howe Lane and Hawthorne Gardens, as well as the other four smaller sites in Goxhill. There are also a number of policy designations such as Important Open Spaces and Playing Fields. There are no policy designations identified for our client's sites at Land south east of School Lane or Thorn Lane, Goxhill. It must also be noted that, whilst development in Large Service Centres is outlined within Draft Policy SS2 as being appropriate on both allocated and 'non-allocated sites within their defined development limits', a review of the proposals map for Goxhill demonstrates once again that this policy has not been prepared, nor can it be applied, in a positive manner. The Inset Map for Goxhill outlines the development limits for the settlement. The development limits wrap tightly around the existing built form of the settlement, therefore leaving very few sites within the Large Service Centres available to come forward as non-allocated sites within defined settlement limits. This approach has been replicated within other Large Service Centres. As such, what appears to be a positively written policy which seeks to deliver against the national aim to 'boost significantly' the supply of housing at face value, in reality this is not the case. The crucial element of Draft Policy SS2 which supports the development of non-allocated sites within the development limits, does not seem to be applicable to Large Service Centres within the emerging Local Plan. Given the above, a review of the development limits for Large Service Centres is strongly recommended, to ensure that development can come forward on sites which are not allocated. An alternative approach to this would be the removal of settlement limits for Large Service Centres altogether. This would retain an element of flexibility in the sites delivered, allowing delivery to reflect market needs. This approach is supported by Paragraph 69(c) of the NPPF. Site A 'Land to the south of School Lane' is enclosed by existing built form on three boundaries therefore making this area of the site largely urban in nature. Sites B and C in their entirety should be included within the Development Limits of Goxhill. Expanding the development limits of Large Service Centres such as Goxhill, to incorporate such sites, will ensure that Housing deliverability issues previously experienced within North Lincolnshire are minimised going forward. An appropriate level of growth must come forward in Large Service Centres to ensure that they remain vibrant communities for people to live and work. This should be reflected through appropriately worded planning policies, which both allocate sufficient growth to the relevant areas and	positively prepared	Recommendation 1- Allocate Land at School Lane / Thorn Lane, Goxhill for residential development to deliver circa 30 dwellings. Recommendation 2- Review the approach to setting Development Limits as outlined within Draft Policy SS11 or remove the Development Limits for Large Service Centres altogether to allow necessary growth to be market driven.	no		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							allow sufficient flexibility for unallocated sites to come forward in appropriate locations. NPPF Paragraphs 78 and 79 are clear that in rural areas, planning policies and decisions should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs. In order to promote sustainable development in rural areas, the NPPF is also clear that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF requires planning policies to identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, particularly in locations where such growth will support local services.					
0307	Rebecca Housam on behalf of Savills	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	object	yes	no	yes	The NPPF requires Local Planning Authority's (LPAs) to identify a supply of 'specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan period, and specific developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the plan'.Policy SS2 outlines the Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire. The Spatial Strategy seeks to deliver growth in the District in a 'balanced manner'. Within Policy SS2, the Council outline a target to deliver at least 7,128 dwellings over the plan period (396 dwelling per annum), an annual reduction of 25 dwellings compared to the Preferred Options draft. The housing need progressed within the Plan is commented on further within these representations. The Plan also allocates a minimum of 131.7ha of employment land and to support 11,500 jobs in the authority. This is a significant increase from the 91.5ha of employment land allocated in the Preferred Options document and will require extra housing land to support the ambitious employment plans and associated economic growth. Paragraph 61 of the NPPF states: To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance. Moreover, this is a minimum with Planning Policy Guidance stating : The standard method for assessing local housing need provides a minimum starting point in determining the number of homes needed in an area. It does not attempt to predict the impact that future government policies, changing economic circumstances or other factors might have on demographic behaviour. Therefore, there will be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than the standard method indicates. Therefore, North Lincolnshire Council need to consider the effects of the national Government's levelling up agenda, as well as their own ambitious plans for economic growth, and what impact this will have on housing need. With North Lincolnshire setting their housing at the minimum housing need, it is unlikely to be sufficient provision to cover the additional housing need in line with the economic growth ambitions.Thus, the total housing figures of the draft plan do not comply with paragraph 35 of the NPPF definition of being Positively Prepared as it is not consistent with achieving sustainable development. As such, the plan is not considered to be sound in its current form.	positively prepared	The housing requirement should be increased to account for the economic growth of the authority.	no		View PDF
0316	Rebecca Housam on	POLICY SS5: OVERALL HOUSING PROVISION	object	yes	no	yes	Savills have significant concerns following a review of the information included within draft policy SS5: Overall Housing Provision. We strongly	positively prepared	Undertake a full review of the housing requirement included	no		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	behalf of Savills						urge the Council to review the housing provision sought across the plan period before progressing the draft plan further. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) should be the used to underpin the preparation of a new Local Plan. Chapter 3 of the NPPF is of primary importance. A key requirement of any emerging plan, according to Paragraph 16 of the NPPF is to: 'be prepared positively in a way that is aspirational but deliverable'. In Policy SS5: Overall Housing Provision, the council outline their housing requirement to be delivered over the plan period (7,128 new dwellings). This equates to 396 dwelling per annum and is a reduction of almost 50% compared to the housing requirement outlined within the Core Strategy (2011) which sought 15,700 dwellings (550-750 dwellings per annum). The Issues and Options Document prepared by North Lincolnshire Council had set out a number of rejected options for future growth. Whilst the housing requirement outlined within the Publication Draft document is greater than Scenario 1 (365 homes per year), the council have also rejected Scenarios 2 (Medium Economic Projection- 452 homes per year) to 4 (Aspirational Economic Growth (Core Strategy) - 754 homes per year). The Publication Draft is also lower than the 419 dwellings per annum set out in the Preferred Options document and shows a clear intention by the Council to select the lowest possible housing growth target. It is evident that in electing to pursue a growth strategy of only the baseline population growth, the Council have not been aspirational in their growth strategy and are therefore not planning positively in the spirit outlined within the NPPF. Whilst we recognise that North Lincolnshire have struggled to deliver the appropriate level of development to meet previous housing targets, we do not consider that the appropriate reaction to address this under delivery is to reduce the housing requirement. Instead, the Council must allocate sufficient deliverable sites to maintain aspirational housing targets, ensuring a buffer is applied to ensure the District's housing supply and housing affordability does not suffer as a consequence, over the forthcoming plan period. The document should be updated to reflect the most recent Housing Delivery Test results. Within the 2020 results, North Lincolnshire delivered only 94% of the total number of homes required and as such an action plan must be produced to create strategies for the authority to increase its housing delivery. Based upon a review of the housing figures outlined within the document, it is clear no buffer has been applied. Instead, the Council have outlined that they will deliver an additional 198 dwellings over the first 5 years of the plan period. This is not well explained, with its justification for flexibility in the delivery of housing. This may derive from the standard methodology which requires a higher housing figure in the earlier years of the plan, and considering the 5% buffer which applies to calculating the 5YHLS, it requires an extra 170 dwellings in the five year period (2020-2025). This does not explain the 28		within the draft Local Plan, with the assessment of future required housing growth.			

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							dwelling discrepancy, although this could be linked to the logistics of identifying suitable sites. As previously outlined, there are significant concerns regarding the evidence base provided to support the Publication Draft Consultation. The supporting document to the housing need calculation is the North Lincolnshire Housing and Economic Needs Assessment 2020. This document takes the minimum requirement: the standard methodology, to calculate the housing need and does not then take into account the economic growth the council is pursuing into consideration; contradicting Planning Practice Guidance . Spatial Objective 1 states that North Lincolnshire intends on implementing an employment growth strategy, supported by the allocation of 131.3ha of employment land. Spatial Objective 4 sets out the authority's intention of Delivering Infrastructure for Growth. These objectives contribute to a framework with strategic infrastructure improvements, which will increase the demand for homes, but with no extra dwellings to support this extra demand. In addition, National Government policy is focussed on a levelling up agenda which seeks to promote extra employment and housing growth in the north. The standard methodology does not take this into account and is based on 2014 figures which do not reflect the government's ambitious targets to level up post-industrial areas. In particular, North Lincolnshire is in an important strategic location within England, with its close proximity to the largest port in the country: Immingham, making it an important location for industrial warehousing. There has been significant increase in demand in these sectors recently, buoyed by the demand caused by the Covid Pandemic. As such, there are exceptional circumstances for the council to go beyond the minimum standard methodology figures, with their clear reasons as to why housing need will be much greater than 2014 predictions. The Council has adopted a pure Standardised Methodology approach, which carries a risk this will be seen as overly simplistic, particularly as there is clear evidence of greater demand than the standard methodology. If the Plan is progressed as is, there is a danger that the Local Plan will be found unsound by the Inspector and North Lincolnshire asked to revise its housing targets upwards accordingly. This issue has recently been raised at the Calderdale Local Plan Examination. A copy of the Inspector's post-hearing letter is included at Appendix 3. Whilst submitted under transitional arrangements the provisions of more recent policy apply. Within this it references Paragraph 61 of the NPPF which confirms the approach to using the Standardised Methodology: "To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance - unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals." (Our emphasis).					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							As outlined above, the NPPF encourages local planning authorities to be ambitious in the development of their Local Plan. Relevant PPG expands on this further, being explicit that if councils want a more ambitious Local Plan for growth then they should incorporate positive growth and housing figures. We therefore have significant concerns regarding the housing requirement progressed to Publication Draft Stage, and would urge the Council to review this figure prior to the submission of the Plan. The housing requirement outlined within the Publication Draft document is not aspirational as is required by the NPPF. It is also not considered to be properly evidenced therefore progressing with this chosen scenario puts the emerging plan at significant risk of being found unsound by the Inspector, as demonstrated recently with Calderdale. Notwithstanding the above, the chosen growth option will have a dramatic negative impact on affordability and housing need within the District, which will in turn, impact the vitality and sustainability of settlements of all sizes, and the viability of services across the District.					
0309	Rebecca Housam on behalf of Savills	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object	yes	no	yes	The policy sets out the location of where residential development should occur. In Goxhill, it is proposed a minimum of 115 dwellings should be provided across the plan period. The Publication Draft document identifies five sites for allocation within Goxhill, with a total of 115 dwellings, all of which currently benefit from planning permission. However, the Council are potentially stifling growth in this Large Service Centre, with the majority of allocated dwellings identified in Goxhill (101 out of 115 dwellings) still subject to the agreement of Reserved Matters; it is noted that no applications for reserved matters have yet been made to confirm these details at the time of writing. There are therefore a number of unknowns which need addressing before development can come forward on these sites. The deliverability of the allocated sites must therefore be questioned. It is therefore understood that all five allocated and consented sites must come forward for development in order for the council to meet its growth objectives for the village. This is considered to be somewhat unlikely given the lack of progress on the various sites to date which is explored further in the next section of this report. As such, in order for the plan to be considered sound, its considered that North Lincolnshire Council should allocate additional sites for residential development within the settlement of Goxhill. It is therefore considered that the approach to growth in Goxhill does not meet the requirements of Sustainable Development as outlined within the NPPF, which encourages LPAs to plan positively in their approach to plan making. The NPPF seeks to ensure that Local Plans should positively seek and support opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change. In contrast, the approach taken for Goxhill is not considered to be flexible, nor is it considered to be positive in respect of seeking opportunities to meet the needs of the community. It is considered that the Council have instead taken the path of least resistance, and have failed in their NPPF requirement to be aspirational in terms of growth. We therefore suggest North Lincolnshire Council allocate further sites for residential development within Goxhill to satisfy the requirement of Policy SS6. In addition, Paragraph 69 of the	positively prepared	More housing sites should be allocated in Goxhill. Savills has submitted representations for two sites in Goxhill which would satisfy the required housing in the village.	no		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							NPPF recognises the important contribution that small and medium sized sites can make to meet the housing requirement of an area. This is considered to be particularly relevant in the short term, as such small and medium sites can often be developed and delivered relatively quickly. In recognition of this important contribution, Large Service Centres are considered to be particularly appropriate for accommodating levels of growth which remain in keeping with the size of the relevant settlement and its services. It is considered to be particularly important in Large Service Centre locations, that Local Planning Authorities allocate a range of sites in terms of both size and location, to ensure that any development which comes forward is sufficiently varied to meet market requirements . As it stands, the number of proposed residential dwellings to come forward in Goxhill would only satisfy the minimum requirement for the Service Centre identified in Policy SS6 which is not considered to be aspirational enough, particularly for a sustainable settlement such as Goxhill which can accommodate further growth. This is on the assumption that the allocated sites actually come forward for development in the first instance.					
Mrs Fay **Husler**												
0055	Mrs Fay Husler	Paragraph 5.1	object	no	no	no	The chosen site on Graizelound Fields Rd is outside the village perimeter and because of its low lying position experiences major flooding and sewerage problems which further development would only compound. The site is only accessed by an old narrow farming lane which is not wide enough to permit 2 vehicles to pass with a narrow concealed entrance from Graize-pound. A more suitable site for development is behind 47 & 49 Low St. with access directly off A161 on Low Street and off Epworth Road with services already in place. The access road from Low Street has 30ft frontage giving adequate room for an adopted road to the rear development field of approx. 4 acres. Services are already in place from both entrances. This site has houses on one side the length of the field but only has houses a short way down the opposite side . It would make sense to fill in the upper part while still if necessary, leaving the lower part of the field with open views. The owners of this land are fully supportive of full or partial development. Given all above issues it makes more sense to select an alternative site or spread the 75 proposed houses across more sites. The Recreational Ground which benefits all residents would no longer enjoy views of countryside if housing development went ahead behind. The Plan assumes development will not commence for 10-20 years but this effectively blocks any other land owner in the area wishing to develop properties.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0056	Mrs Fay Husler	Paragraph 5.1	object	no	no	no	The chosen site on Graizelound Fields Rd is not within the village perimeter and because it is low lying, prone to flooding and sewerage issues. Any further development would only compound this problem. It is only accessible from a very narrow lane which is not wide enough for 2 cars to pass and a narrow concealed entrance at Graizelound. There is a more suitable location within the village directly off A161 on Low Street behind 47 & 49 with a further entrance to this field off Granary Croft, Epworth Rd. The existing house at 47 Low St. has been demolished and the site has a 30ft frontage giving adequate room for an adopted road into the back field from the A161. The field is set between existing houses its full length on one side and houses only part way down on its's opposite side and is approx. 4 acres. The owners of this site are supportive of development of the field either fully or partially to infill the top section to the end of the few houses on left hand side thus leaving the bottom end of the field open if required to do so. I understand the plan is to put an LC14 on this field but given that there are many open views already in Haxey, and the field is private land not accessible to the public it is of no benefit to have an open view clause put on it. It would serve the village better to provide a good accessible development of a selection of affordable houses and bungalows to suit all the community. Development of the Graizelound Fields Rd site would effectively block the open views from the Haxey Recreational Ground if 75 houses were built. Given all the above issues, it makes more sense to either select an alternative site like the one suggested behind 47 &49 Low Street or spread the development of 75 properties across a number of sites providing opportunities to other land owners and lessen the impact on the preferred site. Also, given that the plan assumes development would not commence for 10-20 years, this effectively blocks any other land owner in Haxey wishing to develop properties.	justified	See comments relating to 5.123 - 5.127 above	no		
0098	Mrs Fay Husler	Paragraph 5.1	object	no	no	no	Referring to my previous comments Ref R190400055 Since sending in my comments it has come to my attention that one of our local Councillors has given incorrect information out at the public Meeting on 15th November in Haxey Memorial Hall. The plan shown at this meeting showed the preferred site on Graizelound Fields Rd and also highlighted my field 4 acres behind 47 & 49 Low Street, hatched in green. Quite a number of people were asking about this field and were told it belonged to the Church and could not be built on. I am concerned that this will influence their decisions on the site to be approved and they will therefore not consider this site as an alternative one. I bought this land in2011 and have the Land Registry to prove it. I want to make it plain to North Lincs Planning team who will look at the possible sites that this is a viable alternative one and is fully available to be used. Please see previous comments relating to the sites.	positively prepared		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Mark **Husler** on behalf of Husler Developments Ltd												
0101	Mark Husler on behalf of Husler Developments Ltd	POLICY H1P-26: LAND AT FIELD HOUSE	object	no	no	no	Further to my previous comments and proposed alternative site (CFS0300121), I have spoken to Ms Tanya Coggon to raise a concern that a local parish councillor provided residents and N Lincs council staff with false information at the Haxey open day on 15th November. A resident asked why the site off Low Street that I have proposed was not selected given it is accessible off the A161 and would address local resident concerns re the proposed site (e.g. historical flooding issues, poor single lane road access and removal of countryside views from the Haxey playing fields. Unfortunately, the councillor mis-informed residents and N Lincs representatives that the site at Low Street was not available for development as it was owned by the Church of England. This is false information as the land is privately owned by my family, and connected to 47 and 49 Low street which we also own, and is available for development. Pls note, the site has direct access to the A161 via two locations (the Hunters Croft development and via 47 Low street following the house being demolished in 2020). The land is also situated on a higher level to the chosen site that has a history of flooding, and already has access to services. Regards Mark Husler	effective	Pls see comment above	no		
Becky **Johns**												
0326	Becky Johns	POLICY H1P-4: 1k.	object	yes	no	no	I want to bring to the attention that the building at south Leys school campus is occupied by a thriving and pivotal Performing arts centre for this area and I do not feel this planning document has taken this into account especially in regards to the objectives of being safe, well , prosperous and connected let me explain why. On this site is building being leased to the Kimberley Performing arts Centre. This centre is crucial to our community of Scunthorpe and for the community of Riddings and Westcliff in its current location. It makes performing arts accessible to all and also in a deprived area. Within this centre there is a chance for young people and adults to look after their wellbeing through dance and fitness and also an outlet to express themselves through performing arts singing, drama etc. I feel North Lincolnshire Council should not take this lightly and removing the centre from the site would leave a hole that can not be filled for that community. Young people have the ability to realise their aspirations and even raise their aspirations which is something extremely lacking across our locality. It is only with aspirations will come prosperity and wellness. Currently there are 100s of children attending the centre from across Scunthorpe and the very near location but also wider north Lincolnshire . These children are thriving through their wellbeing and exercise, being part of something and moving on into the performing arts industry there is not another centre like this with so many successful and well rounded young people contributing to our area. It is so important we do not lose	justified	Modify the Planning area to include space for Kimberley Performing Arts centre with the same space allocation and facilities it has now to ensure you are investing in our people.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							focus on the benefits these places and clubs bring to our area. Just building homes is not enough we need to ensure we are investing in the arts in this area and removing this from this site would have devastating and detrimental consequences to the community. The centre comprises of a stage area and numerous studios all at full capacity most nights and weekends with our local residents and children participating in positive performing arts based activities. The centre is linked with John Leggott college now and providing education in the day with hope this will grow and build on the success. It is also acts as a local hub used for other community groups such as Scunthorpe Camera Club, local football, men in sheds looking after men and mental health lets face it we are in a crisis with mental health and building houses will not solve this. I urge you to consider the policy and also make it known as part of this plan that this performing arts centre and community group are an integral part of the area and should not be moved or relocated. it does so much more than a few more houses will ever do for this area. If you are truly engaged in the plans strategic aims you would incorporate a facility within the plan to encourage and support the longevity of the centre there and I do not feel you have considered or identified this as part of the plan and this I object to. I can not stress the talent, the mental wellness and socially engaged and positive people that are being raised and nurtured within Kimberley Performing Arts Centre, do not be short sighted, do not think about the purse strings think about the future and wellbeing of North Lincolnshire's people. Invest in the people of the area, help deprivation and social isolation, promote positive mental health and well being promote the arts in turn your will be promoting North Lincolnshire for the future. Keep Kimberley Performing Arts there for many years and do you know what there is still room to build houses around it. Do the right thing North Lincolnshire Council					
Ian **Johns**												
0615	Ian Johns	POLICY H1P-4: LAND AT FORMER SOUTH LEYS SCHOOL ENDERBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object				Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to you about the proposed plans for housing to be placed upon the site of Kimberly Performing Arts Centre- Policy H1P-4: Land at Former South Leys School at Enderby Road Phase 1. The view the document click: Stage 4: Publication Draft (Regulation 19) | North Lincolnshire Local Plan (northlincs.gov.uk). I am devastated to find that this site will be used for housing rather than for what it has been used for over the last few years. KPAC has been the home of my daughters dance school where she started dancing at the age of 4- she is now on the verge of moving away to dance college with the dream of performing on the west end. The centre is a vital component for children such as my daughter to realise her dreams- without the dedicated space, teachers and dance family her dreams could not have been possible. This is one child from literally hundreds of not thousands that have gone through the doors of KPAC. I know that the centre is not only					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							used for performing arts but has been used for a number of other activities that have brought the community together- the community around the dance school needs this outlet for children and adults to use. I think it would be a travesty if the school were ever to close it would be awful for future generations of kids that have dreams!!! I hope that this decision can be reconsidered… and that the centre can remain a centre hub for the local community to use and thrive.					
Gillian **Kendall**												
0465	Gillian Kendall	Paragraph 14.47	object				The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0505	Gillian Kendall	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0696	Gillian Kendall	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Jamie **Kendall**												
0468	Jamie Kendall	Paragraph 14.47	object				The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0508	Jamie Kendall	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0699	Jamie Kendall	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Michael **Kendall**												
0464	Michael Kendall	Paragraph 14.47	object				The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0504	Michael Kendall	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0695	Michael Kendall	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Ivor **Keyes**												
0016	Ivor Keyes	POLICY HE1: CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT	object	no	no	no	Managing our Historic Environment. The General Narrative preceding the Policy itself appears to have some inconsistencies which need some clarification: Heritage Assets Para 10.11NPPF applies different tests to ˜designated and ˜non-designated heritage assets and goes on to say - Conservation Areas are designated under the relevant legislation - which is fine. The Plan then goes on to say: 10.12 Local planning authorities may identify non-designated heritage assets. These are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions because of heritage interest but which are not formally designated heritage assets. Heritage interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. In some areas, local authorities identify some non-designated heritage assets as ˜locally listed. The council does not have a local list. Non-designated heritage assets are included in the North Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record. Appleby Neighbourhood Plan does have a list of Buildings of Townscape merit which are locally listed which was produced by NLC and so a list of non-designated assets must exist - but not in the HER. The New Local Plan then goes on to list the Conservation Areas followed by: 10.19 Conservation area appraisals were prepared for all 17 conservation areas in North Lincolnshire between 2001 and 2005. The conservation area appraisals define and record what makes these places areas of special architectural or historic interest. They identify their special character and qualities, and provide a clear definition of what makes them special. They also set out what it is important to retain. 10.20 A review of the character of the Council's Conservation Areas has taken place to fulfil the councils overarching responsibility to preserve and enhance its conservation area. A Conservation Area Appraisal document for each conservation area has been adopted by the council to inform the development process as it affects these Conservation Areas and as guidance document for Town Planning Purposes. 10.21 The Conservation Area Appraisal documents provide statements of an area's character and say things about better management of conservation areas. 10.22 The effect of a proposed development on the character or appearance of a Conservation Area is always a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. All development should preserve or enhance that character or appearance. Where they add to its character it is also important that the spaces around and within the	effective	Carry our review of Conservation Area Appraisals prior to referendum - how can residents be expected to vote for something that is expected to be changed?	yes	To explain my reasoning fully.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							conservation area are retained. 10.23 Demolition within a Conservation Area should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances, and will normally be permitted only if the council is satisfied that the proposal for redevelopment is acceptable and there is an undertaking to implement it within a specified period. The NPPF has more details in this regard. 10.24 Development within Conservation Areas must respect the local character and be carefully designed to respect the setting, through consideration of scale, height, massing, alignment, and use of appropriate materials. Keeping valued historic buildings in active and viable use is important for both the maintenance of the building concerned and the overall character of the conservation area. Proposals to change the use of a building might therefore be supported, where features essential to the special interest of the individual building are not lost or altered to facilitate the change of use. And so there is talk about the Appraisals having been reviewed in the Narrative suggesting that all is OK in that respect, but then goes on to say in the Policy itself HE1 which reads very well regarding conserving heritage assets etc, until we get to : The Historic Environment 11. The council will promote the effective management of North Lincolnshire's heritage assets through: Seeking to update existing Conservation Area Appraisals to identify the qualities and interests of each area and management guidelines to guide future development; There appears to be a conflict in the dialogue, therefor my question is , why haven't the Conservation Area appraisals been revisited before the Local Plan goes to Referendum - this process has been going on for close on 4 years? For instance, there are references to design concerning materials, but without a definition of what the materials are, the Policy falls short. The policy itself is good and quite prescriptive, which if taken as read would strengthen a Neighbourhood Plan heritage wise. However there is mention of some individual market towns in section 11 of HE1, but not of smaller communities such as Appleby and Winteringham or Saxby All Saints for example, nor of any reference to any Neighbourhood Plan that has definitive references to heritage assets. (there is reference to Neighbourhood Plans being important elsewhere, and it would be useful to make reference to their importance for Conservation).					
0017	Ivor Keyes	POLICY HE1: CONSERVING AND ENHANCING THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT	object	no	no	no	What is missing from the draft Local Plan, compared to the existing Plan is the absence of a reference to Article 4 Direction which is applied to a number of Conservation Areas in North Lincolnshire, and is intended to strengthen those Conservation Area Appraisals and Supplementary Guidance. In fact the only reference I can find that refers to Article 4 Direction is mentioned in the policies that refer to HMOs in the narrative 5.227 and 5.228. Residents in heritage properties in Conservation Area	Consistent with national policy	Clarify whether the heritage policies are definitive and do not require strengthening by way of Article 4 direction.	yes	To explain more fully what my concerns are.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							covered by Article 4 have gone to lengths to conform to, and there can be some extra expense to that, but if the Policy and Conservation Area narratives are not taken seriously in the New Plan the efforts that residents have made to conform up until now will have gone to waste. Does this mean that the New Plan policies are particularly robust and don't need any re-enforcement.? How will this be policed?					
0018	Ivor Keyes	POLICY SS3: 1f.	object	no	no	no	The word minimised is too subjective, either odour is considered unacceptable or not.	effective	the word minimised should be replaced by the word avoided.	no		
0019	Ivor Keyes	POLICY RD1: 1k.	support	yes	yes	yes	A positive policy, which in fact varies from other policies which are more subjective.	justified	None	no		
0020	Ivor Keyes	Paragraph 15.37	object	no	no	no	The words mitigation and avoided are mean two different things. Mitigation allows , but mitigation implies that that odours are acceptable.	effective	Remove the word mitigation	yes	To explain issues that can arise from mitigation	
0021	Ivor Keyes	POLICY DM3: 8.	object	no	no	no	The wording : Where proposals have the potential to release significant odours or where a sensitive use is being proposed near to an existing odorous process, applicants will be required to provide an odour impact assessment which demonstrates that impacts upon amenity can be avoided or properly mitigated and managed by remedial measures or improvements as part of the design of the proposed development. "impacts upon amenity can be avoided " again followed by the wording "mitigate "- which can be used to minimise as opposing to avoiding an issue, which I believe developers will take advantage of.	effective	Remove the implication of minimising .	yes	the explain fully my experience	
Andy **Killip** on behalf of National Grid												
0778	Andy Killip on behalf of National Grid	General					North Lincolnshire Council Draft Local Plan: Publication Plan October 2021 - National Grid Ventures response. 1. Introduction National Grid Ventures (NGV) is the competitive division of the National Grid group, operating outside of National Grid's core regulated gas and electricity businesses where it develops, operates and invests in energy projects, technologies and partnerships to accelerate the development of our clean energy future. NGV's diverse portfolio of flexible, low carbon and renewable energy businesses includes electricity interconnectors, liquefied natural gas, battery storage, carbon capture utilisation and storage (CCUS) and hydrogen transportation. The North Lincolnshire Draft Plan Period from 2020 to 2038 is a critical time in the transition to a low carbon economy and progress to UK Net Zero in 2050, stretching up to and beyond the Sixth Carbon Budgets (2033 – 2037) under the Climate Change Act 20081 and Carbon Budget Order 2021. The advice to Government on the actions required to meet the Sixth					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Carbon Budget indicate a significant change across the UK involving an 80% reduction in emissions from the 1990 baseline; this requires electricity production to be zero carbon by 2035 along with a two-fold increase in electricity and hydrogen demand2. The Humber region is currently one of the most carbon intensive regions in the UK and represents the greatest opportunity for decarbonisation involving transition for current energy sector clusters in North Lincolnshire as well as significant future low carbon energy sector opportunities. Carbon Capture, Utilisation and Storage (CCUS) NGV is part of the Zero Carbon Humber (ZCH) consortium (https://www.zerocarbonhumber.co.uk/) comprising leading companies and organisations working together to decarbonise the UK's largest industrial cluster through CCUS comprising a carbon dioxide network and a hydrogen network. NGV is also part of the Northern Endurance Partnership (NEP) that will develop the offshore carbon dioxide transportation and storage network in the southern North Sea that will capture and store the carbon dioxide from the Humber industrial cluster. ZCH and the NEP is collaborating with Net Zero Teesside on the East Coast Cluster (https://eastcoastcluster.co.uk/), with the aim of establishing the world's first net zero carbon industrial cluster. NGV's experience in CCUS includes development of the Yorkshire and Humber Carbon Capture Storage pipeline (including promotion of a DCO), and appraisal and development of the Endurance carbon dioxide storage area which is part of a carbon dioxide network being developed by the NEP. NGV previously developed and promoted the Yorkshire and Humber Carbon Capture Storage Cross Country Pipeline Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), associated with the White Rose CCUS project. A renewed commitment by the UK Government to CCUS comes in the context of needing to set the UK on the right track for achieving Net Zero by 2050. CCUS is one of the most viable ways to decarbonise industry, generate low carbon power and enable the production of low carbon hydrogen at a scale, which can, in turn, enable decarbonisation across the energy system. Carbon dioxide is emitted by fossil fuel and other forms of electricity generation and difficult to decarbonise industrial processes such as the manufacture of steel and cement. Deployment of CCUS at a scale in industrial clusters to support cross sector emissions reduction is a key part of the UK Government's 10 Point Plan to also become the world leader in the technology. The 10 Point Plan also aims for 5GW of low carbon hydrogen production by 2030 enabled by CCUS technology. Humber Low Carbon Pipelines Project NGV is promoting the development of the Humber Low Carbon Pipelines (HLCP) Project, intended to include a carbon dioxide transportation network to facilitate CCUS, and a hydrogen transportation network to decarbonise the Humber industrial cluster. HLCP is a NSIP under the Planning Act 2008. Deployment of CCUS infrastructure is described in the Net Zero Strategy as essential activity to 2035 (i.e. to meet the sixth carbon budget), with at least two CCUS industrial clusters by the mid-2020s and four clusters by					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							2030. The Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) has completed the first phase of their cluster sequencing process for the CCUS project deployment. The HyNet and East Coast Clusters have been confirmed as Track-1 clusters for the mid-2020s and funding of £1 billion has been secured through the CCS Infrastructure Fund to deliver this. For Phase-2, BEIS are seeking any prospective emitter projects which can feasibly connect to the transport and storage network of a cluster sequenced onto Track-1. The Government continues to be committed to Track-2 enabling 10Mtpa capacity operational by 2030 which puts Humber among the potential early 'Super Places' to be transformed over the next decade. The aim for the Humber region cluster is to be net zero by 2040, which could be facilitated by strategic planning. The North Lincolnshire Local Plan update process is timely for such consideration given the strategic contribution of ZCH projects to decarbonisation and economic development objectives. We welcome the opportunity to work with you further to discuss the points made below and any other aspects of relevance to development of the updated Local Plan. Initial route corridor options have been identified and were subject to a first phase of non-statutory consultation in September and October 2021. Statutory consultation and submission of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application is anticipated for 2022. 2. Climate Change and Decarbonisation CCUS and hydrogen will likely play a key role in decarbonisation of existing and future industry in North Lincolnshire. Carbon dioxide and hydrogen transportation networks, such as the HLCP project, will be key to enabling the use of carbon capture/usage and hydrogen in North Lincolnshire. The following section refers to relevant sections and policies with the Draft Plan with suggested amendments to ensure that climate change and decarbonisation are fully reflected within the document.					
0803	Andy Killip on behalf of National Grid	Paragraph 2.4					SECTION 2 NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE FACTS & FIGURES Paragraph 2.4 'Our Transformation So Far' (Section 2 'North Lincolnshire Facts & Figures'), provides details of the transformational projects that will shortly go through the planning process in North Lincolnshire. The inclusion of the HLCP Project in this list should be considered as a key transformational project.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0816	Andy Killip on behalf of National Grid	Paragraph 2.6					Paragraphs 2.6 to 2.76 outline a series of key challenges facing North Lincolnshire including: • Cross boundary working • Population changes • Housing provision • Economic development • Employment • Town centres • Visitor economy • Education and skills • Health and wellbeing • Deprivation • Natural environment • Historic environment • Agricultural/rural economy • Air quality • Strategic transport • Local transport • International connections • Digital connectivity • Minerals • Waste In view of the Government's commitment to transition to a low carbon economy and given the focus of decarbonisation in the Humber as one of the most carbon intensive regions in the UK, decarbonisation should be specified as a key challenge for the Plan Area for this plan period.					View PDF
0890	Andy Killip on behalf of National Grid	Paragraph 3.1					Section 3 'A Spatial Vision & Objectives for North Lincolnshire' includes Spatial Objective 11 'Planning for Climate Change'. The reference to increasing the use of low and zero carbon technologies is welcomed, however the inclusion of a specific reference to a carbon dioxide transportation network and a hydrogen transportation network to enable the decarbonisation of present and future industry in North Lincolnshire should be considered. A suggested amendment to the wording in the following paragraph is underlined below: We will also increase the use of low and zero carbon technologies and decarbonisation by encouraging appropriate building design, supporting businesses to adapt and decarbonise, promoting sustainable land management, including habitat protection and the creation of new habitats as natural solutions to climate change, and supporting the development of carbon dioxide and hydrogen transportation networks.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0823	Andy Killip on behalf of National Grid	POLICY DQE7: CLIMATE CHANGE & LOW CARBON LIVING					POLICY DQE7 CLIMATE CHANGE AND LOW CARBON LIVING Reference to North Lincolnshire being a strategic location for hydrogen and industrial decarbonisation should be recognised. In particular, the inclusion of an additional policy criterion in support of a carbon dioxide transportation network (i.e. pipelines and associated infrastructure) and a hydrogen network as a strategic enabler for decarbonisation of present and future industry in North Lincolnshire should therefore be considered. The following additional policy criterion is suggested:8. Support will be given to new development that enables the transition to low carbon and industrial decarbonisation, such as carbon capture technologies. In support of this additional criterion to Policy DQE7, the following supporting text is proposed: Encouragement is given to the promoters of energy related projects to co-ordinate to achieve low carbon living. Co-ordination is necessary to ensure more efficiency in the use of land to minimise impacts and to ensure that there is sufficient space for infrastructure and to facilitate the projects required to support decarbonisation of the energy system.					View PDF
0821	Andy Killip on behalf of National Grid	POLICY DQE8: RENEWABLE ENERGY PROPOSALS					POLICY DEQ8 RENEWABLE ENERGY PROPOSALS The specific mention of carbon capture/reuse in Paragraph 9.76 is welcomed. It is suggested that specific mention should also made to the use of hydrogen as an alternative to fossil fuels to be carried through within the Policy. A recognition within Policy DEQ8 to the importance of carbon capture usage and storage and hydrogen to decarbonisation in North Lincolnshire, and specific support for infrastructure development such as carbon dioxide and hydrogen transportation networks (i.e. pipelines and associated infrastructure) that enable decarbonisation at scale should therefore be made. The addition of the following underlined wording within criterion 2 is therefore proposed: Proposals for renewable energy development and proposals for carbon dioxide and hydrogen transportation networks will be supported where any significant adverse impacts are satisfactorily minimised, and the residual harm is outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. Development and their associated infrastructure will be assessed on their merits and subject to the following impact considerations, taking account of individual and cumulative effects:					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0830	Andy Killip on behalf of National Grid	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS					3. Land Use Designations and Allocations The route corridor options for the HLCP lie in open countryside, extending from east to west though the Plan Area. The route corridor options traverse a number of land use designations and site allocations, none of which are statutory in nature. These include: - Playing Fields - Strategic Employment Site - Landscape Enhancement - Local Geological Site - Mineral Safeguarding - Existing Consented Extraction Site - Local Wildlife Site - SHB Mitigation Site For the most part, neither the identified non-statutory designations or site allocations appear likely to constrain HLCP. However, the route corridor options extend across designated Mineral Safeguarding areas covering extensive areas of the Plan Area which may create local impacts by sterilising these protected mineral resources. Recognising the potential interaction between mineral resources and underground linear infrastructure projects of this nature, inclusion of the following supporting text should be recognised within the following Plan Policies.					View PDF
0846	Andy Killip on behalf of National Grid	POLICY MIN2: MINERAL SAFEGUARDING					POLICY MIN2 MINERAL SAFEGUARDING New paragraph to be added following Paragraph 12.13 as follows: For significant new infrastructure including underground carbon dioxide and hydrogen pipelines that may cross areas protected by this Policy, it is accepted that the nature of the development could limit mineral working in this area should viable deposits be identified.					View PDF
0847	Andy Killip on behalf of National Grid	POLICY MIN3: MINERAL EXTRACTION					POLICY MIN3 MINERAL EXTRACTION New paragraph to be added following Paragraph 12.19 as follows: Consideration should also be given to ensuring that proposals for mineral extraction do not inhibit the deployment and operation of significant new infrastructure and to ensure that adequate buffers are in place between mineral working and underground carbon dioxide and hydrogen pipelines. It is also considered helpful to include a general statement highlighting the potential impacts of new development proposals on underground carbon dioxide and hydrogen pipelines and the need for protective provisions to be put in place. Protection from other development in the corridor and in proximity to the corridor (where development may not be compatible) will be vital to ensure continued viability of the network; such that there is protection for the infrastructure corridor pre-construction and then in the operational stage.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0859	Andy Killip on behalf of National Grid	POLICY SS3: DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES					POLICY SS3 DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES: Paragraph 4.25 – Final sentence to be added as follows: New development should also ensure there are adequate buffers in place between such proposals and underground carbon dioxide and hydrogen supply pipelines in order not to inhibit the deployment and operation of strategically important infrastructure in line with HSE guidance.					View PDF
Roy **Kitching**												
0226	Roy Kitching	Paragraph 5.123	object	no	no	no			Dismiss this proposal at H1P-26	no		
0227	Roy Kitching	Paragraph 5.125	object	no	no	no	Highway access unsuitable for accessing new development via Graizelound Fields Road for an extra 75 dwellings. This road is narrow and from Graizelound is only a single track road with no passing places and no footways. Some residents of Graizelound would also find this extra traffic very intrusive and unsafe given the nature of this road. Existing footways already fall below the ideal standard width of 1.8 mtrs, the minimum being 1.5 mtrs., which allows for public to pass or re-pass each other without hindrance. The width of the existing footways are very questionable and currently require pedestrians to step into the carriageway to pass each other.		Dismiss proposal for 75 new dwellings	no		
0230	Roy Kitching	Paragraph 5.126	object	no	no	no	Drainage issues already within this locality between the A161 and Graizelound Fields Road towards the rear of properties on Hopgarth and Field View. Site is within a Flood Zone 1, and with current climate change predictions, building a development on this scale in this area would put enormous strain on the existing drainage network and putting at risk existing dwellings neighbouring this site. The water table in this area already reaches high levels under heavy rainfall.		Dismiss this proposal of 75 new dwellings.	no		
0231	Roy Kitching	Paragraph 5.127	object	no	no	no	This is an Area of Special Historic Landscape Interest, and should be treated as such. Do the residents of Haxey need or wish a new housing development of this scale? Who decided Haxey needs a new development of this size, and do the Haxey residents actually have a say in this? After all, this is our village, our community, and this proposed development would utterly undermine its character.		Dismiss this proposal.	no		
Marta **Kotwica**												
0792	Marta Kotwica	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation.”					
0810	Marta Kotwica	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0869	Marta Kotwica	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for “up to 400 homes” on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Jeffrey **Laird**												
0400	Jeffrey Laird	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0454	Jeff Laird	Paragraph 14.47					• The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation, and I request that the text be revised to: - “To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended. This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to and from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV’s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation.”					View PDF
0494	Jeff Laird	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND					• Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
		VIEWS										
0572	Jeff Laird	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS					I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: - • I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on 62 acres of greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. My reasons for objecting include the following: - • The fact that it is outside of the current development line, this proposal will undoubtedly have a major impact on the existing, already overburdened infrastructure of the town. The town already has shortage of schools, doctors, dentists etc. and certainly not enough car parking to service the existing retail trade outlets in the town. The additional number of adults, children, and vehicles that this development would bring would cause absolute chaos and probably influence many people to relocate thus defeating the object of the proposal. • If, as proposed, the country is going to be carbon neutral by 2050, then at least 25% of the land area will have to be planted with trees and the last thing that we should be doing is utilising valuable, green, agricultural land which will be needed for food production purposes for the building of new housing developments. • current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Mrs Susan **Laird**												
0399	Mrs Susan Laird	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
Ashley **Lambert-Jefferson**												
0037	Ashley lambert-jefferson	POLICY SS1: PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	support	yes	yes	yes	Plans affecting Barnetby I full support the plans for Barnetby Lorry park New properties on the field behind kings road. The plans will generate new income to the village, provide jobs and boost local economy. I accept there will be some disruption during the works but that inevitable. I hope the plan gets the go ahead	positively prepared		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Stephen **Lambert-Jefferson**												
0038	Stephen Lambert-jefferson	POLICY H1P-19: LAND AT KINGS ROAD	support	yes	yes	yes	I support the plans for further housing on the site off kings road. There is a need for housing in the village and this location is an area which has been outlined previously. when looking at the village as a whole this is an area of the village which can hold a good amount of housing. The concerns of flooding would need addressing as part of the planning as with more housing the water is only going in 1 direction, down to the railway bridge. Clause of affordable/social housing would benefit the village mix of housing stock. Thought would need to be given for the school and doctors as would be an increase in needs for these. I also support the plans for industrial and truck stop at Barnetby top, this is an area which is on a transport link and not far from major ports which are only going to grow. The transport industry has a stronghold in the village and there is a need for the lorry park.	effective		no		
Peter **Large**												
0390	Peter J Large	Evidence Base	Object				The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0448	Peter Large	Paragraph 14.47					he current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation. I request that the text should be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton-upon-Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via the B1206, a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0489	Peter Large	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS					Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the Barton Southern Gateway (the area round the B1218 south of the 30 mph speed limit sign in Brigg Road Barton) should be considered any differently and request that this be added as Item g					View PDF
0683	Peter Large	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES					I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Katie **Laughton**												
0599	Katie Laughton	POLICY H1P-19: LAND AT KINGS ROAD					Ref- H1P-19 Land at top of King Road. As a community member who lives in Barnetby I propose that some of the land discussed in the proposal above is utilised to provide allotment space for local villagers. As a registered Mental health nurse I can recommend highly that this is looked at. Gardening has a significant benefit on mental health along with creating a sense of inclusion and community whilst building social networks. It is something I advocate highly for and something the village would benefit from. Personally, I have been on a waiting list for 4 years with Scunthorpe and I remain on the Brigg and Broughton waiting list however locals will always be prioritised, understandably. There is a lot of interest from Barnetby locals for allotments and this would be a perfect opportunity to begin developing the local community. I would appreciate if the above could be discussed and considered.					View PDF
Mrs Shirley **Leach** on behalf of Thornton Curtis Parish Council												
0853	Mrs Shirley Leach on behalf of Thornton Curtis Parish Council	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	object	Yes	No	Yes	You have not included our recommendations. Inset Map 82 Thornton Curtis We asked for Champions Gate to be included in view of PA20171985 appeal decision . We asked for the boundary to be at the Old Vicarage and not include 28,30,,32 and 34 Main street (see attached map)					View PDF
0854	Mrs Shirley Leach on behalf of Thornton Curtis Parish Council	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	object	Yes	No	Yes	Can the paddock behind 26 Abbey Road be included in the development limit? The land is under the same ownership and should the remainder of the land at 26 Abbey Road be developed the paddock would become landlocked. 9See attached map sent in with rep form)					View PDF
Rebecca **Leconte** on behalf of ADC Infrastructure												
0831	Rebecca Leconte on behalf of ADC Infrastructure	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS					OBJECTION TO THE REMOVAL OF PREFERRED OPTIONS SITES H1P-7P and H1P-8P FROM THE PUBLICATION DRAFT (REGULATION 19) – ADC2867 ADC Infrastructure Ltd have been appointed by DDM Agriculture Ltd to provide transport and highways advice to the landowners of the Stage 3 Preferred Options sites H1P-7P (land south of Barrow Road) and H1P-8P (land at Caistor Road). These sites, together with Site H1P-6P and H1P-9P were included within the Stage 3 Preferred Options. However, whilst Site H1P-6P has been included in the Stage 4 Publication Draft (Regulation 19) as site H1P13, the other three sites have all been removed. We understand that NLC have undertaken transport and infrastructure studies that have concluded that Barton under Humber only has highway capacity for limited development, until the relief road is constructed and operational. As a result, Stage 4 includes a reduced allocation of 583 homes (H1P-12 is for 319 dwellings and H1P-13 is for 225			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							dwellings), and has removed the other three sites. We object, on behalf of our Client, to the reduced allocations and the removal of sites H1P-7P and H1P-8P. Until the NLC transport and infrastructure studies are made publicly available, there is insufficient information available for a transparent and fair public consultation. We have requested a copy of the transport and infrastructure studies that have been prepared by NLC. Once these are available, we intend to review the assumptions made with regards to traffic generation, distribution and assignment, and review the modelling undertaken to determine the impacts of that traffic. We also intend to determine whether there is any mitigation measures, including sustainable transport measures, that can be implemented ahead of the relief road, to provide additional highway capacity. We will then seek to justify the reinstatement of sites H1P-7P and H1P-8P within the Publication Draft (Regulation 19). We trust that you will consider this letter of objection, and the reinstatement of the sites as allocations moving forwards.					
Hannah **Lewis**												
0614	Hannah Lewis	POLICY H1P-4: LAND AT FORMER SOUTH LEYS SCHOOL ENDERBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object				I would like to express my objection to the development of this site given that it currently is home to KPAC which provides extensive performing arts provision to young people and adults. It is perfectly placed to serve many sectors of the community and offers activities that encompass all ages and is a buzzing centre for a wide demographic of the community.					View PDF
Mr Tom **Libera**												
0773	Mr Tom Libera	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0474	Tommy Libera	Paragraph 14.47	object				(3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: “To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation." Kind Regards,					
0514	Tommy Libera	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				(2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0706	Tommy Libera	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I strongly object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Melanie **Lindsley** on behalf of The Coal Authority												
0776	Melanie Lindsley on behalf of The Coal Authority	General	support				Thank you for your notification received on the 15 October 2021 in respect of the above consultation. The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department of Business, Energy & 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. Our records indicate that the North Lincolnshire Council area does not contain any surface coal resource or recorded risks from past coal mining activity at surface or shallow depth. The Coal Authority therefore has no specific comments to make on this current consultation. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss this further.					View PDF
Pauline **Maksymowych**												
0221	Pauline Maksymowych	Paragraph 5.123	object	yes	no	no	Relating to Area of Special Historic Landscape Interest, other areas within Haxey have been discounted using LC14, which can be evidenced within the Housing Site Selection Topic Paper - Page 54, reference OUT66, CFS0300086. Why then doesn't this apply to H1P26. You are willing to revise the boundary of the ASHLI here, why not in these other areas referenced above? Brownfield land has been identified at the Field House site, so why not		Revoking the proposal for land at Field House as this has not been consulted upon with residents.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							limit it to that area only, why are you pushing into a greenfield area, again referencing back to ASHLI. Referencing Page 55 of the Housing Site Selection Topic Paper, site ZXSKI - why has this site at Lowcroft Avenue been discounted, surely a site can't be "too large" - this would be preferable to squeezing residences too closely together. Referencing Page 55 of the Housing Site Selection Topic Paper, site 3HCCA - one reason for not considering this area is given as "The site is within an Area of Special Historic Landscape Interest. Within this area development will not be permitted which would destroy, damage or adversely affect the character, appearance or setting of the historic landscape or any of its features". Surely, this applies to H1P26, given it is on the edge of the village, and such a large development will spoil this area of Haxey - residents have chosen to live in this area for a reason.					
0222	Pauline Maksymowych	Paragraph 5.125	object	no	no	no	- The road accessing the proposed site at H1P26 is not suitable to take further development, particularly in light of the number of dwellings being proposed . At present the road (from Graizelound) is only single track, with no passing places; it is not suitable for traffic given the number of current dwellings on the estate. How can this accommodate the amount and size of vehicle that would be involved in developing the site. The footways can both sides, and the full length of Graizelound Fields Road are either too narrow or non-existent.		Revoke the proposal on Page 128 for the use of H1P26.	no		
0223	Pauline Maksymowych	Paragraph 5.126	object	no	no	no	There have been, and continue to be flooding issues particularly at the top of Graizelound Fields Roads near the War Memorial. The land within our own dwelling collects water easily and if surrounding areas are developed on such a large scale, has there been consideration as to where water will flow given the lack of land/soil to help soak up large amounts of water?		Revoke proposal for H1P26 on Page 128.	no		
0224	Pauline Maksymowych	Paragraph 5.127	object	no	no	no	Relating to Area of Special Historic Landscape Interest, other areas within Haxey have been discounted using LC14, which can be evidenced within the Housing Site Selection Topic Paper - Page 54, reference OUT66, CFS0300086. Why then doesn't this apply to H1P26.		Revoke proposal for H1P26 on Page 128.	no		
Monty **Martin**												
0012	Monty Martin	FIGURE 2.9: OUR TRANSPORT CONNECTIONS	object	yes	no	no	In relation to Barton upon Humber, the consideration of Road access fails to consider sufficiently the need for One Way systems in appropriate parts of the town. It is hoped the Neighbourhood Plan will correct this. The presentation at Baysgarth school was ill prepared and rushed. The signage was poor. The maps were of too small a scale to be easily understood, reproduction of what was in the Plan. Should have been exploded. Each 'station' should have had a clear direction or topic. A copy of the Plan should have been clearly in evidence for reference and those parts that related to Barton also clearly set out. This was lip service, although I do realise it was a last stage and I do have a	effective	Root and branch consideration of safety and traffic flow	yes	To discuss possibilities not already considered	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							copy of the Plan					
0013	Monty Martin	TABLE 4.1: NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE HOUSING DELIVERY TEST 2020 RESULTS	object	no	no	no	The area known as Meldans, formerly the Fred Hopper Cycle Works has a crucial part to play in Barton's further. Designating it as White Land whereas it should have been Mixed use is a derogation of a great opportunity. the land cries out for a new Health Centre, parking and social housing. It is in private ownership and is being developed piecemeal which is contrary to comprehensive development of the public good. NLC needs to take this by the scruff of the neck in a last chance saloon and negotiate with the owner to acquire the land and develop it for the public good.	effective	Set out above	yes	To enlarge on my views.	
Neil **Taylor-Matson** on behalf of Kirton in Lindsey Town Council												
0133	Neil Taylor-Matson on behalf of Kirton in Lindsey Town Council	Paragraph 2.19	object	yes	no	yes	Kirton in Lindsey Town Council wishes to make the following recommendations: Housing allocation for Kirton in Lindsey should include the 302 houses with planning approval at the former RAF base as this would meet aims to join up areas of the town (soundness). That the town Cemetery off Grove Street should be classified as a cemetery and not open green space(soundness). That land at Ings Lane, Kirton in Lindsey with outline planning approval should not be included within the development boundary in case the approval lapses (soundness) Concern is raised by the use of Should throughout the document (soundness). It is not possible to pin point the Inset Map 27 on the drop down menu to leave comment specifically about the issue with the classification of the cemetery and the development boundary, and so I have submitted all comments related to Kirton in Lindsey on this paragraph.	justified	Kirton in Lindsey Town Council wishes to make the following recommendations: Housing allocation for Kirton in Lindsey should include the 302 houses with planning approval at the former RAF base as this would meet aims to join up areas of the town (soundness). That the town Cemetery off Grove Street should be classified as a cemetery and not open green space (soundness). That land at Ings Lane, Kirton in Lindsey with outline planning approval should not be included within the development boundary in case the approval lapses (soundness) Concern is raised by the use of Should throughout the document (soundness). It is not possible to pin point the Inset Map 27 on the drop down menu to leave comment specifically about the issue with the classification of the cemetery and the development boundary, and so I have submitted all comments related to Kirton in Lindsey on this paragraph.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0136	Neil Taylor-Matson on behalf of Kirton in Lindsey Town Council	Paragraph 5.131	object	yes	no	yes	Kirton in Lindsey Town Council wishes to make the following recommendations: Housing allocation for Kirton in Lindsey should include the 302 houses with planning approval at the former RAF base as this would meet aims to join up areas of the town (soundness). That the town Cemetery off Grove Street should be classified as a cemetery and not open green space (soundness). That land at Ings Lane, Kirton in Lindsey with outline planning approval should not be included within the development boundary in case the approval lapses (soundness) Concern is raised by the use of Should throughout the document (soundness). It is not possible to pin point the Inset Map 27 on the drop down menu to leave comment specifically about the issue with the classification of the cemetery and the development boundary, and so I have submitted all comments related to Kirton in Lindsey on this paragraph.	justified	Kirton in Lindsey Town Council wishes to make the following recommendations: Housing allocation for Kirton in Lindsey should include the 302 houses with planning approval at the former RAF base as this would meet aims to join up areas of the town (soundness). That the town Cemetery off Grove Street should be classified as a cemetery and not open green space(soundness). That land at Ings Lane, Kirton in Lindsey with outline planning approval should not be included within the development boundary in case the approval lapses (soundness) Concern is raised by the use of Should throughout the document (soundness). It is not possible to pin point the Inset Map 27 on the drop down menu to leave comment specifically about the issue with the classification of the cemetery and the development boundary, and so I have submitted all comments related to Kirton in Lindsey on this paragraph.	no		
0134	Neil Taylor-Matson on behalf of Kirton in Lindsey Town Council	POLICY H1P-27: LAND AT FORMER RAF KIRTON IN LINDSEY	object	yes	no	yes	Kirton in Lindsey Town Council wishes to make the following recommendations: Housing allocation for Kirton in Lindsey should include the 302 houses with planning approval at the former RAF base as this would meet aims to join up areas of the town (soundness). That the town Cemetery off Grove Street should be classified as a cemetery and not open green space (soundness). That land at Ings Lane, Kirton in Lindsey with outline planning approval should not be included within the development boundary in case the approval lapses (soundness) Concern is raised by the use of Should throughout the document (soundness). It is not possible to pin point the Inset Map 27 on the drop down menu to leave comment specifically about the issue with the classification of the	justified	Kirton in Lindsey Town Council wishes to make the following recommendations: Housing allocation for Kirton in Lindsey should include the 302 houses with planning approval at the former RAF base as this would meet aims to join up areas of the town (soundness). That the town Cemetery off Grove Street should be classified as a cemetery and not open green space(soundness). That land at Ings Lane, Kirton in Lindsey with outline planning	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							cemetery and the development boundary, and so I have submitted all comments related to Kirton in Lindsey on this paragraph.		approval should not be included within the development boundary in case the approval lapses (soundness) Concern is raised by the use of Should throughout the document (soundness). It is not possible to pin point the Inset Map 27 on the drop down menu to leave comment specifically about the issue with the classification of the cemetery and the development boundary, and so I have submitted all comments related to Kirton in Lindsey on this paragraph.			
Jake **McLeod**, Walsingham Planning on behalf of Lidl Great Britain Limited												
0294	Jake McLeod, Walsingham Planning on behalf of Lidl Great Britain Limited	Paragraph 3.10	object	yes	no	yes	Please refer to the separate representation document submitted by Walsingham Planning to localplan@northlincs.gov.uk	justified	In relation to the 'soundness' of the Plan, it is not justified and is not consistent with national policy. Our client's site is allocated for housing in the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD; however, the Council considers the land to be unsuitable for housing. In accordance with paragraph 122a of the NPPF and the spatial vision for the Plan, the Council should have considered the site for alternative deliverable uses. The separate representation document provides further information and demonstrates that our client's site is available, suitable and deliverable for a wide range of commercial uses including: • Retail (non-food and bulky goods); • Drive thru (restaurant and coffee shop); • Trade counter; • General industrial; • Storage and distribution;	yes	Our client owns an allocated housing site which is not proposed to be re-allocated in the new Plan. The site has not once been assessed for re-allocated for alternative deliverable uses, hence the Plan is not justified and is inconsistent with national policy (NPPF paragraph 122a). The site is available, suitable and deliverable for a wide range of commercial uses and should be proposed for re-allocation. Our client wishes to partake in the Hearing Sessions for these reasons.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									• Office; • Car dealership; • Petrol filling station; and • All other appropriate Sui Generis uses. We would request that the Council modifies the Plan to re-allocate our client's site for wide commercial use purposes.			
John **Medley**												
0601	John Medley	POLICY H1P-26: LAND AT FIELD HOUSE	object				Further to the public consultation in Haxey Memorial Hall on 15th November, I wish to register my objection to the planned development in Graizelound Fields Road. It seems to me that this proposal has been taken as a easy option as it is just tacked on to housing existing housing despite it being in designated Isle of Axholme Historic Landscape and with poor road access being single track with dangerous junctions North and south. A far better location would be north of Lowcroft Avenue estate which would have good road access. The only reason that this has been dismissed is that the owners did not put it forward for consideration. NLC have acquired land in this block of land for the school and the parking lay-by so surely they could also consult with the owners for any future housing development. This is also in Historic Landscape but would be a far better site than that proposed in Graizelound Fields. I recommend that North Lincolnshire Planning team and the Planning Inspector seriously consider my alternative proposal.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Frazer **Melton**												
0480	Frazer Melton	Paragraph 14.9					I heard about the Local Plan only a couple of days ago, so I missed the consultation events. And to be frank haven't had the time to trawl through the whole document. However, one point I did note was 14.9. 1) I live in Brigg next to the main road (2 West Terrace, Bridge Street) and must disagree with the statement "congestion is not currently an issue". I see it several times a day most days a week when the traffic backs up as far as the eye can see in both directions. 2) Brigg need a bypass. Some years ago a small section of road was made to avoid the market place (Bridge st - Tesco - Monument roundabout). This does not bypass any other portion of Brigg. 3) One alternative to a bypass that would alleviate traffic from within the urban areas would be a (perhaps limited) junction onto the M180 from the area between Grammar School Road and the River Ancholme. I have heard that there are plans to build houses on the remainder of the industrial estate in this area. Personally I believe that using this remaining free land for a junction would be a better and safer use which is more in line of the function of an industrial estate. 4) New properties are being built on the island without any road widening or other means to reduce traffic flows. More properties are in planning which will add to this. 5) The lack of suitable rest/service/parking facilities for HGVs using the M180 to/from Immingham & inland means that Brigg has become a de-facto "lorry park". Many lorries park overnight in any available positions within the town. Until pub closing time this is not a major problem, but after that the drivers have no toilet facilities, so end up using hedges, bushes etc for their needs, which is unpleasant an unsanitary. From 4am onwards the HGVs then depart Brigg which causes a major disturbance to the residents as well as the vibrations damaging properties. 6) During road works on the M180 the road through Brigg is used for extensive periods - mostly overnight - to bypass the motorway. This is not just one or two nights: the longest was from November-April three years ago. Once again the same problem of disturbance and vibration damage are caused. 7) The remaining part of point 14.9 from "It is important therefore ..." does not bear any relation to the reality of what has happened or is currently happening. Developments are being approved with no increased public transport or safe cycling/walking routes.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Claire **Mills**, Savills UK Limited on behalf of St John's College												
0115	Claire Mills, Savills UK Limited on behalf of St John's College	POLICY DQE11: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK	object					justified	The policy is considered unsound as it is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy. The evidence base should supply the full methodology and mapping undertaken by GLNP to define green infrastructure within the authority area. Not only this, but an opportunity should be provided for third parties to review and comment on this evidence prior to submission of the Local Plan. Without such steps being taken, policy DQE11 cannot be considered sound as it is neither positively prepared or justified and based on the minimal evidence that is provided, appears inconsistent with the definition of green infrastructure set out in national policy. Without the above evidence, it is considered policy DQE11 should be removed from the Local Plan and specifically, SHLAA site CFS0300136 (IA36Q) should be removed from the designation.	yes	To fully explore and debate the reason the site in question has been identified as part of the Green Infrastructure Network.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Mrs Kay **Mitchell-Gough**												
0764	Mrs Kay Mitchell-Gough	POLICY H1P-26: LAND AT FIELD HOUSE	Object				Letter of Objection We are writing with regards to the meeting I attended with the view to potential planning for land off Graizelound Fields Road in Haxey. It was by fluke that this meeting was brought to our attention. Had it not we wouldn't have been able to raise our concerns. One would have thought that information on this proposed building area would have been more readily available. Having lived in Haxey for the past 24 years its been a safe and stunning area to enjoy with my family and friends. Following the meeting we have major concerns relating to any proposals and want to note out letter of objection as such for the numerous reasons why this application should not be applied for, granted or developed. Haxey is a principal part of the Isle of Axholmes Area of Special Historic landscape interest. The Field House proposal involves the decimation of part of this landscape. The medieval strip farming method embodied in the open plan Anglo Saxon fields is unique. It is representative of a sole surviving part of England's landscape heritage. If this is developed or affected in anyway it can never be replaced. Graizelounds Fields Road is an ancient track which even when developed would be inadequate to support Haxeys needs. It struggles even now with local movement. Traffic flow south and north to the cenotaph has been underestimated. Any increase in traffic may also be damaging to this landscape and the safe environment that our families are surrounded by. It also raises the question of drainage that would have a huge impact in the area should this field be developed. In addition, concerns are raised for the educational facilities in the area which would be inadequate including an increase of traffic movement leading to potential vehicle incidents and accidents which have already been an issue on the Nooking. Across all the Local Plan documents even in the 2003 version it is highlighted that these areas need to be protected and in addition worth noting that other documents relating to the following should also be looked at such as: 1. Potential Pre-historic Remains 2. Council Quotes 3. Assessment of potential development land (other areas have higher scores) 4. Map showing importance of the area 5. Field House central to archaeological profile. 6. Lidar view of Isle of Axholme showing ancient landscape.					
Simon William Paul **Morgan**												
0084	Simon William Paul Morgan	Paragraph 14.25	object	yes	no	yes	Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) is not an adequate replacement for scheduled fixed bus services, and is not attractive to me as a car user I would never consider DRT whereas I do consider scheduled fixed services. DRT requires pre-booking and planning ahead, rather than turning up at a bus stop, and there is no guarantee that a bus will available when you want to travel. The focus should be on expanding fixed bus services instead. In addition, this policy has failed twice in the past year. In September 2020, the service 35 between Scunthorpe and Amcotts was truncated to	justified	The paragraph should be deleted.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Keadby in favour of DRT to Amcotts, but was reversed within a matter of weeks. More recently in September 2021, service 94 between Brigg and Kirton in Lindsey has been reinstated after being withdrawn in September 2020 in favour of DRT.					
0041	Simon William Paul Morgan	Paragraph 5.62	object	yes	no	yes	Whilst I support this allocation, it should however be expanded " contingent on delivery of a Barton Relief Road - to include adjacent areas, as proposed in Stage 3 Preferred Options, SHEELA Site References CKXMB, G4HLU, 787LS. Support exists as identified in the Preferred Options Summary of Responses report, paragraphs 5.33, 5.35, 5.37 & 5.39. I see from the Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Topic Paper (paragraph 7.42), the housing allocation for Barton Upon Humber has been reduced due to capacity issues and constraints on the existing local highway network. I do not wish to dispute the highways issues identified, however the publication local plan includes reference to the proposed Barton Link Road in paragraph 14.47 and policy T7. This relief road has the potential to deal with many of the existing highways issues within Barton Upon Humber, and therefore allowing for an expansion of the allocation within Paragraph 5.62 to match that proposed as part of the Preferred Options process.	justified	Expand the scope of the proposed allocation to match SHEELA References CKXMB, G4HLU and 787LS.	no		
0045	Simon William Paul Morgan	Paragraph 6.59	support	yes	yes	yes	I fully support this policy and the justification outlined for it.	justified	Not Applicable.	no		
0079	Simon William Paul Morgan	Paragraph 7.1	object	yes	no	yes	The specific reference to Scunthorpe Town Centre should be removed. This is a general introductory paragraph that should cover all town centres. The aim for all town centres should be to remain vibrant and have a clear direction for their future prosperity.	effective	In the final sentence, replace "If Scunthorpe Town Centre is to remain vibrant" with "For town centres to remain vibrant".	no		
0083	Simon William Paul Morgan	POLICY CSC15: 1.	object	yes	no	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. There is no specific allocation for an extension of Barton Upon Humber Cemetery despite only having 4 years of cremated remains space remaining (as per the Cemetery Provision Topic Paper).	justified	Allocate land north of Barton Upon Humber Cemetery for expansion.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0081	Simon William Paul Morgan	POLICY DQE1: 7.	object	yes	no	yes	This paragraph reference purely to an aspiration, that could yet be rejected or the area covered amended. It cannot therefore be justified as part of a formal policy at this point in time. Other policies, and references to the aspiration for an AONB extension in other paragraphs, are sufficient. The case for the proposed AONB extension, in my personal opinion, is extremely weak, especially over the exact proposed geography. It needs formal independent scrutiny before it receives any legal standing. The proposed AONB would include: -A motorway (M180) and two dual carriageways (A15 and A180) -An international airport (or at least surround it) -Two principal towns, both of which include housing estates that are the exact opposite of beauty -Various industrial estates including the Humber Bridge Industrial Estate and the Elsham Wold Industrial Estate -The Singleton Birch Lime Works in Melton Ross and the Cemex Factory in South Ferriby, both of which are a major feature on the skyline for some miles around -Electricity Pylons The Skyline would also be affected by Scunthorpe Steel Works, the Killingholme Oil Refineries and Saltend Chemical Works. Overall the AONB proposal would cover a mixed rural-urban and mixed industrial-countryside area that is a long way from representing outstanding natural beauty. If it is does proceed, it could be improved by a smaller, more focused geography, omitting towns and industrial areas.	justified	The paragraph should be deleted from the policy.	no		
0082	Simon William Paul Morgan	POLICY DQE2: 1g.	object	yes	no	yes	This landscape enhancement scheme is neither needed, nor an appropriate use of land. Additionally no further details have been made public and the only consultation on it has been as part of the local plan where it risks being overlooked as the focus is on more significant proposals such as housing allocations. The allocation sits in a mixed industrial-residential area. Responding as a resident of the residential area with views onto the proposed designated area, the industrial areas are already appropriately shielded from the residential areas, and the only noise issues are from vehicles that this scheme will do nothing to address. Any investment should instead be put into Waters Edge Country Park, and/or a southwards extension to Baysgarth Park, which could be extended to border the proposed Barton Relief Road. The land would be far better used for housing or preferably commercial development. This would generate additional council tax and/or business rate income for the council. Alternatively the area would benefit from a small convenience store to serve current and future housing, in the same way as such stores are located on Caistor Road and Bowmandale in Barton. None of the areas of the Barton East scheme are currently publicly accessible and unless this was amended, the amenity value of the scheme	justified	The landscape enhancement scheme should be removed from the plan.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							would be very low.					
0043	Simon William Paul Morgan	POLICY EC1-3: LAND TO THE WEST OF HUMBERSIDE AIRPORT	support	yes	yes	yes	I fully support this policy and the justification outlined for it.	justified	Not Applicable	no		
0044	Simon William Paul Morgan	POLICY EC1-4: LAND NORTH OF THE A18 AT HUMBERSIDE AIRPORT	support	yes	yes	yes	I fully support this policy and the justification outlined for it.	justified	Not Applicable	no		
0042	Simon William Paul Morgan	POLICY H1P-13: 1f.	object	yes	no	yes	Whilst the requirement to build or financially support the relief road is very welcome, if the relief road terminates, even temporarily, at Caistor Road, it is going to put an unacceptable level of traffic onto the minor road through Deepdale and onto the B1206. No consideration appears to have been made of this in preparing the policy requirement.	justified	The section of relief road from Barrow Road to Brigg Road, and ideally the full proposal to the A15, must open as a whole, not in intermediate stages, so as to protect Deepdale.	no		
0015	Simon William Paul Morgan	POLICY SS11: 4.	object	yes	no	yes	I wish to object to the development limit for Barton Upon Humber. The Settlement Development Limits Review Topic Paper proposes the development limit for Barton Upon Humber is extended to include EC1-6P, but this isn't reflected on the inset map for Barton Upon Humber.	justified	Revise Map as justified in the Settlement Development Limits Review Topic Paper.	no		
0014	Simon William Paul Morgan	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object	yes	no	yes	I wish to object to the spatial distribution of housing sites, policy SS6, in respect of Barton Upon Humber. I do not believe the decision to allocate only 583 dwellings, or 8% can be justified.During Stage 3 Preferred Options, Barton Upon Humber was allocated 1089 dwellings or 13% of housing growth. This compared to Briggs 1006 dwellings or 12%. I see from the Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Topic Paper (paragraph 7.42), the allocation for Barton has been reduced due to capacity issues and constraints on the existing local highway network. There is now a significant disparity in the planned growth of Barton Upon Humber and Brigg, which comprise the two principal towns.I do not wish to dispute the highways issues identified, however the publication local plan includes reference to the much needed Barton Link Road in paragraph 14.47 and policy T7 that has the potential to deal with many of the existing highways issues within Barton Upon Humber. How can the plan be justified in reducing growth levels for Barton Upon Humber when it is proposing a solution to the constraint identified. Assuming it is delivered, North Lincolnshire Councils own policy T7 undermines their own justification for cutting housing growth in Barton Upon Humber.Additionally I am rather concerned that little to no attention has been paid to employment growth at Wren Kitchens in Barton Upon Humber. Whilst publicly available data is scarce the economic impact report submitted as part of planning application PA-2019-1147 for Wren Kitchens new factory in Barton Upon Humber showed that there were 1535 employees at the Barton Upon Humber site in April 2019, up from 378 when Kimberley Clark ceased trading on the site in March 2013. The planning application then proposed to add between 525 and 1285 new positions. Potentially this could lead to around 1700-2400 new jobs in Barton Upon Humber being added in a 10 year period. As of April 2019 the economic impact report stated that only 34% of Barton Upon Humber based staff lived in North Lincolnshire, and it	justified	The spatial distribution of housing sites for Barton Upon Humber should revert back to 1089 dwellings and 13%, or close to this allowing for modifications made in other settlements. This would need to be conditional on the Barton Link Road being constructed in full.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							would be reasonable to assume not all of the 34% lived in Barton Upon Humber. Therefore I believe it is reasonable to assume there is significant inbound commuting to Barton Upon Humber by Wren Kitchen's employees, far greater than when Kimberly Clark occupied the site, and that this will only increase in number when the new factory opens (planning was approved and is under construction).I can see no assessment of the impact of this employment growth on the Barton Upon Humber housing market being made in the supporting documentation and evidence base published as part off Stage 4. Whilst many employees will not want to relocate to Barton, some may do so. Additionally on sustainability grounds, it would be sensible to promote Barton as a home for Barton based Wren Kitchens employees, where they could walk or cycle to and from work.					
0085	Simon William Paul Morgan	POLICY T2: 4.	object	yes	no	yes	The policy is biased towards one form of bus service - demand responsive - and offers no scope for financially supporting fixed bus services.	justified	Reword to "Support fixed bus services and JustGo North Lincs/ DRT services across the area by seeking contributions from developers".	no		
0080	Simon William Paul Morgan	POLICY TC1: 1b.	object	yes	no	yes	The retail hierarchy groups Barton Upon Humber and Brigg together with Crowle and Epworth, despite Barton and Brigg having significantly larger town centres than Crowle and Epworth. The broader policy TC1 also fails to specifically recognise and offer potential solutions to two challenges faced by Barton Town Centre, as identified in the 2019 North Lincolnshire Retail Study, which the council has commissioned as part of it's evidence base for the new Local Plan. These are: From Paragraph 7.8 "It is therefore considered that the non-food offer represents a weakness of Barton-upon-Humber and a broader comparison goods offer could serve to create a more appealing shopping destination and diversify the wider offer of the town centre." From Paragraph 7.11 "Overall, it is therefore considered that Barton-upon-Humber has a moderate level of vitality and viability." Moderate does not indicate a thriving town centre and indicates that council intervention is needed to prevent the issues faced by Barton Town Centre from worsening.	justified	Barton Upon and Humber and Brigg should be located in a separate, higher, position within the retail hierarchy compared to Crowle and Epworth. Policy provisions from paragraphs 2 and 3 should apply to Barton Upon and Humber and Brigg as well as Scunthorpe.	no		
0046	Simon William Paul Morgan	TABLE 6.2 EXISTING EMPLOYMENT AREAS	object	yes	no	yes	The Humber Bridge Industrial Estate boundary should be extended to include the large area to the east of the Humber Bridge Industrial Estate, to the north of Wren Kitchens and the south of the Barton to Cleethorpes railway. This area, regarded as ELR22 in the 2021 SHELAA has long been allocated for employment use, including with extant planning permission establishing the principle of development. Additionally the 2021 SHELAA calls site ELR22 a Good strategic greenfield site with the potential for employment use. A variety of uses can be found in the location, therefore B1, B2 and B8 uses would be suitable for this site.	justified	Extend Humber Bridge Industrial Estate boundary to include SHEELA site ELR22.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							This site has the potential for rail freight access, and the road access issues will be reduced should the Barton Link Road (paragraph 14.47 and policy T7) be progressed. Just as the council is proposing to work to remove a major constraint on development, it appears the land is being 'given up on'. In addition the town is experiencing and planned to continue to experience housing growth; providing job opportunities within the town should be encouraged to reduce commuting and contribute towards sustainability and tackling climate change. This area could play a significant part in creating new jobs within Barton. Finally as much as the developments at Wren Kitchens are very welcome, diversity of employment within Barton should be encouraged as too much emphasis on one single employer carries risks for the town's economy should that single employer encounter difficulties. A prime example of this is British Steel. The site could provide a significant 'counter-balance' to Wren Kitchens without discouraging Wren Kitchens continued growth.					
Sebastian **Musil**												
0078	Sebastian Musil	POLICY HE1: 11a.	support	yes	yes	yes	I have no reason to believe that Policy HE1 is not compliant.	positively prepared	I'd like to take this opportunity to propose that the boundary for the Barrow Upon Humber conservation area be reviewed, more specifically to include the grade 2 listed Grove House, on Wold Road, as well as the surrounding woodland and pasture that were historically within its curtilage. I understand back in 2018 the farm opposite was included but Grove House was not, since it had been left uninhabited and in a state of disrepair for over a decade. Now that it's undergoing a thorough and sympathetic restoration, in my eyes it would make sense for it to be included in the conservation area.	yes	Grove House has been classed as having a negative effect on the conservation area and rightly so. Now that it is being restored back to its former glory, I believe this should be revisited. Doing so would not only enhance the conservation area but afford further protection to the immediate area.	
Stuart **Nash**												
0588	Stuart Nash	POLICY H1P-26: LAND AT FIELD HOUSE	Object				To get back to the main reason for my E Mail is about the Proposal for 75 House in the field at the end of Graizelound Fields Road. I got a very bad feeling at the meeting that the decision is already made and that Building will go ahead in this area. I along with many other residents from Graizelound Fields Road are against this Proposal Going Ahead, we feel that there are many other Sites around Haxey that are more Fit For Purpose than this Site. Just a few reasons that we have experienced that make this Site Unsuitable: 1, Drainage, I have lived in this area for 6 years and I have had Sewage					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Drain Blockages 5 Times. On 2 of the occasions I called out Yorkshire Water to unblock the Drains, one of the workmen told me (you will always have problems with your drains because the Manhole is so Old and Antiquated and it should be replaced.) he said, don't tell anyone I told you.Some of the residents that live on the right side of Graizelound Fields Road have experienced Raw Sewage coming from the drains during heavy rain falls. 2, The Roads to and from the Proposed Site are unsuitable for any more traffic. 3, Noise Pollution 4, Air PollutionThe Nosie and Air Pollution can get so bad during certain times of Day/Year now, I think it would be completely unbearable if we have another 100/150 Vehicles up and down the road. 5, Unsafe Road Conditions due to the already Very Heavy/Large Vehicles and other traffic that currently use this road. I want to ask you if it would be possible for our very Hard Working and Dedicated MP, Mr Andrew Percy to visit this Site before the final decision is made.					
Kristin Sutton **Nelthorpe**												
0162	Kristin Sutton Nelthorpe	POLICY H1P-30: LAND SOUTH OF MAIN STREET	support	yes	yes	yes	Scawby needs new housing. No one wants new houses in their backyard, however this is a great place for new houses. I think this is legally complaint, sound and complies with the duty to co-operate.	justified		no		
Alison **Nettleton**												
0478	Alison Nettleton	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0523	Alison Nettleton	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0710	Alison Nettleton	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					
M **Nettleton**												
0479	M Nettleton	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0524	M Nettleton	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0711	M Nettleton	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Victoria **Nettleton**												
0477	Victoria Nettleton	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							options to be subject to full and proper consultation.”					
0522	Victoria Nettleton	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0709	Victoria Nettleton	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for “up to 400 homes” on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Mark E **North** on behalf of Aggregates and Production and Dimension Stone- Mineral Products Association												
0785	Mark E North on behalf of Aggregates and Production and Dimension Stone- Mineral Products Association	Paragraph 12.12					Para 12.12 This supporting paragraph is not sound and needs altering to make it compliant with the NPPF as follows. Proposed Changes (deletions in strikethrough; new text in bold) Mineral Safeguard Areas (MSAs) have been defined for North Lincolnshire’s key known mineral resources to ensure that they are not sterilised by non-mineral development, covering sand and gravel, chalk, limestone, silica sand, brick clay and ironstone. They are essential for the construction sector as well as the production of industrial products. Silica sand which is used in the glass, ceramics and foundry sector, for example, is classed as being of national importance, due to limited number of areas where it is found. North Lincolnshire is one of eighteen areas of the UK where it is extracted. The NPPF at paragraph 210 c) states. safeguard mineral resources by defining Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Consultation Areas70; and adopt appropriate policies so that known [emphasis added] locations of specific minerals resources of local and national importance are not sterilised by non-mineral development where this should be avoided (whilst not creating a presumption that the resources defined will be worked)			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0786	Mark E North on behalf of Aggregates and Production and Dimension Stone- Mineral Products Association	Paragraph 12.15					Para 12.15 This supporting paragraph refers to Policy EC6 as seeking to safeguard wharf facilities. Having read EC6 we are not at all clear how this relates to wharves and their safeguarding. Is this a text error?			Yes		View PDF
0844	Mark E North on behalf of Aggregates and Production and Dimension Stone- Mineral Products Association	POLICY MIN2: MINERAL SAFEGUARDING					The MPA wish to be kept informed of the progress of the local plan and matters relating to minerals and would wish to appear at the Examination in Public.Comments:The Mineral Products Association (MPA) is the trade association for the aggregates, asphalt, cement, concrete, dimension stone, lime, mortar, and silica sand industries. MPA membership is made up of most independent SME quarrying companies throughout the UK, as well as the 9 major international and global companies. It covers 100% of UK cement production, 90% of GB aggregates production, 95% of asphalt and over 70% of ready-mixed concrete and precast concrete production. In 2018, the industry supplied £16 billion worth of materials and services to the Economy. It is also the largest supplier to the construction industry, which had annual output valued at £172 billion in 2018. Industry production represents the largest materials flow in the UK economy and is also one of the largest manufacturing sectors. For more information visit: www.mineralproducts.orgPolicy MIN 2 Mineral SafeguardingWe support the principle of this policy but consider in not to be sound nor effective and needs to be altered in respect of part 5 of the policy as follows.Proposed Changes (deletions in strikethrough; new text in bold)Mineral sites (excluding dormant sites) and associated infrastructure that supports the supply of minerals (railheads, wharves) and added value products (concrete batching, coated stone, aggregate recycling operation) in North Lincolnshire will be safeguarded against development that would unnecessarily sterilise the sites and infrastructure or prejudice or jeopardise their use by creating incompatible land uses nearby. All these sites will have buffer zones of 500 m established to maintain proximal safeguarding around these operations. In respect of transport and added value operation 'the agent of change' will apply in line with National Policy.There is no logic to excluding dormant sites and has no policy justification. The NPPF (para.210) requires all known minerals to be safeguarded which must therefore include dormant sites. As drafted the policy is unsound.To make the policy effective there needs to be clarity in respect of 'associated infrastructure' and what this means. Furthermore, to add additional protection the 'agent of2change' principle must be made clear to ensure that any required mitigation falls to the development impinging on a mineral operation (NPPF Para 187), and that existing operations do not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them.Furthermore, all sites to be safeguarded should be listed in the Plan, and identified on the Policy Plan with their buffer zones.			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Dot **Oaks**												
0469	Dot Oaks	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0509	Dot Oaks	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				(2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0701	Dot Oaks	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Colin **Parker**												
0358	Colin Parker	Paragraph 10.54	object	yes	no	yes	I have a number of comments regarding the council's attitude towards LC14 land, especially in Epworth, and with particular reference to the possible development site off Station Road: I can understand the desire to protect valuable heritage assets, but the value has to be weighed against the damage caused long-term to Epworth by effectively sticking a bell jar over it and letting it suffocate. In the case of the strip farming in Ellers Field in general and the Station Road site in particular, I would make the following comments: I. I have walked around the field lanes on many occasions over the years and have noticed a marked decline in the diversity of wildlife, particularly birds (lapwings have disappeared and skylarks are now quite rare, for example). Much of this is due to modern farming techniques and increased use of chemicals. Open fields do not provide good cover or nesting sites. There is plenty of land available in the proposed development site so good quality landscaping and tree planting will help to add biodiversity to the area.	justified	The LC14 land at the proposed development site is not of sufficient value to protect, especially when the development will provide the housing, health care and parking Epworth badly needs	yes	The council does not understand or care about Epworth	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							ii. The use of the land behind Station Road has changed over the years. Originally, it was mainly agricultural, but for many years has lost any hint of historical character. Much of the land is now fenced off for equestrian use. There has been a rusty shipping container in the field for probably twenty years and now there are two stable buildings there, too. If NLC thinks it is protecting valuable heritage assets by refusing development here, it is badly mistaken. There is very little trace of anything historic here. iii. One reason given for refusing planning permission on the brownfield site is that would be an unacceptable visual intrusion and extension of the built environment into the historic landscape. This is absolute nonsense. It is an enclosed brownfield site. It has hedges and trees around it, which would, by and large, remain in place. There is already a large industrial building with a corrugated roof on the site. What is the building if not built environment? From the north, the site can only be seen from the footpath near Maw's mill, but that view is already compromised by the factory units close by the mill. Even so, the extent of hedges and trees is apparent, so the view would not significantly change. From the west, only the roof of the industrial building can be seen above the hedges and trees, so again, the view would hardly change. iv. If the wider site were to be developed, as mentioned above, there is plenty of land for landscaping, so the existing lane on the south side can be enhanced by tree planting. From the north, the site would not be seen at all as it lies well below the crest of the hill, meaning that anyone walking on the field path would still experience the same open field setting as they do now. The view from the west would change, but as it is already compromised by stables, the container and of course, the large industrial building, it could hardly be said to be a dramatic change. v. NLC claims that Ellers field is so important that there should never be any development there. However, the site at Yealand Flats is in Ellers Field (which runs from the A161 past the old railway line and down to West End Road. The row of houses between Torne Valley and the Baptist Chapel on Station Road, built in the 1970s, is partly in Ellers Field (the public footpath running along the southern boundary of the field was diverted when they were built). Furthermore, the most recent extensions to CW Fields factory are built on a strip of what was, until a few years ago, greenfield land in Ellers Field something which was clearly overlooked by the heritage department at the time. vi. It is quite perverse that NLC is so desperate to maintain the open field lands. I can understand that such things are quite rare, but does the council really know what it is trying to preserve? If anyone can point to one selion (strip) of land and say there's a historic selion of land I will tell them they are wrong. Over the years, strips of land have been rented or sold to form larger and larger blocks of land. The effect is that for years and years the landscape has changed from some mythical pattern of narrow strips to a patchwork quilt of large patches. This process will doubtless continue until the land represents nothing more than one large field, just like the ones created by modern farming techniques where all the hedgerows have been grubbed out so that huge pieces of machinery can have a clear run. It is strange how hedgerows are being replanted					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							elsewhere in the country, but NLC seemingly wants to create one huge field.					
0361	Colin Parker	Paragraph 3	object	no	no	yes	The council need to develop a sound and consistent approach to planning. The decision making leaves far too much to be desired. NLC has a long record of planning decisions that demonstrate inconsistency, contradiction and hypocrisy. Furthermore, the council might not be abiding by legal requirements: As there is a brownfield site on Station Road, I want to know why it is not on the council's register of brownfield sites, which I understand is a legal requirement. It is also a legal requirement that brownfield sites are selected for development before greenfield sites. Why is Yealand Flats in the local plan and not Station Road? The grade II listed cottage in Owston Ferry that was given planning permission for rebuild/furnishment but was allowed to be knocked down; 34 houses passed on a partly greenfield site at Sandtoft, which has no facilities and requires s106 payments from the developer in lieu of affordable housing and to provide public transport. Why is this preferred to the Station Road site in Epworth? Why is NLC asking for over £300,000 for education contribution on the Station Road site when no other s106 agreements for other similar sized developments (neither Sandtoft nor Belton) have required any contribution at all? Especially when, as mentioned above, Epworth schools are not full and have to rely on bussing kids in from the Doncaster catchment area. Any additional children on the Station Road development could be sent to private school for less than that; The lack of landscaping in Epworth at Stud Cross, and other developments; The U-turns on signage on the Co-op right next to the Grade I listed rectory; The sheer hypocrisy of allowing factory development in Ellers Field right beneath Maw's mill and then stopping development on a brownfield site a few hundred yards away; The proposal to develop a greenfield site which will obliterate a clear, unobstructed view of Grade II listed Maw's mill ahead of a brownfield site which will have no effect on views of the mill; Taking such a precious attitude to views of Maw's mill whilst considering whether to allow planning permission to develop the mill as a cafe and observatory. Where is the consistency? Where is the strategy? Why is development OK in one place but not OK in a more suitable and secluded place?	justified	Remove some greenfield sites and provide more housing, car parking and a new health care facility for Epworth. Also, be sensible about the value of LC14 land - don't protect something that doesn't exist anymore, especially when the long term future of Epworth is in the balance.	yes	The council neither understand nor care about the future of Epworth. By failing to allocate housing or deal with the problems Epworth faces in consecutive local plans, the council is essentially leaving the town to die, which is contrary to its stated aim of supporting market towns and helping them to thrive.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0061	Colin Parker	Paragraph 5.161	object	yes	no	yes	The majority of proposed housing in the plan is greenfield. The brownfield site off Station Road in Epworth, which would be suitable for around 35 houses, has been consistently ignored by NLC, for no obvious reason. This should have been included ahead of the greenfield site at Yealand Flats. In addition, the site can be extended to include neighbouring greenfield land. The landowners are also keen to fund a new health centre and car parking in the town centre. This scheme has much larger community benefits than any of the proposed housing developments and should be prioritised	justified	The housing site off Station Road and the town centre site for health centre and car parking should be included in the plan. Epworth has had inadequate health care facilities and car parking for many years. Understandably to some extent, therefore, housing provision has been limited. However, the landowners are committed to funding the much-needed community facilities. Epworth has had very little housing for a number of years and really needs to grow to ensure we have the facilities we need.	yes	NLC has neglected Epworth for many years. There was little housing provision in the last plan and the new one is just as bad. Epworth has many problems which ca be solved by developing the right sites to provide housing and badly needed community facilities. NLC has repeatedly ignored these proposals and has abandoned Epworth.	
0062	Colin Parker	POLICY EC1-5: 1b.	object	yes	no	yes	Whilst the development at Sandtoft is supported overall, the proposed access is not a suitable road. There are bad bends and narrow carriageways. A more suitable access would be to put a roundabout in immediately to the south of M180 J2 and a road which runs parallel to the M180 to access the site from the north. This would be a much safer route in and would also cut several kilometres off each journey to and from the site, saving time and cost for every vehicle.	justified	Modify the proposed access route to include the suggestion above.	no		
0360	Colin Parker	POLICY EC1-5: LAND AT SANDTOFT AIRFIELD	object	yes	no	yes	Whilst I support the proposed industrial development, I do not think the proposed access is in any way suitable for increased traffic.At the moment, vehicles over 7.5t must exit the M180 at either J1 or J2 and travel several kilometres along the A18, finally turning onto High Levels Bank (a hairpin bend coming from the east), which is very narrow and has a right angle bend on it. The road itself is in poor condition, the dyke banks are collapsing in places and this road is just not suitable for the HGV traffic that uses it already, never mind any additional traffic from the expansion.To my mind there are two much more suitable alternatives:1. Put a roundabout on the A161 to the south of M180 J2, and build a road heading west, to join up with the existing estate to the east of the proposed site. I appreciate that there are a number of dykes to cross.2. The other option is to put a junction in on the M180 immediately north of the new site. This would be the shortest and neatest long-term solution and would take all the heavy traffic off the A18 and the minor roads and minimize vehicle journey times and emissions.	justified	Change the access route to one of the proposed ones	no		
0357	Colin Parker	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object	no	no	yes	I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed local plan. The main issue is that Epworth has once again been totally abandoned by NLC. There is no provision for housing for the second consecutive plan,	justified	Remove the Yealand Flats site and add the wider site off Station Road and the town centre site for the health centre	yes	I have no confidence that NLC either understand or care	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							despite land being made available. That equates to virtually nothing for thirty years. How is this acceptable? Of the six market towns (Barton, Brigg, Crowle, Epworth, Kirton in Lindsey and Winterton), Epworth is the only town with next to no housing allocation (57 houses) for the second plan running. Barton and Brigg have been selected as principal towns, but there is no principal town on the west of the river. Epworth would be the most sensible candidate as it sits between Crowle and Haxey. Of the top ten ranked settlements, only Messingham has a marginally lower allocation than Epworth. Housing in Brigg, for example, will increase by 1045 (32.2%). 800 of these are on greenfield sites. Crowle, despite having grown considerably in the last plan, gets another 169 houses (9.1%), of which 74 are greenfield. Barrow upon Humber has 178 houses (13.9%), of which 138 are on greenfield sites. Meanwhile a suitable brownfield site in Epworth is being ignored. Why is Epworth being starved of housing? Does the council care about the long-term effects on shops, services and ultimately, the health of the local community? Epworth has a number of problems that NLC is simply ignoring: 1. Lack of housing, including affordable housing Where are new families going to live if there is no housing provision? NLC cannot just shrug its shoulders and tell them to leave town. Or is NLC planning to put something in the water to stop the residents breeding? House prices in Epworth are among the highest in the region and are not sustainable. 2. Health care facilities As the population of Epworth grows older (unavoidably so, as young families leave town as a result of NLC's enforced housing policy), it puts added strain on health facilities that were not designed to cater for so many people. The present surgery was built to cope with around half the current population. The site cannot be expanded and is not fit for purpose. This has been mitigated to a certain extent by pushing appointments out to satellite surgeries, but this causes several problems it forces Epworth residents to drive to neighbouring villages when they are unwell, adding unnecessary time, inconvenience and expense; causes additional emissions and pollution; contributes to local traffic problems in villages; and makes it harder for other villagers to get appointments. This is not a sustainable situation, and will only get worse unless NLC does something to solve the problem. The Care Commissioning Group has no funds to expand local services, and NLC's idea of wellness hubs is nothing but a gimmick and will have no effect on the real day to day issues faced locally. 3. Car parking For years Epworth has suffered from congestion caused by a lack of parking facilities. As mentioned above, as the population ages, this matter will only get worse. NLC has tinkered around by repainting a few on-street		and car parking		about the long term future of Epworth.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							parking bays. A complete waste of time. The solution to Epworth's long-standing problems has been offered to NLC time after time over the course of the last fifteen years, and has been ignored time after time. Why? Is the LC14 land really unique and worth causing the slow death of a market town for? Of course not. The solution is: A number of landowners owning land in Ellers Field to the north of Station Road wish to develop their land for housing and have promised to put 30% of the proceeds back into the community to fund a new health centre and car parking in the town centre. They have identified a suitable site, and the owner is willing to make it available. At a stroke the problems identified above will be solved Epworth will have enough housing for the life of the local plan, including 20% affordable; the new health facilities will be held in trust for the community (not to benefit individual doctors). The CCG has indicated that it will be able to fund ongoing maintenance costs for the GPs; the car parking will make Epworth much more pleasant to pause and wander about in, encouraging more visitors and helping the town centre to thrive in difficult times. NLC should be planning for housing close to where job opportunities will be, but this is not the case. 50Ha of land at Sandtoft is included in the plan for industrial development. Additionally, there are big plans for expanding Doncaster airport, both of which will create thousands of new jobs. Epworth is ideally situated to take advantage of these new opportunities if new housing is provided for. Instead, smaller, more remote, less sustainable settlements have been allocated much larger development (such as Brigg and Kirton in Lindsey). This makes no sense at all. A number of objections have been made in the past, which can easily be refuted: 1. Drainage/flooding I have every sympathy with anyone whose house floods. Some have claimed that the drains/sewers can't cope with any more housing, but this is untrue. The sewers can cope with additional housing. They were upgraded around fifteen years ago to cope with hundreds of houses that were never built. On one occasion, the sewers were blocked by people flushing things that shouldn't be flushed, and on another occasion it was found that a drainage pump was either broken or not powerful enough. The main cause of flooding issues is people blocking the drainage dykes. Cllr Tim Mitchell is, I understand, fully aware of this issue. In one place the dyke has been filled in completely and a chicken hutch built on top of it; and in another the dyke has been piped and filled, but the pipe is far too narrow and restricts the flow in periods of heavy rain. Either the drainage board or NLC should be responsible for sorting this out. It would be a straightforward matter of digging a dyke along the bottom of the site and connecting it to the main drain. Together with a sensible SuDS system for the development, there should be no problems with flooding.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							2. Schools Some have said the schools are full and can't cope with more students. However, the only reason the schools are anywhere near full is because they are being bussed in from outside the LEA catchment area. 30 of last year's new year 7 intake were from outside. This has been the case for a number of years. Approximately 20-25% of students (around 200) at the Academy are bussed in from outside the catchment area. Clearly, as time goes by it will get harder and harder to fill the school with local children. It also means that should the Station Road site be fully developed, there will be sufficient space for any new students. It should be remembered that it will take several years to build out the entire site, so there won't be a sudden rush for local services, just a gradual increase. 3. Station Road is too busy and narrow Firstly, Station Road is not a busy road especially compared to the A161. The road will be widened in front of the site and a footpath added to the north side of the road. Also, it is proposed that a car park will be provided for the use of the Baptist Chapel. As anyone who travels along Station Road at times of chapel services will know, this is the cause of the serious traffic issues along the road. The car park will take all the extra vehicles off the road.					
0060	Colin Parker	POLICY HP1-25: LAND AT YEALAND FLATS	object	yes	no	yes	This site is a greenfield site and has been selected for development whilst a brownfield site off Station Road has been ignored. Concern has been raised regarding the impact of the Station Road site on Maw's Mill. The view of Maw's Mill will not be compromised by that development as the site has already been developed. However, the Yealand Flats site is a greenfield site and the footpath at the south end of the site has a clear view of Maw's Mill (the only clear one possible from near the main east/west road), which will be destroyed by housing.	justified	The Station Road site should be included in the plan in preference to the Yealand Flats site.	yes	NLC has not seriously considered the views of Epworth residents for over a decade. It has washed its hands of the town and the lack of provision for housing, health care and parking will blight the town for another twenty years if the plan is not changed.	
0359	Colin Parker	POLICY HP1-25: LAND AT YEALAND FLATS	object	no	no	yes	The site at Yealand Flats is not an appropriate place to develop:I. The entrance will be onto the A161, which is the busiest road in Epworth, and the view towards the south is not good for anyone trying to get onto the main road;ii. It is a greenfield site, LC14 designated, within the greater Ellers Field. When there is a more secluded and suitable brownfield site available, that site should be developed ahead of Yealand Flats;iii. The view from the public footpath at the south boundary of the site offers one of the few uninterrupted views of Maw's mill and will be totally obliterated by any development here. Why isn't this an issue when Maw's mill looms so large from every other point in Epworth?There is a suitable brownfield site off Station Road that should be developed before this	justified	Remove Yealand Flats site and include Station Road site	yes	The council neither understand nor care about the future of Epworth	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							greenfield site.					
0057	Colin Parker	TABLE 4.2 SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object	yes	no	yes	The allocation of thousands of houses to the Lincolnshire Lakes development is not appropriate. This is a flood plain. In a period of global warming, where sea levels are expected to rise and extreme weather events become more common, building on a flood plain should not happen. I have seen headlines suggesting that the football ground is likely to flood within the next thirty years. How will homeowners be able to insure their houses? I understand that mitigation measures are intended, but even if the Lakes development is protected, it is likely to push the flooding problem to other areas and other properties. I also understand that the land level needs to be raised significantly. How can this be commercially viable? Epworth has once more been ignored for housing allocation, in favour of less sustainable and smaller settlements. There was very little development in the last plan and very little in this, despite there being land available to develop sufficient housing for the lifetime of the plan and landowners willing to commit a large sum to completely fund a new health centre and car park that will solve Epworth's current problems. NLC cannot rely on a survey carried out before the last plan to deny Epworth growth for another twenty years. It looks vindictive to say the least. Epworth's health facilities are completely outdated. They were built to deal with a population less than half the current population. The lack of facilities at Epworth means that around 60% of Epworth residents are forced to visit surgeries in nearby villages for doctor's appointments, which has a knock-on effect on the standard of care of residents in those villages. It also creates traffic problems, particularly in Belton and Haxey - not to mention issues of creating unnecessary journeys and the related pollution/emissions. The level of housing allocated to Epworth is contrary to the stated aim of SS2: 3d and paragraph 4.11. Epworth is one of the largest and most sustainable market towns in the area. The development limits are not set in stone. They are changed whenever it suits NLC (i.e. to accommodate extensions to C W Fields premises and include a greenfield site at Yealand Flats, so there should be no issue with including a brownfield/greenfield site off Station Road which is available. With proposed industrial development at Sandtoft and Doncaster airport likely to create thousands of jobs, residential development in Epworth would be desirable to limit the problems caused by commuting as far as	justified	Epworth needs housing and better health care and parking facilities. Include the site off Station Road and the town centre site for the health centre and car parking as already submitted to NLC several times. This would provide sufficient housing for the life of the plan and also solve Epworth's parking and health care problems.	yes	NLC has failed to consider the site properly in the past and has made no effort to consult the population of Epworth about the scheme mentioned above. NLC is not responsible for health provision (it is the local CCG's job) and is not interested in the inadequacy of the health facilities. The proposed wellbeing hubs are no substitute for proper health facilities.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							possible.					
0058	Colin Parker	TABLE 5.1: HOUSING DELIVERY	object	yes	no	yes	The allocation of housing is skewed towards increasing smaller, less sustainable settlements: Barton (5,454 houses per SHLAA) and Brigg (3,237) will have new housing of around 600 and 1,000 respectively. Kirton (1,433) will get over 500. Crowle, which has seen significant development in recent years, will get another 150 houses. Settlements lower down the SHLAA ranking are set to get increases of 10% or more, whilst Epworth gets next to nothing again. Most of these sites are greenfield. There is land available for development in Epworth - for residential and for a health centre and car parking. This will ensure that Epworth has sufficient housing, close to employment growth areas, and that it's health facilities and town centre will remain sustainable and viable for the future. When developers are willing to fund community facilities on such a scale, their proposals should be considered seriously. This has not happened for Epworth.	justified	The development of land off Station Road for housing and the town centre site for health care and parking should be included in the plan. Epworth is being neglected in favour of less sustainable settlements.	yes	NLC has failed to consider the proposed developments in Epworth and has abandoned it. It has made no serious attempt to gauge public opinion in recent years.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
David **Parker**												
0392	David Parker	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
Eric **Parker**												
0790	Eric Parker	Paragraph 14.47	object				(3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: “To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation.” Yours sincerely					View PDF
0808	Eric Parker	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0867	Eric Parker	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for “up to 400 homes” on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Richard **Patterson**												
0054	Richard Patterson	POLICY H1P-30: LAND SOUTH OF MAIN STREET	object	yes	no	yes	This parcel of land is outside the legal settlement boundary (the building line) encroaching on Greenfield land. Thus is against NPPF, paragraph 35(D) Main Street is inadequate for the extra traffic. It is of insufficient width is badly maintained and has just one footpath. There will be Increased risk of flooding from run off from increasing the impermeable area. The area serves as a natural sponge which will be lost. The road already has seen terrible flooding events affecting those at the end of the street and on to Station road properties. Already the area is shown to be at risk by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Why risk worsening that risk by development? Development of this land will see a loss of Green Space, Wildlife and Ecology depleting the character of the setting and encroaching into the countryside. Any history and together with a loss of ancient history and archaeology that it contained within the area will be lost forever with development. There is known to be a Roman Villa opposite so it is highly likely that there are historical and archaeological remains in the area.	Consistent with national policy	Removal of H1P30 Land South of Main Street from the plan.	no	n/a	
Greg **Pearce** on behalf of David Lock Associates												
0319	Greg Pearce on behalf of David Lock Associates	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object	yes	no	yes	ABLE object to Policy SS6 spatial Distribution of Housing Supply, Policy SS7 Strategic Allocation at Lincolnshire Lakes and Policy H1: Site Allocations because they are not effective as set out in paragraph 35(c) of the NPPF. Housing Requirement By way of context, the standard methodology has significantly reduced the annual requirement for North Lincolnshire. It now aligns much closer to the average rates of housing delivery in recent years across the district. For example, in the Preferred Options Local Plan (February 2020) the annual requirement was 419, and the Core Strategy requirement (the adopted plan at present) requires 754 homes per annum. The reduction in the number of homes required means fewer dwellings need to be identified to meet the lower requirement, though this reduction has not been generated through recent years of successful housing delivery. This is clearly demonstrated through Figure 1 below (which has been extracted from the NLC Housing Delivery Test of August 2020). Figure 1: NLC Annual Completions over the past 10 years (NLC Housing Deliver Test, August 2020) The historic delivery rates demonstrate that the previous planning strategy of relying on the Lincolnshire Lakes scheme to meet the housing need did not work and no meaningful or effective measures were put in place to try and meet the housing requirement. This approach is clearly contrary to paragraph 60 of the NPPF which identifies the Government's	effective	Please see above regarding comments in relation to soundness of the Plan.	yes	Please see above regarding comments in relation to soundness of the Plan.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. Furthermore, the housing delivery test scores demonstrates that despite the reduction in the housing requirement NLC is still underachieving in the delivery of housing. The table below sets out the scores NLC were awarded since the first test was introduced in 2018. Year Score 2018 73% (20% buffer required) 2019 75% (20% buffer required) 2020 94% (Action Plan and 5% buffer required) Figure 2: Housing Delivery Test scores for North Lincolnshire Council, extracted from gov.net. Housing delivery has improved but NLC has still failed to deliver its annual housing target in any one year since 2007/08. The housing supply is therefore critical in ensuring that the housing requirement for NLC is met. The amount of supply available should take into account the consistent failings to meet the requirement in previous years and ultimately reduce the risk of continued failings to deliver the annual housing requirement. The most effective way to reduce this risk is to allocate and make available more sites for delivery. Housing Supply An over-reliance on delivery at Lincolnshire Lakes means there is a high risk of North Lincolnshire being unable to meet its housing need of 7,126 dwellings. A separate note is attached in Appendix 1 which contains a review of the likely housing delivery at Lincolnshire Lakes and this shows the scheme could deliver between 990 dwellings and 1,650 dwellings up to 2038 leading to a substantial shortfall in the housing supply. The note challenges the assumptions of on-site delivery through two measures; firstly the significant lead in times associated with a site as complex as Lincolnshire Lakes, and secondly challenging the annual delivery rate by applying conservative and optimistic delivery scenarios for Lincolnshire Lakes In both instances the scheme falls short of the 2,150 dwellings suggested in the Local Plan the conservative scenario produced 990 dwellings and the optimistic scenario produces 1,650 dwellings. Consequently, the overall housing supply in the Plan would be reduced to 6,826 at best or 6,166 at worst through the overreliance of the Lincolnshire Lakes scheme alone. In addition, other sites and permissions have been analysed and this shows that it is reasonable to also exclude these from the supply. Site H1P-13 (Land off Barrow Road, Barton-upon-Humber) is allocated for 225 homes. However paragraph 5.64 of the Publication Plan states the first phase of the link road will need to be constructed as part of this allocation to provide the first link the first phase of the link road between A1077 and Caistor Road. The link road for the site represents a significant piece of infrastructure required to bring site forward. Land to the south of the allocation was put forward in the most recent SHELAA but was not allocated in the Publication Plan, which brings into question the feasibility					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							of delivering a link road when only 225 homes are allocated. There is no apparent evidence of funding being considered or available to deliver the link road, therefore there are doubts as to whether a 225 homes scheme can absorb the costs associated with this infrastructure. On that basis it is considered that 225 homes are undeliverable if the full link road connection is required and 225 should be removed from Local Plan. Site H1C-20 (Glandford Park Stadium) is currently listed as a committed development for 160, however it can only be brought forward as part of stadium redevelopment plans for Scunthorpe United. However stadium redevelopment plans have been put on hold due to Covid-19 and there is currently no evidence to suggest the works will commence. The stadium redevelopment planning permission (PA/2018/1388) is set to expire on 2nd July 2022, and there is no evidence of any of pre-commencement conditions being discharged. On this basis this site cannot be relied upon as a committed development for the purposes of the Local Plan. Therefore on the basis of the above, the total number of sites across the plan should be reduced by a further 385 dwellings. This indicates an overall shortfall of 6,441 at best or 5,781 against the housing need of 7,126 dwellings. In terms of the 5-year housing land supply position, the Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement (August 2021) confirms the following number of homes will be available for each year of the 5 year housing land supply. Year Number of Homes 2021/2022 362 2022/2023 425 2023/2024 455 2024/2025 493 2025/2026 523 Figure 3: Annual Housing Supply, calculated from Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement (August 2021) As has been demonstrated previously the number of homes in the supply are higher than the delivery rates achieved across NLC historically and brings into question whether the future delivery will match the perceived supply of housing. The Housing Land Supply Statement also indicates that NLC can demonstrate a supply of housing equivalent to 5.64 years with a surplus of 207 homes. However we seek to challenge whether certain allocated sites will contribute to the 5-year housing land supply that is suggested. Sites H1P-14, H1P-15, H1P-16, H1P-17 and H1P-18 (various allocations to the north and east of Brigg) comprise 840 homes collectively. However there are causes for concern with including the sites within the 5-year housing land supply. As with Site H1P-13, this is due to the requirement for the delivery of a link road through each of the allocations. We would also question why the sites were not allocated as one in the Publication Plan if the site is in multiple ownerships we have found, in our experience of delivering large scale sites, that this has the potential to delay securing					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							planning permissions due to lengthy and complicated S.106 agreements needing to be prepared. On this basis the 180 homes identified in the Five-Year Housing Land Supply Statement for these sites should be removed from the supply. Further concerns about the 5-year housing land supply are raised as a result of recent appeal decisions as set out in the table below. Each appeal confirms that NLC cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply (albeit no exact figure is provided in the listed appeal decisions): Appeal Reference Appeal decision date 5YHLS discussion APP/Y2003/W/21/3268814 14/09/2021 Unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites APP/Y2003/W/21/3272134 13/09/2021 Both parties agree no 5YHLS can be demonstrated. APP/Y2003/W/21/3274828 09/09/2021 Both parties agree no 5YHLS can be demonstrated. APP/Y2003/W/21/3268393 09/09/2021 The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. There is no description of the actual shortfall however, the Council indicates in the committee report that the proposal would address the current under-supply of housing land therefore I consider the shortfall to be significant. APP/Y2003/W/21/3267607 05/05/2021 There is no dispute between the parties that the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a deliverable five-year supply of housing sites and therefore the development of the appeal site would make a positive, albeit small, contribution towards boosting housing land supply in the local area Figure 4: List of appeal decisions confirming NLC cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, extracted from PINS This raises further doubt over the reliability of the housing supply position put forward by NLC. The most efficient and effective remedy to this situation would be to allocate further sites through the Local Plan.					
0314	Greg Pearce on behalf of David Lock Associates	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object	yes	no	yes	ABLE object to Policy SS6 spatial Distribution of Housing Supply, Policy SS7 Strategic Allocation at Lincolnshire Lakes and Policy H1: Site Allocations because they are not effective as set out in paragraph 35(c) of the NPPF. Housing Requirement By way of context, the standard methodology has significantly reduced the annual requirement for North Lincolnshire. It now aligns much closer to the average rates of housing delivery in recent years across the district. For example, in the Preferred Options Local Plan (February 2020) the annual requirement was 419, and the Core Strategy requirement (the adopted plan at present) requires 754 homes per annum. The reduction in the number of homes required means fewer dwellings need to be identified to meet the lower requirement, though this	effective	Please see reasons for why the Plan is considered to be unsound.	yes	Please see reasons for why the Plan is considered to be unsound.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							reduction has not been generated through recent years of successful housing delivery. This is clearly demonstrated through Figure 1 below (which has been extracted from the NLC Housing Delivery Test of August 2020). Figure 1: NLC Annual Completions over the past 10 years (NLC Housing Deliver Test, August 2020). The historic delivery rates demonstrate that the previous planning strategy of relying on the Lincolnshire Lakes scheme to meet the housing need did not work and no meaningful or effective measures were put in place to try and meet the housing requirement. This approach is clearly contrary to paragraph 60 of the NPPF which identifies the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. Furthermore, the housing delivery test scores demonstrates that despite the reduction in the housing requirement NLC is still underachieving in the delivery of housing. The table below sets out the scores NLC were awarded since the first test was introduced in 2018. Year Score 2018 73% (20% buffer required) 2019 75% (20% buffer required) 2020 94% (Action Plan and 5% buffer required) Figure 2: Housing Delivery Test scores for North Lincolnshire Council, extracted from gov.net. Housing delivery has improved but NLC has still failed to deliver its annual housing target in any one year since 2007/08. The housing supply is therefore critical in ensuring that the housing requirement for NLC is met. The amount of supply available should take into account the consistent failings to meet the requirement in previous years and ultimately reduce the risk of continued failings to deliver the annual housing requirement. The most effective way to reduce this risk is to allocate and make available more sites for delivery. Housing Supply An over-reliance on delivery at Lincolnshire Lakes means there is a high risk of North Lincolnshire being unable to meet its housing need of 7,126 dwellings. A separate note is attached in Appendix 1 which contains a review of the likely housing delivery at Lincolnshire Lakes and this shows the scheme could deliver between 990 dwellings and 1,650 dwellings up to 2038 leading to a substantial shortfall in the housing supply. The note challenges the assumptions of on-site delivery through two measures; firstly the significant lead in times associated with a site as complex as Lincolnshire Lakes, and secondly challenging the annual delivery rate by applying conservative and optimistic delivery scenarios for Lincolnshire Lakes In both instances the scheme falls short of the 2,150 dwellings suggested in the Local Plan the conservative scenario produced 990 dwellings and the optimistic scenario produces 1,650 dwellings. Consequently, the overall housing supply in the Plan would be reduced to 6,826 at best or 6,166 at worst through the overreliance of the Lincolnshire Lakes scheme alone.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							In addition, other sites and permissions have been analysed and this shows that it is reasonable to also exclude these from the supply. Site H1P-13 (Land off Barrow Road, Barton-upon-Humber) is allocated for 225 homes. However paragraph 5.64 of the Publication Plan states the first phase of the link road will need to be constructed as part of this allocation to provide the first link the first phase of the link road between A1077 and Caistor Road. The link road for the site represents a significant piece of infrastructure required to bring site forward. Land to the south of the allocation was put forward in the most recent SHELAA but was not allocated in the Publication Plan, which brings into question the feasibility of delivering a link road when only 225 homes are allocated. There is no apparent evidence of funding being considered or available to deliver the link road, therefore there are doubts as to whether a 225 homes scheme can absorb the costs associated with this infrastructure. On that basis it is considered that 225 homes are undeliverable if the full link road connection is required and 225 should be removed from Local Plan. Site H1C-20 (Glandford Park Stadium) is currently listed as a committed development for 160, however it can only be brought forward as part of stadium redevelopment plans for Scunthorpe United. However stadium redevelopment plans have been put on hold due to Covid-19 and there is currently no evidence to suggest the works will commence. The stadium redevelopment planning permission (PA/2018/1388) is set to expire on 2nd July 2022, and there is no evidence of any of pre-commencement conditions being discharged. On this basis this site cannot be relied upon as a committed development for the purposes of the Local Plan. Therefore on the basis of the above, the total number of sites across the plan should be reduced by a further 385 dwellings. This indicates an overall shortfall of 6,441 at best or 5,781 against the housing need of 7,126 dwellings. In terms of the 5-year housing land supply position, the Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement (August 2021) confirms the following number of homes will be available for each year of the 5 year housing land supply. Year Number of Homes 2021/2022 362 2022/2023 425 2023/2024 455 2024/2025 493 2025/2026 523 Figure 3: Annual Housing Supply, calculated from Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement (August 2021) As has been demonstrated previously the number of homes in the supply are higher than the delivery rates achieved across NLC historically and brings into question whether the future delivery will match the perceived supply of housing. The Housing Land Supply Statement also indicates that NLC can demonstrate a supply of housing equivalent to 5.64 years with a surplus of 207 homes. However we seek to challenge whether certain allocated sites					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							will contribute to the 5-year housing land supply that is suggested. Sites H1P-14, H1P-15, H1P-16, H1P-17 and H1P-18 (various allocations to the north and east of Brigg) comprise 840 homes collectively. However there are causes for concern with including the sites within the 5-year housing land supply. As with Site H1P-13, this is due to the requirement for the delivery of a link road through each of the allocations. We would also question why the sites were not allocated as one in the Publication Plan if the site is in multiple ownerships we have found, in our experience of delivering large scale sites, that this has the potential to delay securing planning permissions due to lengthy and complicated S.106 agreements needing to be prepared. On this basis the 180 homes identified in the Five-Year Housing Land Supply Statement for these sites should be removed from the supply. Further concerns about the 5-year housing land supply are raised as a result of recent appeal decisions as set out in the table below. Each appeal confirms that NLC cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply (albeit no exact figure is provided in the listed appeal decisions): Appeal Reference Appeal decision date 5YHLS discussion APP/Y2003/W/21/3268814 14/09/2021 Unable to demonstrate a five- year supply of deliverable housing sites APP/Y2003/W/21/3272134 13/09/2021 Both parties agree no 5YHLS can be demonstrated. APP/Y2003/W/21/3274828 09/09/2021 Both parties agree no 5YHLS can be demonstrated. APP/Y2003/W/21/3268393 09/09/2021 The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. There is no description of the actual shortfall however, the Council indicates in the committee report that the proposal would address the current under-supply of housing land therefore I consider the shortfall to be significant. APP/Y2003/W/21/3267607 05/05/2021 There is no dispute between the parties that the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a deliverable five-year supply of housing sites and therefore the development of the appeal site would make a positive, albeit small, contribution towards boosting housing land supply in the local area. Figure 4: List of appeal decisions confirming NLC cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, extracted from PINS This raises further doubt over the reliability of the housing supply position put forward by NLC. The most efficient and effective remedy to this situation would be to allocate further sites through the Local Plan.					
0317	Greg Pearce on behalf of David Lock Associates	POLICY SS7: STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION –	object	yes	no	yes	ABLE object to Policy SS6 spatial Distribution of Housing Supply, Policy SS7 Strategic Allocation at Lincolnshire Lakes and Policy H1: Site Allocations because they are not effective as set out in paragraph 35(c) of the NPPF.	effective	Please see comments above in relation to soundness of the Local Plan.	yes	Please see comments above in relation to	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
		LINCOLNSHIRE LAKES					Housing Requirement By way of context, the standard methodology has significantly reduced the annual requirement for North Lincolnshire. It now aligns much closer to the average rates of housing delivery in recent years across the district. For example, in the Preferred Options Local Plan (February 2020) the annual requirement was 419, and the Core Strategy requirement (the adopted plan at present) requires 754 homes per annum. The reduction in the number of homes required means fewer dwellings need to be identified to meet the lower requirement, though this reduction has not been generated through recent years of successful housing delivery. This is clearly demonstrated through Figure 1 below (which has been extracted from the NLC Housing Delivery Test of August 2020). Figure 1: NLC Annual Completions over the past 10 years (NLC Housing Deliver Test, August 2020) The historic delivery rates demonstrate that the previous planning strategy of relying on the Lincolnshire Lakes scheme to meet the housing need did not work and no meaningful or effective measures were put in place to try and meet the housing requirement. This approach is clearly contrary to paragraph 60 of the NPPF which identifies the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. Furthermore, the housing delivery test scores demonstrates that despite the reduction in the housing requirement NLC is still underachieving in the delivery of housing. The table below sets out the scores NLC were awarded since the first test was introduced in 2018. Year Score 2018 73% (20% buffer required) 2019 75% (20% buffer required) 2020 94% (Action Plan and 5% buffer required) Figure 2: Housing Delivery Test scores for North Lincolnshire Council, extracted from gov.net. Housing delivery has improved but NLC has still failed to deliver its annual housing target in any one year since 2007/08. The housing supply is therefore critical in ensuring that the housing requirement for NLC is met. The amount of supply available should take into account the consistent failings to meet the requirement in previous years and ultimately reduce the risk of continued failings to deliver the annual housing requirement. The most effective way to reduce this risk is to allocate and make available more sites for delivery. Housing Supply An over-reliance on delivery at Lincolnshire Lakes means there is a high risk of North Lincolnshire being unable to meet its housing need of 7,126 dwellings. A separate note is attached in Appendix 1 which contains a review of the likely housing delivery at Lincolnshire Lakes and this shows the scheme could deliver between 990 dwellings and 1,650 dwellings up				soundness of the Local Plan.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							to 2038 leading to a substantial shortfall in the housing supply. The note challenges the assumptions of on-site delivery through two measures; firstly the significant lead in times associated with a site as complex as Lincolnshire Lakes, and secondly challenging the annual delivery rate by applying conservative and optimistic delivery scenarios for Lincolnshire Lakes In both instances the scheme falls short of the 2,150 dwellings suggested in the Local Plan the conservative scenario produced 990 dwellings and the optimistic scenario produces 1,650 dwellings. Consequently, the overall housing supply in the Plan would be reduced to 6,826 at best or 6,166 at worst through the overreliance of the Lincolnshire Lakes scheme alone. In addition, other sites and permissions have been analysed and this shows that it is reasonable to also exclude these from the supply. Site H1P-13 (Land off Barrow Road, Barton-upon-Humber) is allocated for 225 homes. However paragraph 5.64 of the Publication Plan states the first phase of the link road will need to be constructed as part of this allocation to provide the first link the first phase of the link road between A1077 and Caistor Road. The link road for the site represents a significant piece of infrastructure required to bring site forward. Land to the south of the allocation was put forward in the most recent SHELAA but was not allocated in the Publication Plan, which brings into question the feasibility of delivering a link road when only 225 homes are allocated. There is no apparent evidence of funding being considered or available to deliver the link road, therefore there are doubts as to whether a 225 homes scheme can absorb the costs associated with this infrastructure. On that basis it is considered that 225 homes are undeliverable if the full link road connection is required and 225 should be removed from Local Plan. Site H1C-20 (Glandford Park Stadium) is currently listed as a committed development for 160, however it can only be brought forward as part of stadium redevelopment plans for Scunthorpe United. However stadium redevelopment plans have been put on hold due to Covid-19 and there is currently no evidence to suggest the works will commence. The stadium redevelopment planning permission (PA/2018/1388) is set to expire on 2nd July 2022, and there is no evidence of any of pre-commencement conditions being discharged. On this basis this site cannot be relied upon as a committed development for the purposes of the Local Plan. Therefore on the basis of the above, the total number of sites across the plan should be reduced by a further 385 dwellings. This indicates an overall shortfall of 6,441 at best or 5,781 against the housing need of 7,126 dwellings. In terms of the 5-year housing land supply position, the Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement (August 2021) confirms the following number of homes will be available for each year of the 5 year housing land supply. Year Number of Homes 2021/2022 362 2022/2023 425 2023/2024 455 2024/2025 493					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							2025/2026 523 Figure 3: Annual Housing Supply, calculated from Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement (August 2021) As has been demonstrated previously the number of homes in the supply are higher than the delivery rates achieved across NLC historically and brings into question whether the future delivery will match the perceived supply of housing. The Housing Land Supply Statement also indicates that NLC can demonstrate a supply of housing equivalent to 5.64 years with a surplus of 207 homes. However we seek to challenge whether certain allocated sites will contribute to the 5-year housing land supply that is suggested. Sites H1P-14, H1P-15, H1P-16, H1P-17 and H1P-18 (various allocations to the north and east of Brigg) comprise 840 homes collectively. However there are causes for concern with including the sites within the 5-year housing land supply. As with Site H1P-13, this is due to the requirement for the delivery of a link road through each of the allocations. We would also question why the sites were not allocated as one in the Publication Plan if the site is in multiple ownerships we have found, in our experience of delivering large scale sites, that this has the potential to delay securing planning permissions due to lengthy and complicated S.106 agreements needing to be prepared. On this basis the 180 homes identified in the Five-Year Housing Land Supply Statement for these sites should be removed from the supply. Further concerns about the 5-year housing land supply are raised as a result of recent appeal decisions as set out in the table below. Each appeal confirms that NLC cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply (albeit no exact figure is provided in the listed appeal decisions): Appeal Reference Appeal decision date 5YHLS discussion APP/Y2003/W/21/3268814 14/09/2021 Unable to demonstrate a five- year supply of deliverable housing sites APP/Y2003/W/21/3272134 13/09/2021 Both parties agree no 5YHLS can be demonstrated. APP/Y2003/W/21/3274828 09/09/2021 Both parties agree no 5YHLS can be demonstrated. APP/Y2003/W/21/3268393 09/09/2021 The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. There is no description of the actual shortfall however, the Council indicates in the committee report that the proposal would address the current under-supply of housing land therefore I consider the shortfall to be significant. APP/Y2003/W/21/3267607 05/05/2021 There is no dispute between the parties that the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a deliverable five-year supply of housing sites and therefore the development of the appeal site would make a positive,					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							albeit small, contribution towards boosting housing land supply in the local area Figure 4: List of appeal decisions confirming NLC cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, extracted from PINS This raises further doubt over the reliability of the housing supply position put forward by NLC. The most efficient and effective remedy to this situation would be to allocate further sites through the Local Plan.					
Joe **Perkins** on behalf of Banks Group												
0374	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	5 year Housing Land supply	Object		No		A full report was submitted to the council challenging the 5 year housing land supply.(see email)			Yes		View PDF
0374	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Paragraph 1.2	object		No		1.1 Paragraph 1.2 makes no reference to the SHIIP. This is a key part of the economic strategy in the area and should be reflected in the North Lincolnshire Local Plan.			Yes		View PDF
0374	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Paragraph 1.5	object		No		1.2 At Paragraph 1.5, Growth Ambitions are referred to as correlating with the 'Place Strategy' – There is no other reference to the Place Strategy in any part of the local plan which means that the whole basis of the growth strategy is fundamentally undermined. There is also no document of this name in any of the evidence base, as mentioned in paragraph 1.12. This document should be added to the evidence base and the consultation period should be extended to allow comment on this document.			Yes		View PDF
0445	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Paragraph 14.15	n/a				4.1 Paragraph 14.15 states that Brigg train station only runs a Saturday service as a stop between Cleethorpes and Sheffield. Barton upon Humber has a local service at its train station that runs daily. This would make Barton upon Humber a more sustainable settlement for housing growth than Brigg, due to variance of transport options.			Yes		View PDF
0739	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Paragraph 3.11	Object		No		1.3 Spatial Objective 1 Growing the Economy should refer to the importance of the road and rail network, this omission should that the policy is lacking precision. Spatial Objective 2 should refer to potential developments, adjacent to the settlement boundary, that could provide sustainable contributions to the overall housing supply where they are demonstrably sustainable.			Yes		View PDF
0483	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Paragraph 4.12	Support				Paragraph 4.12 suggests the larger developments should occur in Scunthorpe, Barton upon Humber and Brigg. We agree with this because these areas are the most suitable for housing growth due to their facilities and employment opportunities.			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0485	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Paragraph 4.8	Object				1.4 Paragraph 4.8 states that the spatial vision will encompass housing growth in the most sustainable way, close to local facilities and employment opportunities. We support this approach to the spatial strategy and Barton upon Humber, as a Principal Town within North Lincolnshire, is one of the most sustainable choices for housing growth. Policy SS2 (2.a.) refers to delivering a minimum of '7128 new homes' – this is inconsistent with the Council's assertions in their Vision at 3.10 and should be 8,380. Policy SS2.2.b. should refer to a 'minimum' of 11,500 new jobs and should, as a minimum level of detail, specify how many new jobs will be created over the first 5-year period. The allocation of this amount of employment land must be underpinned by adequate economic modelling. 3.c. of policy SS2 should include flexible wording in the policy to support sustainable edge of settlement developments in circumstances such as where the council cannot demonstrate a 5 year land supply. This would comply with the intention of the council's SS1 Policy (although SS1 has been confirmed to be unnecessary in these representations). In relation to the Spatial Strategy; the council should allocate enough housing to correlate to the amount of employment land allocated and to the number of jobs provided. This correlation between the economic and housing growth should be specified as part of the spatial strategy and must be founded in objective evidence. Banks Property support the settlement hierarchy approach and agree with the Council that Barton Upon Humber should be the next focus for growth, after Scunthorpe, as the second most sustainable location for growth in North Lincolnshire.			Yes		View PDF
0929	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY CSC1: HEALTH AND WELLBEING	Object				the link between provision of affordable housing and public health is unclear and the wording of this policy therefore needs to be reconsidered. This policy should relate to Health and Wellbeing however many of the subclauses do not relate to the topic at hand; this policy is too prescriptive and should be reworded to ensure relevance to the Health and wellbeing policy (CSC1).			Yes		View PDF
0935	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY CSC10: COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES	Support				Policy CSC10 – point 7 should include the word 'proportionate'. The provision of more meaningful (i.e. closer to the development stie or improvement of struggling facilities) should be afforded more weight in the decision making process and this should be reflected in the policy wording.			Yes		View PDF
0936	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY CSC11: ENTERTAINMENT AND CULTURAL FACILITIES	Object				Policy CSC11 is a regurgitation of Town Centre policies in the NPPF and serves no purpose hence should be deleted from the Local Plan.			Yes		View PDF
0937	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY CSC13: BURIAL GROUNDS AND CEMETERY PROVISION	Object				Policy CSC13 makes no reference to amenity issues that may arise from cemeteries. The location of cemeteries is not justified through any objective evidence in the local plan and locating new cemeteries 'adjacent to existing cemeteries' is completely unfounded as a policy and is not based on any evidence. Consideration should also be given for air and water pollutants in relation to this form of development. Policy CSC13 is lacking detail and is in significant need of reconsideration. This necessity for this policy is demonstrated by a recent applications for this form of development in the area. Assessments should also be completed for transport impacts that may arise as a result of the proposed development in relation to this specific use.			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0938	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY CSC14: CHURCHES PRAYER HOUSES AND OTHER PLACES OF WORSHIP	object				Policy CSC14 makes no reference to a place of worship as a community asset and is therefore inconsistent with national policy. The social sustainability of this form of development has not been considered as part of this policy wording, the policy therefore needs to be revised. Any loss or gain of community asset should be appraised in the policy.			Yes		View PDF
0939	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY CSC15: TOURISM AND VISITOR ATTRACTIONS					Policy CSC15 is not positively prepared and contrary to national planning policy. Paragraph 84 c) of NPPF states 'Planning policies and decisions should enable: c) sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside.' Policy CSC15 2. relates to visitor attractions where a countryside location is necessary. The policy does not refer to proposals being required to respect the character of the countryside as required by NPPF and instead lists four criteria that must be met. Whilst a proposal can 'help to enhance' an affected asset, the policy should clarify the way in which a decision will ensure that any harm to an asset within or adjacent to the site is quantified and is outweighed by potential benefits of a proposal. The policy should specify how this harm will be quantified. The policy should, but does not, state any potential benefits that could outweigh harm. The policy should specify that developers must provide justification for 'necessary countryside locations' and this policy should provide criteria against which a decision maker can assess whether a proposal is truly necessary to be located in the countryside, and whether any harm to the countryside is outweighed. Being a tourist attraction is not a substantial reason to justify harm to the countryside. The council must find further justification for development in the countryside that may otherwise be considered to be inappropriate this should be clarified in the context of NPPF wording. In addition to the conflict with NPPF, the policy is not positively prepared and the evidence that underpins the policy is unclear. Criterion a refers to meeting visitor needs. We are not aware of any assessment of visitor needs within the council area and it is unclear how this criteria could be met by future planning applications.			Yes		View PDF
0940	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY CSC16: HOTEL AND GUEST HOUSE ACCOMMODATION	object				Policy CSC16 makes no reference to the need for parking and deliveries in association with the use of a building as a hotel/guesthouse. This policy also makes no reference to the economic impacts the creation of a new hotel could create; this is a key aspect of sustainable development, is a clear omission by the council and should be rectified.			Yes		View PDF
0941	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY CSC17: CAMPING AND CARAVAN SITES	Object				Policy CSC17 makes no reference to noise, water, air or light pollution that may arise as a result of the proposed use as a campsite. This policy is also lacking content with regards to highways implications – a caravan site will be subject to longer vehicles therefore special provisions may have to be made at a site access that could detriment highways safety and residential amenity. Any policy wording with regards to access should be justified through objective evidence provided by the council.			Yes		View PDF
0930	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY CSC3: PROTECTION AND PROVISION OF OPEN SPACE, SPORTSAND RECREATION FACILITIES	Object				Point 1 of this policy CSC3 serves no purpose with regards to development management and should be removed from the policy wording. Point 8 of this policy should include the word proportionate to ensure that the provision of facility is relevant to the proposal in question. Policy CSC3 should also include wording which relates to contributions offered voluntarily, by the developer, as part of the preparation of the planning			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							application. Direct contributions to local sports clubs should be afforded weighting in the decision making process as this will make a more meaningful contribution to local facilities and will reduce the necessity for administrative costs and delays when clubs are seeking to secure funding from the Council.					
0931	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY CSC4: ALLOTMENTS	Object				Policy CSC4 – Allotments – is negatively worded and should be worded in a way which promotes sustainable development. There is also no provision within this policy for the creation of new allotments within new developments. The creation of new allotments would create a high value localised community benefit that would serve a local need and incrementally assist in food production for the entire region. This omission is incongruent with the general council aims to support opportunities for the local growing of food.			Yes		View PDF
0932	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY CSC5: GOLF COURSES	Object				CSC5 – golf Courses – this policy aims to protect the best agricultural land however does not acknowledge that the vast majority of agricultural land within North Lincolnshire comprises Grade 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land and that each caser should therefore be considered on its merits.			Yes		View PDF
0933	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY CSC6: WATER BASED LEISURE	Object				Policy CSC6 – water based leisure –fails to acknowledge mitigatory measures which can be used to offset potential harm to any of the assets mentioned within the policy.			Yes		View PDF
0934	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY CSC8: EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES	Support				Policy CSC8 – Banks Property support the extension of schools to accommodate an identified new for growth. This growth should be proportionate and should be objectively justified in the local plan or in consultation response to planning applications. Barton Upon Humber, as a primary town, is a sustainable location for growth due to the existing education provision and the flexibility of expansion of these facilities.			Yes		View PDF
0925	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				Policy DQE1 – Landscape – is not positively worded, is too restrictive and should hence be reconsidered to ensure the plan is sound. Wording should be included to refer to mitigation measures and specific features relevant to the NLC area. Each site should be assessed on its merits and mitigation measures should be proportionate to ensure that ample housing land is allocated in sustainable locations.			Yes		View PDF
0928	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY DQE11: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK					Policy DQE11 Green infrastructure network – this policy should attach weight to development proposals which propose to enhance the green infrastructure network. This is a material consideration that affects planning balance. Better connection between existing green infrastructure can create a more meaningful and useable network of green space which will enhance the physical and mental wellbeing of local residents 3.9 Policy DQE11 Green infrastructure network – this policy should attach weight to development proposals which propose to enhance the green infrastructure network. This is a material consideration that affects planning balance. Better connection between existing green infrastructure can create a more meaningful and useable network of green space which will enhance the physical and mental wellbeing of local residents.			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0926	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY DQE3: BIODIVERSITY AND GEODIVERSITY	Object				DQE3 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity – 1.c. does not specify which DEFRA Metric to use and this would therefore be open to interpretation, this needs to be confirmed by inserting more specific policy wording. This policy does not specify where mitigation measures should be implemented nor does it set out a preferential order of options (within the site boundary, within the local authority, within 5km of the site etc) for locating mitigation measure if they are required. The lack of specificity means that this policy is ineffective and requires amendment to make it sound.			Yes		View PDF
0927	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY DQE5: MANAGING FLOOD RISK	Object				Policy DQE5 aims to direct development away from areas of high flood risk this policy wording however is wholly discordant with the Council approach to policy H1; where they have decided to include at least one housing site (H1P12) which is approximately 90% Flood zone 3 and does not benefit from flood defences, this site was previously allocated as employment land for that reason. This demonstrates inconsistencies between planning policies within the Local Plan hence proving that the Plan is ineffective and lacking proper justification.			Yes		View PDF
0923	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY EC6: SUPPORTING THE RURAL ECONOMY	Object				Policy EC6 – 1.f. should require proposals to demonstrate that no 'unacceptable level' of adverse effect on highway safety. Any development is always likely to have an impact on highways network however this can be offset by mitigative measures. Policy 1.h. does not quantify the percentage of net gains on sites. One this has been applied some sites could be rendered unviable.			Yes		View PDF
0584	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Policy H1: Site Allocations	Object				Numerous sites allocated within this plan are fundamentally flawed which suggests that the Council's site assessment methodology is flawed and should be resolved prior to examination of the local plan. This will likely result in the deletion of site which are not available, or deliverable; which will hence necessitate the allocation of further sites. Policy H1 should include the land to the south of Horkstow Road in Barton Upon Humber; this site is deliverable as can be demonstrated by recently submitted planning application and this site presents a super alternative to many of the draft allocated sites in the emerging local plan. 2.2 The committed housing sites table contains numerous discrepancies relating to planning applications references. Some of them are incorrect and the column is not updated when new planning applications are submitted, or older applications are revised. Although it could be that there are further errors, the following issues have been found: • H1C-3: planning reference 'PA/2018/2186' is the incorrect reference and does not match the site allocation. • H1C-9: planning reference '2017/1399' is written incorrectly, should be 'PA/2017/1399'. • H1C-11: planning reference 'PA/2017/213' is incorrect and does not match the site allocation. • H1C-13: planning reference 'PA/2018/240' does not exist. The planning reference is actually 'PA/2018/2404'. • H1C-28: planning reference 'PA/2017/1234' is for H1C-27. H1C-28 is Phase 2 of H1C-27 but the planning permission of 'PA/2017/1234' is for 67 dwellings, which is the number of dwellings for Phase 1. Phase			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							2 does not have its own planning permission. • H1C-58: planning reference 'PA/1999/0920' does not exist. No alternative reference can be found. Proposed Sites 2.1 The regulation 18 Preferred Options Local Plan identified land in Barton upon Humber for 1,070 dwellings. The Pre-Submission Local Plan allocates land for 544 dwellings in the town. No substantial explanation is given for the reduction of housing in Barton which as set out in policy SS2 (Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire), is considered to be one of two Principal Towns and a 'focus for growth including new housing'. The reduction in housing in this sustainable location is therefore unjustified Unlike many other parts of the authority, Barton upon Humber is a strong market area where strategic scale housing can be delivered, emphasising the need to allocated sufficient land for housing needs within the town. 2.2 In the Proposed sites table of Policy H1: Land to the west of Brigg Road, Barton upon Humber should be included as a proposed housing site as per the following; Land to the West of Brigg Road, Barton upon Humber Greenfield Site area: 26.3 hectares Remaining dwellings at 1/1/2021: 390 2.3 As set out in our representations including the site promotion brochure, the site is a suitable housing allocation located immediately adjacent to the southern edge of Barton upon Humber. The site is located in a highly sustainable location within a suitable walking distance of many services and amenities within the town centre. The masterplan demonstrates a landscape led approach to the development of the site including substantial amount of green infrastructure. 2.4 Currently there are no bus stops to the south of the A1077 in the town. Discussions with local bus operators have been held to re-route a bus through the site. This will ensure that all proposed dwellings are within 400 metres of a bus stop and will also result in around 650 existing housing also being within the desirable walking distance that currently are not. This will ensure compliance with Policy T3 (New Development and Transport) and very few alternative sites in Barton upon Humber would be able to comply with this policy. Policy H1P-13 Land off Barrow Road 2.5 Banks Property object to the propose housing allocation. Criterion f) requires a new link road to be constructed between the A1077 and Caistor Road including a new roundabout. The site appears to be reliant on the delivery of the first section of the Barton Link Road and criterion f) requires a significant amount of the link road outwith the boundaries of the allocated sites, to be delivered as part of the housing allocation. 2.6 As per our representations to Policy T7, we do not believe that there is sufficient evidence on costs and funding for the link road and we don't not					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							believe that a housing allocation of 225 dwellings can deliver such a substantial section of road with no housing on 2/3 of the section of road being delivered. 2.7 The council should allocate sites in Barton upon Humber that are not dependent on the delivery of a key section of the new proposed link road and that are viable. **Policies map extract of site H1P-13 and the Barton Link Road required to be provided this was included in the rep showing the link road.**					
0590	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY H1P-11 BRUMBY RESOURCE CENTRE, EAST COMMON LANE	Object				This policy is related to the allocated land at Brumby Resource Centre, East Common Lane. Banks Property object to the allocation of this site and strongly believe that the site should be deallocated from the Local Plan. As noted above in representations related Policy SS5, this site was allocated for new residential development in the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD. It should be noted that for North Lincolnshire, the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD was adopted in March 2016. There is no planning application, pending or otherwise, associated with these allocations. Whilst the has indicated that there is housebuilder interest, there is no confirmation of an associated housebuilder with this allocation. Allocations within a Development Plan are considered to be category B NPPF deliverable sites and require a clear demonstration of delivery for inclusion within the supply. It should be noted that for North Lincolnshire, the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD was adopted in March 2016. The age of the Allocations DPD at over five years old, demonstrates that this site is undeliverable as is demonstrated by lack of progress that has been made with the site since it was allocated, over five years ago. In summary, Banks Property request that this site is deallocated from the Local Plan for residential development as it is clearly undeliverable. There is no evidence to suggest that anything has changed since the site was last allocated to suggest it is now deliverable. This policy is related to the allocated land at Brumby Resource Centre, East Common Lane. Banks Property object to the allocation of this site and strongly believe that the site should be deallocated from the Local Plan. As noted above in representations related Policy SS5, this site was allocated for new residential development in the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD. It should be noted that for North Lincolnshire, the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD was adopted in March 2016. There is no planning application, pending or otherwise, associated with these allocations. Whilst the has indicated that there is housebuilder interest, there is no confirmation of an associated housebuilder with this allocation. Allocations within a Development Plan are considered to be category B NPPF deliverable sites and require a clear demonstration of delivery for inclusion within the supply. It should be noted that for North Lincolnshire, the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD was adopted in March 2016. The age of the Allocations DPD at over five years old, demonstrates that this site is undeliverable as is demonstrated by lack of progress that			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							has been made with the site since it was allocated, over five years ago. In summary, Banks Property request that this site is deallocated from the Local Plan for residential development as it is clearly undeliverable. There is no evidence to suggest that anything has changed since the site was last allocated to suggest it is now deliverable.					
0593	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY H1P-15: LAND AT WESTERN AVENUE	Object				This policy is related to the allocated land at Land at Western Avenue, Brigg. Banks Property object to the allocation of this site and strongly believe that the site should be deallocated from the Local Plan. As noted above in representations related Policy SS5, this site was allocated for new residential development in the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD. It should be noted that for North Lincolnshire, the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD was adopted in March 2016. There is no planning application, pending or otherwise, associated with these allocations. Whilst the has indicated that there is housebuilder interest, there is no confirmation of an associated housebuilder with this allocation. Allocations within a Development Plan are considered to be category B NPPF deliverable sites and require a clear demonstration of delivery for inclusion within the supply. It should be noted that for North Lincolnshire, the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD was adopted in March 2016. The age of the Allocations DPD at over five years old, demonstrates that this site is undeliverable as is demonstrated by lack of progress that has been made with the site since it was allocated, over five years ago. In summary, Banks Property request that this site is deallocated from the Local Plan for residential development as it is clearly undeliverable. There is no evidence to suggest that anything has changed since the site was last allocated to suggest it is now deliverable.			Yes		View PDF
0594	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY H1P-16: LAND AT WRAWBY ROAD PHASE 2	Object				This policy is related to the allocated land at Land at Wrawby Road, Phase 2. Banks Property object to the allocation of this site and strongly believe that the site should be deallocated from the Local Plan. As noted above in representations related Policy SS5, this site was allocated for new residential development in the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD. It should be noted that for North Lincolnshire, the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD was adopted in March 2016. There is no planning application, pending or otherwise, associated with these allocations. Whilst the has indicated that there is housebuilder interest, there is no confirmation of an associated housebuilder with this allocation. Allocations within a Development Plan are considered to be category B NPPF deliverable sites and require a clear demonstration of delivery for inclusion within the supply. It should be noted that for North Lincolnshire, the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD was adopted in March 2016. The age of the Allocations DPD at over five years old, demonstrates that this site is undeliverable as is demonstrated by lack of progress that has been made with the site since it was allocated, over five years ago. In summary, Banks Property request that this site is deallocated from the			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Local Plan for residential development as it is clearly undeliverable. There is no evidence to suggest that anything has changed since the site was last allocated to suggest it is now deliverable.					
0596	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY H1P-17: LAND AT WRAWBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object				This policy is related to the allocated land at Land at Wrawby Road, Phase 1. Banks Property object to the allocation of this site and strongly believe that the site should be deallocated from the Local Plan. As noted above in representations related Policy SS5, this site was allocated for new residential development in the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD. It should be noted that for North Lincolnshire, the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD was adopted in March 2016. There is no planning application, pending or otherwise, associated with these allocations. Whilst the has indicated that there is housebuilder interest, there is no confirmation of an associated housebuilder with this allocation. Allocations within a Development Plan are considered to be category B NPPF deliverable sites and require a clear demonstration of delivery for inclusion within the supply. It should be noted that for North Lincolnshire, the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD was adopted in March 2016. The age of the Allocations DPD at over five years old, demonstrates that this site is undeliverable as is demonstrated by lack of progress that has been made with the site since it was allocated, over five years ago. In summary, Banks Property request that this site is deallocated from the Local Plan for residential development as it is clearly undeliverable. There is no evidence to suggest that anything has changed since the site was last allocated to suggest it is now deliverable.			Yes		View PDF
0603	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY H1P-26: LAND AT FIELD HOUSE					H1P-26 is the site where Joe has the connection to the L/O. I am unsure if we attack it due to no L/O consultation or if we leave it alone as we may have an opportunity to become involved?			Yes		View PDF
0609	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY H1P-4: LAND AT FORMER SOUTH LEYS SCHOOL ENDERBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object				This policy is related to the allocated land at former South Leys School, Enderby Road. Banks Property object to the allocation of this site and strongly believe that the site should be deallocated from the Local Plan. As noted above in representations related Policy SS5, this site was allocated for new residential development in the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD. It should be noted that for North Lincolnshire, the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD was adopted in March 2016. There is no planning application, pending or otherwise, associated with these allocations. Whilst the has indicated that there is housebuilder interest, there is no confirmation of an associated housebuilder with this allocation. Allocations within a Development Plan are considered to be category B NPPF deliverable sites and require a clear demonstration of delivery for inclusion within the supply. It should be noted that for North Lincolnshire, the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD was adopted in March 2016. The age of the Allocations DPD at over five years old, demonstrates that this site is undeliverable as is demonstrated by lack of progress that has been made with the site since it was allocated, over five years ago.			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							In summary, Banks Property request that this site is deallocated from the Local Plan for residential development as it is clearly undeliverable. There is no evidence to suggest that anything has changed since the site was last allocated to suggest it is now deliverable.					
0924	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY RD1: SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE	Object				Policy RD1 – development in the countryside – should make reference to and include flexibility for edge of settlement urban extensions. As the local authority is non -Green Belt, the omission of policy wording to facilitate urban extension in specified circumstances would mean that there would be no direction from the local plan if the plan were to become out of date in the event of the Council not being able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing.			Yes		View PDF
0649	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY SS1: PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	object				The inclusion of Policy SS1 is wholly unnecessary as it largely regurgitates the wording of paragraphs: 11 d), 12. Policy SS1 is unjustified and is ineffective. This policy should be removed in order to improve the plan's chances of being considered sound. 'Growth that is not for its own sake' is vague wording and should be removed, it is essentially repetition of 'sustainable growth'. This policy makes no reference to the Council's supply of housing at the time of prospective decision, nor does it make any reference to the historic delivery of housing the LPA area. If this policy is to remine in the plan it should be robustly justified by the Council. 1.7 Paragraph 4.46 states level of growth is dependent on sustainability and infrastructure. Following this statement, Barton upon Humber should be an area of higher growth because of its high level of sustainability in terms of facilities, availability of land that has low flood risk, and its rank in the settlement hierarchy			Yes		View PDF
0655	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	Object				Policy S11 states that development limits will be applied to most settlements in North Lincolnshire. The policy states that proposed development outwith the development limits will be restricted. Banks Property generally support the need for the Council to define development limits around settlements using existing Development patterns, capacity, existing planning consents and settlement character. This is in order to protect open countryside and contribute to sustainable development. However, Banks Property do not believe that the Council have properly considered how this policy could be adapted to apply if in the context of the Council being unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. Banks Property believe that the Council must add further flexibility to Policy SS11. This is so that if at any time during the emerging local plan period the Council are unable to robustly evidence a five-year housing land supply then under these circumstances there is an opportunity for sites to come forward outwith the development limits to bolster housing supply so long as proposed schemes also align with other policies.			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0664	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Policy SS2: Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire	object				Policy SS2: Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire 1.8 Banks Property supports policy SS2 because we believe further growth is required in Barton upon Humber as it is the second most sustainable location in North Lincolnshire and providing, ample services in the Town Centre. 1.9 Paragraph 2c employment growth in Transport Corridors will result in more housing demand, therefore higher supply required. Being close to the employment areas is key, so further growth in Barton upon Humber is welcomed. 1.10 Paragraph 3c allows for further growth in Barton upon Humber that is currently not allocated in the Local Plan because it is a Principal Town, making it a key service centre. Banks Property supports the focus for growth including new housing in Barton upon Humber. 1.11 Paragraphs 3d-3g states there will be less growth in the smaller areas of North Lincolnshire. We agree with this, the focus for growth should be in the main, urban areas.			Yes		View PDF
0665	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY SS3: DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES	object				1.12 SS3 – Design – 1.a. should include wording which attaches significant weight to good design in the decision-making process, in line with the wording of policy 134 of the NPPF. Greater clarity should be provided as to the potential necessity to provide a design code. Failure to include this wording would result in the policy being negative and not being positively prepared. 1.13 1.d. should make reference to, and be provide evidence supporting, the 'fabric first' approach. This is an approach that is emerging regarding environmental sustainability. Building materials have not been Support should be given to proposals that can demonstrate sustainably sourced materials; 1.f. makes no reference to oppressiveness which should be included and justified; 1.i. should specify exactly what percentage biodiversity net gain should be achieved (this percentage should be supported by evidence); 1.m should look to improve opportunities 'and provision' for walking cycling and public transport within or adjacent to new developments. SS3 does not quantify the weight to be attached to each of the elements a-o; this weight should be quantified for each element and the weighting should be justified by evidence. The policy should set out circumstances for potential material considerations that could outweigh any of the composite parts of this policy.			Yes		View PDF
0753	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY SS4: NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING IN NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	object				1.14 There is no reference to the neighbourhood plans being positively prepared. Developing neighbourhood plans is an opportunity for local communities to actively influence the development in their locality. Any neighbourhood plans should look to allocated more housing, as a minimum, than the NLC Local Plan; neighbourhood plans should not be used as restrictive tools that constrains sustainable development, they should be used to promote sustainable growth and 'shape development' (NPPF para 13 & 29) in locations that were not previously recognised in the local plan. Neighbourhood plans must, as a minimum, allocate sufficient land for housing growth on sites where the provision of housing, on balance, can be proven to have acceptable level of impacts.			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0673	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY SS5: OVERALL HOUSING PROVISION	Object				Policy SS5 is not considered to be sound as it is not justified or consistent with national policy for the following reasons: Policy SS5 states that the housing requirement for the plan period is a total of 7,128 new dwellings, and that some 2,379 of these units will be delivered on sites that already have planning permission or are already under construction. Banks Property believes that the housing requirement should be further investigated to ensure that it is sufficient to meet the local housing need. Banks Property generally support the need for the Council to maintain a rolling five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Property believe that the Council must strongly considers the need to provide additional allocations in sustainable locations, as identified by the spatial strategy, to provide flexibility in housing supply. At present, the Council only propose to allocate an additional 198 units to provide some flexibility. This only provides a very small amount of flexibility and Banks Property considers that the Council should seek to provide further flexibility in the supply. This is especially important as some sites allocated by the Council may fail to deliver due to a plethora of reasons such as the need for much infrastructure on large allocations, poor market areas across the authority and in the largest settlement in the authority, Scunthorpe, which may lead viability issues for developers. Furthermore, there a is a history of allocated sites in North Lincolnshire of failing to deliver, which have left the Council without a 5-year housing land supply over the past. Allocated sites which have not yet delivered include: • Land at former south Leys School, Enderby Road, Phase 1, Scunthorpe; • Brumby Resource Centre, East Common Lane; • Land at Western Avenue, Brigg; • Wrawby Road Phase 1 and Wrawby Road Phase 2 The sites noted above were all allocated for residential development in the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD. It should be noted that for North Lincolnshire, the Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD was adopted in March 2016. There is no planning application, pending or otherwise, associated with these allocations. Whilst the has indicated that there is housebuilder interest, there is no confirmation of an associated housebuilder with any of the allocations. It is acknowledged that an EIA Screening Opinion was submitted to the Council in 2019 in relation to BRIH-4 and part of BRIH-3 however no submission has come forward since. Due a clear history of allocated sites failing to subsequently deliver housing, the Council should strongly consider allocating more housing in sustainable locations, such as Barton upon Humber, to provide flexibility in the housing supply. Overall, Banks Property does not believe that the proposed housing provision is sufficient to support the Government's levelling up agenda and the national objective to significantly boost the supply of homes.			Yes		View PDF
0681	Joe Perkins on	POLICY SS5: OVERALL	object		No		1.15 It should be noted that for a number of years, North Lincolnshire			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	behalf of Banks Group	HOUSING PROVISION					Council have not been able to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. Whilst the allocation of new housing sites should increase delivery rates, this will only occur if the right sites in the right locations are allocated. A number of proposed new housing allocations are reliant on significant pieces of infrastructure whilst others are in poor market areas and therefore it is likely that previous delivery issues are likely to remain. This historic undersupply should be reflected through flexibility in the local plan policy wording to allow sustainable urban extensions to come forward where it can be demonstrated that there is no significant harm. 1.16 7,128 new dwellings over the plan period is an insufficient housing allocation to meet local demand and this figure is inconsistent with the Council's vision at 3.10 of this Local Plan. Some of the 2379 dwelling proposed on extant permission are unlikely to be delivered as they lie on undeliverable sites. Sites have been included in the 5-year land supply, yet have no evidence to prove they are deliverable. Johnson Mowat have provided a report ('Assessment of the North Lincolnshire Five Year Housing Land Supply, November 2021') that concludes that many housing sites in the Local Plan are undeliverable within the plan period and should not be included in the supply. Accordingly, more (or different) housing sites should be allocated and one of the most sustainable sites in North Lincolnshire lies to the south of Horkstow Road in Barton Upon Humber. Policy SS5. 4. states that the council will allocate an additional 198 'within the first 5 years of the plan'; this policy wording fully confirms that, with 7128 units, the council has irrefutably failed to allocate enough housing land in the Local Plan and this intention to allocate more housing in the first 5 years proves that the plan is not currently sound. The need to allocate more housing in the first 5 years of the plan reiterates the Council's lack of confidence in those sites that have been allocated therefore every allocated site should be reviewed in more detail to ascertain whether any are undeliverable. Alternative sites should also be assessed in order to confirm whether the Council has allocated the most suitable available sites. Where alternative sites are more sustainable, these should replace the draft allocations. 1.17 To ensure sufficient housing land is provided to meeting housing needs throughout the whole plan period, we would suggest that the housing requirement is increased and less reliance placed on dwellings that already have permission to ensure there is sufficient flexibility to meeting housing needs as required by paragraph 60 of NPPF. 1.18 Paragraph 4.41 should clarify that where the council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply the relevant policies will become out of date. This needs to be specified within the policy wording and suitable flexibility should be included to clarify the first locations of search in the circumstances where the Local Authority cannot demonstrate sufficient housing land supply. This issue is particularly pertinent in North Lincolnshire due to the historic inability to demonstrate a 5 year supply.					
0716	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites	object				1.19 Banks Property objects to policy SS6 because allocating 8% housing growth in Barton upon Humber does not reflect Policy SS2, which states Barton upon Humber is a Principal Town that should benefit from larger developments than the smaller areas of North Lincolnshire. The council			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							have therefore taken an inconsistent approach to allocating land in the Local Planning Authority area. Barton upon Humber is an appropriate area for large development because it has an array of local facilities and services that other areas within North Lincolnshire cannot compete with. 1.20 Paragraph 1 table shows Brigg is receiving almost double the allocation that Barton upon Humber has received, however Barton upon Humber scores equally in the settlement hierarchy against Brigg (both 69/76). However, the settlement survey ranks Barton upon Humber as number 2 in the overall hierarchy positions, and Brigg as number 3. This would suggest Barton upon Humber is better suited for the higher number of housing allocations.					
0719	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY SS7: STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION – LINCOLNSHIRE LAKES	Object		No		Policy SS7 is not considered to be sound as it is not justified, effective or consistent with national policy for the following reasons:Policy H1 identifies the housing allocations, these include 2,189 on Committed Sites and 5,301 on Proposed Sites. It is of high important that all the sites allocated for new residential development within the Local Plan are deliverable over the plan period. The Council's assumptions related to the delivery and capacity of allocated land should be realistic and based upon and supported by a robust evidence base. The Lincolnshire Lakes allocation as part of Policy SS7 is not deliverable over the plan period and is not appropriately planned. Therefore, this policy is neither justified, nor consistent with the NPPF.Before taking issue with the lack of appropriate planning that has led to the allocation of this site, it is of significant importance to note the clear deliverability issues that the site has. The Lincolnshire Lakes land was allocated for development in the adopted Core Strategy, adopted in June 2011. Although an Area Action Plan has come forward for the site since then, there has been little evidence that the wider site was going to come forward and this is still the case over 10 years after the site was allocated in the Core Strategy. Over the majority of the past decade no housing has come forward, only recently has development commenced for an 88-unit scheme, on the site showing it is clearly not deliverable as defined by the NPPF. This highlights that Policy SS7 has not been prepared effectively or in accordance with the NPPF.Furthermore, in relation to deliverability, the Council has set a target for 2150 units of this allocation to be delivered by 2038. This equates to an average delivery of 126.5 units to be delivered over the next 17 years, assuming that somehow 126.5 units could be delivered in the remainder of 2021. When factoring in that masses of infrastructure that the Council have proposed to come forward which is required to make the site deliverable, it is unlikely that even an unrealistically low delivery target of 126.5 units per annum is achievable over the plan. Notwithstanding the clear lack of deliverability associated with the site. It also is not planned for appropriately. The site is located within the large areas of Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3. Although some of the site benefits from flood defences, the allocation of housing in the Flood Zone is discordant with Policy DQE5, which aims to direct development away from areas of high flood risk. This also is contradictory to Paragraph 159 of the NPPF which states that 'development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk'. Paragraph 162 of the NPPF also states that a sequential test should be used 'to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding from any source.			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding'. This contradiction to both local and national policy further highlights that this Policy as well as the Local Plan is ineffective, lacking proper justification and does not align with the NPPF.Banks Property also take issue with the access to the site as the access proposed are not suitable to serve a development of this size. The policy also makes no reference to the provision of public transport in the area. The majority of employment land in Scunthorpe is on the opposite side of the settlement to this allocation and therefore it is too far a distance for what is considered to be suitable for active travel.The Lincolnshire Lakes site also possess viability issues due to the reliance on a significant amount of new infrastructure. The site is reliant on much externally sourced funding as noted at Paragraph 14.44 and 14.45. It is unclear if the necessary funding has been secured and how likely it is that all of the remaining necessary funding is to come forward in a timeframe that will allow 2150 units to be completed by the end of this plan period.As the actual delivery trajectory of the site is ging to be much slower than predicted along with significant infrastructure and viability issues in combination with a high risk of flooding this policy is not sound. Due to this there is a need for the Council to allocate more deliverable sites which are of a range of scales in sustainable locations like Barton upon Humber, to ensure that the Council meets its housing requirement for the plan period. The land west of Brigg Road is a logical and highly sustainable extension out with of the Flood Zone which can quickly deliver housing in a sustainable location. The site is not reliant on any external funding and possess no viability issues.					
0723	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY SS8: EMPLOYMENT LAND REQUIREMENT (INCLUDING STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT SITES)	Supports				1.21 Banks Property supports this policy because it shows the importance of needing new jobs within an area to support growth. New houses are required in an area to accommodate new jobs, so housing and employment growth are interdependent . 1.22 The location of the employment land mentioned in Policy SS8 is commutable from Barton upon Humber, making the area suitable for housing growth. additional flexibility should comprise part of this policy in order to ensure that adequate employment land can come forward over the plan period. The need for employment land should reflect local demand and should be underpinned by appropriate evidence. 1.23 Policy SS11 development limits, should include wording to acknowledge that sites that are out with but abutting the settlement limit should be given the first priority when looking for new sites or looking for alternatives. These urban extension sites should be identified through policy wording in order to create a focus for any planning applications that try to make the tilted balance argument in the event of the council failing to provide a 5 year land supply (which is likely to occur over the plan period)			Yes		View PDF
0725	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Policy T1: Promoting Sustainable Transport	Supports				4.2 Banks Property supports this policy because we believe it is important to promote sustainable transport choices, such as providing housing developments that can provide extensions to existing bus routes. 4.3 Paragraph 2a suggests development should be in the most sustainable areas to reduce journey times and the need for private transport to			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							reduce emissions. This can be achieved by choosing larger and more sustainable sites in Principal Towns such as Barton upon Humber, rather than having medium sized developments in Rural Settlements that require transport to access most facilities.					
0726	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Policy T2: Promoting Public Transport	Supports				4.4 Banks Property supports this policy because we believe it is important to promote public transport choices, such as providing housing developments that can provide extensions to existing bus routes.			Yes		View PDF
0727	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Policy T3: New Development and Transport	Supports				4.5 Banks Property supports this policy because we believe all new developments should have access to different modes of sustainable transport, both public and private. 4.6 Paragraph 2a states that there should be a bus stop less than 400 metres from the development site. There are several sites in Policy H1 that are more than 400 metres from a bus stop, therefore are not considered sustainable. 4.7 Policy T4 does not quantify the actual need for parking per house or per bedroom in a house and generally lacks clarity. This policy also omits any mention of proximity to town centre or employment locations when assessing the need for parking; a site that is within walking distance of local services or an employment site is less likely to need parking than a site that is reliant upon cars.			Yes		View PDF
0732	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Policy T7: Safeguarding Transport Infrastructure	Object				4.8 Whilst Banks Property support a Barton Link Road in the future, we have concerns regarding the alignment of the route, interaction with proposed housing sites and funding. We would suggest that the link road is omitted from the list of safeguarded routes in Policy T7 and removed from the policies map, and a reference added to Policy T7 not support in principle to the route that requires further detailed evidence before being safeguarded in the local plan. Such an approach would enable a local plan review to identify and safeguard the route once a greater understanding of the alignment, interaction with proposed housing sites and funding has been established. 4.9 There have been various alignments of a link road and the route contained within the Draft North Lincolnshire Local Plan followed a much different alignment. No explanation has been provided as to why a new route has been identified. We are not aware of any investigations being undertaken to establish ground conditions, topographical constraints and accurate costs for the delivery of the road. No details on how the road will be funded have been provided. 4.10 We believe the route of the new link road encompasses at least 11 different landowners. The most westerly part of the route cuts across land controlled by Banks Property. No approach to the landowner or ourselves has been made and it would therefore appear that the council intend to deliver the road using Compulsory Purchase Powers which will result in further delay and cost to the delivery of the link road. The eastern part of the route crosses proposed housing allocation H1P-13 which is required to deliver a significant part or the road which may result in the site being unviable. 4.11 The identification of the link road in Policy T7 1.c. appears to be			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							unjustified and hence fails the tests of soundness. 4.12 On 26 November 2021 we noticed that the representation period had been moved back by one week to 3 December 2021. When the changing date was queried with the policy team, we were advised that the date had been extended due to 'public complaints about the lack of information on the Barton Link Road being made publicly available'. We were advised that a technical note had been uploaded to the council's website. No information regarding the updated piece of evidence was sent from the council and there is nothing on the council's website that highlights the new information available. It is legitimate to assume that a number of interested parties remain unaware of the technical note's existence and is not fully considered in representations. In any case, the case piece of evidence should be publicly consulted on for a full 6 week representation period to allow it to be fully considered rather than merely a 1 week period. Due to the date of the technical note being May 2021, the council appear to be withholding key information regarding a safeguarding proposal in the local plan and the representation period should be re-run in full for another 6 week period. 4.13 In the short time available to review the technical note we would make the following comments; a) The Technical Note is dated May 2021 and appears to be based on proposed housing allocations from the Preferred Options Local Plan (Regulation 18) published in early 2020. Table 7 of the Technical Note includes a series of housing allocations which have been subsequently been omitted from the local plan including the following sites; H1P-8 Land to the south of Barrow Road (213 dwellings), H1P-9 Land at Caistor Road (360 dwellings), H1P-10 Land between Caistor Road and Eastfield Road (98 dwellings). The Technical Note uses the quantum of housing allocations to establish trip rates and the assessment of options for a new link road. As a significant amount of housing allocations have been removed from Barton upon Humber, such assessments are flawed and undermine the case for a new link road. The evidence should be updated based on the currently proposed housing allocations. b) The Technical Note appears to be a high level option appraisal of routes and contains a traffic assessment of one junction, the A1077/Holdyke/Hungate Mini Roundabout. The results of the modelling indicate that the junction is operating just below capacity however, the conclusion 'based on existing knowledge' is that the junction is at 'full capacity'. The Technical Note then refers to a Section 106 contribution for capacity improvements (traffic lights) from the large manufacturer on the eastern side of the town. c) The Technical Note makes a series of ill-informed assumptions and is lacking in detail. We would expect to see an assessment of the whole of the A1077 running through Barton upon Humber considering; • Operation of the existing and future network • Environmental context • Committed development • Future development					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							• Journey times • Speeds • Previous studies • Socio-economic assessment (to establish need for intervention) • Comprehensive traffic modelling • Stakeholder engagement d) The Technical Note has not looked at ways to reduce delays, improve journey times and reliability or to maximise opportunities for pedestrians/cyclists. The reader has no visibility of the of the severity of the capacity issues on the A1077 which necessitates a new road being built across open countryside. Reference is made to previous Barton Link Road assessment work, however none of this information has previously been made publicly available. The three LTP documents referred to in section 4 (references) should be made available. e) The Technical Note establishes the need for a highways improvement scheme at the A1077/Holydyke/Hungate Mini Roundabout irrespective of a link road being in place. Paragraph 3.2.5 includes an unspecified Section 106 contribution which has been omitted. It would be useful to see the contribution secured with regard to the required improvements. 4.14 In summary, there is a lack of information regarding the need for the Barton Link Road. The information provided is lacking in detail and incorporates various assumptions which have subsequently been superseded. Banks Property do not believe that the safeguarding of the route complies with paragraph 110 of NPPF part d) because a significant impact/issue has not been identified to demonstrate that the link road is a cost effective mitigation. 4.15 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. This could be addressed by a future local plan review.					
0735	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	POLICY TC1: RETAIL HIERARCHY AND TOWN CENTRE AND DISTRICTCENTRE DEVELOPMENT	Supports				3.1 Banks Property supports policy TC1 because it correctly recognises Barton upon Humber as a Principal Town Centre which can be supported by development. Barton upon Humber already has a large range of services and facilities to support the local area, so further development will require new housing to accommodate the growing town. Wording should be included to confirm that the vibrancy and vitality of town centres will be supported by housing growth this will encourage local spending creating jobs and boosting the economy. 3.2 Barton Upon Humber should be identified as the main town centre in paragraph 7.20 as it provides more services than the other centre identified within this tier of the Retail Hierarchy and it is highly accessible. Barton is clearly the second most economically active settlement in North Lincolnshire and this should be reflected in the retail hierarchy. 3.3 Policy EC6 – 1.f. should require proposals to demonstrate that no 'unacceptable level' of adverse effect on highway safety. Any development is always likely to have an impact on highways network however this can be offset by mitigative measures. Policy 1.h. does not quantify the percentage of net gains on sites. One this has been applied			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							some sites could be rendered unviable. 3.4 Policy RD1 – development in the countryside – should make reference to and include flexibility for edge of settlement urban extensions. As the local authority is non -Green Belt, the omission of policy wording to facilitate urban extension in specified circumstances would mean that there would be no direction from the local plan if the plan were to become out of date in the event of the Council not being able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing. 3.5 Policy DQE1 – Landscape – is not positively worded, is too restrictive and should hence be reconsidered to ensure the plan is sound. Wording should be included to refer to mitigation measures and specific features relevant to the NLC area. Each site should be assessed on its merits and mitigation measures should be proportionate to ensure that ample housing land is allocated in sustainable locations. 3.6 DQE3 – Biodiversity and Geodiversity – 1.c. does not specify which DEFRA Metric to use and this would therefore be open to interpretation, this needs to be confirmed by inserting more specific policy wording. This policy does not specify where mitigation measures should be implemented nor does it set out a preferential order of options (within the site boundary, within the local authority, within 5km of the site etc) for locating mitigation measure if they are required. The lack of specificity means that this policy is ineffective and requires amendment to make it sound. 3.7 Policy DQE5 aims to direct development away from areas of high flood risk this policy wording however is wholly discordant with the Council approach to policy H1; where they have decided to include at least one housing site (H1P12) which is approximately 90% Flood zone 3 and does not benefit from flood defences, this site was previously allocated as employment land for that reason. This demonstrates inconsistencies between planning policies within the Local Plan hence proving that the Plan is ineffective and lacking proper justification. 3.8 Policy DQE11 Green infrastructure network – this policy should attach weight to development proposals which propose to enhance the green infrastructure network. This is a material consideration that affects planning balance. Better connection between existing green infrastructure can create a more meaningful and useable network of green space which will enhance the physical and mental wellbeing of local residents. 3.9 Policy DQE11 Green infrastructure network – this policy should attach weight to development proposals which propose to enhance the green infrastructure network. This is a material consideration that affects planning balance. Better connection between existing green infrastructure can create a more meaningful and useable network of green space which will enhance the physical and mental wellbeing of local residents. 3.10 At Policy CSC1 – health and wellbeing – the link between provision of affordable housing and public health is unclear and the wording of this policy therefore needs to be reconsidered. This policy should relate to Health and Wellbeing however many of the subclauses do not relate to the topic at hand; this policy is too prescriptive and should be reworded to					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							ensure relevance to the Health and wellbeing policy (CSC1). 3.11 Point 1 of this policy CSC3 serves no purpose with regards to development management and should be removed from the policy wording. Point 8 of this policy should include the word proportionate to ensure that the provision of facility is relevant to the proposal in question. Policy CSC3 should also include wording which relates to contributions offered voluntarily, by the developer, as part of the preparation of the planning application. Direct contributions to local sports clubs should be afforded weighting in the decision making process as this will make a more meaningful contribution to local facilities and will reduce the necessity for administrative costs and delays when clubs are seeking to secure funding from the Council. 3.12 Policy CSC4 – Allotments – is negatively worded and should be worded in a way which promotes sustainable development. There is also no provision within this policy for the creation of new allotments within new developments. The creation of new allotments would create a high value localised community benefit that would serve a local need and incrementally assist in food production for the entire region. This omission is incongruent with the general council aims to support opportunities for the local growing of food. 3.13 CSC5 – golf Courses – this policy aims to protect the best agricultural land however does not acknowledge that the vast majority of agricultural land within North Lincolnshire comprises Grade 1, 2 or 3a agricultural land and that each caser should therefore be considered on its merits. 3.14 Policy CSC6 – water based leisure –fails to acknowledge mitigatory measures which can be used to offset potential harm to any of the assets mentioned within the policy. 3.15 Policy CSC8 – Banks Property support the extension of schools to accommodate an identified new for growth. This growth should be proportionate and should be objectively justified in the local plan or in consultation response to planning applications. Barton Upon Humber, as a primary town, is a sustainable location for growth due to the existing education provision and the flexibility of expansion of these facilities. 3.16 Policy CSC10 – point 7 should include the word 'proportionate'. The provision of more meaningful (i.e. closer to the development stie or improvement of struggling facilities) should be afforded more weight in the decision making process and this should be reflected in the policy wording. 3.17 Policy CSC11 is a regurgitation of Town Centre policies in the NPPF and serves no purpose hence should be deleted from the Local Plan. 3.18 Policy CSC13 makes no reference to amenity issues that may arise from cemeteries. The location of cemeteries is not justified through any objective evidence in the local plan and locating new cemeteries 'adjacent to existing cemeteries' is completely unfounded as a policy and is not based on any evidence. Consideration should also be given for air and water pollutants in relation to this form of development. Policy CSC13 is lacking detail and is in significant need of reconsideration. This necessity					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							for this policy is demonstrated by a recent applications for this form of development in the area. Assessments should also be completed for transport impacts that may arise as a result of the proposed development in relation to this specific use. 3.19 Policy CSC14 makes no reference to a place of worship as a community asset and is therefore inconsistent with national policy. The social sustainability of this form of development has not been considered as part of this policy wording, the policy therefore needs to be revised. Any loss or gain of community asset should be appraised in the policy. 3.20 Policy CSC15 is not positively prepared and contrary to national planning policy. Paragraph 84 c) of NPPF states 'Planning policies and decisions should enable: c) sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments which respect the character of the countryside.' Policy CSC15 2. relates to visitor attractions where a countryside location is necessary. The policy does not refer to proposals being required to respect the character of the countryside as required by NPPF and instead lists four criteria that must be met. Whilst a proposal can 'help to enhance' an affected asset, the policy should clarify the way in which a decision will ensure that any harm to an asset within or adjacent to the site is quantified and is outweighed by potential benefits of a proposal. The policy should specify how this harm will be quantified. The policy should, but does not, state any potential benefits that could outweigh harm. The policy should specify that developers must provide justification for 'necessary countryside locations' and this policy should provide criteria against which a decision maker can assess whether a proposal is truly necessary to be located in the countryside, and whether any harm to the countryside is outweighed. Being a tourist attraction is not a substantial reason to justify harm to the countryside. The council must find further justification for development in the countryside that may otherwise be considered to be inappropriate this should be clarified in the context of NPPF wording. In addition to the conflict with NPPF, the policy is not positively prepared and the evidence that underpins the policy is unclear. Criterion a refers to meeting visitor needs. We are not aware of any assessment of visitor needs within the council area and it is unclear how this criteria could be met by future planning applications. 3.21 Policy CSC16 makes no reference to the need for parking and deliveries in association with the use of a building as a hotel/guesthouse. This policy also makes no reference to the economic impacts the creation of a new hotel could create; this is a key aspect of sustainable development, is a clear omission by the council and should be rectified. 3.22 Policy CSC17 makes no reference to noise, water, air or light pollution that may arise as a result of the proposed use as a campsite. This policy is also lacking content with regards to highways implications – a caravan site will be subject to longer vehicles therefore special provisions may have to be made at a site access that could detriment highways safety and residential amenity. Any policy wording with regards to access should be justified through objective evidence provided by the council.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Karen **Pickering** on behalf of Scawby Parish Council												
0748	Karen Pickering - clerk to Scawby PC	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	Object				Scawby Parish Council wish to object to the local plan which is currently being consulted on. Scawby Parish Council requests that the development line/boundary remains as it currently is and not as the map provided for consultation. The new 'consulting' map shows new areas of land to be included within the boundary line - namely an area of land at Sturton - The parish council requests that this is not included within the development line. Please advise if this submission is satisfactory or if you require this statement/objection in another format.					View PDF
Karen **Pickering** on behalf of Ulceby Parish Council												
0892	Karen Pickering, on behalf of Ulceby Parish Council	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS					Ulceby parish Council have considered the local plan provided for consultation and confirm that the development boundary line as proposed is satisfactory to Ulceby PC and the parish Council supports this proposed development boundary line.					View PDF
Karen **Pickering** on behalf of Wootton Parish Council												
0893	Karen Pickering Clerk to parish Council	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS					Wootton parish Council have considered the local plan which is currently in consultation and would like to support the proposed development boundary line as it is stipulated within this consultation document.					View PDF
Mike **Pilsworth** on behalf of RSPB												
0331	Mike Pilsworth on behalf of RSPB	Paragraph 2.5	object	no	yes	yes	RSPB is supportive of the Plan as a whole and are supportive of the comments submitted made by Lincolnshire wildlife trust. Within the housing allocation section however we believe that the approach to dealing with impacts of recreational disturbance on the designated sites particular the Humber SPA/ SAC are potentially weak, providing greenspace around developments will only partly mitigate impacts as people will undoubtedly travel to nearby sites such as the estuary and with potential to cause disturbance, but the plan does not appear to outline a clear strategy as to how this will tracked and mitigated. Within the adjacent North East Lincs local plan this has been more clearly set out and we would encourage a similar approach in North Lincs The North East Lincs plan states within it's housing allocation policy - paragraph 5 page 135 http://www.nelincs.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/20180518-AdoptedLocalPlan2018-WEB.pdf "The Council will track planning permissions granted on all housing sites and will identify and secure appropriate, effective and timely mitigation to manage increasing recreational pressures on the Humber Natura 2000 sites when necessary; this includes a commitment to further development of the Cleethorpes Habitat Management Plan. Any mitigation or management measures identified will be implemented prior to impacts occurring."		Within the housing allocation policy state that housing planning applications and levels of recreational disturbance will be tracked by the council to ensure timely and appropriate mitigation put in place to manage increased recreational pressure on the Humber Natura 2000 site	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							We would therefore welcome a more consistent approach from all the local authorities around the Humber as to how housing development / tourism development is tracked and recreational disturbance impacts mitigated for throughout the whole of the Humber Natura 2000 site.					
Mark **Plaskitt**												
0877	Mark Plaskitt	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				Good Afternoon, I am writing to you as our MP to voice my objection to the Banks housing development in Barton-upon-Humber. I have grown up and lived in this town for 48 years and have fond memories of this, I've seen the town grow from an average sized town to what I and others consider a very large. I've worked away from home most of my life after serving my apprenticeship locally but always return home to spend my hard earned salary in my home town . I can't imagine what a disastrous effect the banks development would have in a town that struggles to cope with absurd amounts of traffic, poor road surfaces, not being able to get a doctors appointment, the chemists are unable to cope, dentists, schools, parking, services, drainage, dog mess by inconsiderate owners, all of this is happening now and has been for years. The only way the police will do anything for a victim is if they think you're going to defend yourself against the criminals. I dread to think how 400 more houses and the people living in them are going to increase these already unacceptable problems. The relief road is a joke being told since I was at school, the only sensible option is to have the 1 KM stretch proposed by the RAID community. My childhood home is on Barrow Rd in the town, if I visit my Mother I can't get in or out her drive without a Russian roulette manoeuvre at any time of day. Keigar homes are building another 300 plus houses as you will know, I fully understand the need for homes but when is enough - enough for an already struggling town that still has the same services and infrastructure as it did 30 years ago. I hope yourself and our council will consider the likes of me and my neighbours and not greedy land developers with no interest in people or their genuine concerns. As I mentioned previously I always return home to spend my gains but after genuine consideration if this development goes ahead I will be forced to move my family to a different location and I resent being forced into this situation. I hope you will back your voters.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Steve **Pluta**												
0284	Steve Pluta	POLICY HP1-25: LAND AT YEALAND FLATS	object	no	no	no	The Current Local plan has been very poorly advertised, no one at the consultations meetings could provide any list where it had been advertised to raise awareness and get the widest views. which is a failure to cooperate with the citizens of Epworth. The proposal has changed since stage3 where the Yealand development was 92 properties and is now down to 45. I can find no evidence that the other land submissions that were rejected because they were to small have been re assessed for suitability with this change of mind. Reasons why this development is unsuitable and against policy of the land around the town of Epworth. The proposed development identified as (H1P-25) green belt land, at Yealand flats, Epworth, will occupy 1.5ha for up to 45 dwellings of mixed sizes and styles and in accordance with Policy H3 require a percentage of affordable homes. Whilst not always the case the majority of affordable new homes tend to be 3 story properties built to minimise land costs to achieve the affordability requirement. This style of housing would be out of character for the immediate area and have significant impact on the historic landscape which North Lincs planning has for many years vigorously protected to their credit. The properties on Mill View Close which borders the proposed development are all single story bungalows and would be over shadowed by any constructions other than single story properties. Between Mill View close and the proposed area to develop is public foot path 53A and any development to the north of this busy well used path will obscure the only uninterrupted view of the grade II listed Maws Mill from the North of Epworth. The visual obstruction of this historic asset has again been vigorously protected by North Lincs planning in the rejection of many planning applications over recent years. Allowing the development will damage the historical and aesthetic significance of Maws Mill which is of national importance making the proposal contrary to paragraphs 193,194 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), policy CS6 of the core Strategy and policy HE5 of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan. The Proposed site is located within the core historic landscapes to the north of Epworth, one of the best preserved ancient open strip field areas (dating back over a 1000 years) in the Isle of Axholme AND the country. Up until a few years ago this site was one of a few fields around Epworth that was farmed in strips again highlighting the historic legacy of this location. If North Lincs Council persists in the pursuit of the use of Yealand flats for housing it is clear it will be in breach of its own policies and obligation to protect the historic landscape around Epworth. A recent planning application PA/2021/715 to build 34 properties on BROWNFIELD land off of station road Epworth, would be a much better location for The Current Local plan has been very poorly advertised, no	Consistent with national policy		yes	I would like to take part in the hearing sessions to fully get the issues and challenges with this location debated and ensure that the submission doesn't deliver irreversible damage to the historic landscape that it will have a significant impact on. In addition that the 5 year reviews don't encroach on further Historical Landscape at this location.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							one at the consultations meetings could list where it had been advertised to raise awareness and get the widest views. The Current Local plan has been very poorly advertised, no one at the consultations meetings could list where it had been advertised to raise awareness and get the widest views. this development as it would not impact on the loss of green belt land, and remove an eyesore of an industrial building but it was declined for all the reasons above re protecting the historic landscape. Looking at the applications over the last few years and the failed locations during the current local plan process, there is another common fact, they were all developments / proposals by private individuals but HIP-25 is owned by North Lincs council and therefore raises the question that it is operating double standards in protecting the historic landscape until there is an opportunity to profit significantly by selling its own land to developers. When planning application PA/2021/715 was posted, North Lincs ward councillors Tim Mitchell and David Robinson wrote to all of the residents of Epworth making them aware of the application and encouraging comments. The local plan process made no attempts to get close to making residents aware of this process and the impact the outcome would have on the historic landscape around Epworth					
Lorraine **Preston**												
0619	Lorraine Preston	POLICY H1P-4: LAND AT FORMER SOUTH LEYS SCHOOL ENDERBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object				Kimberley Performing Arts Centre has always played a close part in my heart, I have been involved with the dance school since I was a child myself and both my children have attended there. It is the most wonderful place for children and adults to go and the teachers and staff are like family to us. Since moving to the Enderby Road site the school has been able to open up to the local community inviting them into summer fayres and Christmas fayres, workshops throughout the summer holidays and other activities to keep children engaged during school holidays. We also open the building up to outside clubs to come and use our space and facilities. We offer groups and classes to all ages from 2 to adults and are very inclusive of everyone. This has been advantageous to us being located where we are as we are centrally located. I feel it would be a massive loss to lose this location as it is so centrally located and is only a short drive for most people and is within walking distance for many people too. I feel it would have a detrimental effect on the school to be moved at this point especially as a long lease was signed at the beginning of the term with no plans highlighted at that point to make any changes to it.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Stewart **Provan** on behalf of The Banks Group												
0119	Stewart Provan on behalf of The Banks Group	POLICY MIN1: MINERAL SUPPLY REQUIREMENTS	object	yes	no	no	The Banks Group OBJECT to the approach taken in the plan to planning for the future supply of clay from the district. Policy MIN1 of the draft plan categorically states that appropriate landbanks will also be maintained for silica sand and brick clay, in line with national policy. The draft plan then goes on in the subsequent paragraphs (12.4 to 12.10) to describe what those landbanks are in terms of national policy, and selectively then applies those landbank calculations to the circumstances within the administrative area of the local authority. It is notable however that while the description in these paragraphs provides some detail on the position in relation to aggregate minerals (by reference largely to the LAA), no further reference is made to the position in relation to the landbank position for clay. As a result, having fully acknowledged at paragraph 12.9 that in relation to clays, the size of a suitable landbank is 25 years. There is no evidence contained in the plan, or its supporting evidence base, which adequately demonstrates that the plan does indeed provide a 25 year landbank for clay. It is notable and of concern that none of the new sites or areas of search as defined in policy MIN6 relate to clay. In so far as it may be argued that policy MIN6 provides for alternative sites to come forward, such an approach does not constitute the positive planning for new development expected of NPPF.	Consistent with national policy	The text of the plan should be amended to explain the sandbank position in relation to clay and if necessary i.e. the evidence indicates that the sandbank of consented clay reserves is insufficient to provide a 25 year sandbank, the plan should make provision for new clay working by identifying suitable sites or areas of search.	no		
0120	Stewart Provan on behalf of The Banks Group	POLICY MIN2: MINERAL SAFEGUARDING	object	yes	no	no	The Banks Group OBJECT to the approach taken in Chapter 12 of the draft plan on the grounds that the approach taken in the draft plan will limit innovation in the development of new mineral opportunities in the district. In doing so the draft plan fails to accord with national planning policy in relation to the sustainable development of minerals in the NPPF as well as the UK Governments Net-Zero Strategy 2021. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) expects plans to, inter alia, be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development and be prepared positively in a way that is aspirational but deliverable. This expectation is not reflected in the policies or approach of the draft plan in specific regard to minerals other those minerals commonly worked for aggregate, oil and gas. The UK Governments Net-Zero Strategy 2021 , updated in October 2021, further emphasises the need to make provisions for enabling innovation and flexible policies in the mineral sector, which the current draft plan lacks. The strategy states: We will support the engagement of the UKs mining sector in new and existing markets, facilitating investment and collaboration in extraction and processing opportunities. - (Net Zero Strategy 2021, p.237) The UK Government has made clear commitments to publish a UK Critical Minerals strategy in 2022, which will set out the nationwide approach to securing technology-critical minerals and metals. These are in line with the Critical Minerals Associations recommendations , which ask for clear	positively prepared	As worded the text of the plan does not provide for the imminent publication of the UK Government's Critical Mineral Strategy. The text of the plan should be amended to recognise the potential for new mineral working within the District, particularly in relation to critical minerals.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							provisions to enable an emerging industry focused on delivering a domestic critical minerals supply and subsequently securing the UKs supply of these essential resources. It also recommends specific actions regarding streamlining the planning and permitting processes, including to: Establish an enabling environment for developing and growing a domestic critical minerals sector by streamlining processes, improving coordination across the planning and permitting systems. Provide regular training events for planning/permitting decision makers on critical minerals exploration, mining, processing, infrastructure/ service needs, ESG, mine closure and stakeholder engagement. (p.9) These positive policies and actions are not addressed within the draft plan.					
Ian **Ransford**												
0249	Ian Ransford	POLICY EC1-5: LAND AT SANDTOFT AIRFIELD	object	yes	no	yes	Whilst I support the development at Sandtoft overall, I have an issue with the access. The proposed access is a bad road. It is narrow with tight bends and is not suitable for increased heavy traffic. A more suitable long term access road should be built by putting a roundabout on the A161 just south of junction 2 and building a road parallel to the motorway. It would be a much safer road and would also be several kilometres shorter than the proposed route, saving huge amounts of time, fuel and emissions.	justified	Amend the access route to the development	no		
0362	Ian Ransford	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object	no	no	yes	The main issue is that Epworth has once again been totally abandoned by NLC. There is no provision for housing for the second consecutive plan, despite land being made available. That equates to virtually nothing for thirty years. How is this acceptable? Of the six market towns (Barton, Brigg, Crowle, Epworth, Kirton in Lindsey and Winterton), Epworth is the only town with next to no housing allocation (57 houses) for the second plan running. Barton and Brigg have been selected as principal towns, but there is no principal town on the west of the river. Epworth would be the most sensible candidate as it sits between Crowle and Haxey. Of the top ten ranked settlements, only Messingham has a marginally lower allocation than Epworth. Housing in Brigg, for example, will increase by 1045 (32.2%). 800 of these are on greenfield sites. Crowle, despite having grown considerably in the last plan, gets another 169 houses (9.1%), of which 74 are greenfield. Barrow upon Humber has 178 houses (13.9%), of which 138 are on greenfield sites. Meanwhile a suitable brownfield site in Epworth is being ignored. Why is Epworth being starved of housing? Does the council care about the long-term effects on shops, services and ultimately, the health of the local community? Epworth has a number of problems that NLC is simply ignoring:	effective	The development site off Station Road and the town centre site for the health centre and car parking should be included in the plan	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							1. Lack of housing, including affordable housing Where are new families going to live if there is no housing provision? NLC cannot just shrug its shoulders and tell them to leave town. Or is NLC planning to put something in the water to stop the residents breeding? House prices in Epworth are among the highest in the region and are not sustainable. 2. Health care facilities As the population of Epworth grows older (unavoidably so, as young families leave town as a result of NLC's enforced housing policy), it puts added strain on health facilities that were not designed to cater for so many people. The present surgery was built to cope with around half the current population. The site cannot be expanded and is not fit for purpose. This has been mitigated to a certain extent by pushing appointments out to satellite surgeries, but this causes several problems it forces Epworth residents to drive to neighbouring villages when they are unwell, adding unnecessary time, inconvenience and expense; causes additional emissions and pollution; contributes to local traffic problems in villages; and makes it harder for other villagers to get appointments. This is not a sustainable situation, and will only get worse unless NLC does something to solve the problem. The Care Commissioning Group has no funds to expand local services, and NLC's idea of wellness hubs is nothing but a gimmick and will have no effect on the real day to day issues faced locally. 3. Car parking For years Epworth has suffered from congestion caused by a lack of parking facilities. As mentioned above, as the population ages, this matter will only get worse. NLC has tinkered around by repainting a few on-street parking bays. A complete waste of time. The solution to Epworth's long-standing problems has been offered to NLC time after time over the course of the last fifteen years, and has been ignored time after time. Why? Is the LC14 land really unique and worth causing the slow death of a market town for? Of course not. The solution is: A number of landowners owning land in Ellers Field to the north of Station Road wish to develop their land for housing and have promised to put 30% of the proceeds back into the community to fund a new health centre and car parking in the town centre. They have identified a suitable site, and the owner is willing to make it available. At a stroke the problems identified above will be solved “ Epworth will have enough housing for the life of the local plan, including 20% affordable; the new health facilities will be held in trust for the community (not to benefit individual doctors). The CCG has indicated that it will be able to fund ongoing maintenance costs for the GPs; the car parking will make Epworth much more pleasant to pause and wander about in, encouraging more visitors and helping the town centre to thrive in difficult times.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							NLC should be planning for housing close to where job opportunities will be, but this is not the case. 50Ha of land at Sandtoft is included in the plan for industrial development. Additionally, there are big plans for expanding Doncaster airport, both of which will create thousands of new jobs. Epworth is ideally situated to take advantage of these new opportunities if new housing is provided for. Instead, smaller, more remote, less sustainable settlements have been allocated much larger development (such as Brigg and Kirton in Lindsey). This makes no sense at all. A number of objections have been made in the past, which can easily be refuted: 1. Drainage/flooding I have every sympathy with anyone whose house floods. Some have claimed that the drains/sewers can't cope with any more housing, but this is untrue. The sewers can cope with additional housing. They were upgraded around fifteen years ago to cope with hundreds of houses that were never built. On one occasion, the sewers were blocked by people flushing things that shouldn't be flushed, and on another occasion it was found that a drainage pump was either broken or not powerful enough. The main cause of flooding issues is people blocking the drainage dykes. Cllr Tim Mitchell is, I understand, fully aware of this issue. In one place the dyke has been filled in completely and a chicken hutch built on top of it; and in another the dyke has been piped and filled, but the pipe is far too narrow and restricts the flow in periods of heavy rain. Either the drainage board or NLC should be responsible for sorting this out. It would be a straightforward matter of digging a dyke along the bottom of the site and connecting it to the main drain. Together with a sensible SuDS system for the development, there should be no problems with flooding. 2. Schools Some have said the schools are full and can't cope with more students. However, the only reason the schools are anywhere near full is because they are being bussed in from outside the LEA catchment area. 30 of last year's new year 7 intake were from outside. This has been the case for a number of years. Approximately 20-25% of students (around 200) at the Academy are bussed in from outside the catchment area. Clearly, as time goes by it will get harder and harder to fill the school with local children. It also means that should the Station Road site be fully developed, there will be sufficient space for any new students. It should be remembered that it will take several years to build out the entire site, so there won't be a sudden rush for local services, just a gradual increase. 3. Station Road is too busy and narrow Firstly, Station Road is not a busy road especially compared to the A161. The road will be widened in front of the site and a footpath added to the north side of the road. Also, it is proposed that a car park will be provided for the use of the Baptist Chapel. As anyone who travels along Station Road at times of chapel services will know, this is the cause of the serious traffic issues along the road. The car park will take all the extra vehicles off the road.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0363	Ian Ransford	POLICY HE2: AREA OF SPECIAL HISTORIC LANDSCAPE INTEREST	object	no	no	yes	The Council has to be realistic in its assessment of landscape value, otherwise no development will ever happen in Epworth as the development limits are drawn so tightly and all possible infill has taken place. The council is ignoring a once-in-a-lifetime development opportunity off Station Road, whereby the developers wish to provide the housing Epworth needs over the life of the plan AND will fund new car parking and health facilities in the town centre. All Epworth's problems solved. Yet the council make LC14 a holy grail that cannot be developed - unless it suits the council's purpose (Yealand Flats!) Face the facts - the land off Station Road is below the crest of a hill, so cannot be seen from the north or from Station Road. Part of the site is brownfield and already has a large industrial building on it, so the "open field" setting is already compromised - add to that C W Fields' factory buildings to the east and the fact that much of the land is no longer agricultural - it is fenced off for equestrian use. As if that wasn't enough, there has been a container on the land for years, and there are now two stable buildings in the field. How is any of this of "special historic landscape interest"? There has been development in Ellers field for many years. In my view, as long as it doesn't impinge upon the views from the footpath to the north of Ellers field (at the top of the hill, where there are wide open views, then let's be sensible and develop the lower part and do what's right for Epworth, not just for a dozen nimbies.	justified	Include the wider Station Road & town centre developments to fix Epworth	no		
0247	Ian Ransford	POLICY HP1-25: LAND AT YEALAND FLATS	object	yes	no	yes	This is a greenfield in Ellers Field in LC14 land. The footpath on the south side of the site has a clear view of Maw's Mill, which will be completely clocked out if it is developed. The junction will tip more traffic onto the busy main road. There is a much more suitable brownfield site off Station Road. Brownfield sites should always be developed in preference to greenfield. In addition, at Station Road, there will be little impact on the view of Maw's Mill as the site has already been developed and has a large industrial building on it, and hedges and trees surrounding it. Further, the view of the mill has already been compromised by factory units immediately below the mill. There are also much bigger problems in Epworth which NLC are completely ignoring: 1. The lack of housing - there has been little development in Epworth for many years. This local plan does absolutely nothing to provide the affordable housing the town needs to prevent local youngsters from being forced to leave town to set up homes. 2. The out of date and inadequate health facilities - the surgery was built to cope with less than half the number of patients it currently services. GP appointments for many Epworth residents have to be serviced by satellite surgeries in the surrounding villages, which causes unnecessary distress, expense and wasted time for the patients and has knock-on effects for other villages, including traffic problems. This won't be solved by some	justified	I do not believe the Yealand Flats site is suitable for development. It should be removed from the plan and replaced with the brownfield site off Station Road. Furthermore, I believe the wider site on Station Road should also be included in the plan, together with the town centre site identified and available for the new health centre and car parking as it would go a long way towards solving Epworth's problems.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							pathetic little "wellbeing hub." People need access to proper health care, not just a chat and a leaflet. 3. There is a chronic shortage of car parking in Epworth. This has been known for years and yet NLC is completely unwilling to solve the issue. This keeps people from coming into town. As a result, shops are struggling and going out of business. It's hard enough for shopkeepers as it is. Why is NLC punishing those in Epworth? NLC's policy is to support and encourage market towns, yet it has disgracefully abandoned Epworth in favour of smaller and less sustainable settlements. With an ageing demographic, further pressure will be placed on health facilities if there is no investment and development in Epworth. The schools only survive by bussing in around 20-25% of their intake from outside the local education area authority. Epworth is ideally placed to take advantage of new jobs created by the proposed industrial development at Sandtoft and Doncaster airport, yet there is no housing provision in the local plan. There is a perfectly suitable site off Station Road. The landowners want to make an unprecedented contribution to the community by providing a new health centre and car parking for the community and NLC just keep ignoring it. I can understand the desire to protect valuable heritage land, but if there is to be any development in Epworth, some will have to be built on. It's a question of which is the best site and what are the benefits in mitigation. The Station Road site shows little or nothing of the open field system. In fact, much of it is fenced off and is being used for equestrian uses. Buildings have encroached into Ellers Field for years, most recently the extension to Fields' factory, which forced NLC to redraw the development boundary! Yealand Flats is not a solution. Epworth will continue to struggle unless there is a serious long term plan. It needs housing and investment in community facilities and the only was to do this is by development of the most suitable site.					
Rachael **Reddin** on behalf of Barnetby le Wold Parish Council												
0828	Rachael Reddin on behalf of Barnetby le Wold Parish Council	POLICY EC1-7: LAND AT SOUTH OF BARNETBY TOP INTERCHANGE AND TO THE WEST OF THE A18					Hi There, Thank you for the extension to the deadline, Barnetby Parish Council have met to discuss their comment in respect of the Local Plan please see the following comments for consideration: On each site shown on local plan that affect Barnetby le Wold – (H1P-19, EC1-8 and EC1-7), it has been requested that the waterways and sewerage and highway infrastructures MUST be improved updated before any major developments are initiated and the due to current systems not being adequate.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0829	Rachael Reddin on behalf of Barnetby le Wold Parish Council	POLICY EC1-8: LAND AT SOUTH OF BARNETBY TOP INTERCHANGE AND TO THE EAST OF THE A18					Hi There, Thank you for the extension to the deadline, Barnetby Parish Council have met to discuss their comment in respect of the Local Plan please see the following comments for consideration: On each site shown on local plan that affect Barnetby le Wold – (H1P-19, EC1-8 and EC1-7), it has been requested that the waterways and sewerage and highway infrastructures MUST be improved updated before any major developments are initiated and the due to current systems not being adequate.					View PDF
0839	Rachael Reddin on behalf of Barnetby le Wold Parish Council	POLICY H1P-19: LAND AT KINGS ROAD					Hi There, Thank you for the extension to the deadline, Barnetby Parish Council have met to discuss their comment in respect of the Local Plan please see the following comments for consideration: On each site shown on local plan that affect Barnetby le Wold – (H1P-19, EC1-8 and EC1-7), it has been requested that the waterways and sewerage and highway infrastructures MUST be improved updated before any major developments are initiated and the due to current systems not being adequate.					View PDF
Sallyanne **Reed**												
0404	Sallyanne Reed	Evidence Base	Object				Dear NLC, I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to the Barton upon Humber Link/Relief Road Evidence Base addendum and the extended comments deadline of 3/12/21: The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: “To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGVs, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation.” The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							review/consultation process. Please can you acknowledge receipt of this email.					
0451	Sallyanne Reed	Paragraph 14.47					The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0491	Sallyanne Reed	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS					Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0685	Sallyanne Reed	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES					I just wanted to say that I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Hugh **Rees**												
0007	Hugh Rees	Paragraph 4.102	object	yes	no	yes	Suggestion to include land in the Brigg Development Area I am suggesting the inclusion in the Brigg Development Area of part of a plot of land on Westrum Lane (Land Registry title number HS295478). It submitted the site as ref CFS0300105. The area suggested for inclusion is of the same level of flood risk assessment as existing housing on Westrum Lane. A general national requirement of Five-Year housing Supply land availability assessments is for the inclusion of smaller sites. This is considered to be a pivot to a more sophisticated approach to identifying sites for housing development, so delivering the overarching planning approach of making better places. The suggested area for inclusion in the Brigg Development Area is well aligned with this general approach.	Consistent with national policy	Suggestion to include land in the Brigg Development Area I am suggesting the inclusion in the Brigg Development Area of part of a plot of land on Westrum Lane (Land Registry title number HS295478). It submitted the site as ref CFS0300105. The suggestion is to include only part of the plot of land, as the lower-lying portion has been considered in the Strategic Flood Assessment to be at greater risk of flooding. The boundary is defined by the natural landscape. The initial	Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									outline concept is for the area of greater flooding risk to become a natural area for play, amenities, and conducive to protect and enhance the natural conservation/ wildlife habitat and its biodiversity, as well as existing hedgerows and large trees. The provision of open space / green space is for the social viability, and quality of life in a rich variety of aspects supporting the residents for their well-being, so that is a place where people can thrive, flourish, and are happy. This appears well aligned with the approach of A Green Future, and also in accordance with policies SS7-1, DQE2, DQE3, DQE5, DQE6, DQE9, DQE11, DQE12, CSC1 and CSC3. The portion of the plot suggested for inclusion is of the same level of flood risk assessment as the existing housing on Westrum Lane.			
0009	Hugh Rees	Paragraph 4.102	object	yes	no	yes	This representation is additional / supplementary to response R19040007. In that representation, I incorrectly replied that I did not wish to attend a hearing session. This representation is only to correct my earlier representation; I now wish to attend any hearing session. The suggested land to include in the Brigg Development Area is all within Strategic Flood Assessment Zone 1 There are areas that have designated for housing development at Brigg which have part of their area in Strategic Flood Assessment zones 2/3A i.e. at a higher risk of flooding.	justified	The representation is to include land on Westrum Lane, Brigg in the Brigg Development Area. Please see Representation R19040007	yes	To be able to put forward / answer any questions regarding - the suggested amend to include land on Westrum Lane in the Brigg Development Area, - and also for a site to be included for housing development	View PDF
James **Rigby**, Globe Consultants Limited on behalf of Globe Consultants Limited												
0108	James Rigby, Globe Consultants Limited on	POLICY EC1: EMPLOYMENT LAND SUPPLY	support	yes	yes	yes	Representations made by Globe Consultants on behalf of Brocklesby Estate. These representations do not focus on an assessment of the legal compliance of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft or	Consistent with national policy	Whilst these representations have been prepared place on record Brocklesby Estate's continued support of both draft	yes	Brocklesby Estate wish to retain the option to appear at the examination	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	behalf of Globe Consultants Limited						whether the Council has satisfied its statutory Duty to Cooperate, instead Brocklesby Estate wish to make specific representations on soundness. Specifically, these representations focus on Policy EC1: Employment Land Supply, Policy EC1-7: Land at south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the west of the A18, and Policy EC1-8: Land at south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the east of the A18. These representations have been prepared place on record Brocklesby Estate continued support of both draft Allocated Employment Sites (EC1-7 and EC1-8). Draft Allocated Employment Sites EC1-7 and EC1-8 are informed by the evidence base which supports the NLLPPD, including the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (˜SHELAA), Council Plan, Economic Growth Plan, the emerging Local Industrial Strategy and the Local Economic Assessment. It is also noted that the Council have also published an Employment Allocations Topic Paper (EATP) as part of the suite of evidence base documents released in conjunction with ˜Regulation 19 consultation on the NLLPPD. A key consideration of the NLLPD evidence base " most notably the SHELAA 2021 " is to ensure that the future requirements of all employment sectors are met. To this end, the available employment land stock in North Lincolnshire has been considered by the Council alongside land requirements, economic forecasts, and new potential employment sites. This has led to those sites which are seen to best meet predicted future demands for employment land to be recommended to be considered for inclusion in the NLLPPD, and sites which are seen to be unsuitable or surplus to anticipated requirements to be recommended for de-allocation or not included. The EATP states that as part of previous consultations on the emerging Local Plan there was broad support for continuation of the existing strategic locational approach taken in the adopted North Lincolnshire Core Strategy. Of direct relevance to the emerging allocation is further reference within the EATP which states that main transport corridors were highlighted as the preferred strategic locations for future growth outside of Scunthorpe and the market towns " the EATP confirms that, in a North Lincolnshire context, this would relate to land alongside or near to, the M180/M181, A180, A160, A18, A15, the A1077 Scunthorpe orbital, the Cleethorpes to Doncaster railway line and Humberside Airport. Draft Allocated Employment Sites EC1-7 and EC1-8 represent highly accessible locations served by the M180/A180, A18, and A15 trunk roads as well as being in close proximity to Humberside Airport and, therefore, their emerging allocation is consistent with the Council's stated preferred strategic locations for future growth. Accordingly, it is considered that the NLLPD is positively prepared and justified forming an appropriate strategy which is based on proportionate evidence and as well as a robust assessment of reasonable alternatives. Moreover, the emerging allocation is considered to be effective and deliverable over the plan period. In terms of the final test of soundness, draft Allocated Employment Sites EC1-7 and EC1-8 are considered to be consistent with national policy enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the		Allocated Employment Sites (EC1-7 and EC1-8), it is noted that there is a discrepancy between the site references included in Policies EC1, EC1-7, and EC1-8 and Inset Map 05 (Barnetby le Wold). Draft Allocated Employment Site EC1-7 (Land at south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the west of the A18) as identified as EC1-8 on Inset Map 05. Draft Allocated Employment Site EC1-8 (Land at south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the east of the A18) as identified as EC1-7 on Inset Map 05. Inset Map 05 is reproduced at Paragraph 6.62 and 6.67 of the NLLPD. The site references set out on Inset Map 05 are incorrect and not consistent with Policies EC1-7, and EC1-8. It is respectfully requested that Inset Map 05, Paragraphs 6.62 and 6.67 of the NLLP are modified to show the correct site references.		hearing sessions in order to respond to any issued identified by the Inspector or representations made by third parties (if necessary).	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (Napa) and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant.					
0109	James Rigby, Globe Consultants Limited on behalf of Globe Consultants Limited	POLICY EC1-7: 1.	support	yes	yes	yes	Representations made by Globe Consultants on behalf of Brocklesby Estate. These representations do not focus on an assessment of the legal compliance of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft (NLLPPD) or whether the Council has satisfied its statutory Duty to Cooperate, instead Brocklesby Estate wish to make specific representations on soundness. Specifically, these representations focus on Policy EC1: Employment Land Supply, Policy EC1-7: Land at south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the west of the A18, and Policy EC1-8: Land at south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the east of the A18. These representations have been prepared place on record Brocklesby Estate's continued support of both draft Allocated Employment Sites (EC1-7 and EC1-8). The emerging allocation of Draft Allocated Employment Site EC1-7 is informed by the evidence base which supports the NLLPPD, including the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), Council Plan, Economic Growth Plan, the emerging Local Industrial Strategy and the Local Economic Assessment. It is also noted that the Council have also published an Employment Allocations Topic Paper (EATP) as part of the suite of evidence base documents released in conjunction with Regulation 19 consultation on the NLLPPD. A key consideration of the NLLPD evidence base " most notably the SHELAA 2021" is to ensure that the future requirements of all employment sectors are met. To this end, the available employment land stock in North Lincolnshire has been considered by the Council alongside land requirements, economic forecasts, and new potential employment sites. This has led to those sites which are seen to best meet predicted future demands for employment land to be recommended to be considered for inclusion in the NLLPPD, and sites which are seen to be unsuitable or surplus to anticipated requirements to be recommended for de-allocation or not included. The EATP states that as part of previous consultations on the emerging Local Plan there was broad support for continuation of the existing strategic locational approach taken in the adopted North Lincolnshire Core Strategy. Of direct relevance to the emerging allocation is further reference within the EATP which states that main transport corridors were highlighted as the preferred strategic locations for future growth outside of Scunthorpe and the market towns " the EATP confirms that, in a North Lincolnshire context, this would relate to land alongside or near to, the M180/M181, A180, A160, A18, A15, the A1077 Scunthorpe orbital, the Cleethorpes to Doncaster railway line and Humberside Airport. Draft Allocated Employment Site EC1-7 represents a highly accessible location served by the M180/A180, A18, and A15 trunk roads as well as being in close proximity to Humberside Airport and, therefore, its emerging allocation is consistent with the Council's stated preferred strategic locations for future growth.	Consistent with national policy	Whilst these representations have been prepared place on record Brocklesby Estate's continued support of both draft Allocated Employment Sites (EC1-7 and EC1-8), it is noted that there is a discrepancy between the site references included in Policies EC1, EC1-7, and EC1-8 and Inset Map 05 (Barnetby le Wold). Draft Allocated Employment Site EC1-7 (Land at south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the west of the A18) as identified as EC1-8 on Inset Map 05. Draft Allocated Employment Site EC1-8 (Land at south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the east of the A18) as identified as EC1-7 on Inset Map 05. Inset Map 05 is reproduced at Paragraph 6.62 and 6.67 of the NLLPD. The site references set out on Inset Map 05 are incorrect and not consistent with Policies EC1-7, and EC1-8. It is respectfully requested that Inset Map 05, Paragraphs 6.62 and 6.67 of the NLLP are modified to show the correct site references.	yes	Brocklesby Estate wish to retain the option to appear at the examination hearing sessions in order to respond to any issued identified by the Inspector or representations made by third parties (if necessary).	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Accordingly, it is considered that the NLLPD is positively prepared and justified forming an appropriate strategy which is based on proportionate evidence and as well as a robust assessment of reasonable alternatives. Moreover, the emerging allocation is considered to be effective and deliverable over the plan period. In terms of the final test of soundness, draft Allocated Employment Site EC1-7 is considered to be consistent with national policy enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant. The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and provides guidance on how these should be applied across seventeen main chapters. Providing safe and secure overnight parking for HGVs is a priority for the Government with the following statement provided at NPPF Paragraph 109: 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. Alongside the NPPF, Written Ministerial Statements 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. 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. 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. 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.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							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. Of further relevance is the WMS published on 22 June 2021 (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.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0110	James Rigby, Globe Consultants Limited on behalf of Globe Consultants Limited	POLICY EC1-8: 1.	support	yes	yes	yes	Representations made by Globe Consultants on behalf of Brocklesby Estate. These representations do not focus on an assessment of the legal compliance of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft (NLLPPD) or whether the Council has satisfied its statutory Duty to Cooperate, instead Brocklesby Estate wish to make specific representations on soundness. Specifically, these representations focus on Policy EC1: Employment Land Supply, Policy EC1-7: Land at south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the west of the A18, and Policy EC1-8: Land at south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the east of the A18. These representations have been prepared place on record Brocklesby Estate's continued support of both draft Allocated Employment Sites (EC1-7 and EC1-8). The emerging allocation of Draft Allocated Employment Site EC1-8 is informed by the evidence base which supports the NLLPPD, including the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), Council Plan, Economic Growth Plan, the emerging Local Industrial Strategy and the Local Economic Assessment. It is also noted that the Council have also published an Employment Allocations Topic Paper (EATP) as part of the suite of evidence base documents released in conjunction with Regulation 19 consultation on the NLLPPD. A key consideration of the NLLPD evidence base " most notably the SHELAA 2021 " is to ensure that the future requirements of all employment sectors are met. To this end, the available employment land stock in North Lincolnshire has been considered by the Council alongside land requirements, economic forecasts, and new potential employment sites. This has led to those sites which are seen to best meet predicted future demands for employment land to be recommended to be considered for inclusion in the NLLPPD, and sites which are seen to be unsuitable or surplus to anticipated requirements to be recommended for de-allocation or not included. The EATP states that as part of previous consultations on the emerging Local Plan there was broad support for continuation of the existing strategic locational approach taken in the adopted North Lincolnshire Core Strategy. Of direct relevance to the emerging allocation is further reference within the EATP which states that main transport corridors were highlighted as the preferred strategic locations for future growth outside of Scunthorpe and the market towns " the EATP confirms that, in a North Lincolnshire context, this would relate to land alongside or near to, the M180/M181, A180, A160, A18, A15, the A1077 Scunthorpe orbital, the Cleethorpes to Doncaster railway line and Humberside Airport. Draft Allocated Employment Site EC1-8 represents a highly accessible location served by the M180/A180, A18, and A15 trunk roads as well as being in close proximity to Humberside Airport and, therefore, its emerging allocation is consistent with the Council's stated preferred strategic locations for future growth. Accordingly, it is considered that the NLLPD is positively prepared and justified forming an appropriate strategy which is based on proportionate evidence and as well as a robust assessment of reasonable alternatives.	Consistent with national policy	Whilst these representations have been prepared place on record Brocklesby Estate's continued support of both draft Allocated Employment Sites (EC1-7 and EC1-8), it is noted that there is a discrepancy between the site references included in Policies EC1, EC1-7, and EC1-8 and Inset Map 05 (Barnetby le Wold). Draft Allocated Employment Site EC1-7 (Land at south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the west of the A18) as identified as EC1-8 on Inset Map 05. Draft Allocated Employment Site EC1-8 (Land at south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the east of the A18) as identified as EC1-7 on Inset Map 05. Inset Map 05 is reproduced at Paragraph 6.62 and 6.67 of the NLLPD. The site references set out on Inset Map 05 are incorrect and not consistent with Policies EC1-7, and EC1-8. It is respectfully requested that Inset Map 05, Paragraphs 6.62 and 6.67 of the NLLP are modified to show the correct site references.	yes	Brocklesby Estate wish to retain the option to appear at the examination hearing sessions in order to respond to any issued identified by the Inspector or representations made by third parties (if necessary).	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Moreover, the emerging allocation is considered to be effective and deliverable over the plan period. In terms of the final test of soundness, draft Allocated Employment Site EC1-8 is considered to be consistent with national policy enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant. The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and provides guidance on how these should be applied across seventeen main chapters. Chapter 6 of the NPPF seeks to develop a strong and competitive economy and, accordingly, identifies that Planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt (Paragraph 81). NPPF Paragraph 82(b) sets out that planning policies should identify sites for local and inward investment to match the strategy and to meet anticipated needs over the plan period. NPPF Paragraph 83 expects that planning policies should recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors. This includes making provision for clusters or networks of knowledge and data-driven, creative or high technology industries; and for storage and distribution operations at a variety of scales and in suitably accessible locations. The latter is of particular relevance to draft Allocated Employment Site EC1-8 given the fact that, strategically, the site is very well positioned on the motorway network relative to Scunthorpe, Immingham, Grimsby, and Hull. 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 Yorkshire, which encompasses energy production and consumption, steel and process engineering, chemicals and associated logistics, and the food sector and food belt corridor from York to Lincoln encompassing growing, logistics, processing and research and development. Given the locational and strategic advantages of the site, it would be reasonable to assume a market requirement for storage and distribution operations " the indicative masterplan submitted to the Council on 1 March 2021 provides for units up to 300,000 square feet, providing a spatial framework which supports a sector specifically identified as a priority within NPPF Paragraph 83.					
Jamie **Roberts**												
0562	Jamie Roberts	POLICY EC1-6: LAND AT NORTH WEST OF THE A15 BARTON INTERCHANGE					Morning, I have previously emailed relevant information and comments pertaining to the proposed employment site at Barton-upon-Humber (please find attached) during the Stage 3 process. I recently attended a consultation (Baysgarth) on the 3rd Nov and discussed my thoughts on this proposed development. Please find a list of concerns (and thoughts) relating to this proposal (referring to your publication 'North Lincolnshire Local Plan Oct 2021':			Yes	In ref. to your Stage 4 proposal 'If you wish to take part in the hearing session(s) you must outline why you think this is necessary, in your representations at this time. The	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							1. Population growth - envisaged that the majority of growth will be >65 in North Lincolnshire; hence, will the majority of employees be from outside of the area (dependent on skills) and hence more car use? 2. Promote a prosperous rural economy through sustainable business growth, agricultural diversification and rural growth that respects the character of the countryside. So building on Grade1 (excellent and rare in this area) Agricultural land is deemed feasible and adjacent to the Barton Wolds on the edge of this proposal? 3. All developments in North Lincolnshire will be planned and designed to the highest possible quality in a way that respects their surroundings. How does the open countryside get preserved and respect their surroundings i.e. will there be a landscape buffer to shield from view (I believe there is the mention of 'screening' from the dwellings on Westfield Road' but how in this scenario? 4. Spatial Objective 5: Supporting Our Rural Areas and Countryside To support strong and flourishing rural communities and countryside by encouraging diversification of the rural economy and retaining and enhancing key local facilities, infrastructure and services whilst promoting appropriate sustainable development in rural settlements which meets local needs and reflects the surrounding environment. Hence how will this development reflect the surrounding environment which is open-countryside. 5. Provide high standards of amenity and privacy, by ensuring the impacts of development on adjacent and nearby properties are minimised. These impacts include noise, odour, fumes, dust or other nuisance, or the effects of overlooking or overshadowing. POLICY SS3: DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES How will this actually be kept to a minimum in this scenario? 6. 4.18 All new development in North Lincolnshire should be of a high quality design and make a positive contribution to its locality and the area as a whole. It should respect and respond to its surroundings, not harm local amenity, and protect local distinctiveness and character. Design and layout should be based on a clear understanding of the characteristics of the site and its context. This includes existing built form, heights, scale, massing, topography etc. Density is closely aligned with design/layout. These should make efficient use of land and resources using appropriate density levels. This could include the use of imaginative designs. I would like to understand how this will conform to the area being proposed for development? 7. 6.61 This area lies within SFRA Flood Zone 1. A Flood Risk Assessment will be required as part of the application process to assess and mitigate the risk of flooding from surface water drainage. Where practical Sustainable Drainage Systems should be incorporated into the				Inspector will decide the most appropriate procedure to hear from members of the public who would like to participate in hearing(s). This may be in writing, or they may invite you to attend and speak at the hearing sessions.' - the answer is 'yes' as I believe I have a 'sound' case (as a resident on Westfield Road) to share my thoughts.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							development. To the north of the site there are a number of residential properties/small holdings. .A comprehensive landscape buffer will need to be provided that effectively screens the business park from the surrounding area including the existing properties to the north located off Westfield Road. States 'a comprehensive landscape buffer will be need to screen the business park from the surrounding area including the properties off Westfield Road' - therefore, how would this be accomplished if this proposal is approved by the inspectorate etc..? i.e. would the proposed entrance (off Gravel Pit lane) be close enough to the main A1077 and future initial developments be situated adjacent to the A1077 to ensure privacy/screening/noise adheres to policy 6.61 in which case the landscape buffer (assume trees etc..) can grow and act as an actual screening buffer to the residents off Westfield Road? 8. Implementation m. Development of Policy EC1-6 is to be brought forward by the developer. The delivery of the site is expected to be completed by 2025. n. Site specific infrastructure requirements identified for this site in the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule will be implemented within the timescales agreed by the identified lead delivery organisation at the Planning Application stage could you please expand on this point i.e. who will undertake any Site specific Infrastructure implementation? 9. 2. Development will be expected to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. Areas of lower quality agricultural land should be used where the proposals result in the significant development of agricultural land in preference to the best and most versatile agricultural land. As previously stated in point 2, how could the most best and versatile agricultural land (Grade 1) be chosen in this scenario as I am sure there must be other sites (Grade 2/3) which could have served this proposed development? 10. Development proposals should: a. relate well to local topography and the built form and be of an appropriate scale, siting, layout, design, density and use of materials to minimise the impact on the landscape character of the site and its surroundings; How will any new development conform to the local topography in this case i.e. will any new building be at a certain height for example to minimise the impact on the landscape character and it's surroundings? 11. Respect the existing topography, landscape character and identity, and relate well to the site and surroundings, particularly in relation to siting, height, scale, massing, form and lot widths; d. Where applicable, not result in the visual or physical coalescence with any neighbouring settlement;					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Related to para d. again, this goes back to 'how' the existing dwellings off Westfield Road will be totally 'screened' from this proposed business park? 12. Incorporate and retain as far as possible existing natural and historic features such as hedgerows, trees, ponds, boundary walls, field patterns, buildings or structures and watercourses; g. Incorporate appropriate landscape treatment to ensure that the development can be satisfactorily assimilated into the surrounding area; There is already ancient hedgerows surrounding this proposal; hence, I would have assumed these will be retained (and have any gaps filled in to have a continuous corridor for landscape purposes and moreover wildlife etc.. 13. Amenity Considerations 4. The amenities which occupiers of neighbouring properties may reasonably expect to enjoy must not be harmed by or as a result of the development (including extensions to existing premises and change of use). Proposals should demonstrate, where appropriate, how the following matters have been considered, in relation to both the construction and life of the development: a. Compatibility with neighbouring land uses; b. Overlooking; c. Overshadowing; d. Loss of light; e. Adequate storage, sorting and collection of household and commercial waste, including provision for increasing recyclable waste; and, f. Creation of safe environments As stated earlier, how can these points be addressed in regard to the properties off Westfield Road? To summarise, I am not completely objecting to the proposed employment development at Barton-upon-Humber; however, is it the most feasible place to have such a development (to the concerns I have already raised within this email). I understand, it's importance to the Strategic Road Network; however, are there better sites (off the actual A15) i.e. Elsham as an example which already supports such infrastructure and road access etc...and are immediately off the Strategic road network. However, if this proposal is approved (and I want to know if my points I have raised have been acted upon) then I believe it would be realistic and feasible to be able to co-ordinate on any future developments on this site to ensure minimal impact to the surrounding area i.e. it's topography, amenity, visual presence etc... In ref. to your Stage 4 proposal 'If you wish to take part in the hearing session(s) you must outline why you think this is necessary, in your representations at this time. The Inspector will decide the most appropriate procedure to hear from members of the public who would like to participate in hearing(s). This may be in writing, or they may invite					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							you to attend and speak at the hearing sessions.' - the answer is 'yes' as I believe I have a 'sound' case (as a resident on Westfield Road) to share my thoughts.					
Michelle **Robinson**, Barton Willmore on behalf of Barratt Homes Yorkshire East and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East												
0420	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Barratt Homes Yorkshire East and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East	General	object	no	no	no	1. Background Our Client has land interests within the District and is keen to engage with the Council to ensure that a sound and legally compliant Local Plan is brought forward that will ensure the District's development needs are successfully delivered. We have been engaged throughout the local plan process on behalf of our Client and in particular our representations focus upon the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of new homes. Whilst our Client agrees that the Local Plan is legally compliant, there are serious concerns about the soundness of the Plan. Our Client's view is that the Local Plan is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy. The soundness tests are set out at paragraph 35 of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).8. Conclusion and Summary Whilst our Client agrees that the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan is legally compliant, there are serious concerns about the soundness of the Plan as it is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy. It is out Client's view that the current Publication Draft will not meet the soundness tests of NPPF nor offer a sustainable future for the communities of North Lincolnshire. We trust that out Client's comments will be duly considered. We would like to express our interest in attending the Examination in Public should the Council decide to submit the Publication Draft to the Secretary of State in its current format.			Yes	Wish to attend	View PDF
0525	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Barratt Homes Yorkshire East and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East	Policy H1: Site Allocations	object	No	No	No	6. Site Specific Criteria The criteria required by each of the site allocations are very generic, repetitive and are not unique to the individual site's circumstances. Our Client would question whether these criteria are justified or effective. Some of the criteria are more of a validation requirement at a planning application stage and it is unclear in what circumstances an application would be approved or refused e.g. the requirement of a comprehensive landscaping scheme, including biodiversity enhancement. This bring ambiguity into the policy in terms of what is or is not acceptable to the local planning authority and is likely to bring unnecessary delays into the decision making process. As drafted the Plan is not effective. In addition, whilst the implementation criteria is well intentioned, it is not clear how this will be effective or enforceable at a planning application or site implementation stage. Our Client maintains that in order to be effective, this criteria should be deleted and instead policy introduced which will enable the delivery of suitable, unallocated sites to come forward to help ensure that a sufficient and adequate supply of housing is maintained.			Yes	Wish to attend	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0623	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Barratt Homes Yorkshire East and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East	POLICY H2: HOUSING MIX AND DENSITY	object	No	No	No	5. Density NPPF is clear that policies should make the most effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses. Our Client would wish to raise the deliverability of some of the densities set out within Policy H2 which proposes densities as high as 70 dwellings per net hectare in Scunthorpe town centre to as low as 20 dwellings per net hectare in the rural hamlets and villages. Having had regard to the individual site allocations and draft Policy TC2 Placemaking and Good Urban Design, our Client would seriously question whether the yield and density assumptions made are effective. It would appear that some of the density assumptions have been applied to the gross site area and hasn't had regard to any site constraints or the need for on site policy requirements by way of example: • H1P – 23, Mill Road, gross site area 1.05ha with a yield of 52 (almost 50 dwellings per hectare) on a very narrow site. Paragraph 5.110 suggests the site could achieve 57 dwellings (almost 55 dwellings per hectare). In order to be effective, the Plan should also set out the net site area so it is clear how the site specific and density requirements have been calculated. This will help to ensure there is sufficient housing being identified to meet housing needs.			Yes	Wish to attend	View PDF
0629	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Barratt Homes Yorkshire East and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East	POLICY H3: AFFORDABLE HOUSING	object	No	No	No	7. Affordable Housing Whilst our Client does not object to the delivery of 10% affordable housing on sites, it must be fully justified by robust viability evidence alongside all other policy requirements set out within the draft Plan. We would again question whether the density assumptions applied are realistic and whether applying such a high assumption is having an inadvertently positive impact on viability which is not realistic or justified. Our Client supports the flexibility offered by Policy ID1 Delivering Infrastructure however, as drafted criteria 4 does not align with CIL Regulations in terms of the S106 tests.			Yes	Wish to attend	View PDF
0660	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Barratt Homes Yorkshire East and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	object	No	No	No	Policies SS2 and SS5 refer to a significantly reduced figure of 7,128 new homes. Policy SS5 then also seeks to apply an uplift of 10% to ensure the delivery within the first five years to 7,326 dwellings. Our Client sees this as a serious flaw in the Publication Draft local plan. It is unclear from the Sustainability Appraisal whether the housing need figure in Policy SS2 and SS5 has been appraised by the Sustainability Appraisal and why there is an apparent reduction in the housing need figure from 8,380 to 7,326 new homes. Similarly, the Preferred Options consultation of the emerging Plan proposed 7,961 new homes. Based on the evidence of inability to meet 5-year housing land supply and housing delivery test, it is our Client's view that the Council should be aiming to meet 8,380 dwellings and should be allocating additional housing sites or introduce a policy for determining unallocated site to ensure this is met and the Plan is positively prepared,			Yes	Wish to attend	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							effective and justified.					
0672	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Barratt Homes Yorkshire East and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East	POLICY SS5: OVERALL HOUSING PROVISION	object	no	no	no	Having considered the evidence within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, it is agreed that North Lincolnshire is a self-contained housing market area. Our Client supports the use of the Government's standard methodology to determine a baseline for North Lincolnshire's housing needs to 2038 and then to apply an uplift. The Publication draft Plan outlines that one of the key challenges facing the Council is providing a sufficient supply of housing land and quality of homes. Our Client wholly agrees with this statement. Table 4.1 of the Publication Draft demonstrates that the Council is failing to meet housing need. Our Client wishes to point out that there is a typographical error in the table and for 2019-20 this should read 396 not 369 as per paragraph 4.35 of the draft Plan. The Housing Delivery Test is therefore more precarious than is identified. The Council's Action Plan should consider the need to introduce a 10% uplift across the full plan period to ensure flexibility or to include a policy approach that will be supportive of suitable, unallocated developments coming forward across the District. The evidence is clear that North Lincolnshire has not delivered the number of homes it requires. This situation is further exacerbated as the Council has been unable to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land for a number of years, particularly in light of the new definition of deliverable set out in Annex 2 of the NPPF. In light of this and the HDT results, our Client considers that the Council should allocate more sites for housing or introduce a policy to deal with unallocated sites in order to ensure a Local Plan which is effective. The number of dwellings which the Council is seeking to deliver by the end of the Plan period is also unclear. The Plan's spatial vision on page 34 sets out that 8,380 new homes will be delivered. This would ensure sufficient flexibility in terms of meeting housing needs . This is an issue which is also throughout the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken for the Local Plan. On page 50 of the Sustainability Appraisal, the delivery of 8,380 is deemed positive in the short, medium and longer term. Similarly on page 54 of the Sustainability Appraisal, the provision of over 8,000 homes is referenced.			Yes	Wish to attend	View PDF
0420	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Barratt Homes Yorkshire East and David Wilson Homes Yorkshire East	POLICY SS5: OVERALL HOUSING PROVISION	object	No	No	No	Policies SS2 and SS5 refer to a significantly reduced figure of 7,128 new homes. Policy SS5 then also seeks to apply an uplift of 10% to ensure the delivery within the first five years to 7,326 dwellings.Our Client sees this as a serious flaw in the Publication Draft local plan. It is unclear from the Sustainability Appraisal whether the housing need figure in Policy SS2 and SS5 has been appraised by the Sustainability Appraisal and why there is an apparent reduction in the housing need figure from 8,380 to 7,326 new homes. Similarly, the Preferred Options consultation of the emerging Plan proposed 7,961 new homes. Based on the evidence of inability to meet 5-year housing land supply and housing delivery test, it is our Client's view that the Council should be aiming to meet 8,380 dwellings and should be			Yes	Wish to attend	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							allocating additional housing sites or introduce a policy for determining unallocated site to ensure this is met and the Plan is positively prepared, effective and justified.3. Delivering a Sufficient Supply of HomesNPPF is clear that in order to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed. Paragraph 68 requires strategic policy making authorities to have a clear understanding of the land available and identify a supply of:a) Specific, deliverable sites for the first five years of the plan period;b) Specific, developable sites or broad locations of growth for years 6-10 and years 11-15.Policy SS5 acknowledges that 2,379 dwellings already benefit from planning permission. Having considered the contents of Appendix 7: Housing Trajectory, it is not possible to determine the likely delivery of sites which already benefit from planning permission. Our Client believes that this is a serious omission in the evidence base and it is therefore not possible to determine whether the Council is identifying sufficient amount of specific, deliverable sites for the first five years or specific developable sites or broad locations of growth for years 6-10 and years 11-15. It is also unclear whether the approach to determining deliverable sites in in line with the definition in Annex 2 of NPPF or indeed whether the build out rates are realistic. Based on our experience of five-year land supply position statements with North Lincolnshire Council, many of the dwellings with planning permission are unlikely to be deliverable. Our Client would therefore welcome the opportunity to comment on the sites which currently underpin Appendix 7. On this basis it is not possible to determine whether Plan is effective or consistent with national policy.There is no policy within the emerging Plan that would consider any potential windfall development opportunities which may arise. The Plan is not effective in its ability to main a sufficient and adequate supply of new homes.					
Michelle **Robinson**, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea Land Epworth Limited												
0436	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea Land Epworth Limited	General					On behalf of our Client, Millea Land (Epworth) Limited, we write in response to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft which is currently out for consultation until 26th November 2021. Millea Land (Epworth) Limited are working on the behalf of the landowner east of Belton Road, Epworth. 1. Background Our Client has land interests within Epworth and is keen to engage with the Council to ensure that a sound and legally compliant Local Plan is brought forward that will ensure the District's development needs are successfully delivered. We have been engaged throughout the local plan process on behalf of our Client and in particular our representations focus upon the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of new homes. Whilst our Client agrees that the Local Plan is legally compliant, there are serious concerns about the soundness of the Plan. Our Client's view is that					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							the Local Plan is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy. The soundness tests are set out at paragraph 35 of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).					
0435	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea Land Epworth Limited	General- Conclusion and Summary					Conclusion and Summary Whilst our Client agrees that the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan is legally compliant, there are serious concerns about the soundness of the Plan as it is not positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy. It is out Client's view that the current Publication Draft will not meet the soundness tests of NPPF nor offer a sustainable future for the communities of North Lincolnshire. We trust that out Client's comments will be duly considered. We would like to express our interest in attending the Examination in Public should the Council decide to submit the Publication Draft to the Secretary of State in its current format.					View PDF
0582	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea Land Epworth Limited	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS					Land East of Belton Road, Epworth Our Client's site is bound to the west by Belton Road and extends as far as Fairview Cottage and Peter's Poultry. The site includes the site of the existing Holmes and Gardens Garden Centre and associated car parking which is to the north of the Epworth defined shopping centre. Along the eastern boundary of the Site, land is protected and identified as part of the Green Infrastructure network which will provide a strong, mature landscape buffer to any future development. Part of the site falls within the development limits for Epworth and is outside of the conservation area. There are several listed buildings within the conservation area therefore the Setting of both the listed buildings and the conservation area is important and these will be fully considered as our Client's scheme progresses in accordance with the development plan. Our Client is proposing a mixed use scheme on the site which includes: • Relocation of the garden centre (9,000 sq ft internal, 7,340 sq ft external); • A retail convenience store (19,500 sq ft) and four retail units (1x2,500sq ft and 4 x 5,000 sq ft); • Business / office space (4,000 sq ft); • Older persons' specialist accommodation (70 beds); • 69 Residential units (mix of 2, 3, 4 and 5 beds) which will include policy compliant affordable homes; and the • Relocation of the GP medical centre (10,000 sq ft). Our Client is keen that any future development of this site meet the needs and aspirations of the community of Epworth. This includes housing which will meet development needs but also offices and employment spaces to support jobs and the economy. This is particularly important during the current climate as more people choose to work closer to home. Opportunities can also be secured to support retailers and business and introduce complimentary uses to support the viability and vitality of Epworth town centre. This can be supported through additional car parking which has been raised as an issue. Furthermore, new					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							development will support services and facilities within Epworth which are so important to the community including local schools. It is understood that the community are seeking a community orchard. There are opportunities through partnering with the Garden Centre for example and could either be achieved on site or secured via a financial contribution from the development. The relocation of the garden centre and retention on the wider site will retain the business and jobs within Epworth whilst also providing an updated building and free car parking. Our Client believes that in order to meet the development needs of North Lincolnshire and to ensure a sustainable and prosperous future for Epworth that our Client's land should be allocated for the above uses. The addition of this omission site will ensure that the draft Plan is positively prepared, justified and effective. We continue to promote this site through dialogue with the Council's planning and strategic development team.					
0604	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea Land Epworth Limited	POLICY H1P-27: LAND AT FORMER RAF KIRTON IN LINDSEY					6. Housing Allocation at Former RAF Base, Kirton in Lindsay Our Client acknowledges the allocation for approximately 302 dwellings on the former RAF base at Kirton in Lindsay. Whilst our Client agrees that this is a brownfield site which should be brought back into an active use, our Client has concerns about the deliverability of the site. It is understood that the planning consent has lapsed and whilst it is being currently marketed, there is little appetite from the market to bring it forward. In addition, the scale of the scale of the site in such a remote location brings significant concerns in terms of sustainable development. Paragraph 5.128 of the draft Plan acknowledges that the allocation is in the open countryside, with rural views. There are no services or facilities easily accessible and on this basis, our Client's view is this site should be redeveloped for a more suitable use which would bring benefits to the rural economy and not an isolated residential estate in the countryside. For these reasons, our Client objects to this allocation as being unsound.					View PDF
0633	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea Land Epworth Limited	Policy H4: Specialist and Supported Housing					Affordable and Older Person's Housing Our Client concurs with paragraph 5.186 that North Lincolnshire has an above average population of persons aged 65 or over. Therefore Policy H4: Specialist and Supported Housing and Policy H5: Housing for Older People are welcomed, particular in view of land east of Belton Road. Paragraph 5.190 of the Publication draft Local Plan acknowledges the significant rise of the resident population aged 65-84 years and projects that it is set to rise by 37.2% and aged 85 plus by 125% within the next 20 years (almost this Plan period). Our Client therefore believes that the approach advocated is insufficient to meet this growing need. Currently, the draft Plan allocates 210 dwellings for older people including 20 dwellings at Yealand Flats, Epworth. Our Client suggests that this approach is not positively prepared as it will not meet the area's need for older person's accommodation. Instead, further allocations for older persons accommodation should be identified or flexibility included within Policy H5 to allow for suitable proposals outside of development limits to come forward where there is an identified need.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							An alternative to this approach would be to incorporate explicit reference to older persons accommodation into the Rural Exceptions policy as also being an exception where a local need is identified.					
0634	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea Land Epworth Limited	Policy H5: Housing for Older People					Affordable and Older Person's HousingOur Client concurs with paragraph 5.186 that North Lincolnshire has an above average population of persons aged 65 or over. Therefore Policy H4: Specialist and Supported Housing and Policy H5: Housing for Older People are welcomed, particular in view of land east of Belton Road.Paragraph 5.190 of the Publication draft Local Plan acknowledges the significant rise of the resident population aged 65-84 years and projects that it is set to rise by 37.2% and aged 85 plus by 125% within the next 20 years (almost this Plan period). Our Client therefore believes that the approach advocated is insufficient to meet this growing need. Currently, the draft Plan allocates 210 dwellings for older people including 20 dwellings at Yealand Flats, Epworth. Our Client suggests that this approach is not positively prepared as it will not meet the area's need for older person's accommodation. Instead, further allocations for older persons accommodation should be identified or flexibility included within Policy H5 to allow for suitable proposals outside of development limits to come forward where there is an identified need.An alternative to this approach would be to incorporate explicit reference to older persons accommodation into the Rural Exceptions policy as also being an exception where a local need is identified.					View PDF
0637	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea Land Epworth Limited	Policy HE1: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment					Area of Special Landscape Interest Our Client acknowledges the identification of the Area of Special Landscape Interest both on the allocated site at Yealand Flats and on our Client's land. The designation relates to the Isle of Axholme Historic Landscape Character Area. Our Client recognises the importance of the wider area as having importance as one of the largest areas of preserved medieval strip fields in the UK. However the Review of the Isle of Axholme Historic Landscape Character Assessment, undertaken by JBA Consulting Ltd, recognises on page 24 that areas of Ancient Open Strip Fields (within which both sites are located) have already been encroached upon by housing and paddocks since previous assessments in 1997 and 2011. Whilst we welcome the purpose of the review, our Client is concerned that large areas of land are effectively dismissed from any opportunity for what would otherwise result in sustainable development despite being already encroached upon. Policy HE1: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment and Policy HE2: Area of Special Historic Landscape Interest both seek to restrict development which would destroy, damage of adversely affect the character, appearance or setting of the historic landscape, or any of its features. Our Client maintains that the proposed development on land east of Belton Road would be no more harmful than the allocated site to the west and would bring significant benefits to Epworth and its locality. Criteria 3. of HE2 is particularly restrictive and therefore unsound owing to its onerous and restrictive nature. Our Client seeks the wording of Policy HE2 to be redrafted to be more consistent with NPPF paragraph 195 for example: "Development required to meet the social and / or economic needs of rural communities will be permitted where the benefits					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							significantly outweigh any harm to the significance of the heritage landscape. Planning applications must also avoid or minimise any conflict with the asset through careful siting and design.					
0600	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea Land Epworth Limited	POLICY HP1-25: LAND AT YEALAND FLATS					Housing Allocation Yealand Flats Land, Epworth Our Client acknowledges the allocation for approximately 45 dwellings in Epworth. It is noted, that it is yet unknown whether the site can be developed in a way which is sympathetic with its location and meet the policy tests set out in Policy HE2. The criteria required by each of the site allocations are very generic, repetitive and are not unique to the individual site's circumstances. Our Client would question whether these criteria are justified or effective. Some of the criteria are more of a validation requirement at a planning application stage and it is unclear in what circumstances an application would be approved or refused e.g. the requirement of a comprehensive landscaping scheme, including biodiversity enhancement. This brings ambiguity into the policy in terms of what is or is not acceptable to the local planning authority and is likely to bring unnecessary delays into the decision making process. As drafted the housing allocations are not effective and likely to bring about even more uncertainty in terms of site delivery. In addition, whilst the implementation criteria is well intentioned, it is not clear how this will be effective or enforceable at a planning application or site implementation stage. Our Client maintains that in order to be effective, this criteria should be deleted and instead policy introduced which will enable the delivery of suitable, unallocated sites to come forward to help ensure that a sufficient and adequate supply of housing is maintained.					View PDF
0658	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE					2. Overall Housing Provision Having considered the evidence within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, it is agreed that North Lincolnshire is a self-contained housing market area. Our Client supports the use of the Government's standard					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	Land Epworth Limited						methodology to determine a baseline for North Lincolnshire's housing needs to 2038 and then to apply an uplift. The Publication draft Plan outlines that one of the key challenges facing the Council is providing a sufficient supply of housing land and quality of homes. Our Client wholly agrees with this statement. Table 4.1 of the Publication Draft demonstrates that the Council is failing to meet housing need. Our Client wishes to point out that there is a typographical error in the table and for 2019-20 this should read 396 not 369 as per paragraph 4.35 of the draft Plan. The Housing Delivery Test is therefore more precarious than is identified. The Council's Action Plan should consider the need to introduce a 10% uplift across the full plan period to ensure flexibility or to include a policy approach that will be supportive of suitable, unallocated developments coming forward across the District. The evidence is clear that North Lincolnshire has not delivered the number of homes it requires. This situation is further exacerbated as the Council has been unable to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land for a number of years, particularly in light of the new definition of deliverable set out in Annex 2 of the NPPF. In light of this and the HDT results, our Client considers that the Council should allocate more sites for housing or introduce a policy to deal with unallocated sites in order to ensure a Local Plan which is effective. The number of dwellings which the Council is seeking to deliver by the end of the Plan period is also unclear. The Plan's spatial vision on page 34 sets out that 8,380 new homes will be delivered. This would ensure sufficient flexibility in terms of meeting housing needs: This is an issue which is also throughout the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken for the Local Plan. On page 50 of the Sustainability Appraisal, the delivery of 8,380 is deemed positive in the short, medium and longer term. Similarly on page 54 of the Sustainability Appraisal, the provision of over 8,000 homes is referenced. Policies SS2 and SS5 refer to a significantly reduced figure of 7,128 new homes. Policy SS5 then also seeks to apply an uplift of 10% to ensure the delivery within the first five years to 7,326 dwellings. Our Client sees this as a serious flaw in the Publication Draft local plan. It is unclear from the Sustainability Appraisal whether the housing need figure in Policy SS2 and SS5 has been appraised by the Sustainability Appraisal and why there is an apparent reduction in the housing need figure from 8,380 to 7,326 new homes. Similarly, the Preferred Options consultation of the emerging Plan proposed 7,961 new homes. Based on the evidence of inability to meet 5-year housing land supply and housing delivery test, it is our Client's view that the Council should be aiming to meet 8,380 dwellings and should be allocating additional housing sites or introduce a policy for determining unallocated sites to ensure this is met and the Plan is positively prepared, effective and justified.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0672	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea Land Epworth Limited	POLICY SS5: OVERALL HOUSING PROVISION					2. Overall Housing Provision Having considered the evidence within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, it is agreed that North Lincolnshire is a self-contained housing market area. Our Client supports the use of the Government's standard methodology to determine a baseline for North Lincolnshire's housing needs to 2038 and then to apply an uplift. The Publication draft Plan outlines that one of the key challenges facing the Council is providing a sufficient supply of housing land and quality of homes. Our Client wholly agrees with this statement. Table 4.1 of the Publication Draft demonstrates that the Council is failing to meet housing need. Our Client wishes to point out that there is a typographical error in the table and for 2019-20 this should read 396 not 369 as per paragraph 4.35 of the draft Plan. The Housing Delivery Test is therefore more precarious than is identified. The Council's Action Plan should consider the need to introduce a 10% uplift across the full plan period to ensure flexibility or to include a policy approach that will be supportive of suitable, unallocated developments coming forward across the District. The evidence is clear that North Lincolnshire has not delivered the number of homes it requires. This situation is further exacerbated as the Council has been unable to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land for a number of years, particularly in light of the new definition of deliverable set out in Annex 2 of the NPPF. In light of this and the HDT results, our Client considers that the Council should allocate more sites for housing or introduce a policy to deal with unallocated sites in order to ensure a Local Plan which is effective. The number of dwellings which the Council is seeking to deliver by the end of the Plan period is also unclear. The Plan's spatial vision on page 34 sets out that 8,380 new homes will be delivered. This would ensure sufficient flexibility in terms of meeting housing needs: This is an issue which is also throughout the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken for the Local Plan. On page 50 of the Sustainability Appraisal, the delivery of 8,380 is deemed positive in the short, medium and longer term. Similarly on page 54 of the Sustainability Appraisal, the provision of over 8,000 homes is referenced. Policies SS2 and SS5 refer to a significantly reduced figure of 7,128 new homes. Policy SS5 then also seeks to apply an uplift of 10% to ensure the delivery within the first five years to 7,326 dwellings. Our Client sees this as a serious flaw in the Publication Draft local plan. It is unclear from the Sustainability Appraisal whether the housing need figure in Policy SS2 and SS5 has been appraised by the Sustainability Appraisal and why there is an apparent reduction in the housing need figure from 8,380 to 7,326 new homes. Similarly, the Preferred Options consultation of the emerging Plan proposed 7,961 new homes. Based on the evidence of inability to meet 5-year housing land supply and housing delivery test, it is our Client's view					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							that the Council should be aiming to meet 8,380 dwellings and should be allocating additional housing sites or introduce a policy for determining unallocated sites to ensure this is met and the Plan is positively prepared, effective and justified.3. Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes. NPPF is clear that in order to support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed. Paragraph 68 requires strategic policy making authorities to have a clear understanding of the land available and identify a supply of: a) Specific, deliverable sites for the first five years of the plan period; b) Specific, developable sites or broad locations of growth for years 6-10 and years 11-15. Policy SS5 acknowledges that 2,379 dwellings already benefit from planning permission. Having considered the contents of Appendix 7: Housing Trajectory, it is not possible to determine the likely delivery of sites which already benefit from planning permission. Our Client believes that this is a serious omission in the evidence base and it is therefore not possible to determine whether the Council is identifying sufficient amount of specific, deliverable sites for the first five years or specific developable sites or broad locations of growth for years 6-10 and years 11-15. It is also unclear whether the approach to determining deliverable sites is in line with the definition in Annex 2 of NPPF or indeed whether the build out rates are realistic. Based on our experience of five-year land supply position statements with North Lincolnshire Council, many of the dwellings with planning permission are unlikely to be deliverable. Our Client would therefore welcome the opportunity to comment on the sites which currently underpin Appendix 7. On this basis it is not possible to determine whether Plan is effective or consistent with national policy. There is no policy within the emerging Plan that would consider any potential windfall development opportunities which may arise. The Plan is not effective in its ability to main a sufficient and adequate supply of new homes.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0672	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea Land Epworth Limited	POLICY SS5: OVERALL HOUSING PROVISION					2. Overall Housing Provision Having considered the evidence within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, it is agreed that North Lincolnshire is a self-contained housing market area. Our Client supports the use of the Government's standard methodology to determine a baseline for North Lincolnshire's housing needs to 2038 and then to apply an uplift. The Publication draft Plan outlines that one of the key challenges facing the Council is providing a sufficient supply of housing land and quality of homes. Our Client wholly agrees with this statement. Table 4.1 of the Publication Draft demonstrates that the Council is failing to meet housing need. Our Client wishes to point out that there is a typographical error in the table and for 2019-20 this should read 396 not 369 as per paragraph 4.35 of the draft Plan. The Housing Delivery Test is therefore more precarious than is identified. The Council's Action Plan should consider the need to introduce a 10% uplift across the full plan period to ensure flexibility or to include a policy approach that will be supportive of suitable, unallocated developments coming forward across the District. The evidence is clear that North Lincolnshire has not delivered the number of homes it requires. This situation is further exacerbated as the Council has been unable to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land for a number of years, particularly in light of the new definition of deliverable set out in Annex 2 of the NPPF. In light of this and the HDT results, our Client considers that the Council should allocate more sites for housing or introduce a policy to deal with unallocated sites in order to ensure a Local Plan which is effective. The number of dwellings which the Council is seeking to deliver by the end of the Plan period is also unclear. The Plan's spatial vision on page 34 sets out that 8,380 new homes will be delivered. This would ensure sufficient flexibility in terms of meeting housing needs: This is an issue which is also throughout the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken for the Local Plan. On page 50 of the Sustainability Appraisal, the delivery of 8,380 is deemed positive in the short, medium and longer term. Similarly on page 54 of the Sustainability Appraisal, the provision of over 8,000 homes is referenced. Policies SS2 and SS5 refer to a significantly reduced figure of 7,128 new homes. Policy SS5 then also seeks to apply an uplift of 10% to ensure the delivery within the first five years to 7,326 dwellings. Our Client sees this as a serious flaw in the Publication Draft local plan. It is unclear from the Sustainability Appraisal whether the housing need figure in Policy SS2 and SS5 has been appraised by the Sustainability Appraisal and why there is an apparent reduction in the housing need figure from 8,380 to 7,326 new homes. Similarly, the Preferred Options consultation of the emerging Plan proposed 7,961 new homes. Based on the evidence of inability to meet 5-year housing land supply and housing delivery test, it is our Client's view					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							that the Council should be aiming to meet 8,380 dwellings and should be allocating additional housing sites or introduce a policy for determining unallocated sites to ensure this is met and the Plan is positively prepared, effective and justified.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0691	Michelle Robinson Planning Associate Barton Willmore	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES					4. Spatial Distribution Policy SS2 sets out the Council's Spatial Strategy for the area and recognises the role of Epworth as a large service centre. Whilst our Client supports the intention to maintain and enhance their role as large service centres that provide for local employment opportunities, key service and facilities, the approach to non-allocated sites being within defined development limits is not justified. SS6 sets out the Council's approach to the spatial distribution of housing across the area. Our Client welcomes that the purpose of the spatial distribution is to direct housing to the most sustainable locations recognising the Scunthorpe urban area and the principal towns, large service centres and then the larger rural settlements. The hierarchy of approach appears to be well evidenced and robust. However, our Client wishes to raise concerns regarding the way in which the calculation of the distribution is not justified. In particular, there appears to be no evidence behind the significant changes in the distribution between the Regulation 18 (Preferred Options) to this Regulation 19 (Publication draft) stage. For example: Preferred Options Policy SS6p: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites identified 1.10% of the housing growth (92 dwellings) to be distributed towards Epworth. The Publication draft Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites only identifies 0.8% of the housing growth (57). This is a considerable reduction and not evidenced. There appears to be no assessment to this within the Sustainability Appraisal or the supporting evidence based documents for such a change in the distribution in one of the most sustainable settlements as evidenced by the North Lincolnshire Settlement Survey. It appears that the approach is unjustified in being driven up by housing allocations rather than a top down approach to an evidence-led distribution based on the findings of the Settlement Study. Our Client would welcome a more evenly dispersed approach to distribution which recognises the role and function of Epworth in terms of maintaining its role as a large service centre or to allow for greater flexibility should non-allocated sites be forthcoming.					View PDF
0713	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea Land Epworth Limited	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object	No	No	No	4. Spatial Distribution Policy SS6 sets out the Council's approach to the spatial distribution of housing across the area. Our Client welcomes that the purpose of the spatial distribution is to direct housing to the most sustainable locations recognising the Scunthorpe urban area and the principal towns, large service centres and then the larger rural settlements. The hierarchy of approach appears to be well evidenced and robust. However, our Client wishes to raise concerns regarding the way in which the calculation of the distribution is not justified. In particular, there appears to be no evidence behind the significant changes in the distribution between the Regulation 18 (Preferred Options) to this Regulation 19 (Publication draft) stage or why some settlements have a			Yes	Wish to attend	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							greater distribution identified than other settlements in the same tier. By way of example and not exhaustive: • Barton-upon-Humber: Preferred Options Policy SS6p: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites identified 13% of the housing growth (1,089 dwellings) to be distributed towards Barton-upon-Humber. The Publication draft Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites only identifies 8% of the housing growth (583). This is a reduction of almost half. • Large service centres such as Kirton in Lindsey, Ulceby, Crowle, Barrow upon Humber have significantly greater total dwellings directed to them whereas some settlements identified as the same tier, as set out in the Settlement hierarchy and Growth Topic Paper such as Belton, Westgate and Woodhouse. • Ulceby is identified within the Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Topic Paper as a larger rural settlement, however Policy SS6 of the Publication Plan identifies Ulceby as a large service centre and identifies 131 dwellings (1.8% of the distribution). This is significantly higher than any other larger rural settlement. There appears to be no assessment to this within the Sustainability Appraisal or the supporting evidence based documents for such a significant change in the distribution in one of the most sustainable settlements as evidenced by the North Lincolnshire Settlement Survey. It appears that the approach is unjustified in being driven up by housing allocations rather than a top down approach to an evidence-led distribution based on the findings of the Settlement Study.					
0721	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea Land Epworth Limited	POLICY SS7: STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION – LINCOLNSHIRE LAKES					5. Strategic Allocation Lincolnshire Lakes Our Client would also welcome the opportunity to consider the evidence base which underpins the trajectory and estimated build out rates for the strategic site identified at Lincolnshire Lakes. As acknowledged at para 4.48 of the Publication Draft Plan, an Area Action Plan (AAP) was adopted in May 2016. The Lincolnshire Lakes Area Action Plan (AAP) will be replaced once the new Local Plan is adopted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the required infrastructure requirements for the delivery of the emerging Plan including the strategic allocation at Lincolnshire Lakes. Some of the infrastructure funding has already been secured, however much of the infrastructure is to be funded by the private sector. We would expect to see a more detailed trajectory which links to the phasing of the infrastructure and any assumed build out rates within the Local Plan Viability Assessment to be provided in order to determine whether the delivery of 2,150 homes by the end of the plan period is achievable. Our Client is concerned that the Council is relying upon the delivery of units within the first five years of the plan period which does not meet the deliverable definition in NPPF. Given our knowledge regarding lead in times, it is our Client's view that the site will not be completing units until later than anticipated by the Council. At best Lincolnshire Lakes will deliver 100 completions per year once it comes on stream which is still several years away. Paragraph 73 d. of NPPF recognises that realistic assessments of likely rates of delivery,					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							given the lead-in times for large scale sites, and identify opportunities for supporting rapid implementation. Our Client's view is that a more cautious and realistic estimation of the likely delivery timescales for the Lincolnshire Lakes is required in order for the Plan to be justified and effective. The anticipated delivery rates are over estimated and the number of dwellings to be delivered by 2038 is more realistically at 1,000 units. The existing AAP was adopted in May 2016 and had a vision for 6,000 dwellings to be delivered by 2028. The delivery has not been achieved owing to the need for critical infrastructure to be in place. Given the Council's track record in under delivery, our Client does not see any evidence to justify the projected build out rates within the draft Plan for Lincolnshire Lakes. Our Client seeks a more realistic projected build out rates and the residual dwellings to be re-allocated and distributed effectively to settlements in line with the spatial distribution including at Epworth. It is necessary that additional sites should be allocated across a more dispersed range of settlements including Epworth to ensure that the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes is met and the local plan is found sound and is capable of adoption.					
0734	Michelle Robinson, Barton Willmore on behalf of Millea Land Epworth Limited	POLICY TC1: RETAIL HIERARCHY AND TOWN CENTRE AND DISTRICT CENTRE DEVELOPMENT					Prosperous Town Centres Our Client supports the Plan's approach to protecting the retail hierarchy set out in Policy TC1 which includes the second tier of principal town / local service centre which includes Epworth. Part 4. of Policy TC1 sets out that proposals for commercial, business and Class E uses will be permitted in the defined town centre boundary. Paragraph 6.19 of the North Lincolnshire Retail and Leisure Study (2019) recognises that the convenience goods offer within Epworth is relatively limited. In addition, paragraph 6.21 acknowledges the lack of car parking provision was an issue identified by 31.2% of respondents to the household survey. The policies map identifies the boundary for Epworth's town centre as set out below: However, the boundary on the policies map differs from the boundary which has been used within the Council's evidence base document North Lincolnshire Retail and Leisure Study (2019) which includes land at the Holmes and Gardens Centre and its car park. There appears to be no justification within the Sustainability Appraisal for a departure from the evidence base. Our Client therefore seeks an amendment to the Local Plan to ensure the policies map aligns with the evidence base in order to ensure that the local plan is justified and effective. Our Client would also suggest that in order to ensure flexibility and support Epworth's role as an important top-up shopping and service destination, that reference within TC1 is made to the need of a sequential test should proposals come forward which are outside of the defined centre. This will ensure that such opportunities will be considered on edge of centre sites should they arise. Otherwise policy TC1 is not consistent with the NPPF paragraphs 87 and 88.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Paul **Rounce**												
0850	Paul Rounce	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS					The northern boundary of the site abuts the existing Development Limits definition of Kirton inLindsay.(submitted ref CFS0300111)It is contended that the subject site, like the adjacent site, should be included within theDevelopment Limits definition of the settlement. The proposed definition is as it standsarbitrary.When approaching Kirton in Lindsay from the south west along the B1206, the southwesternboundary of the site represents the first signs of built form and village type character / activity.Beyond the subject site south and westwards the nature and character of the landscape is thatof high quality open agricultural land that is being actively farmed.Up until 2002 the land was grazed by horses on a sporadic basis. The site was howeverunattractive to horse owners due to the low-quality grazing that the site could provide. Manyyears ago, the site was a tennis court that fell into disuse and disrepair. As a result, despitenumerous efforts, it has not been possible to encourage the growth of quality grasses forgrazing. The site is plagued by thistles. It is for this reason that the site has not been activelyused for some 18 years. This situation will continue to be the case with no solution available tobring the site back into active use.The inclusion of the site within the Development Limits offers an opportunity to bring thesubject site back into use and deliver unmet affordable housing provision within thesettlement. As noted in the appeal decision pertaining to the adjacent site, the Inspector notedthat “I am satisfied that the appeal site is in an accessible location for affordable housing”. Henoted that the area was in close proximity to the primary school and the distances to servicesand facilities were acceptable.When the subject site is viewed from above and the field patterns and uses are examined, it isevident that the site physically marries better to the settlement than the high quality activelyused open agricultural land to the south and west. Policy SS11 Development Limits states that“Where possible, limits should follow clearly defined features or constraints such as roads”. Asnoted above, the subject site represents a step change when approaching Kirton in Lindsay. Itrepresents the first change in character from open agricultural land to the urban area. Thesubject site’s southern and western boundaries provide a highly defensible boundary to thesettlement for the long-term future of Kirton in Lindsay. It does not represent open agriculturalcountryside like that beyond.Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Policy SS11: Development Limits definition beamended to reflect the true physical characteristics and character of the area to include thesubject within the Development Limits of the settlement.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Clive **Sargeantson**												
0095	Clive Sargeantson	POLICY H1P-28: LAND ADJACENT TO IVY HOUSE FARM ON MAIN STREET	object	yes	no	yes	I do not consider this sight to be viable for several reasons. The first one of these is flood risk. Having objected to other Planning Applications in this area of Ealand, I know that the site is situated, for a significant area of it on a flood plain, Also with regards to surface water flooding, the Northern end of the same field is classified by the EA has one of the worst area's in the boundary of Ealand. Also I consider that the 600mm culvert running down the Eastern side of Main Street and the Wood & Ealand Common Drain are not fit for purpose. Apart from that I think that building within Ealands boundaries, has been overdone, and given the fact that there will be 30 more cars in the village if this development succeeds, combined with the extra cars coming from the Seven Lakes development to visit the Post Office, it's all too much!		I do not think there should be any more building within Ealands Planning boundaries at all. It is obvious that the additional dwellings recently built at the North end of Main Street and on Outage are stressing the drainage system down Main Street, Wood & Ealand Common Drain (W&ECD), and possibly the North Soak Drain which in my opinion is badly maintained. Also W&ECD hasn't been maintained at all this year. I have chased various authorities in the past to improve the drainage structure of Ealand. But as soon as you stop pestering them they revert back to their old ways. Until we have a major happening, like when the banks of the North Soak Drain collapsed in I think Nov.2019. I think Ealand has given enough with the 55 houses to be built near the Seven Lakes complex, other houses mentioned above and the houses near the new pub.	yes	Because I have been monitoring the drainage system that runs into the North Soak Drain has much as I legally can. I don't have access to everywhere obviously, like land belonging to SSE. I've been using my own time and burning my own fuel in doing so. By the way, the only thing I can think of in the Duty to Co-operate category is that Crowle & Ealand Town Council didn't tell anybody about the recent meeting by about the new plan by the NLC, at their council offices on November 4th. It was supposed to be at the hub anyway!	
Darren **Saunders**												
0086	Darren Saunders	Paragraph 5.123	object	yes	no	no	Farm Buildings are still in use			yes	The proposed development backs directly onto our property, this development would change the whole estate, not only from construction, which would cause massive upheaval of the estate,	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
											noise and traffic issues it would also impact on house values during the construction and after completion. A small one track road would be made into an busy B / A road. 74 dwellings would mean approx. 87 more vehicles plus daily deliveries	
0087	Darren Saunders	Paragraph 5.125	object	no	no	no	The proposed road access would alter the current traffic passing through the area. This is a single track road, extending it would cause additional traffic changing the estate around the area, increasing noise, pollution and disruption, 74 houses equates to 87 cars on average, plus deliveries and I believe this would change the area totally			yes	The proposed development backs directly onto our property, this development would change the whole estate, not only from construction, which would cause massive upheaval of the estate, noise and traffic issues it would also impact on house values during the construction and after completion. A small one track road would be made into an busy B / A road. 74 dwellings would mean approx. 87 more vehicles plus daily deliveries	
S Sharpe												
0406	S Sharpe	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are:The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021.It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete.Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							subsequent review/consultation process.					
0475	Mr S Sharpe	Paragraph 14.47	object				(3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation." Kind Regards,					View PDF
0515	Mr S Sharpe	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				(2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0707	Mr S Sharpe	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I strongly object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Mrs S **Sharpe**												
0787	Mrs S Sharpe	Paragraph 14.47	object				(3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation." Kind Regards,					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0805	Mrs S Sharpe	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				(2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0864	Mrs S Sharpe	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I strongly object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Nicholas **Shoot**												
0341	Nicholas Shoot	Paragraph 8.1	support	yes	yes	yes	I find the local plan as a whole and in particular POLICY RD1: SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE - as Sound and agree to all areas as Protection of low growth settlements and grade 1 agricultural land is vital to health and well being and the rural way of life. POLICY RD1: SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE Noting also that the protection of out of development limits and grade 1 agricultural land included in many of the policies also being Consistent with national policy and current and future main stream Government policies. being of brownfield first. Development will be expected to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. Areas of lower quality agricultural land should be used where the proposals result in the significant development of agricultural land in preference to the best and most versatile agricultural land Smaller Rural Settlements Alkborough; Althorpe; Appleby; Bonby; Burringham; East Butterwick; Eastoft; Elsham; Flixborough; Garthorpe & Fockerby; Howsham; Kirmington; Luddington; North Killingholme; Redbourne; West Halton; Wootton & Worlaby These settlements will accommodate small-scale development of a limited nature, within their defined settlement developments, that supports their vitality and viability. Small sites will have a role to play. All development should reflect the character and nature of these villages and give due consideration to the availability and capacity of infrastructure to support its growth. All proposals will be considered on their merits.	Consistent with national policy		yes		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0340	Nicholas Shoot	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	support	yes	yes	yes	I find the local plan as a whole and in particular POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE - as Sound and agree to all areas as Protection of low growth settlements is vital to health and well being and the rural way of life. POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE Noting also that the protection of out of development limits and grade 1 agricultural land included in many of the policies also being Consistent with national policy and current and future main stream Government policies. being of brownfield first. Smaller Rural Settlements Alkborough; Althorpe; Appleby; Bonby; Burringham; East Butterwick; Eastoft; Elsham; Flixborough; Garthorpe & Fockerby; Howsham; Kirmington; Luddington; North Killingholme; Redbourne; West Halton; Wootton & Worlaby These settlements will accommodate small-scale development of a limited nature, within their defined settlement developments, that supports their vitality and viability. Small sites will have a role to play. All development should reflect the character and nature of these villages and give due consideration to the availability and capacity of infrastructure to support its growth. All proposals will be considered on their merits.	Consistent with national policy		yes		
0339	Nicholas Shoot	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	support	yes	yes	yes	I find the local plan as a whole and in particular POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES - as Sound and agree to all areas identified for development in TABLE 4.2 SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES. Noting also that the protection of out of development limits and grade 1 agricultural land included in many of the policies also being Consistent with national policy and current and future main stream Government policies. being of brownfield first. Protection of low growth settlements is vital to health and well being and the rural way of life.	Consistent with national policy		yes	Ensure areas not marked for development are identified without notification or sound judgement giving voice to reasonable objections.	
Elayne **Smith**												
0396	Elayne Smith	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
James **Smith**												
0395	James Smith	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0470	James Peter Smith	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0510	James Peter Smith	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				(2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0702	James Peter Smith	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Mike **Smith**												
0747	Mike Smith	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS					Hi I've been looking at Inset 24 of the Local Plan and I notice that the development boundary runs through the middle of my garden rather than around the edge. See attached. Address is 31 Hunts Lane (Old Mill House), I think I have raised this before but can't recall the response - what is the best way to get it corrected?					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Nigel **Smith**												
0397	Nigel Smith	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
Paul **Smith** on behalf of The Strategic Land Group												
0835	Paul Smith on behalf of The Strategic Land Group	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS					1. Introduction 1.1 These representations have been prepared by The Strategic Land Group Limited ('SLG') in response to the Regulation 19 consultation on the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft (the emerging Local Plan). 1.2 SLG control an area of land to the north of Ings Road in Kirton in Lindsey. Part of the site (edged in blue at figure 1.1 and Appendix 1) benefits from an outline planning permission for residential development which was granted on appeal (references PA/2020/588 and 3261878). That area of land is proposed as a housing allocation (H1C-59) in the emerging Local Plan. This part of the site amounts to c. 2.81 hectares and will be referred to as Phase 1. 1.3 We propose that the remainder of that site (edged in red at figure 1.1 and Appendix 1) should also be allocated for housing development. This part of the site amounts to c. 1.46 hectares and will be referred to as Phase 2.2. Policy H1: Site Allocations 2.1 We support the allocation of Phase 1 for housing development under policy H1C-59. The site has planning permission and is being actively marketed for sale, demonstrating its suitability for development and its deliverability. 2.2 In addition, however, Phase 2 of the land at Ings Road should also be allocated for development. The site sits immediately to the west of existing residential development and between two proposed housing allocations – H1C-59 and H1C-57 - both of which benefit from extant planning permissions. The fourth boundary is almost entirely delineated by the railway line. As a result, the Phase 2 site is almost wholly surrounded by existing or proposed development. Just 75m of the site's perimeter of approximately 990m (around 7.5%) adjoins the open countryside. This relationship is illustrated in Figure 2.1.2.3 As we will set out in Section 3 of this submission, there are no technical impediments to the development of the Phase 2 site. It is therefore not justified to leave the site outside the settlement boundary of the town and the emerging Local Plan cannot be considered to be positively prepared in this regard. We submit that, instead, the Phase 2 site should be allocated for housing			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							development. Amendments Sought 2.4 Policy H1 should be amended to allocate the Phase 2 site for the development of approximately 30 dwellings.3. Proposed Residential Allocation – Phase 2 land at Ings Road, Kirton in Lindsey 3.1 In this section we will outline why the Phase 2 site, like the adjoining Phase 1 site, is a suitable, achievable location for residential development. The fact that the Phase 1 site benefits from a residential planning permission and is proposed as a housing allocation is robust evidence of the suitability of Phase 2 for housing development. However, for completeness we will briefly summarise the main technical factors. Coverage 3.2 We consider that the Phase 2 site can accommodate around 30 new dwellings. That would represent a lower density than the Phase 1 site (which can deliver around 79 homes across c. 2.81 hectares at approximately 28 dwellings per hectare). However, as set out later in this section, some of the Phase 2 land will be needed to provide additional wildlife habitats to allow Phase 1 to achieve a 10% net gain in biodiversity. Highways and Accessibility 3.3 The site is well located in respect of existing services and facilities. In this regard, the planning inspector who considered the appeal in respect of the Phase 1 planning application noted that: Kirton in Lindsey is identified as a Market Town in the development plan and includes a range of services commensurate with that designation, including shops, community facilities and schools. Although the appeal site is located on the edge of the town, these services are not an unacceptable walking or cycling distance from the appeal site even allowing for the topography of the area. I consider that residents of the proposal would be able to conveniently access these services to meet many of their everyday needs. 3.4 The same locational benefits exist for Phase 2.3.5 Pedestrian and vehicular access to Phase 2 could be provided via Phase 1. The plan at Appendix 2 shows two possible locations for that access – one or both of which could be utilised - based on the illustrative layout submitted in support of the outline planning application for Phase 1. 3.6 The highways impacts of the development at Phase 1 formed the basis of one of the reasons for the Phase 1 application being refused. It is notable in this regard that the council's highways officers did not object to the development on these grounds – the application was recommended for approval by officers – but instead reflected the concerns of local members. The highways impacts were therefore considered extensively as part of the planning appeal. The planning inspector found that there was no reason in highways terms for the development to be prevented, commenting:					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							The appellants have provided extensive technical evidence at both the application and appeal stages which demonstrates that the level of traffic can be accommodated on Ings Road and that the proposal would not exacerbate any highway safety concerns. 3.7 The access to Phase 2 has been considered by the highways consultant iTransport. Their advice can be found at Appendix 3. In summary, however, they concluded that with the improvements already being delivered as part of Phase 1, the surrounding highway network could accommodate the additional traffic generated by a further 30 homes. 3.8 There are therefore no reasons in highways terms why the Phase 2 site could not be developed. Ecology 3.9 An Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey was carried out in July 2018 by Rachel Hacking Ecology. This covered both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites and concluded that there were no ecological reasons why the site could not be developed. The findings of that report were accepted by the council as part of the Phase 1 planning application and so can be assumed to be acceptable in respect of Phase 2 as well.3.10 The planning permission for Phase 1 anticipates that part of the Phase 2 site will be utilised to provide additional wildlife habitats in order to achieve a 10% net gain in biodiversity. Delivering 30 new homes at a similar density to the illustrative layout for Phase 1 would leave around 0.5 hectares – roughly a third of the Phase 2 site area – to accommodate that habitat creation. The plan at Appendix 2 shows approximately where this new habitat would be located. 3.11 Irrespective of that, however, the exact number of homes and the precise extent of the land required for biodiversity net gain across the two sites would be determined via a planning application. That would provide an opportunity for the council to insist on a lower number of dwellings if that were the only way to deliver the necessary habitat improvements. Flood Risk 3.12 Figure 3.1 below shows that the entirety of the site lies within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore suitable for residential development. Drainage 3.13 Surface water drainage can be provided via the watercourse that adjoins the southern boundary of Phase 2 (and the northern boundary of Phase 1). Surface water flows would be attenuated on site before being discharged into the watercourse at an appropriate rate. 3.14 Foul water drainage can be provided via the existing foul water sewer that runs adjacent to the eastern boundary of Phase 1. 3.15 No concerns were raised by statutory consultees to the development of Phase 1. Landscape and Visual Impacts 3.16 A Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal of the Phase 1 site was carried out by TPM Landscape in March 2020. This report concluded that development of the site would not have an unacceptable impact on the local landscape. This finding was accepted by the council, with the					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							committee report noting that: It is considered that a scheme could be achieved that would retain the sense of place in this area of Kirton Lindsey, whilst also not giving rise to any unacceptable impingement upon future and existing amenity rights. As a result, in terms of the impact the development would have on the character of this area of Kirton Lindsey, it is considered to be acceptable. 3.17 Although these findings relate to Phase 1, the landscape impacts of Phase 2 will be even less. We have outlined how the site is surrounded by existing or proposed development with almost no open outlook onto the countryside. There are, therefore, fewer visual receptors for Phase 2 than for Phase 1. As a result, there is no reason in landscape or visual impact terms why the site could not be developed. Archaeology and Heritage 3.18 A series of archaeological investigations have been carried out in respect of the Phase 1 site, including geophysical surveys and trial trenching. Only two of the fifteen trial trenches produced archaeological finds. These were both at the southern end of Phase 1 – the furthest part of the site from Phase 2 – and yielded finds of only local significance. 3.19 Although a similar exercise would be required as part of a planning application for the Phase 2 site, there is therefore no reason in heritage terms why the Phase 2 site could not be developed. (Please see attached brochure also emailed in)					
0236	Paul Smith on behalf of The Strategic Land Group	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object	yes	no	yes	The Plan is not positively prepared as it does not allocate Phase 2 of the land north of Ings Lane, Kirton-in-Lindsey for residential development. *Further details in this regard have been emailed to the council's Local Plan email address.*	positively prepared	Phase 2 of the land north of Ings Lane in Kirton-in-Lindsey should be allocated for development.	no		
Stuart **Smith**												
0467	Stuart Smith	Paragraph 14.47	object				The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to:"To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0507	Stuart Smith	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. Therefore, I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0698	Stuart Smith	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19)					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
		DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES					document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (A) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for “up to 400 homes” on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage in the area.					
Thomas **Smith**												
0011	Thomas Smith	POLICY SS1: PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT	support	yes	yes	yes	Former RAF Kirton Base Why hasn't anything further been considered to redevelop the whole site to its boundary. It will ease the pressure within the town boundary itself. Plenty of provision to build a mini supermarket, new school premises etc. It'll ease the flooding and drainage issues within the town boundary too. Not only that it'll bring local employment to the area and ease the local housing crisis we're seeing all over the country	Consistent with national policy		no		
Jack **Startin**												
0067	Jack Startin	Paragraph 11.48	object	yes	no	yes	No provision for a Skate Park, Sports Centre or artificial grass pitches in Kirton-in-Lindsey.	effective	There is no provision for a Skate Park, Sports Centre or artificial grass pitches in Kirton-in-Lindsey in the Plan. Why? It has been done in a lot of the other larger service centres, e.g. Crowle, Winterton, Epworth. Why not in Kirton-in-Lindsey? Why are the residents of the town being penalised for living there by having to travel by car (due to the lack of bus & rail services) to other larger service centres, e.g. Gainsborough & Brigg.	no		
0066	Jack Startin	Paragraph 11.60	object	yes	no	yes	Allotment provision in Kirton in Lindsey	effective	There is a site in Kirton-in-Lindsey that is currently being developed (by Kirton in Lindsey Town Council) for allotments. This area is not identified on Inset 27. It should be. The Town Council will be able to advise as to the exact location of the site.	no		
0064	Jack Startin	Paragraph 14.15	object	yes	no	yes	The Plan appears to ignore Kirton in Lindsey which is designated as 'Larger Service Centre'.	effective	Despite Kirton in Lindsey being designated as a 'Larger Service Centre' the current rail connection (Sheffield to Grimsby via Brigg & Barnetby)	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									is woefully inadequate with only 3 passenger services only on a Saturday! This current level of rail provision does nothing to reduce travel by car. There needs to be a clear plan to improve the passenger service permanently for work days & work hours if the aspiration to get people out of cars is to be achieved.			
0065	Jack Startin	Paragraph 14.17	object	yes	no	yes	The level of a regular bus service to & from Kirton in Lindsey is inadequate.	effective	The current scheduled bus service (#103), between Scunthorpe & Lincoln, is every 2 hrs Monday to Saturday. The last bus back from Scunthorpe is 4.10pm which means anyone working there is reliant on a car to get back home after work (& therefore will also use it to go to work). Using the Just Go provision is not practical for a lot of people as it means booking every trip (2 times a day x 5 days a week), plus a lot of people who would use a bus may not have the necessary technology (laptop, PC, smart phone) in order make the bookings. There is no scheduled bus service that connects Kirton in Lindsey & Gainsborough (a large conurbation with shops). Connectivity should not just be within Lincs but also to other nearby centres that offer employment, shopping & leisure facilities that are outside of the Lincs boundary but are still within10-15 miles.	no		
0073	Jack Startin	Paragraph 7.32	object	yes	no	yes	Off road car parking provision.	effective	The Plan needs to make it clear that sufficient off road parking must be provided for those living in dwellings & also at places of work. By sufficient it would mean, for example, a 3-bed house having a minimum of 2 off road spaces for parking of vehicles. Despite the best intentions & words by Lincs	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									Council in the Plan, there is no way that there will realistically be any great reduction in car use in the Lincs area. The area is mainly too rural & the rural areas suffer from a lack of suitable bus & rail service provision. Provision of sufficient & proper off road parking will greatly help with the quality of the built environment. A current eyesore in many areas is the large amount of vehicles parked in pavements & grass verges (due to lack of parking spaces next to or in front of a dwelling or work place).			
0068	Jack Startin	Paragraph 9.85	object	yes	no	yes	Cemetery not designated as such.	justified	The cemetery in Kirton-in-Lindsey is denoted/coloured on Inset 27 as Local Green Space & not, as it should be, as Cemetery.	no		
0069	Jack Startin	Paragraph 9.85	object	yes	no	no	Sports Field not shown as such on the plan. Allotment site not shown as such on the plan.	justified	The current sports field & pavilion '(KLASSIC Park') on Ings Road is not mentioned in the plan nor shown in Inset 27. The allotment site (under development by the Town Council) off the B.1400 is not mentioned in the plan nor shown in Inset 27.	no		
0071	Jack Startin	POLICY DQE7: 2d.	object	yes	no	yes	Rainwater harvesting.	effective	Why are there no mandatory conditions for rainwater harvesting systems? The water from which should then be used to flush toilets, etc. This would divert rainwater from the surface drainage systems which is obviously beneficial as it diverts it & increases the time it takes to get to the river system (via sewage treatment plants).	no		
0070	Jack Startin	POLICY DQE7: 3a.	object	yes	no	yes	Scheduled bus & rail service provision for Kirton-in-Lindsey.	effective	The plan needs to have measures in place that will provide an effective rail & scheduled bus service to &	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									from Kirton-in-Lindsey to places of work, e.g. in Scunthorpe, Lincoln, Brigg, Gainsborough, as well as further afield in order to get people out of cars & onto rail & bus services thereby reducing travel by those methods. The Plan currently appears to make no mention of this aspect making it seem like getting to & from Kirton-in-Lindsey is not important.			
0074	Jack Startin	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object	yes	no	yes	Housing site allocations nearer to the main Kirton-in-Lindsey town centre. Whilst the plan shows site allocations H1C-56-60, all but one (H1C-60) of these are over a 10 minute walkaway from the main centre (shown outlined in blue on Inset 27) - bearing in mind not only the distance but also the route is up a fairly steep hill (thus increasing the walking time for most people & making it near impossible for elderly people) thus people drive up the hill to the shops. Doing so impacts negatively on the limited parking in the main centre which then has a negative visual impact as well as a negative emotional impact (frustration, confusion, etc). Sites need to be shown, even if aspirational, that are nearer to the centre thus making it easier for people to leave their car behind & walk or cycle to the shops. Suitable sites are: Land to the west of North Cliff road & east of H1C-58; Land to the east of North Cliff Road & north of Barnard Meadows & Fusilier way; Land east of South Cliff Road, north of Mill Lane, south of Redbourne Mere. Although these parcels of land are in private ownership they should still be marked as desirable (for the above reasons) for residential development & be compulsorily purchase if necessary. Developing these parcels of land for residential properties go towards better Town Planning (which has been sadly lacking over the last 15-20 yrs). Something also needs to be done to 'join up' former MoD dwellings (Bircham Crescent, York Road etc.) with the rest of the town. At present the houses on Bircham Crescent & those nearby feel as thought they belong to a separate village ('Little Kirton'?) both visually & emotionally.	effective		no		
0063	Jack Starting	Paragraph 14.44	object	yes	no	yes	It makes no provision for upgrading of Brigg Road, Scunthorpe. Traffic along this road has got progressively slower over the last 10 yrs., especially at the junction with Station Road. Brigg Road needs widening with more lanes to allow traffic, including freight, to move more quickly. If done this will in effect produce a much needed ring road around Scunthorpe by joining with existing roads to the north & west.	effective	It makes no provision for upgrading of Brigg Road, Scunthorpe. Traffic along this road has got progressively slower over the last 10 yrs., especially at the junction with Station Road. Brigg Road needs	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									widening with more lanes to allow traffic, including freight, to move more quickly. If done this will in effect produce a much needed ring road around Scunthorpe by joining with existing roads to the north & west.			
Mr Justin **Steggles**												
0476	Mr Justin Steggles	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0521	Mr Justin Steggles	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				(2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0708	Mr Justin Steggles	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Lee **Storey**												
0589	Lee Storey	POLICY H1P-26: LAND AT FIELD HOUSE	Object				LETTER OF OBJECTION I am writing with regards to the meeting last week to look at potential planning for land off Graizelound Fields Road in Haxey. Having lived on Hopgarth, Haxey, for the past 20 years bringing up a family in such a safe and stunning area. I have major concerns relating to any proposals, as there are numerous reasons why this such are not applied for, granted, or developed. Haxey is a principal part of the Isle of Axholme's Area of Special Historic Landscape Interest. The Field House proposal involves the decimation of a part of this landscape. The medieval strip farming method embodied in the open plan Anglo Saxon fields is unique. It is representative of a sole surviving part of England's landscape heritage. If this is developed or affected in anyway it can never be replaced. Why would any council want to be a party to such destruction? Across all the Local Plan documents, even in the 2003 version, it is highlighted that these areas need to be protected. This view has been positioned as definitive. It is black and white. Protect the area! So why has this proposal arisen? Why on earth are we giving consideration to any plan that involves its destruction. If anything, the council should be helping to encourage the wider public to visit the Isle of Axholme to enjoy and study its uniqueness and sole surviving medieval landscape which is priceless. Graizelound Fields Road is an ancient track which even when developed would be inadequate to support Haxey's needs. It struggles even now with local movement. Traffic flow south and north to the cenotaph has been underestimated. Any increase in traffic may also be damaging to this landscape. Educational facilities in the area are inadequate for further residential growth. Having brought my family up in the area. Schooling has always been an issue with limited spaces. Developing anything further would considerably increase traffic movement, increasing pollution in rural locations, as well as potential vehicle incidents and accidents. The unique vista of the playing fields overlooking the open fields would also be closed off. Both footballers and Cricket clubs love playing in Haxey due to its position and views I would also like to point out that Field House Farm area is also far from redundant. Corn was only harvested here approximately 4 weeks ago from very productive soil. As well as land directly backing on to the house being used for animal feed growth. One concern that I believe is a little underhand is that no resident in the area was given any notice whatsoever of the meeting. You may say it was on the council's website. However, you cannot reply on people seeing the website. A letter as a minimum should have been sent to every house to					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							inform them of such discussions and proposals. Having been told that a letter hadn't been sent out due to cost is very concerning. Personally, it seems like this is being dealt with a little underhand and under the radar. A little concerning for local authority to deal with matters this way. In addition to this letter. I have contacted Historic England as well as other heritage interested parties to discuss this further. I have attached some documents relating to the following that should also be looked at which are accessible on the council and other websites 1) Potential Pre-Historic Remains 2) Council Quotes 3) Assessment of potential development land (other areas have higher scores) 4) Map showing importance of the area 5) Field House central to archaeological profile 6) Lidar view of Isle of Axholme showing ancient landscape By opening any type of planning development or applications in Haxey or the Isle of Axholme. This would open floodgates with regards to other landowners selling land to developers and ruining the area for good. I would be grateful if you could please acknowledge this objection (A number of pictures supporting this rep were also emailed in)					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Ian **Stuart**, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd												
0408	Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	Evidence Base Barton Link Road Technical Report	Object				This preliminary Highway Statement has been prepared regarding a parcel of land south of the A1077 barrow Road, Barton upon Humber. This parcel of land is being promoted through the North Lincs Local Plan process. The proposed land is immediately south of a draft allocation of land for residential development (H1P-13) as indicated on Plan 1 below and shown outlined in a red line. (Please see email for map) .This land has been removed from the previous version of the draft local plan. Also shown on the above plan is a proposed relief road alignment. We are aware of the Barton Link Road technical note which is contained within the Evidence Base documents for the North Lincolnshire Local Plan and we are surprised that this document has just been made available at this very late stage in the LP consultation. This does not give sufficient time for a detailed review however we include some initial comments below:- Anecdotal evidence suggests that these southern rural connections and links are actually used at present and hence nay improvements would surely service to increase the traffic use and profile relief to the east of Barton, although some localised improvements to these roads may also need to be considered. Providing a first phase of the relief road (for any of the Options 1 to 4 being considered) is considered to be an eminently sensible way forward at this stage although it would be dependant on the allocation of the additional land set out above. The first phase of the relief road could be provided by the developer through the allocation of sites, with the remainder of the relief road being provided at a later stage. indeed it could potentially be easier to achieve government funding for the remainder of the relief road, if part of this road is secured via private sector development. Traffic benefits would include the potential to remove some of the Wren factory traffic from the centre of Barton by providing this alternative route. Not only would the proposed allocation site therefore be able to deliver the first phase of the relief road but it is considered that there would also be some instant traffic alleviation to the east of Barton and within Barton town centre itself. This would either partly or wholly mitigate against the potential increase in traffic which would be generated by the additional development land housing. Any potential traffic impact would be considered in a later Transport assessment , however the proposed allocation is well connected to Barton and is considered to be in a good location to encourage sustainable transport. We consider that this is a sound strategy from a highways perspective and we would therefore recommend that the additional land set out above is allocated in the Local Plan. I hope that the above is sufficient at this stage however please get back to me if you require any clarification or further information.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0409	Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	Evidence Base Barton Link Road Technical Report	Object				Good afternoon, It has come to my notice that a Technical Note in respect of the proposed Barton Link Road was added to the Local Plan evidence base at the end of last week and that additional time has been made available to respond. Accordingly I attach a Preliminary Highway Statement prepared by BSP Consulting on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd and should be grateful if you would add it as an addendum to the submissions already made. I should stress that this is a preliminary statement but it has been prepared with considerable knowledge of the local highway situation and with the intention that a more thorough assessment can be prepared for submission to a future EIP should it be necessary. In the meantime might I draw attention to the conclusion at the final paragraph on page 2 that BSP believe that clear benefits would arise from construction of the first phase of the link road between Barrow Road and Caister Road. I believe this section could easily be facilitated by development commencing from both ends and controlled by a Section 106 Agreement to guarantee delivery. Should you feel that it might be beneficial to discuss the possible allocation of site A [as shown on the attached letter] in advance of the EIP then Keigar Homes would be happy to do so.					View PDF
0585	Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	Policy H1: Site Allocations	Object		No		Policy SS5 advises that delivery of housing will mainly be through sites allocated by Policy H1. In commenting on Policy SS5 it was explained why a similar reliance on specific site allocations failed in the past. The following extract is relevant: From experience of working within the area it is clear that a significant contributary factor [to the housing delivery deficit] was too great a reliance on specific allocations intended to deliver approximately the total requirement. Many of the allocation were a flawed by lack of understanding of market and development considerations and failed to materialise as hoped and there was no back up plan. The current Plan follows the same path and is in danger of failing for precisely the same reasons. The local housing market is not as dynamic as many others so it is necessary to adopt a pro-active approach rather than a cautionary one. It should not be assumed that land will come forward at the rate anticipated or even at all, merely because it is allocated. This is easily demonstrated by the number of very old planning permissions in the schedule at Policy H1 [one dates back to 2004!] The intention to deliver the required amount of housing through allocated sites should be reviewed as it is not fit for purpose or effective as proposed. A combination of more allocations, including some identified as reserve sites and greater flexibility is necessary. The latter might be helped by an allowance for windfall but only through less stringent settlement boundaries and associated policies and a less prescriptive distribution of housing sites than set out in Policy SS6. It is also suggested that the flexibility allowance be extended beyond the first five years to encompass the whole of the Plan period, perhaps subject to review. 6.2 The schedule at Policy H1 is made up of committed sites totalling 2,189 and proposed sites totalling 5,301 adding up to 7,490. This is only	No The Plan is not considered sound for the reasons explained and thus because: • It is not justified; • It is not effective and • It is not consistent with national policies.	Proposed Modifications 1. Sites H1-15 and H1C-29 should be removed from the schedule of housing sites and moved to a new reserve schedule. The main schedule should be reappraised to identify any other questionable sites and should any emerge they also should be moved to a reserve schedule. 2. Paragraph 2 of sub- policies H1P-14 to 17 should be changed. Following the first sentence it should continue as follows: The road will be constructed in phases commencing from Wrawby Road and Atherton Way as part of associated housing development. It will be built to a design, specification and along a route to be approved through the grant of planning permission and controlled through appropriate conditions and Section 106 Agreements. It will be required that as each phase is developed the road		Keigar Homes is a local housing developer with an unparalleled knowledge of the district. Over many years it has built about 25% of the total number of houses erected in North Lincolnshire and is able to contribute to debate through both local knowledge and expertise in the housing market.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							marginally more than the required figure of 7,326 referred to in Policy SS5. There is no flexibility if any sites fail to come forward as anticipated. It is too precise as to be practical. 6.3 As an example, many of the committed sites relate to very old planning permissions which should not be entirely relied on. For example, ref H1C-29 [PA/2004/0692] dates back to 2004 yet is still included to provide some 44 dwellings! 6.4 Of the proposed allocations almost 3,000 relate to two site areas, Lincolnshire Lakes and the H1P -14 to 17 sites at Brigg. These are long standing proposals allocated in previous development plans. Whilst they may well provide some housing this time round it is questionable whether they should be relied on. In comprising about 60% of the total proposed sites it is a question of putting almost all one's eggs in one basket, so to speak. 6.5 The problem with the Brigg sites is that a new link road from Wrawby Road to Atherton Way is required both to release the sites for development and to reduce congestion within the town centre. Ignoring the possibility of public funding the proposed planning methodology for bringing the sites forward is impractical. Paragraphs 5.70, 5.75, 580 and 5.85 which relate to the H1 14-17 sites all require the sites to be "considered jointly" and "phased appropriately through a masterplan approach". This is supported by Policy ID1 which deals with the delivery of infrastructure. 6.6 The principle of such an approach is OK in theory but extremely unlikely to succeed in practice without direct intervention by the Council. It has not succeeded so far and these sites have been promoted by the Council for a very long time. 6.7 If the policy were to be amended to permit market forces to drive the sites forward it would enable the land with direct access to Wrawby Road and possibly Atherton Way to be developed relatively soon. Thus, site H 17 and part of H 16 could be granted planning permissions with conditions and legal agreements requiring the link road to be constructed to an appropriate specification along an agreed route to the boundary of the site. In turn this would eventually enable the remainder of site H1-16 and site H1-15 to be developed, subject to valuation considerations with regard to access. Keigar Homes have secured an interest in site H1-17 and undertake to develop it within the Plan period subject to a change in policy as suggested. 6.8 Bearing these matters in mind there seems virtually no prospect of site H1-15 and the northern part of site H1-16 coming forward within the Plan period whilst those with direct access to existing roads are only likely to do so if the policy approach is changed. These sites should be moved to a reserve category.		will be constructed to a point which will release and provide access to the next phase. [Note: this does not remove any property rights but merely enables development to continue as planned. 3. In order to help redress the likely shortfall the following sites are prosed for inclusion in the schedule of housing sites. Housing numbers are assessed on the basis of Policy H2.			
0577	Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object				This preliminary Highway Statement has been prepared regarding a parcel of land south of the A1077 barrow Road, Barton upon Humber. This parcel of land is being promoted through the North Lincs Local Plan process. The proposed land is immediately south of a draft allocation of land for residential development (H1P-13) as indicated on Plan 1 below and shown					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	Keigar Homes Ltd						outlined in a red line. (Please see email for map) . This land has been removed from the previous version of the draft local plan. Also shown on the above plan is a proposed relief road alignment. We understand that NLC are considering restricting the number of new homes which can be built to the east of Barton until the relief road has been built from Barrow Road to the A15. The latest proposed alignment for the relief road is shown on Plan 2 below:(see email). The allocation of the additional land shown outlined by the red line on plan 1 above will enable the first section of the relief road to be delivered between Barrow Road and Caistor Road. It is a commonplace to see relief roads being brought forward in a number of phases (i.e. in line with funding or development opportunities) and we consider that this would be a sound way to deliver a first phase of the relief road. Connecting Barrow Road and Caistor Road will provide some traffic relief to the east of Barton as traffic will then be able to travel via Caistor Road/Burnham Road to the B1206 and the A15. This would include the potential to remove some of the Wren factory traffic from the centre of Barton by providing this alternative route. Not only would this scheme therefore be able to deliver the first phase of the relief road, but there would also be instant traffic alleviation to the east of Barton and within Barton town centre itself. This would either partly or wholly mitigate against the potential increase in traffic which would be generated by the additional development land housing. Any potential traffic impact would be considered in a later Transport assessment , however the proposed allocation is well connected to Barton and is considered to be in a good location to encourage sustainable transport. Providing a first phase of the relief road is therefore considered to be an eminently sensible way forward at this stage, although it would be dependant on the allocation of the additional land set out above (see map). The first phase of the relief road could be provided by the developer through the allocation of sites, with the remainder of the relief road being provided at a later stage. indeed it could potentially be easier to achieve government funding for the remainder of the relief road, if part of this road is secured via private sector development. We consider that this is a sound strategy from a highways perspective and we would therefore recommend that the additional land set out above is allocated in the Local Plan. I hope that the above is sufficient at this stage however please get back to me if you require any clarification or further information.					
Robert Ian **Stuart**, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd												
0328	Robert Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object	yes	no	yes	6.1 Policy SS5 advises that delivery of housing will mainly be through sites allocated by Policy H1. In commenting on Policy SS5 it was explained why a similar reliance on specific site allocations failed in the past. The following extract is relevant: From experience of working within the area it is clear that a significant contributary factor [to the housing delivery deficit] was too great a reliance on specific allocations intended to deliver approximately the total requirement. Many of the allocation were a flawed by lack of understanding of market and development considerations and failed to materialise as hoped and there was no back up plan. The current Plan follows the same path and is in danger of failing for	effective	Proposed Modifications1. Sites H1-15 and H1C-29 should be removed from the schedule of housing sites and moved to a new reserve schedule. The main schedule should be reappraised to identify any other questionable sites and should any emerge they also should be moved to a reserve schedule.2. Paragraph 2 of sub-	yes	Keigar Homes is a local housing developer with an unparalleled knowledge of the district. Over many years it has built about 25% of the total number of houses erected in North Lincolnshire and is able to	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							precisely the same reasons. The local housing market is not as dynamic as many others so it is necessary to adopt a pro-active approach rather than a cautionary one. It should not be assumed that land will come forward at the rate anticipated or even at all, merely because it is allocated. This is easily demonstrated by the number of very old planning permissions in the schedule at Policy H1 [one dates back to 2004!] The intention to deliver the required amount of housing through allocated sites should be reviewed as it is not fit for purpose or effective as proposed. A combination of more allocations, including some identified as reserve sites and greater flexibility is necessary. The latter might be helped by an allowance for windfall but only through less stringent settlement boundaries and associated policies and a less prescriptive distribution of housing sites than set out in Policy SS6. It is also suggested that the flexibility allowance be extended beyond the first five years to encompass the whole of the Plan period, perhaps subject to review. 6.2 The schedule at Policy H1 is made up of committed sites totalling 2,189 and proposed sites totalling 5,301 adding up to 7,490. This is only marginally more than the required figure of 7,326 referred to in Policy SS5. There is no flexibility if any sites fail to come forward as anticipated. It is too precise as to be practical. 6.3 As an example, many of the committed sites relate to very old planning permissions which should not be entirely relied on. For example, ref H1C-29 [PA/2004/0692] dates back to 2004 yet is still included to provide some 44 dwellings! 6.4 Of the proposed allocations almost 3,000 relate to two site areas, Lincolnshire Lakes and the H1P -14 to 17 sites at Brigg. These are long standing proposals allocated in previous development plans. Whilst they may well provide some housing this time round it is questionable whether they should be relied on. In comprising about 60% of the total proposed sites it is a question of putting almost all one's eggs in one basket, so to speak. 6.5 The problem with the Brigg sites is that a new link road from Wrawby Road to Atherton Way is required both to release the sites for development and to reduce congestion within the town centre. Ignoring the possibility of public funding the proposed planning methodology for bringing the sites forward is impractical. Paragraphs 5.70, 5.75, 580 and 5.85 which relate to the H1 14-17 sites all require the sites to be considered jointly and has appropriately through a masterplan approach. This is supported by Policy ID1 which deals with the delivery of infrastructure. 6.6 The principle of such an approach is OK in theory but extremely unlikely to succeed in practice without direct intervention by the Council. It has not succeeded so far and these sites have been promoted by the Council for a very long time. 6.7 If the policy were to be amended to permit market forces to drive the sites forward it would enable the land with direct access to Wrawby Road and possibly Atherton Way to be developed relatively soon. Thus, site H 17 and part of H 16 could be granted planning permissions with conditions		policies H1P-14 to 17 should be changed. Following the first sentence it should continue as follows: The road will be constructed in phases commencing from Wrawby Road and Atherton Way as part of associated housing development. It will be built to a design, specification and along a route to be approved through the grant of planning permission and controlled through appropriate conditions and Section 106 Agreements. It will be required that as each phase is developed the road will be constructed to a point which will release and provide access to the next phase. [Note: this does not remove any property rights but merely enables development to continue as planned. 3. In order to help redress the likely shortfall the following sites are proposed for inclusion in the schedule of housing sites. Housing numbers are assessed on the basis of Policy H2.Note: Plans will not paste in so but have been submitted by separate email A Barton Upon Humber Land between Barrow Road and Caister Road.This site is marked A on the attached inset plan of Barton. It extends to some 14.3 ha [34.4 acres] which at the lower end of the appropriate density range set out in Policy H2 would provide about 575 dwellings. This site was included in the previous Options Plan and its inclusion would bring the overall number of new houses proposed for Barton up to a figure more commensurate with the Town's status. It is understood it was		contribute to debate through both local knowledge and expertise in the housing market.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							and legal agreements requiring the link road to be constructed to an appropriate specification along an agreed route to the boundary of the site. In turn this would eventually enable the remainder of site H1-16 and site H1-15 to be developed, subject to valuation considerations with regard to access. Keigar Homes have secured an interest in site H1-17 and undertake to develop it within the Plan period subject to a change in policy as suggested. 6.8 Bearing these matters in mind there seems virtually no prospect of site H1-15 and the northern part of site H1-16 coming forward within the Plan period whilst those with direct access to existing roads are only likely to do so if the policy approach is changed. These sites should be moved to a reserve category.The Plan is not considered sound for the following reasons and because: It is not positively prepared, Is not effective; It is not consistent with national planning policy and It is not justified.		deleted due to doubts about the impact of additional traffic through the town centre. However, the inclusion of the site would enable the first phase of the planned bye-pass to be constructed as far as the Caister Road. This could easily be achieved as part and parcel of the housing development and secured through condition and legal agreement. If development were to start from both the Barrow and Caister Roads it would help minimise the potential impact within the town. Highway consultants, BSP Consulting have advised that the delivery of phase 1 of the by-pass as proposed would both practical and beneficial in helping to divert traffic away from the town centre. A letter from BSP will be submitted separately.Keigar Homes are in negotiation to purchase both site A and the already allocated site alongside Barrow Road. Not to scale B - Barrow Upon Humber Land at Wold Road, Barrow Upon Humber. -- Sites A and B. Keigar Homes have an option to purchase both sites A and B. Both were considered favourably in the SHLAA and relate very well to the structural form of the settlement. Site A is some 1.6 Ha [3.8 acres] in extent and could accommodate about48 dwellings whilst site B is some 0.75 Ha [1.8] acres in extent and could accommodate about 23 dwellings.Land at Ferry Road East, Barrow Upon Humber. – Site C This site of some 1.0 Ha [2.39 acres] is owned by Keigar Homes and would comprise the			

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									second phase of development currently under construction on approved site H1C-35. A planning application is currently pending for the erection of 18 dwellings. Land at Ferry Road, Barrow Upon Humber -- Site DThis site of approximately 1.0 Ha [2.39 acres] is part of the same field that includes proposed allocation H1P 20 and alongside approved site H1C-34. It is illogical to omit it as it lies between allocated sites and the town. Whilst development might be limited by heritage issues associated with the nearby conservation area and views of the church, it should be considered in conjunction with the allocated part of the same field. Subject to heritage issues it might accommodate some 30 dwellings. C --Land at Goxhill Two sites, both owned by Keigar Homes, are proposed as shown on the map below. Site A is some 0.9Ha [2.13 acres] in extent and is capable of accommodating about 27 dwellings. It would form a logical extension of the adjoining site which is currently being developed by Keigar. Site B is some 2Ha [5.1 acres in extent and could accommodate about 64 dwellings although Keigar considers the site suitable for specialist lifetime dwellings for the over 55s which might have a bearing on density. Not to scaleD - Wootton Both Sites A and B on the map below enjoy the benefit of planning permission for housing and should be allocated accordingly. The form of development for four dwellings approved on site B is very restricted so in order to				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									provide more scope to provide a design more sympathetic to the character of the village it is proposed that the allocation and settlement boundary be slightly extended as illustrated by the broken black line.			
0676	Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	POLICY ID1: DELIVERING INFRASTRUCTURE	Object		No		Paragraph 3 suggests that where numerous parcels of land, most likely in different ownerships, are proposed for development then separate/individual planning applications will be treated as one. That is a different thing to saying that each application will be required to fit within an agreed framework or approved masterplan. It is impractical and unreasonable and should be deleted.	The Plan is considered unsound for the reasons explained and because: • It is not positively prepared, • Is not effective; • It is not consistent with national planning policy and • It is not justified.	Delete paragraph 3		Keigar Homes is a local housing developer with an unparalleled knowledge of the district. Over many years it has built about 25% of the total number of houses erected in North Lincolnshire and is able to contribute to debate through both local knowledge and expertise in the housing market.	View PDF
0333	Robert Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	POLICY ID1: DELIVERING INFRASTRUCTURE	object	yes	no	yes	1 Paragraph 3 suggests that where numerous parcels of land, most likely in different ownerships, are proposed for development then separate/individual planning applications will be treated as one. That is a different thing to saying that each application will be required to fit within an agreed framework or approved masterplan. It is impractical and unreasonable.The Plan is considered to be unsound for the reasons explained and because:It is not justified;It is not effective and It is inconsistent with national policy.	effective	Delete paragraph 3	yes	Keigar Homes wishes to participate in the hearing sessions because as an experience local housing developer it feels well able to contribute to debate. In recent years it has consistently built about 25% of the total number of houses completed in the district and has an unparalleled knowledge of local market conditions.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0329	Robert Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	POLICY RD1: 1l.	object	yes	no	yes	This policy does not accord with the advice in Paragraph 79 of the Framework to support sustainable development in rural areas, particularly where it will support local services and where, in the case of smaller settlements, development in one village might support services in a village nearby. Instead, it concentrates entirely to the subsequent advice in Paragraph 80 to avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside other than in certain circumstances. The Plan is considered unsound for the reasons explained and because: It is not positively prepared, Is not effective; It is not consistent with national planning policy and It is not justified.	Consistent with national policy	Proposed Modifications Change the introduction to paragraph 1 as follows: Land outside settlement boundaries will be classed as countryside where development will be limited in accordance with the advice in paragraphs 79 and 80 of the NPPF. This might include limited sustainable development that relates well to the structural form, scale and character of a settlement and/or where it is located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Elsewhere in the countryside development will be restricted with the exception of the following which will be supported where proposals respect the intrinsic character of their surroundings: etc. All references to the term development limit should be deleted and where appropriate changed to settlement boundaries.	yes	Keigar Homes is a local housing developer with an unparalleled knowledge of the district. Over many years it has built about 25% of the total number of houses erected in North Lincolnshire and is able to contribute to debate through both local knowledge and expertise in the housing market.	View PDF
0468	Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	POLICY RD1: SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE	Object		No		The Plan is not considered to be sound. 7.1 This policy does not accord with the advice in Paragraph 79 of the Framework to support sustainable development in rural areas, particularly where it will support local services and where, in the case of smaller settlements, development in one village might support services in a village nearby. Instead, it concentrates entirely to the subsequent advice in Paragraph 80 to avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside other than in certain circumstances.	The Plan is considered unsound for the reasons explained and because: • It is not positively prepared, • Is not effective; • It is not consistent with national planning policy and	Proposed Modification Change the introduction to paragraph 1 as follows: Land outside settlement boundaries will be classed as countryside where development will be limited in accordance with the advice in paragraphs 79 and 80 of the NPPF. This might include limited sustainable development that relates well to the structural form, scale and character of a settlement and/or where it is located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Elsewhere in the countryside development will be restricted with the exception	Yes	Keigar Homes is a local housing developer with an unparalleled knowledge of the district. Over many years it has built about 25% of the total number of houses erected in North Lincolnshire and is able to contribute to debate through both local knowledge and expertise in the housing market.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
								• It is not justified.	of the following which will be supported where proposals respect the intrinsic character of their surroundings: etc. All references to the term development limit should be deleted and where appropriate changed to settlement boundaries.			
0656	Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	Policy SS11: Development Limits	Object		No		The Plan is not considered to be sound. Objections are submitted on two principal grounds: • That the use of development limits as proposed is not compliant with the Framework; • That the limits defined on settlement plans are too restrictive. Not compliant with Framework 5.1 There is a distinction between the term and application of development limits as proposed in Policy SS11 and the use of settlement boundaries to define structural form and as planning tool to apply appropriate policies. The former serves to restrict development to within boundary limits whilst the latter provides a way of guiding development to sustainable locations. 5.2 Sub-paragraph 3 of Policy SS11 states categorically that development will not be allowed outside defined limits unless it is essential to the functioning of the countryside or in association with tourism. The use of development limits in this way is not compliant with the overarching intention of the Framework to encourage sustainable development because the application of defined limits creates arbitrary boundaries around settlements which allows no discretion. 5.3 Paragraph 4.101 explains the purpose as generally to ensure that future development occurs in sustainable locations and to protect the countryside from inappropriate development. The two points are quite different and relate to different paragraphs of the Framework; in particular, paragraphs 79 and 80. 5.4 The Appeal Court case of Braintree v SS for Communities and others [EWCA Civ 610, 2018 WL.01513032] provided a landmark judgement and is relevant in this instance. The case concerned the advice in paragraph 55 [now 79 and 80] of the Framework that LPAs should avoid new “isolated” homes in the countryside, but it also discussed related wider issues. Lord Justice Lindblom drew attention to the fact that the Framework does not define what is meant by the term settlement, or that “only the land and buildings within that settlement or development boundary will constitute the settlement”. It was pointed out that it would be wrong to deny the [Framework] policy’s support – and indeed, would turn it against – proposed dwellings that “could contribute to social sustainability because of [their] proximity to other homes”.	No The Plan is not considered sound for the reasons explained and thus because: • It is not justified; • It is not effective and • It is not consistent with national policies.	Proposed Modifications Change the heading of the Policy to Settlement Boundaries Change paragraph 1 as follows: Within the defined settlement boundaries of Scunthorpe & Bottesford [and others] [which are shown on the policies/inset maps] the principle of residential development is acceptable subject to the application of all other policies in the Local Plan. Change paragraph 3 as follows: Land outside settlement boundaries will be classed as countryside where development will be limited in accordance with the advice in paragraphs 79 and 80 of the NPPF. This might include limited sustainable development that relates well to the structural form, scale and character of a settlement and/or where it is located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Elsewhere development will be restricted to that which is essential to the functioning of, or to meet the needs associated with the countryside. Etc All references to the term development limit should be deleted and where appropriate changed to settlement	Yes	Keigar Homes is a local housing developer with an unparalleled knowledge of the district. Over many years it has built about 25% of the total number of houses erected in North Lincolnshire and is able to contribute to debate through both local knowledge and expertise in the housing market.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							5.6 Since then, there have been many other legal and planning appeal cases that are helpful. In essence, it is now accepted that the term "isolated homes in the countryside" referred to in Paragraph 80 cannot logically be applied in the consideration of development proposals situated in sustainable locations alongside established settlements. That is not to say that any such proposals should be accepted without careful scrutiny of how they relate in scale and form to the character and appearance of the settlement. 5.7 It is suggested that Policy SS11 should be deleted in its present form and replaced by a policy to define settlement boundaries within which the principle of [residential] development is generally acceptable. In addition, it should make clear that sustainable development of limited scale in locations adjacent to settlements may be considered favourably if it relates well with the built form and character of the settlement and the availability of services. Defined boundaries are too restrictive. 5.8 Notwithstanding the principal objection to Policy SS11 referred to above, the boundaries defined in settlement inset maps are drawn so tightly that they leave virtually no scope for even the bare minimum of development within them, other than on allocated sites. This is particularly apparent in market towns and rural settlements and undermines the advice in Paragraph 79 of the Framework that "planning policies should identify opportunities to grow and thrive". 5.9 Settlement boundaries were defined in previous local development plans and a background paper describes the basis of how they have been revised. In essence, very little change has occurred. The result is that very few opportunities are available for windfall development, which might explain the apparent lack of reference in the housing provision figures. The overly restrictive nature of this policy is a significant issue with regard to the overall lack of flexibility in housing provision. 5.10 It is unnecessary to refer to all the many examples of just how restrictive and illogical settlement boundaries are defined but as an illustration the recent adjustment of the boundary around a corner of Winterton might be mentioned. Keigar Homes are developing land off North Street but as the attached plan shows, the settlement boundary has been left largely as it was, leaving a wedge of so-called countryside thrust awkwardly into the built-up structure of the settlement. It is proposed that the boundary be adjusted as shown. (see rep for map which has been included)		boundaries.			
0322	Robert Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	object	yes	no	yes	Objections are submitted on two principal grounds: That the use of development limits as proposed is not compliant with the Framework; That the limits defined on settlement plans are too restrictive. Not compliant with Framework 5.1 There is a distinction between the term and application of development limits as proposed in Policy SS11 and the use of settlement	Consistent with national policy	Proposed Modifications Change the heading of the Policy to Settlement Boundaries Change paragraph 1 as follows: Within the defined settlement boundaries of Scunthorpe & Bottesford [and others] [which	yes	Keigar Homes wishes to participate in the hearing sessions because, as an experience local housing developer, it feels well able to contribute to	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							boundaries to define structural form and as planning tool to apply appropriate policies. The former serves to restrict development to within boundary limits whilst the latter provides a way of guiding development to sustainable locations. 5.2 Sub-paragraph 3 of Policy SS11 states categorically that development will not be allowed outside defined limits unless it is essential to the functioning of the countryside or in association with tourism. The use of development limits in this way is not compliant with the overarching intention of the Framework to encourage sustainable development because the application of defined limits creates arbitrary boundaries around settlements which allows no discretion. 5.3 Paragraph 4.101 explains the purpose as generally to ensure that future development occurs in sustainable locations and to protect the countryside from inappropriate development. The two points are quite different and relate to different paragraphs of the Framework; in particular, paragraphs 79 and 80. 5.4 The Appeal Court case of Braintree v SS for Communities and others [EWCA Civ 610, 2018 WL.01513032] provided a landmark judgement and is relevant in this instance. The case concerned the advice in paragraph 55 [now 79 and 80] of the Framework that LPAs should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside, but it also discussed related wider issues. Lord Justice Lindblom drew attention to the fact that the Framework does not define what is meant by the term settlement, or that only the land and buildings within that settlement or development boundary will constitute the settlement. It was pointed out that it would be wrong to deny the [Framework] policy's support and indeed, would turn it against proposed dwellings that could contribute to social sustainability because of [their] proximity to other homes 5.6 Since then, there have been many other legal and planning appeal cases that are helpful. In essence, it is now accepted that the term isolated homes in the countryside referred to in Paragraph 80 cannot logically be applied in the consideration of development proposals situated in sustainable locations alongside established settlements. That is not to say that any such proposals should be accepted without careful scrutiny of how they relate in scale and form to the character and appearance of the settlement. 5.7 It is suggested that Policy SS11 should be deleted in its present form and replaced by a policy to define settlement boundaries within which the principle of [residential] development is generally acceptable. In addition, it should make clear that sustainable development of limited scale in locations adjacent to settlements may be considered favourably if it relates well with the built form and character of the settlement and the availability of services. Defined boundaries are too restrictive. 5.8 Notwithstanding the principal objection to Policy SS11 referred to above, the boundaries defined in settlement inset maps are drawn so tightly that they leave virtually no scope for even the bare minimum of development within them, other than on allocated sites. This is		are shown on the policies/inset maps] the principle of residential development is acceptable subject to the application of all other policies in the Local Plan. Change paragraph 3 as follows: Land outside settlement boundaries will be classed as countryside where development will be limited in accordance with the advice in paragraphs 79 and 80 of the NPPF. This might include limited sustainable development that relates well to the structural form, scale and character of a settlement and/or where it is located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Elsewhere development will be restricted to that which is essential to the functioning of, or to meet the needs associated with the countryside. Etc All references to the term development limit should be deleted and where appropriate changed to settlement boundaries.		debate. In recent years it has consistently built about 25% of the total number of houses completed in the district and has an unparalleled knowledge of local market conditions.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							particularly apparent in market towns and rural settlements and undermines the advice in Paragraph 79 of the Framework that planning policies should identify opportunities to grow and thrive. 5.9 Settlement boundaries were defined in previous local development plans and a background paper describes the basis of how they have been revised. In essence, very little change has occurred. The result is that very few opportunities are available for windfall development, which might explain the apparent lack of reference in the housing provision figures. The overly restrictive nature of this policy is a significant issue with regard to the overall lack of flexibility in housing provision. 5.10 It is unnecessary to refer to all the many examples of just how restrictive and illogical settlement boundaries are defined but as an illustration the recent adjustment of the boundary around a corner of Winterton might be mentioned. Keigar Homes are developing land off North Street but as the attached plan shows, the settlement boundary has been left largely as it was, leaving a wedge of so-called countryside thrust awkwardly into the built-up structure of the settlement. It is proposed that the boundary be adjusted as shown. Winterton - map submitted separately The Plan is considered unsound for the reasons explained and because: It is not positively prepared, Is not effective; It is not consistent with national planning policy and It is not justified.					
0662	Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	Object		No		In principle the Spatial Vision of sustainable growth which offers prosperity and well-being for residents of the district is supported. However, subsequent policies do not follow and develop the intentions of the strategy as one would expect and in some cases are likely to undermine it. Issues and policies relating particularly to climate change are of concern. 2.2 The Spatial Strategy [Policy SS2] does not altogether flow from the Spatial Vision as one might expect and this is carried through to subsequent policies. The Vision is one of growth. It tells us that the “focus will be on sustainable economic growth” and “to support our growing economy, the area will be a location for sustainable housing growth with at least 8,380 new homes being delivered”. It is not clear why this has been reduced in Policy SS2 to “at least 7,128 new homes”. 2.3 Subsequent policies do not altogether reflect a strategy of growth. For example, there is a clear difference between employment policies and housing policies. The former is framed positively to seek investment and growth whilst the latter are inclined to be negative and restrictive. Such an approach is understandable in a buoyant market area but not in a quiet market area such as North Lincolnshire. History tells us that this approach has failed in the past. 2.4 The Policy calls for the development of at least 131.7 ha of employment land “in key locations that support the delivery of housing	No	Proposed Modifications a. The commitment to growth should be carried through to subsequent policies of the Plan, particularly those relating to housing. b. A greater proportion of housing growth should be allocated to the eastern part of the district to support the major employment allocations proposed at and close to the Humber Bank.	Yes	Keigar Homes is a local housing developer with an unparalleled knowledge of the district. Over many years it has built about 25% of the total number of houses erected in North Lincolnshire and is able to contribute to debate through both local knowledge and expertise in the housing market.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							growth" and "amongst these areas are South Humber Gateway" etc. More will be said with regard to other related policies but suffice it to say that with the exception of Scunthorpe there is no obvious relationship between the proposed location of major employment land and new housing. 2.5 In this regard the strategy is fundamentally flawed as it fails to have sufficient regard to the requirements of climate change expectations and legislation at both national and international levels. The Publication Plan acknowledges the issue of climate change but does not carry it forward effectively through the spatial strategy and subsequent policies. 2.6 It is universally acknowledged that the use of fossil fuels should be reduced and that one way of doing so is to reduce vehicle journeys. Planning policy has a key role to play in arranging land uses in such a way as to achieve this objective. An obvious and accepted principle is to plan for residential and employment areas to be closely related in order to reduce journey to work distances. In this instance the major employment areas of the South Humber Bank and North Killingholme are unsupported by any planned new housing on a similar scale within a reasonable distance. 2.7 The extent of housing that might ultimately be required to underpin the aspiration for huge employment growth at the Humber Bank is not known. Indeed, the background paper on housing and economic growth suggests it might be very little. However, two points are relevant: Firstly, with so much importance attached to the expansion of the Humber Bank employment zone, both locally and nationally, it would be wise at the very least to identify how and where housing might be located to serve it should it be necessary. This could be done through some form of reserve allocation. Such clarity would be of help to prospective investors. Secondly, whether or not any greater housing provision is necessary, what is provided should be located sustainably in relation to employment opportunities. 2.8 Another area of concern is the proposed major housing allocation known as Lincolnshire Lakes. As the name implies, it lies in an area at risk of flooding and yet it is universally accepted that it is unsustainable to build new houses in such areas. Indeed, the Publication Plan notes this principle and whilst it is acknowledged that the scale of the project has been reduced, it still proceeds to allocate a substantial area of land for housing. It is acknowledged that some preliminary infrastructure/remedial works have already been carried out and that outline planning permissions have been granted and thus, it might be argued to be committed. However, the proposed allocation is neither compliant with Policy DQE 5: Flood Risk, nor with national policy as set out in Section 14 of the Framework.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0662	Robert Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	object	yes	no	yes	2.1 In principle the Spatial Vision of sustainable growth which offers prosperity and well-being for residents of the district is supported. However, subsequent policies do not follow and develop the intentions of the strategy as one would expect and in some cases are likely to undermine it. Issues and policies relating particularly to climate change are of concern. 2.2 The Spatial Strategy [Policy SS2] does not altogether flow from the Spatial Vision as one might expect and this is carried through to subsequent policies. The Vision is one of growth. It tells us that the focus will be on sustainable economic growth and to support our growing economy, the area will be a location for sustainable housing growth with at least 8,380 new homes being delivered. It is not clear why this has been reduced in Policy SS2 to at least 7,128 new homes. 2.3 Subsequent policies do not altogether reflect a strategy of growth. For example, there is a clear difference between employment policies and housing policies. The former is framed positively to seek investment and growth whilst the latter are inclined to be negative and restrictive. Such an approach is understandable in a buoyant market area but not in a quiet market area such as North Lincolnshire. History tells us that this approach has failed in the past. 2.4 The Policy calls for the development of at least 131.7 ha of employment land in key locations that support the delivery of housing growth and amongst these areas are South Humber Gateway etc. More will be said with regard to other related policies but suffice it to say that with the exception of Scunthorpe there is no obvious relationship between the proposed location of major employment land and new housing. 2.5 In this regard the strategy is fundamentally flawed as it fails to have sufficient regard to the requirements of climate change expectations and legislation at both national and international levels. The Publication Plan acknowledges the issue of climate change but does not carry it forward effectively through the spatial strategy and subsequent policies. 2.6 It is universally acknowledged that the use of fossil fuels should be reduced and that one way of doing so is to reduce vehicle journeys. Planning policy has a key role to play in arranging land uses in such a way as to achieve this objective. An obvious and accepted principle is to plan for residential and employment areas to be closely related in order to reduce journey to work distances. In this instance the major employment areas of the South Humber Bank and North Killingholme are unsupported by any planned new housing on a similar scale within a reasonable distance. 2.7 The extent of housing that might ultimately be required to underpin the aspiration for huge employment growth at the Humber Bank is not known. Indeed, the background paper on housing and economic growth suggests it might be very little. However, two points are relevant: Firstly, with so much importance attached to the expansion of the Humber Bank employment zone, both locally and nationally, it would be wise at the very least to identify how and where housing might be located to serve it	Consistent with national policy	Proposed Modifications a. The commitment to growth should be carried through to subsequent policies of the Plan, particularly those relating to housing. b. A greater proportion of housing growth should be allocated to the eastern part of the district to support the major employment allocations proposed at and close to the Humber Bank.	yes	Keigar Homes is a local housing developer with an unparalleled knowledge of the district. Over many years it has built about 25% of the total number of houses erected in North Lincolnshire and is able to contribute to debate through both local knowledge and expertise in the housing market.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							should it be necessary. This could be done through some form of reserve allocation. Such clarity would be of help to prospective investors. Secondly, whether or not any greater housing provision is necessary, what is provided should be located sustainably in relation to employment opportunities. 2.8 Another area of concern is the proposed major housing allocation known as Lincolnshire Lakes. As the name implies, it lies in an area at risk of flooding and yet it is universally accepted that it is unsustainable to build new houses in such areas. Indeed, the Publication Plan notes this principle and whilst it is acknowledged that the scale of the project has been reduced, it still proceeds to allocate a substantial area of land for housing. It is acknowledged that some preliminary infrastructure/remedial works have already been carried out and that outline planning permissions have been granted and thus, it might be argued to be committed. However, the proposed allocation is neither compliant with Policy DQE 5: Flood Risk, nor with national policy as set out in Section 14 of the Framework. The Plan is considered unsound for the reasons explained and because: It is not positively prepared, It is not consistent with national planning policy and It is not justified.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0676	Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	POLICY SS5: OVERALL HOUSING PROVISION	Object		No		It is unfortunate that the housing growth figure does not seem to reflect the strategic aim to grow the economy. Indeed, it is not clear why the intention expressed in the Spatial Vision to deliver at least 8,380 new homes to support the growing economy is not carried forward to Policy SS5 which aims to provide only 7,326; a reduction of about 12.5%. 3.2 The objectively assessed need of 7,128 new houses is increased to 7,326 by the addition of a further 198 to be provided in the first 5 years of the Plan. The intention is to provide an element of flexibility. This suggests that the annual requirement of 396 dwellings per annum will increase by some 40 [39.6] per year to 436. It is not clear why an additional number for the purposes of flexibility is required for the first five years but not thereafter. 3.3 Paragraph 4.41 explains that the policy "will mainly be delivered through sites allocated in Policy H3". It is assumed this is an error and should mean H1. The sum of allocated sites is 5,301 of which two site areas comprise almost 3,000 or 60% of the total. These are Lincolnshire Lakes and a group of composite sites in Brigg. Both of these featured in the 2011 Core Strategy and were included in the 2016 Housing and Employment Allocations Plan, whilst some of the Brigg sites were allocated as far back as the 2003 Local Plan. Neither site area has yet delivered any new homes and there is no evidence to suggest they will do so to any material degree in the near future. 3.4 The Housing Delivery Test data suggests that the Council has delivered 94% of its requirement during the relevant period. Yet this is misleading. For example, the 2018 Delivery Test measurement was only 73%, whilst in the preceding ten years or so annual housing delivery was not only well below the requirements at that time but significantly below the present requirement. This is clearly demonstrated by Graph 1 in the Delivery Test Action Plan dated July,2021. The following are the actual figures for the previous ten years up to 2020: 2010/11 ----- 457 2011/12 ----- 399 2012/13 ----- 326 2013/14 ----- 379 2014/15 ------367 2015/16 ------379 2016/17 ------272 2017/18 ------363 From Graph 1 2018/19 ----about 300 2019/20-----about 369 Average --- 361 *It should be noted there is a discrepancy between these figures derived from NLC and the 2921 Housing Delivery Test Action Plan and those shown in Table 1 on page 47 3.5 The Housing Delivery Test which measures delivery over the preceding three financial years and a requires a buffer to be added depending on the	No The Plan is not considered sound for the reasons explained and thus because: It is not justified; It is not effective and It is not consistent with national policies.	Proposed Modifications More housing allocations should be added; A number of reserve allocations should be provided with an appropriate monitoring mechanism to trigger release; Greater provision of windfall sites should be encouraged through a revision of settlement boundaries and through acknowledgement of limited sustainable development opportunities in proximity to settlements; The flexibility allowance should be extended beyond the first five years with an appropriate monitoring mechanism.	Yes	Keigar Homes is a local housing developer with an unparalleled knowledge of the district. Over many years it has built about 25% of the total number of houses erected in North Lincolnshire and is able to contribute to debate through both local knowledge and expertise in the housing market.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							deficit set against the adopted requirement. However, it does not question how or why the rate of delivery might have changed. In this case it is reasonable obvious that the reason housing delivery has improved in the recent past has been because significant numbers of unallocated sites have been approved, many at appeal. This should be seen against a background where for a number of years the Council was unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land. 3.6 It might be argued that the housing requirement is now significantly less than it was. In response it is pointed out that the average delivery figure over the ten-year period referred to above was still significantly less than currently required. 3.7 From experience of working within the area it is clear that a significant contributary factor was too great a reliance on specific allocations intended to deliver approximately the total requirement. Many of the allocation were a flawed by lack of understanding of market and development considerations and failed to materialise as hoped and there was no back up plan. 3.8 The current Plan follows the same path and is in danger of failing for precisely the same reasons. The local housing market is not as dynamic as many others so it is necessary to adopt a pro-active approach rather than a cautionary one. It should not be assumed that land will come forward at the rate anticipated or even at all, merely because it is allocated. This is easily demonstrated by the number of very old planning permissions in the schedule at Policy H1 [one dates back to 2004!] 3.9 The intention to deliver the required amount of housing through allocated sites should be reviewed as it is not fit for purpose as proposed and thus will be ineffective in delivering the required number of new houses. A combination of more allocations, including some identified as reserve sites and greater flexibility is necessary. The latter might be helped by an allowance for windfall but only through less stringent settlement boundaries and associated policies and a less prescriptive distribution of housing sites than set out in Policy SS6. It is also suggested that the flexibility allowance be extended beyond the first five years to encompass the whole of the Plan period, perhaps subject to review. Further comments will be added in respect of Policy H1.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0308	Robert Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	POLICY SS5: OVERALL HOUSING PROVISION	object	yes	no	yes	It is unfortunate that the housing growth figure does not seem to reflect the strategic aim to grow the economy. Indeed, it is not clear why the intention expressed in the Spatial Vision to deliver at least 8,380 new homes to support the growing economy is not carried forward to Policy SS5 which aims to provide only 7,326; a reduction of about 12.5%. 3.2 The objectively assessed need of 7,128 new houses is increased to 7,326 by the addition of a further 198 to be provided in the first 5 years of the Plan. The intention is to provide an element of flexibility. This suggests that the annual requirement of 396 dwellings per annum will increase by some 40 [39.6] per year to 436. It is not clear why an additional number for the purposes of flexibility is required for the first five years but not thereafter. 3.3 Paragraph 4.41 explains that the policy will mainly be delivered through sites allocated in Policy H3. It is assumed this is an error and should mean H1. The sum of allocated sites is 5,301 of which two site areas comprise almost 3,000 or 60% of the total. These are Lincolnshire Lakes and a group of composite sites in Brigg. Both of these featured in the 2011 Core Strategy and were included in the 2016 Housing and Employment Allocations Plan, whilst some of the Brigg sites were allocated as far back as the 2003 Local Plan. Neither site area has yet delivered any new homes and there is no evidence to suggest they will do so to any material degree in the near future. 3.4 The Housing Delivery Test data suggests that the Council has delivered 94% of its requirement during the relevant period. Yet this is misleading. For example, the 2018 Delivery Test measurement was only 73%, whilst in the preceding ten years or so annual housing delivery was not only well below the requirements at that time but significantly below the present requirement. This is clearly demonstrated by Graph 1 in the Delivery Test Action Plan dated July,2021. The following are the actual figures for the previous ten years up to 2020: 2010/11 ------ 457 2011/12 ----- 399 2012/13 ------ 326 2013/14 ------ 379 2014/15 -------367 2015/16 -------379 2016/17 -------272 2017/18 -------363 From Graph 1 2018/19 ----about 300 2019/20-----about 369 Average --- 361 • It should be noted there is a discrepancy between these figures derived from NLC and the 2921 Housing Delivery Test Action Plan and those shown in Table 1 on page 47 3.5 The Housing Delivery Test which measures delivery over the preceding three financial years and a requires a buffer to be added depending on the	effective	Proposed Modifications More housing allocations should be added; A number of reserve allocations should be provided with an appropriate monitoring mechanism to trigger release; Greater provision of windfall sites should be encouraged through a revision of settlement boundaries and through acknowledgement of limited sustainable development opportunities in proximity to settlements; The flexibility allowance should be extended beyond the first five years with an appropriate monitoring mechanism.	yes	Keigar Homes wishes to participate in hearing sessions because it is an experienced housing developer that consistently builds about 25% of the total number constructed annually in North |Lincolnshire and thus can contribute to debate through an unparalleled knowledge of the district and the housing market.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							deficit set against the adopted requirement. However, it does not question how or why the rate of delivery might have changed. In this case it is reasonable obvious that the reason housing delivery has improved in the recent past has been because significant numbers of unallocated sites have been approved, many at appeal. This should be seen against a background where for a number of years the Council was unable to demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land. 3.6 It might be argued that the housing requirement is now significantly less than it was. In response it is pointed out that the average delivery figure over the ten-year period referred to above was still significantly less than currently required. 3.7 From experience of working within the area it is clear that a significant contributary factor was too great a reliance on specific allocations intended to deliver approximately the total requirement. Many of the allocation were a flawed by lack of understanding of market and development considerations and failed to materialise as hoped and there was no back up plan. 3.8 The current Plan follows the same path and is in danger of failing for precisely the same reasons. The local housing market is not as dynamic as many others so it is necessary to adopt a pro-active approach rather than a cautionary one. It should not be assumed that land will come forward at the rate anticipated or even at all, merely because it is allocated. This is easily demonstrated by the number of very old planning permissions in the schedule at Policy H1 [one dates back to 2004!] 3.9 The intention to deliver the required amount of housing through allocated sites should be reviewed as it is not fit for purpose as proposed and thus will be ineffective in delivering the required number of new houses. A combination of more allocations, including some identified as reserve sites and greater flexibility is necessary. The latter might be helped by an allowance for windfall but only through less stringent settlement boundaries and associated policies and a less prescriptive distribution of housing sites than set out in Policy SS6. It is also suggested that the flexibility allowance be extended beyond the first five years to encompass the whole of the Plan period, perhaps subject to review. Further comments will be added in respect of Policy H1. The Plan is not considered sound for the reasons explained and thus because: It is not justified; It is not effective and It is not consistent with national policies.					
0712	Robert Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object	yes	no	yes	4.1 The arrangement of settlements which seems to be derived from the evidence of the revised 2019 Settlement Survey is accepted as logical with the exception of the degree of housing allocated to Barton Upon Humber which is little more than half that allocated to the other Principal Town, Brigg. This fails to build on the services and facilities which the town has to offer. 4.2 However, it is of major concern that the policy is too prescriptive and thus lacks flexibility. It is not necessary to get down to the level of detail in		Proposed Modifications Allocate a greater number of houses to Barton Upon Humber to reflect the town's status as a Principal Town; Amend paragraph 1 as follows: As a general guide the delivery	yes	Keigar Homes wishes to participate in the hearing sessions because as an experience local housing developer it feels well able to	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							a Local Plan that tells us that a minute percentage or specific number of houses is directed to individual settlements, some of which are very small. It is the sort of detail that one envisages being pored over at appeal. However, the main problem is the lack of flexibility. The Plan period extends years into the future and policies should be able to adapt to changing circumstances. The problem has been very well brought to the forefront in recent times through issues relating to 5-year housing land supply and the consequential effect on policy interpretation. 4.3 It is not the principle of the policy which is questioned but rather the degree of detail it provides. Indeed, it gets down to micro levels of decimal points. Instead of prescribing the precise amount of growth to be distributed to individual settlements it would provide more flexibility to group them together into sub-regions. Alternatively, it should be made clear in the text that figures are provided only as a general guide as otherwise it will be interpreted as a negative tool which might be used against otherwise sustainable development proposals. 4.4 The phrase about restricting development outside development limits in Paragraph 2 should be deleted for the reasons set out in objection to Policy SS10 and briefly summed up as being non-compliant with national planning policy as set out in the Framework. 4.5 An additional concern is that the proposed distribution of new housing fails to relate to the distribution of proposed employment sites. Whilst the level of focus on Scunthorpe is understood, there is no acknowledgement of the strategic aim to support economic growth at the South in the east of the district at the Humber Bank and to a lesser extent, North Killingholme. Policy SS8 calls for 900 ha of land to be allocated at the South Humber Bank and yet this hugely ambitious project is almost totally unsupported by any specific or reserve allocation of housing land to provide essential homes for workers. 4.6 Not only does this undermine the economic growth potential of the South Humber Bank, but in the absence of houses nearby, it will inevitably lead to an unsustainable travel to work pattern. In this sense the housing and employment distribution policies are unrelated to each other and thus contrary both to the strategic objectives of the Plan as a whole and to the Government's commitment to climate change. 4.7 Notwithstanding the lack of any specific allocations, the intention to direct growth to settlements which are relatively close to the Humber Gateway sites is supported. Whether the amount proposed is sufficient is questioned. Such settlements include Barton Upon Humber, Barrow Upon Humber and Gohil which are well related to the South Humber Bank and benefit from the availability of a rail service. [Barrow station is at Barrow Haven]. Barton is an increasingly thriving market town whilst both Barrow and Goxhill have the physical structure to support substantial growth. In addition, they have services and facilities which are capable of expansion to serve both the immediate and surrounding communities as advocated in the Framework. Whether these and the few other settlements in the eastern part of the district would be sufficient to provide for the housing needs of huge employment site such as those proposed is open to question. As proposed, Policy SS6 might be a deterrent to potential		of new dwellings will be distributed approximately but not specifically as follows: Delete the words in paragraph 2 outside development limits and replace with the words in isolated and unsustainable locations; Readjust the distribution of housing sites to increase the numbers in the eastern part of the district.		contribute to debate. In recent years it has consistently built about 25% of the total number of houses completed in the district and has an unparalleled knowledge of local market conditions.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							investors. The Plan is considered to be unsound for the reasons explained and because: It is not positively prepared; It is not justified; It is not effective and It is inconsistent with national policy.					
0712	Ian Stuart, Avoca Planning, Landscape and Development Ltd on behalf of Keigar Homes Ltd	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	Object		No		The arrangement of settlements which seems to be derived from the evidence of the revised 2019 Settlement Survey is accepted as logical with the exception of the degree of housing allocated to Barton Upon Humber which is little more than half that allocated to the other Principal Town, Brigg. This fails to build on the services and facilities which the town has to offer. 4.2 However, it is of major concern that the policy is too prescriptive and thus lacks flexibility. It is not necessary to get down to the level of detail in a Local Plan that tells us that a minute percentage or specific number of houses is directed to individual settlements, some of which are very small. It is the sort of detail that one envisages being pored over at appeal. However, the main problem is the lack of flexibility. The Plan period extends years into the future and policies should be able to adapt to changing circumstances. The problem has been very well brought to the forefront in recent times through issues relating to 5-year housing land supply and the consequential effect on policy interpretation. 4.3 It is not the principle of the policy which is questioned but rather the degree of detail it provides. Indeed, it gets down to micro levels of decimal points. Instead of prescribing the precise amount of growth to be distributed to individual settlements it would provide more flexibility to group them together into sub-regions. Alternatively, it should be made clear in the text that figures are provided only as a general guide as otherwise it will be interpreted as a negative tool which might be used against otherwise sustainable development proposals. 4.4 The phrase about restricting development outside development limits in Paragraph 2 should be deleted for the reasons set out in objection to Policy SS10 and briefly summed up as being non-compliant with national planning policy as set out in the Framework. 4.5 An additional concern is that the proposed distribution of new housing fails to relate to the distribution of proposed employment sites. Whilst the level of focus on Scunthorpe is understood, there is no acknowledgement of the strategic aim to support economic growth at the South in the east of the district at the Humber Bank and to a lesser extent, North Killingholme. Policy SS8 calls for 900 ha of land to be allocated at the South Humber Bank and yet this hugely ambitious project is almost totally unsupported by any specific or reserve allocation of housing land to provide essential homes for workers. 4.6 Not only does this undermine the economic growth potential of the South Humber Bank, but in the absence of houses nearby, it will inevitably lead to an unsustainable travel to work pattern. In this sense the housing	No The Plan is not considered sound for the reasons explained and thus because: • It is not justified; • It is not effective and • It is not consistent with national policies.	Proposed Modifications • Allocate a greater number of houses to Barton Upon Humber to reflect the town's status as a Principal Town; • Amend paragraph 1 as follows: As a general guide the delivery of new dwellings will be distributed approximately but not specifically as follows: • Delete the words in paragraph 2 "outside development limits" and replace with the words in isolated and unsustainable locations; • Readjust the distribution of housing sites to increase the numbers in the eastern part of the district.	Yes	Keigar Homes is a local housing developer with an unparalleled knowledge of the district. Over many years it has built about 25% of the total number of houses erected in North Lincolnshire and is able to contribute to debate through both local knowledge and expertise in the housing market.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							and employment distribution policies are unrelated to each other and thus contrary both to the strategic objectives of the Plan as a whole and to the Government's commitment to climate change. 4.7 Notwithstanding the lack of any specific allocations, the intention to direct growth to settlements which are relatively close to the Humber Gateway sites is supported. Whether the amount proposed is sufficient is questioned. Such settlements include Barton Upon Humber, Barrow Upon Humber and Gohil which are well related to the South Humber Bank and benefit from the availability of a rail service. [Barrow station is at Barrow Haven]. Barton is an increasingly thriving market town whilst both Barrow and Goxhill have the physical structure to support substantial growth. In addition, they have services and facilities which are capable of expansion to serve both the immediate and surrounding communities as advocated in the Framework. Whether these and the few other settlements in the eastern part of the district would be sufficient to provide for the housing needs of huge employment site such as those proposed is open to question. As proposed, Policy SS6 might be a deterrent to potential investors.					
Paul **Sutton** on behalf of P.S. Planning & Heritage												
0112	Paul Sutton on behalf of P.S. Planning & Heritage	POLICY EC1: EMPLOYMENT LAND SUPPLY	object	yes	no	yes	We consider the plan to be unsound because it has not carried forward a major employment site allocation from the 2007 Local Plan - BRIE-1, Former Brigg Sugar Factory Site. The site is wholly owned by Property Recycling Group PLC and over the last 19 years they have prepared the wider area for redevelopment, which has included the development of the Glanford Brigg Power Station and the Brigg Renewable Energy Plant. They have also constructed a new access from the B1206 and carried out extensive site investigations, flood water management schemes and decontamination works. There is current interest from several developers and companies interested in developing the remaining land for B2 and B8 uses, and some of these have submitted formal applications for pre-application advice to the Council in the past. The de-allocation of this employment site will hinder its potential development for employment purposes in the future, even taking into account that the land is proposed to be included within the development limits for the town. The site is 'brownfield' land and should be a priority for development in the new Local Plan. The attached plan shows the boundary of the site we would like to see allocated for employment (B2, B8 and E(g) uses), which extends to approximately 24.8ha. The Local Plan will not be effective because it has ignored a large strategic employment site that is brownfield land and which is both deliverable and developable in the early years of the Plan. This omission of a site that is allocated in the current Local Plan, and which received a positive assessment in the Council's SHELAA (Sept. 2021) is also inconsistent with	effective	We would like to see the former British Sugar Site at Brigg (as shown on the attached plan), included as an employment site allocation within Policy EC-1 of the Local Plan for B2, B8 and E(g) uses. The site area would be approximately 24.8ha. The site allocation should also be shown as an allocated employment site on the Proposals Map for Brigg.	yes	To make a full statement of our case before an independent inspector.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							national policy, which seeks to promote the use of brownfield land before green field sites.					
Darl **Sweetland** on behalf of Anglian Water												
0417	Darl Sweetland on behalf of Anglian Water	General					Thank you for consulting Anglian Water on the Publication Draft of the Local Plan. Firstly, may I advise the Council that I have taken over as Anglian Water's lead on Local Plan and national infrastructure matters. Anglian Water has been consulted at the previous Plan stages as the statutory water supply provider for the eastern two thirds of the Council area and the statutory wastewater provider for eastern half of North Lincolnshire. Anglian Water's previous consultation responses included: identifying that North Lincolnshire - and the wider Anglian Water region – is classed (by the Environment Agency) as an area of water stress, meaning that water resources may not necessarily be freely available and so supporting a higher standard of water efficiency for new development (110l/p/d). (Issues & Options consultation) supporting the spatial vision and the design of development which uses SuDS and the drainage hierarchy to increase resilience to flooding & climate change (Preferred Options consultation) using spatial options and design to manage demand and reduce the need for new water and sewage infrastructure (Preferred Options consultation) in relation to policy SS6p the need identified by the Council to consider wastewater recycling capacity at Barton, Brigg, Wrawby, Hiibaldstow and Scawby. Water re-use measures as part of policies DQE7P and DQE8P considering the sewerage network when employment and service business planning applications are brought forward seeking clearer policy support for renewable energy projects at existing infrastructure sites					View PDF
0434	Darl Sweetland on behalf of Anglian Water	General	support				In summary, the draft Plan now includes policy to address the issues raised by Anglian Water which are considered to improve the effectiveness and consequent soundness of the Plan.					View PDF
0544	Darl Sweetland on behalf of Anglian Water	POLICY DQE5: MANAGING FLOOD RISK					Anglian Water welcomes the following policy in the draft Plan: Policy DQE5 and the requirement that proposals demonstrate that public sewer network and wastewater treatment capacity is available or can be put in place to serve the development. Also see page 23 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan – June 2021 – regarding the Anglian Water pre-planning advice service to developers.					View PDF
0548	Darl Sweetland on behalf of Anglian Water	POLICY DQE7: CLIMATE CHANGE & LOW CARBON LIVING					Anglian Water welcomes the following policy in the draft Plan: Policy DQE7 and specifically part 2.b. setting out the requirement for a 110 litres per person per day water efficiency standard to enable new developments to positively contribute towards the transition to low carbon living					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0574	Darl Sweetland on behalf of Anglian Water	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS					Anglian Water notes that the sites at Pasture Road South, Barton upon Humber (Policy H1P-12) and Barrow Road, Barton upon Humber (Policy H1P-13) require wastewater infrastructure improvements. We support the requirements in these policies that developers engage early with Anglian Water to establish available capacity and the need if required for reinforcement. Given the long lead in and/ or extended development timescales for the two sites, Anglian Water may be able to propose wastewater capacity improvements as part of the emerging or future Drainage and Wastewater Management Plans which could enable enhancements to be funded from 2024 onwards (see page 22 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan – June 2021).					View PDF
0650	Darl Sweetland on behalf of Anglian Water	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS					Anglian Water welcomes the following policy in the draft Plan: Policy SS11 and Policy WAS5 and their the support for water, water recycling and wastewater infrastructure which may necessarily be outside urban areas					View PDF
0657	Darl Sweetland on behalf of Anglian Water	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE					Anglian Water notes and supports the spatial strategy (Policy SS2) and the proposed 7,128 new homes with the focus for growth on the urban areas of Scunthorpe and Bottesford.					View PDF
0718	Darl Sweetland on behalf of Anglian Water	POLICY SS7: STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION – LINCOLNSHIRE LAKES					Anglian Water welcomes the following policy in the draft Plan: Policy SS7 including Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and management of surface water in accordance with the drainage hierarchy to reuse and recycle water.					View PDF
0733	Darl Sweetland on behalf of Anglian Water	POLICY TC1: RETAIL HIERARCHY AND TOWN CENTRE AND DISTRICT CENTRE DEVELOPMENT					Anglian Water welcomes the following policy in the draft Plan: Policy TC1 requiring proposals for hot food takeaways to demonstrate that that appropriate measures to prevent the discharge of Fats, Oil and Grease to the sewerage network have been implemented and will be maintained in perpetuity					View PDF
0737	Darl Sweetland on behalf of Anglian Water	POLICY WAS5: WASTE WATER TREATMENT					Anglian Water welcomes the following policy in the draft Plan: Policy SS11 and Policy WAS5 and their the support for water, water recycling and wastewater infrastructure which may necessarily be outside urban areas. Policy WAS5 support for supporting infrastructure including renewable energy at wastewater treatment facilities					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Lynette **Swinburne**, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance												
0536	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	Object		No		NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN: PUBLICATION PLAN (REGULATION 19), OCTOBER 2021 LAND IN APPLEBY POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS POLICY DQE8: RENEWABLE ENERGY PROPOSALS Savills is instructed by The Trustees of Lord St Oswald Deceased to submit representations in response to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Plan (Regulation 19), closing date 26th November 2021. Specifically, these representations relate to land within and around the village of Appleby, which forms The Appleby Estate, and is within the ownership of our clients. Appleby is an established residential settlement located to the north east of Scunthorpe and whilst facilities in the village itself are limited, it is only 4.3 miles/7km way from the shops, services and employment opportunities of Scunthorpe itself. In addition, the village is less than three miles away from Winterton where there are local shops and services, as well as Primary and Secondary Schools. The village is served by the 55 bus service, which provides connections to Scunthorpe, Winterton and Burton Upon Stather and a dedicated school service is also provided (route 55S). POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS The Publication Plan proposes the inclusion of an Area of High Landscape Value (AHLV). This designation was not included within the Regulation 18 version of the Local Plan. The designation did not form part of the Local Development Framework documents (Core Strategy, June 2011/Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD, March 2016). The last time the AHLV was in used by the LPA, was in the North Lincolnshire Local Plan, May 2003. The relevant policy (LC8) was not saved in 2007 and was not carried through in the subsequent iteration of the plan. The most recent development plan documents of the Local Development Framework make reference only to an Area of Historic Landscape Value. It was therefore a surprise to our client that a significant and restrictive designation, affecting large areas of the authority, was introduced via a Regulation 19 consultation. Whilst the statutory 6 week consultation period has been allowed for the consideration of the draft, this is not considered sufficient to enable a meaningful assessment of the need for the designation, nor the evidence that underpins it. The introduction of the AHLV via a Regulation 18 Preferred Options consultation, would have allowed for greater opportunity to challenge and interrogate the evidence and rationale for the area affected by the designation. This is particularly relevant to those areas that are now proposed for inclusion within AHLV		Comments and amendments to the Local Plan It is considered that Policy DQE1: Protection of Landscape, Townscape and Views (8. Areas of High Landscape Value) has been introduced too late in the plan-making process to ensure that it can be properly considered. The change in approach is not sufficiently justified given the potentially restrictive nature of the policy and as such, it is has not been positively prepared. It should therefore be removed from the policy.	Yes	Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information in relation to the comments above. Further information in relation to the Area of High Landscape Value will be forwarded when available. In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above policies on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							that were not included within its previous iteration in 2003 or within the Area of Historic Landscape Value. It is therefore considered that that approach to DQE1 in relation to the Areas of High Landscape Value is insufficiently justified. Whilst evidence exists about the landscape character, the specific case for the inclusion of new areas within a restrictive landscape designation such as the AHLV does not appear to have been provided. The designation could also affect the delivery of other policies within the emerging Plan, and could constrain development that would otherwise be appropriate, such as renewable energy generation. It is not therefore considered that this part of the plan is positively prepared. A review of the landscape evidence has been instructed by our client to determine whether the land within their ownership around Appleby has been appropriately assessed and meets the criteria for inclusion within the AHLV. This work is underway and will be shared within the authority as soon as it is available. Comments and amendments to the Local Plan It is considered that Policy DQE1: Protection of Landscape, Townscape and Views (8. Areas of High Landscape Value) has been introduced too late in the plan-making process to ensure that it can be properly considered. The change in approach is not sufficiently justified given the potentially restrictive nature of the policy and as such, it is has not been positively prepared. It should therefore be removed from the policy.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0279	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY DQE1: 8.	object	yes	no	yes	The Publication Plan proposes the inclusion of an Area of High Landscape Value (AHLV). This designation was not included within the Regulation 18 version of the Local Plan. The designation did not form part of the Local Development Framework documents (Core Strategy, June 2011/Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD, March 2016). The last time the AHLV was in used by the LPA, was in the North Lincolnshire Local Plan, May 2003. The relevant policy (LC8) was not saved in 2007 and was not carried through in the subsequent iteration of the plan. The most recent development plan documents of the Local Development Framework make reference only to an Area of Historic Landscape Value. It was therefore a surprise to our client that a significant and restrictive designation, affecting large areas of the authority, was introduced via a Regulation 19 consultation. Whilst the statutory 6 week consultation period has been allowed for the consideration of the draft, this is not considered sufficient to enable a meaningful assessment of the need for the designation, nor the evidence that underpins it. The introduction of the AHLV via a Regulation 18 Preferred Options consultation, would have allowed for greater opportunity to challenge and interrogate the evidence and rationale for the area affected by the designation. This is particularly relevant to those areas that are now proposed for inclusion within AHLV that were not included within its previous iteration in 2003 or within the Area of Historic Landscape Value. It is therefore considered that that approach to DQE1 in relation to the Areas of High Landscape Value is insufficiently justified. Whilst evidence exists about the landscape character, the specific case for the inclusion of new areas within a restrictive landscape designation such as the AHLV does not appear to have been provided. The designation could also affect the delivery of other policies within the emerging Plan, and could constrain development that would otherwise be appropriate, such as renewable energy generation. It is not therefore considered that this part of the plan is positively prepared. A review of the landscape evidence has been instructed by our client to determine whether the land within their ownership around Appleby has been appropriately assessed and meets the criteria for inclusion within the AHLV. This work is underway and will be shared within the authority as soon as it is available.	positively prepared	It is considered that Policy DQE1: Protection of Landscape, Townscape and Views (8. Areas of High Landscape Value) has been introduced too late in the plan-making process to ensure that it can be properly considered. The change in approach is not sufficiently justified given the potentially restrictive nature of the policy and as such, it is has not been positively prepared. It should therefore be removed from the policy.	yes	In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above policies on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0280	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY DQE1: 8.	object	yes	no	yes	The Publication Plan proposes the inclusion of an Area of High Landscape Value (AHLV). This designation was not included within the Regulation 18 version of the Local Plan. The designation did not form part of the Local Development Framework documents (Core Strategy, June 2011/Housing and Employment Land Allocations DPD, March 2016). The last time the AHLV was in used by the LPA, was in the North Lincolnshire Local Plan, May 2003. The relevant policy (LC8) was not saved in 2007 and was not carried through in the subsequent iteration of the plan. The most recent development plan documents of the Local Development Framework make reference only to an Area of Historic Landscape Value. It was therefore a surprise to our client that a significant and restrictive designation, affecting large areas of the authority, was introduced via a Regulation 19 consultation. Whilst the statutory 6 week consultation period has been allowed for the consideration of the draft, this is not considered sufficient to enable a meaningful assessment of the need for the designation, nor the evidence that underpins it. The introduction of the AHLV via a Regulation 18 Preferred Options consultation, would have allowed for greater opportunity to challenge and interrogate the evidence and rationale for the area affected by the designation. This is particularly relevant to those areas that are now proposed for inclusion within AHLV that were not included within its previous iteration in 2003 or within the Area of Historic Landscape Value. It is therefore considered that that approach to DQE1 in relation to the Areas of High Landscape Value is insufficiently justified. Whilst evidence exists about the landscape character, the specific case for the inclusion of new areas within a restrictive landscape designation such as the AHLV does not appear to have been provided. The designation could also affect the delivery of other policies within the emerging Plan, and could constrain development that would otherwise be appropriate, such as renewable energy generation. It is not therefore considered that this part of the plan is positively prepared. A review of the landscape evidence has been instructed by our client to determine whether the land within their ownership around Appleby has been appropriately assessed and meets the criteria for inclusion within the AHLV. This work is underway and will be shared within the authority as soon as it is available.	justified	It is considered that Policy DQE1: Protection of Landscape, Townscape and Views (8. Areas of High Landscape Value) has been introduced too late in the plan-making process to ensure that it can be properly considered. The change in approach is not sufficiently justified given the potentially restrictive nature of the policy and as such, it is has not been positively prepared. It should therefore be removed from the policy.	yes	In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above policies on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	View PDF
0280	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY DQE8: 5.	object	yes	no	yes	The overall approach to renewable energy development as set out in policy DQE8 is generally supported and considered to be in accordance with national guidance.However, part 5 of the policy notes: Proposals for wind and solar energy development will be permitted if:a. it is located in an area that is identified as potentially suitable for wind or solar energy development in an adopted neighbourhood plan or the Council is satisfied that local communities are supportive of the proposal; and,b. the development is a renewable energy proposal associated with an existing operational water/sewage treatment site. It is agreed that the other criteria listed Policy DQE8 are fair and in the interests of securing appropriate renewable schemes in North Lincolnshire. However, our client	Consistent with national policy	Part 5a of Policy DQE8 goes further than the NPPF in terms of securing support and places an additional barrier to achieving sustainable development. Instead, it is considered that the policy should focus on engagement to ensure that there are opportunities for the local community to meaningfully	yes	In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above policies on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							has concerns about the part of 5a which requires that; the Council is satisfied that local communities are supportive of the proposal.The NPPF and NPPG explicitly support planning for renewable technologies. Paragraph 155 suggests that local plans should provide a positive strategy for renewable and low carbon energy and heat. Whilst the NPPF also suggests that plans could consider identifying suitable areas for these technologies, there is no requirement for community support of these projects. The White Paper Planning for the Future (October 2020) recognises the need for increased democracy in the planning process and suggests measures to encourage as many people as possible to participate in planning. A new approach, such as that within the White Paper could represent a way to encourage all the voices in a community to consider development opportunities, rather than the current system which is often dominated by the most vocal and sometimes single interest groups.This additional policy requirement would place a further burden on the development of renewable technologies at a time when pressure to reduce carbon emissions is very high. COP26 earlier in 2021 highlighted the need for countries to strengthen their commitment to reducing their environmental impacts wherever possible. Whilst public perception and acceptance of the need for alternative technologies is increasing, there are many occasions where these can be unpopular, especially when proposed to take place near to where people live. The NPPG notes that planning has an important role in the delivery of new renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure in locations where the local environmental impact is acceptable. However, even when impacts can be demonstrated to be appropriate and benefits to the area, clear, it can be difficult to overcome public preconceptions.It is therefore considered that the part 5a of DQE8 is not consistent with national policy and cannot be considered sound.It is also considered that the additional burden placed on development by policy 5a prevents the plan from being positively prepared and is not in accordance with the principles of sustainable development which are at the heart of the NPPF.The inclusion of this part of the policy requiring support from the community is not justified and there is no evidence that suggests why this is particularly necessary in North Lincolnshire. Part 5b of DQE8 is supported, and it is noted that renewable technologies can provide a valuable addition to water/sewage treatment sites. However, it is considered that the criteria in part 5 of DQE should not be cumulatively necessary, rather, each element should be supported in its own right. Parts 5a or 5b should be able to be delivered. In addition, standalone renewable developments of an appropriate scale should also be supported where the impacts have been assessed and found to be acceptable.		participate in the development of proposals as they evolve. Therefore, it is recommended that the policy be amended to remove this additional barrier to reducing carbon emissions. Policy 5 should also be amended to remove the cumulative approach to criteria, replacing and with or. Finally, Policy 5 should be expanded to support standalone renewable developments of an appropriate scale where the impacts have been assessed and found to be acceptable		discuss the matters further.	
0554	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY DQE8: 5.	object	yes	no	yes	The overall approach to renewable energy development as set out in policy DQE8 is generally supported and considered to be in accordance with national guidance. However, part 5 of the policy notes: Proposals for wind and solar energy development will be permitted if: a. it is located in an area that is identified as potentially suitable for wind or solar energy development in an adopted neighbourhood plan or the	positively prepared	Part 5a of Policy DQE8 goes further than the NPPF in terms of securing support and places an additional barrier to achieving sustainable development. Instead, it is considered that the policy should focus on engagement to ensure that there are	yes	In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above policies on behalf of our	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Council is satisfied that local communities are supportive of the proposal; and, b. the development is a renewable energy proposal associated with an existing operational water/sewage treatment site. It is agreed that the other criteria listed Policy DQE8 are fair and in the interests of securing appropriate renewable schemes in North Lincolnshire. However, our client has concerns about the part of 5a which requires that; the Council is satisfied that local communities are supportive of the proposal. The NPPF and NPPG explicitly support planning for renewable technologies. Paragraph 155 suggests that local plans should provide a positive strategy for renewable and low carbon energy and heat. Whilst the NPPF also suggests that plans could consider identifying suitable areas for these technologies, there is no requirement for community support of these projects. The White Paper Planning for the Future (October 2020) recognises the need for increased democracy in the planning process and suggests measures to encourage as many people as possible to participate in planning. A new approach, such as that within the White Paper could represent a way to encourage all the voices in a community to consider development opportunities, rather than the current system which is often dominated by the most vocal and sometimes single interest groups. This additional policy requirement would place a further burden on the development of renewable technologies at a time when pressure to reduce carbon emissions is very high. COP26 earlier in 2021 highlighted the need for countries to strengthen their commitment to reducing their environmental impacts wherever possible. Whilst public perception and acceptance of the need for alternative technologies is increasing, there are many occasions where these can be unpopular, especially when proposed to take place near to where people live. The NPPG notes that planning has an important role in the delivery of new renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure in locations where the local environmental impact is acceptable. However, even when impacts can be demonstrated to be appropriate and benefits to the area, clear, it can be difficult to overcome public preconceptions. It is therefore considered that the part 5a of DQE8 is not consistent with national policy and cannot be considered sound. It is also considered that the additional burden placed on development by policy 5a prevents the plan from being positively prepared and is not in accordance with the principles of sustainable development which are at the heart of the NPPF. The inclusion of this part of the policy requiring support from the community is not justified and there is no evidence that suggests why this is particularly necessary in North Lincolnshire. Part 5b of DQE8 is supported, and it is noted that renewable technologies can provide a valuable addition to water/sewage treatment sites. However, it is considered that the criteria in part 5 of DQE should not be		opportunities for the local community to meaningfully participate in the development of proposals as they evolve. Therefore, it is recommended that the policy be amended to remove this additional barrier to reducing carbon emissions. Policy 5 should also be amended to remove the cumulative approach to criteria, replacing and with or. Finally, Policy 5 should be expanded to support standalone renewable developments of an appropriate scale where the impacts have been assessed and found to be acceptable		client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							cumulatively necessary, rather, each element should be supported in its own right. Parts 5a or 5b should be able to be delivered. In addition, standalone renewable developments of an appropriate scale should also be supported where the impacts have been assessed and found to be acceptable.					
0282	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY DQE8: 5.	object	yes	no	yes	The overall approach to renewable energy development as set out in policy DQE8 is generally supported and considered to be in accordance with national guidance. However, part 5 of the policy notes: 5. Proposals for wind and solar energy development will be permitted if: a. it is located in an area that is identified as potentially suitable for wind or solar energy development in an adopted neighbourhood plan or the Council is satisfied that local communities are supportive of the proposal; and, b. the development is a renewable energy proposal associated with an existing operational water/sewage treatment site. It is agreed that the other criteria listed Policy DQE8 are fair and in the interests of securing appropriate renewable schemes in North Lincolnshire. However, our client has concerns about the part of 5a which requires that; the Council is satisfied that local communities are supportive of the proposal. The NPPF and NPPG explicitly support planning for renewable technologies. Paragraph 155 suggests that local plans should provide a positive strategy for renewable and low carbon energy and heat. Whilst the NPPF also suggests that plans could consider identifying suitable areas for these technologies, there is no requirement for community support of these projects. The White Paper ˜Planning for the Future (October 2020) recognises the need for increased democracy in the planning process and suggests measures to encourage as many people as possible to participate in planning. A new approach, such as that within the White Paper could represent a way to encourage all the voices in a community to consider development opportunities, rather than the current system which is often dominated by the most vocal and sometimes single interest groups. This additional policy requirement would place a further burden on the development of renewable technologies at a time when pressure to reduce carbon emissions is very high. COP26 earlier in 2021 highlighted the need for countries to strengthen their commitment to reducing their environmental impacts wherever possible. Whilst public perception and acceptance of the need for alternative technologies is increasing, there are many occasions where these can be unpopular, especially when proposed to take place near to where people live. The NPPG notes that planning has an important role in the delivery of new renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure in locations where the local environmental impact is acceptable. However, even when impacts can be demonstrated to be appropriate and benefits to the area, clear, it can be difficult to	justified	Part 5a of Policy DQE8 goes further than the NPPF in terms of securing support and places an additional barrier to achieving sustainable development. Instead, it is considered that the policy should focus on engagement to ensure that there are opportunities for the local community to meaningfully participate in the development of proposals as they evolve. Therefore, it is recommended that the policy be amended to remove this additional barrier to reducing carbon emissions. Policy 5 should also be amended to remove the cumulative approach to criteria, replacing and with or. Finally, Policy 5 should be expanded to support standalone renewable developments of an appropriate scale where the impacts have been assessed and found to be acceptable	yes	In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above policies on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							overcome public preconceptions. It is therefore considered that the part 5a of DQE8 is not consistent with national policy and cannot be considered sound. It is also considered that the additional burden placed on development by policy 5a prevents the plan from being positively prepared and is not in accordance with the principles of sustainable development which are at the heart of the NPPF. The inclusion of this part of the policy requiring support from the community is not justified and there is no evidence that suggests why this is particularly necessary in North Lincolnshire. Part 5b of DQE8 is supported, and it is noted that renewable technologies can provide a valuable addition to water/sewage treatment sites. However, it is considered that the criteria in part 5 of DQE should not be cumulatively necessary, rather, each element should be supported in its own right. Parts 5a or 5b should be able to be delivered. In addition, standalone renewable developments of an appropriate scale should also be supported where the impacts have been assessed and found to be acceptable.					
0554	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY DQE8: RENEWABLE ENERGY PROPOSALS	object		No		POLICY DQE8: RENEWABLE ENERGY PROPOSALS The overall approach to renewable energy development as set out in policy DQE8 is generally supported and considered to be in accordance with national guidance. However, part 5 of the policy notes: “5. Proposals for wind and solar energy development will be permitted if: a. it is located in an area that is identified as potentially suitable for wind or solar energy development in an adopted neighbourhood plan or the Council is satisfied that local communities are supportive of the proposal; and, b. the development is a renewable energy proposal associated with an existing operational water/sewage treatment site.” It is agreed that the other criteria listed Policy DQE8 are fair and in the interests of securing appropriate renewable schemes in North Lincolnshire. However, our client has concerns about the part of 5a which requires that; “the Council is satisfied that local communities are supportive of the proposal.” The NPPF and NPPG explicitly support planning for renewable technologies. Paragraph 155 suggests that local plans should provide a positive strategy for renewable and low carbon energy and heat. Whilst the NPPF also suggests that plans could consider identifying suitable areas for these technologies, there is no requirement for community support of these projects. The White Paper ‘Planning for the Future’ (October 2020) recognises the need for increased democracy in the planning process and suggests measures to encourage as many people as possible to participate in		Comments and amendments to the Local Plan Part 5a of Policy DQE8 goes further than the NPPF in terms of securing support and places an additional barrier to achieving sustainable development. Instead, it is considered that the policy should focus on engagement to ensure that there are opportunities for the local community to meaningfully participate in the development of proposals as they evolve. Therefore, it is recommended that the policy be amended to remove this additional barrier to reducing carbon emissions. Policy 5 should also be amended to remove the cumulative approach to criteria, replacing ‘and’ with ‘or’. Finally, Policy 5 should be expanded to support standalone renewable developments of an appropriate scale where the		Please do not hesitate to contact me should you require any further information in relation to the comments above. Further information in relation to the Area of High Landscape Value will be forwarded when available. In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above policies on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							planning. A new approach, such as that within the White Paper could represent a way to encourage all the voices in a community to consider development opportunities, rather than the current system which is often dominated by the most vocal and sometimes single interest groups. This additional policy requirement would place a further burden on the development of renewable technologies at a time when pressure to reduce carbon emissions is very high. COP26 earlier in 2021 highlighted the need for countries to strengthen their commitment to reducing their environmental impacts wherever possible. Whilst public perception and acceptance of the need for alternative technologies is increasing, there are many occasions where these can be unpopular, especially when proposed to take place near to where people live. The NPPG1 notes that planning "has an important role in the delivery of new renewable and low carbon energy infrastructure in locations where the local environmental impact is acceptable." However, even when impacts can be demonstrated to be appropriate and benefits to the area, clear, it can be difficult to overcome public preconceptions. It is therefore considered that the part 5a of DQE8 is not consistent with national policy and cannot be considered sound. It is also considered that the additional burden placed on development by policy 5a prevents the plan from being positively prepared and is not in accordance with the principles of sustainable development which are at the heart of the NPPF. The inclusion of this part of the policy requiring support from the community is not justified and there is no evidence that suggests why this is particularly necessary in North Lincolnshire. Part 5b of DQE8 is supported, and it is noted that renewable technologies can provide a valuable addition to water/sewage treatment sites. However, it is considered that the criteria in part 5 of DQE should not be cumulatively necessary, rather, each element should be supported in its own right. Parts 5a or 5b should be able to be delivered. In addition, standalone renewable developments of an appropriate scale should also be supported where the impacts have been assessed and found to be acceptable. Comments and amendments to the Local Plan Part 5a of Policy DQE8 goes further than the NPPF in terms of securing support and places an additional barrier to achieving sustainable development. Instead, it is considered that the policy should focus on engagement to ensure that there are opportunities for the local community to meaningfully participate in the development of proposals as they evolve. Therefore, it is recommended that the policy be amended to remove this additional barrier to reducing carbon emissions. Policy 5 should also be amended to remove the cumulative approach to criteria, replacing 'and' with 'or'. Finally, Policy 5 should be expanded to support standalone renewable developments of an appropriate scale where the impacts have been assessed and found to be acceptable		impacts have been assessed and found to be acceptable			

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0306	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object	yes	no	yes	Savills is instructed by The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance to submit representations in response to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Plan (Regulation 19), October 2021. Specifically, these representations relate to land in Barnetby le Wold and Ulceby which is within the ownership of our clients. Barnetby le Wold and Ulceby are both identified as Large Service Centres within the Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire as set out in Policy SS2 of the Publication Plan. Criterion d of SS2 relates to these settlements, and notes that:To maintain and enhance their role as large service centres, that provide local employment opportunities, and key services and facilities for their surrounding areas, these settlements will be the focus for an appropriate level of growth. This will be through the provision of allocated sites within this plan, and through non-allocated sites within their defined development limits. Any development should reflect the character and nature of each settlement, together with infrastructure capacity. Therefore, planning policy recognises that Large Service Centres have an important role to play in the growth of North Lincolnshire. Barnetby le WoldIn March 2018, Land off St Barnabas Road (reference 3TME) was submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential housing allocation. Consideration of the site is undertaken within the SHELAA 2021, which includes it within the list of discounted sites for the following reasons:. Existing infrastructure is unsuitable to serve development of this size. The site is adjacent to a railway line so noise may be an issue. The site is isolated from the existing built up areaFurther consideration of these matters is undertaken below:Existing infrastructure is unsuitable to serve development of this size. It is unclear what this comment refers to. The site is served by a public highway, the capacity of which to accommodate growth is yet to be determined. There may also be access via the adjacent housing estate.The site is adjacent to a railway line so noise may be an issue. The railway line extends through the centre of Barnetby le Wold and the village is served by a station, which is an important facility for residents. The benefits of building near to railway stations is recognised within the NPPF and can be an important factor in ensuring the long term sustainability of rural services.Whether noise arising from the railway would be an issue is a development management matter that would be addressed via any future planning application. There are many ways to mitigate noise through site layout and careful design. However, much development in Barnetby le Wold is already in close proximity to the railway, including the recently permitted scheme on Victoria Road for 23 dwellings (ref: PA/2019/1454) which is recognised within the Proposed Plan as housing commitment H1C-32.The sustainability benefits of being in close proximity to a railway station and the importance of growth to the viability of rural services are considered to outweigh any perceived concerns about impacts on amenity. The site is isolated from the existing built up areaExisting housing extends along the entire southern boundary of the site. Development would therefore offer a seamless extension to the existing built up area of Barnetby le Wold. The village is bisected by the railway line as noted above. However, the majority of services are located on the eastern side of the railway, where our client's land is located. These services include a shop, takeaways and Primary School.UlcebyIn March 2020, an additional site was put forward	justified	Comments and Amendments - Barnetby le WoldBarnetby le Wold is a sustainable settlement which is suitable for growth as confirmed in policy SS2. Site 3TME presents an opportunity for additional growth alongside the proposed allocation at H1P-19. Whether developed in full or in part, the site can offer flexibility to the future development of the village. It should therefore be included as a housing allocation or within the settlement boundary. The comments about 3TME in the SHELAA are not justified for the reasons outlined above.Including additional flexibility to the plan through the introduction of additional allocations would make the plan more effective over the plan period.Comments and Amendments - UlcebyOn behalf of our client, we are seeking to clarify the position in relation to site CFS0300078 and whether it has been assessed as part of the evidence base of the plan. Without this information, it is not possible to determine whether the approach to growth in Ulceby is justified and effective.Ulceby is a sustainable settlement which is suitable for growth as confirmed in policy SS2. Site CFS0300078 presents an opportunity for additional growth alongside the five committed housing schemes in the village, particularly as there are no new allocations proposed. The site can offer flexibility in the future development of the village and present a proactive way of securing growth should the committed sites be delayed or stall. It should therefore be included as a housing allocation or within the settlement	yes	In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above settlements on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							for consideration as a housing allocation, in Ulceby (CFS0300078). A review of the SHELAA 2021 does not appear to show that this site has been assessed. It is also not considered within the Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper.The site is located at the western gateway into the village and is accessed via an existing farm track from the A1077. It is adjoined by residential development along its northern boundary and St Nicholas Church is adjacent to the west.The site is currently in use for agriculture. The scale and L-shape of the land means that its development could fit into the pattern of development in the village, contributing a modest scale of growth within a landscaped buffer.A site plan is included within Appendix 1 although an online map was submitted in March 2020.		boundary. Including additional flexibility to the plan through the introduction of additional allocations would make the plan more effective over the plan period.			

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0313	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object	yes	no	yes	Savills is instructed by The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance to submit representations in response to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Plan (Regulation 19), October 2021. Specifically, these representations relate to land in Barnetby le Wold and Ulceby which is within the ownership of our clients. Barnetby le Wold and Ulceby are both identified as Large Service Centres within the Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire as set out in Policy SS2 of the Publication Plan. Criterion d of SS2 relates to these settlements, and notes that: To maintain and enhance their role as large service centres, that provide local employment opportunities, and key services and facilities for their surrounding areas, these settlements will be the focus for an appropriate level of growth. This will be through the provision of allocated sites within this plan, and through non-allocated sites within their defined development limits. Any development should reflect the character and nature of each settlement, together with infrastructure capacity. Therefore, planning policy recognises that Large Service Centres have an important role to play in the growth of North Lincolnshire. Barnetby le Wold In March 2018, Land off St Barnabas Road (reference 3TME) was submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential housing allocation. Consideration of the site is undertaken within the SHELAA 2021, which includes it within the list of discounted sites for the following reasons: Existing infrastructure is unsuitable to serve development of this size. The site is adjacent to a railway line so noise may be an issue. The site is isolated from the existing built up area Further consideration of these matters is undertaken below: Existing infrastructure is unsuitable to serve development of this size. It is unclear what this comment refers to. The site is served by a public highway, the capacity of which to accommodate growth is yet to be determined. There may also be access via the adjacent housing estate. The site is adjacent to a railway line so noise may be an issue. The railway line extends through the centre of Barnetby le Wold and the village is served by a station, which is an important facility for residents. The benefits of building near to railway stations is recognised within the NPPF and can be an important factor in ensuring the long term sustainability of rural services. Whether noise arising from the railway would be an issue is a development management matter that would be addressed via any future planning application. There are many ways to mitigate noise through site layout and careful design. However, much development in Barnetby le	effective	Comments and Amendments Barnetby le Wold is a sustainable settlement which is suitable for growth as confirmed in policy SS2. Site 3TME presents an opportunity for additional growth alongside the proposed allocation at H1P-19. Whether developed in full or in part, the site can offer flexibility to the future development of the village. It should therefore be included as a housing allocation or within the settlement boundary. The comments about 3TME in the SHELAA are not justified for the reasons outlined above. Comments and Amendments On behalf of our client, we are seeking to clarify the position in relation to site CFS0300078 and whether it has been assessed as part of the evidence base of the plan. Without this information, it is not possible to determine whether the approach to growth in Ulceby is justified and effective. Ulceby is a sustainable settlement which is suitable for growth as confirmed in policy SS2. Site CFS0300078 presents an opportunity for additional growth alongside the five committed housing schemes in the village, particularly as there are no new allocations proposed. The site can offer flexibility in the future development of the village and present a proactive way of securing growth should the committed sites be delayed or stall. It should therefore be included as a housing allocation or within the settlement boundary.	yes	In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above settlements on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Wold is already in close proximity to the railway, including the recently permitted scheme on Victoria Road for 23 dwellings (ref: PA/2019/1454) which is recognised within the Proposed Plan as housing commitment H1C-32. The sustainability benefits of being in close proximity to a railway station and the importance of growth to the viability of rural services are considered to outweigh any perceived concerns about impacts on amenity. The site is isolated from the existing built up area Existing housing extends along the entire southern boundary of the site. Development would therefore offer a seamless extension to the existing built up area of Barnetby le Wold. The village is bisected by the railway line as noted above. However, the majority of services are located on the eastern side of the railway, where our client's land is located. These services include a shop, takeaways and Primary School. Ulceby In March 2020, an additional site was put forward for consideration as a housing allocation, in Ulceby (CFS0300078). A review of the SHELAA 2021 does not appear to show that this site has been assessed. It is also not considered within the Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper. The site is located at the western gateway into the village and is accessed via an existing farm track from the A1077. It is adjoined by residential development along its northern boundary and St Nicholas Church is adjacent to the west. The site is currently in use for agriculture. The scale and L-shape of the land means that its development could fit into the pattern of development in the village, contributing a modest scale of growth within a landscaped buffer. A site plan is included within Appendix 1 although an online map was submitted in March 2020.		Including additional flexibility to the plan through the introduction of additional allocations would make the plan more effective over the plan period. Including additional flexibility to the plan through the introduction of additional allocations would make the plan more effective over the plan period.			

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0315	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object	yes	no	yes	Savills is instructed by The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance to submit representations in response to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Plan (Regulation 19), October 2021. Specifically, these representations relate to land in Burton upon Stather and Wrawby, which is within the ownership of our clients. Burton upon Stather, Wrawby and South Ferriby are identified as Larger Rural Settlements within the Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire as set out in Policy SS2 of the Publication Plan. Part e of SS2 relates to these settlements, and notes that: Larger rural settlements will accommodate an appropriate level of development that supports their function. Sites of an appropriate scale and nature will be allocated in the plan. Non-allocated sites within the defined settlement development limit will also be supported. All development should take into account the nature and character of these settlements. Therefore, planning policy recognises that Larger Rural Settlements have a role to play in the growth of North Lincolnshire. Burton upon Stather In March 2018, Land off Tee Lane, Burton upon Stather (KD4T8) was submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential housing allocation. Consideration of the site is undertaken within the SHELAA 2021, which includes it within the list of discounted sites for the following reasons: Highways have concerns about impact of development on existing highway infrastructure. The site has a number of Tree Preservation Orders on site. The site is within 1000m of Burton Kennels so noise may be an issue. Further consideration of these matters is undertaken below: Highways have concerns about impact of development on existing highway infrastructure The information within the SHELAA 2021 does not expand upon these concerns so it is not possible to specifically address them, other than to note that the site is served by the public highway. It appears to have good visibility and whilst single carriageway at present, there are verges which could allow for it to be upgraded to serve development. The site is within 1000m of Burton Kennels so noise may be an issue. Burton Kennels are located on Stather Road, which is approximately 400m away from the nearest part of the site. However, between the kennels and the development site is a mature woodland, which itself is around 200m wide and would therefore provide a buffer to any potential noise. In addition, any development proposals for the site would be accompanied by an appropriate acoustic impact assessment to ensure that noise levels on the site would be acceptable.	justified	Comments and Amendments Burton upon Stather Burton upon Stather is a sustainable settlement which is suitable for growth as confirmed in policy SS2. Site KD4T8 presents an opportunity to secure housing for the village over the plan period which would have a positive impact on local services. KD4T8 should therefore be included as a housing allocation or within the settlement boundary of Burton upon Stather. Comments and Amendments – Wrawby Wrawby is a sustainable settlement which is suitable for growth as confirmed in policy SS2. Site K4XSR in particular, presents an opportunity for additional growth alongside the committed developments in the village. Whether developed in full or in part, the site can offer flexibility to the future development of the village. It should therefore be included as a housing allocation or within the settlement boundary. Including additional flexibility to the plan through the introduction of additional allocations would make the plan more effective over the plan period. Comments and Amendments - South Ferriby South Ferriby is a sustainable suitable for growth although no housing commitments or proposed residential allocations identified within the Plan nor are there are plans to extend the settlement boundary. The lack of growth proposed in the village means that the growth	yes	In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above settlements on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							The site has a number of Tree Preservation Orders The site is in agricultural use and any trees are located along the site boundary. They would not therefore represent a barrier to development. Burton upon Stather is identified as a Larger Rural Settlement and has a number of local facilities including a Primary School. The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper identifies a growth requirement of 63 dwellings in the village over the plan period. However, there are no housing commitments or proposed residential allocations identified within the Plan nor are there are plans to extend the settlement boundary. The lack of growth proposed in the village means that the growth strategy for Burton upon Stather is not positively prepared to enable the village's growth needs to be met. It is not effective and would place additional pressure on other settlements to accommodate growth. In addition, the approach is not consistent with national policy, specifically paragraph 79, which states: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Restricting growth in this sustainable settlement would not support the existing local services and facilities. The matters identified about demonstrate that the approach in Burton upon Stather is therefore not justified. Wrawby In March 2018, four sites in Wrawby were submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential housing allocations: Land west of Barton Road XJDJZ Land east of Tunnel Road K4XSR Land North of Chapel Lane IKPI9 Land south of Chapel Lane 3FHDP Consideration of the sites is undertaken within the SHELAA 2021, which includes three of the sites within the list of discounted sites for the following reasons: IKPI9 Land north of Chapel Lane The site is unable to form suitable access with adopted highway. 3FHDP Land south of Chapel Lane The site is unable to form suitable access with adopted Highway XJDJZ Land to the west of B1206 The site is isolated away from the main built up area. However, site K4XSR, Land East of Tunnel Road was included in the list of suitable sites in the SHELAA 2021 with a potential capacity of 157 dwellings. The following comments were made about the site: The site lies within SFRA Flood Zone 1.		strategy for South Ferriby is not positively prepared to enable the village's growth needs to be met. It is not effective and would place additional pressure on other settlements to accommodate growth. In addition, the approach is not consistent with national policy, specifically paragraph 79, which states: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Restricting growth in this sustainable settlement would not support the existing local services and facilities. The matters identified about demonstrate that the approach in South Ferriby is therefore not justified.			

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							There may be potential contamination on the site. The scale of the proposed site is large in comparison to the existing settlement, which will be considered when exploring development potential further. It is unclear why the Land East of Tunnel Road was not selected as a proposed housing allocation. The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper notes that only 36 dwellings are required for Wrawby, and these are to be delivered via existing commitments. It is considered that our client's site can provide flexibility of choice to the market if included as a housing allocation. Alternatively, as the site is larger than the proposed growth for the village over the plan period, it presents an opportunity to secure wider benefits to the village, through the inclusion of complementary facilities alongside housing. In addition, the site could come forward in phases, presenting an opportunity for incremental, planned growth which extends beyond the current plan, into future plan periods. South Ferriby In March 2018, Land to the south of Sluice Road, South Ferriby (T9E73) was submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential allocation for employment uses. The Proposed Plan shows that part of the site is located within a LWS. The remainder of the site outside the LWS is immediately adjacent to a residential area and may therefore be more suited to new housing which could be accessed via the existing access track.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0318	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object	yes	no	yes	Savills is instructed by The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance to submit representations in response to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Plan (Regulation 19), October 2021. Specifically, these representations relate to land in Burton upon Stather and Wrawby, which is within the ownership of our clients. Burton upon Stather, Wrawby and South Ferriby are identified as Larger Rural Settlements within the Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire as set out in Policy SS2 of the Publication Plan. Part e of SS2 relates to these settlements, and notes that: Larger rural settlements will accommodate an appropriate level of development that supports their function. Sites of an appropriate scale and nature will be allocated in the plan. Non-allocated sites within the defined settlement development limit will also be supported. All development should take into account the nature and character of these settlements. Therefore, planning policy recognises that Larger Rural Settlements have a role to play in the growth of North Lincolnshire. Burton upon Stather In March 2018, Land off Tee Lane, Burton upon Stather (KD4T8) was submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential housing allocation. Consideration of the site is undertaken within the SHELAA 2021, which includes it within the list of discounted sites for the following reasons: Highways have concerns about impact of development on existing highway infrastructure. The site has a number of Tree Preservation Orders on site. The site is within 1000m of Burton Kennels so noise may be an issue. Further consideration of these matters is undertaken below: Highways have concerns about impact of development on existing highway infrastructure The information within the SHELAA 2021 does not expand upon these concerns so it is not possible to specifically address them, other than to note that the site is served by the public highway. It appears to have good visibility and whilst single carriageway at present, there are verges which could allow for it to be upgraded to serve development. The site is within 1000m of Burton Kennels so noise may be an issue. Burton Kennels are located on Stather Road, which is approximately 400m away from the nearest part of the site. However, between the kennels and the development site is a mature woodland, which itself is around 200m wide and would therefore provide a buffer to any potential noise. In addition, any development proposals for the site would be accompanied by an appropriate acoustic impact assessment to ensure that noise levels on the site would be acceptable.	effective	Comments and Amendments Burton upon Stather Burton upon Stather is a sustainable settlement which is suitable for growth as confirmed in policy SS2. Site KD4T8 presents an opportunity to secure housing for the village over the plan period which would have a positive impact on local services. KD4T8 should therefore be included as a housing allocation or within the settlement boundary of Burton upon Stather. Comments and Amendments – Wrawby Wrawby is a sustainable settlement which is suitable for growth as confirmed in policy SS2. Site K4XSR in particular, presents an opportunity for additional growth alongside the committed developments in the village. Whether developed in full or in part, the site can offer flexibility to the future development of the village. It should therefore be included as a housing allocation or within the settlement boundary. Including additional flexibility to the plan through the introduction of additional allocations would make the plan more effective over the plan period. Comments and Amendments - South Ferriby South Ferriby is a sustainable suitable for growth although no housing commitments or proposed residential allocations identified within the Plan nor are there are plans to extend the settlement boundary. The lack of growth proposed in the village means that the growth	yes	In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above settlements on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							The site has a number of Tree Preservation Orders The site is in agricultural use and any trees are located along the site boundary. They would not therefore represent a barrier to development. Burton upon Stather is identified as a Larger Rural Settlement and has a number of local facilities including a Primary School. The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper identifies a growth requirement of 63 dwellings in the village over the plan period. However, there are no housing commitments or proposed residential allocations identified within the Plan nor are there are plans to extend the settlement boundary. The lack of growth proposed in the village means that the growth strategy for Burton upon Stather is not positively prepared to enable the village's growth needs to be met. It is not effective and would place additional pressure on other settlements to accommodate growth. In addition, the approach is not consistent with national policy, specifically paragraph 79, which states: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Restricting growth in this sustainable settlement would not support the existing local services and facilities. The matters identified about demonstrate that the approach in Burton upon Stather is therefore not justified. Wrawby In March 2018, four sites in Wrawby were submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential housing allocations: Land west of Barton Road XJDJZ Land east of Tunnel Road K4XSR Land North of Chapel Lane IKPI9 Land south of Chapel Lane 3FHDP Consideration of the sites is undertaken within the SHELAA 2021, which includes three of the sites within the list of discounted sites for the following reasons: IKPI9 Land north of Chapel Lane The site is unable to form suitable access with adopted highway. 3FHDP Land south of Chapel Lane The site is unable to form suitable access with adopted Highway XJDJZ Land to the west of B1206 The site is isolated away from the main built up area. However, site K4XSR, Land East of Tunnel Road was included in the list of suitable sites in the SHELAA 2021 with a potential capacity of 157 dwellings. The following comments were made about the site: The site lies within SFRA Flood Zone 1. There may be potential contamination on the site. The scale of the proposed site is large in comparison to the existing		strategy for South Ferriby is not positively prepared to enable the village's growth needs to be met. It is not effective and would place additional pressure on other settlements to accommodate growth. In addition, the approach is not consistent with national policy, specifically paragraph 79, which states: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Restricting growth in this sustainable settlement would not support the existing local services and facilities. The matters identified about demonstrate that the approach in South Ferriby is therefore not justified.			

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							settlement, which will be considered when exploring development potential further. It is unclear why the Land East of Tunnel Road was not selected as a proposed housing allocation. The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper notes that only 36 dwellings are required for Wrawby, and these are to be delivered via existing commitments. It is considered that our client's site can provide flexibility of choice to the market if included as a housing allocation. Alternatively, as the site is larger than the proposed growth for the village over the plan period, it presents an opportunity to secure wider benefits to the village, through the inclusion of complementary facilities alongside housing. In addition, the site could come forward in phases, presenting an opportunity for incremental, planned growth which extends beyond the current plan, into future plan periods. South Ferriby In March 2018, Land to the south of Sluice Road, South Ferriby (T9E73) was submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential allocation for employment uses. The Proposed Plan shows that part of the site is located within a LWS. The remainder of the site outside the LWS is immediately adjacent to a residential area and may therefore be more suited to new housing which could be accessed via the existing access track.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0299	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object	yes	no	yes	Savills is instructed by The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance to submit representations in response to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Plan (Regulation 19), October 2021. Specifically, these representations relate to land in Burton upon Stather and Wrawby, which is within the ownership of our clients. Burton upon Stather, Wrawby and South Ferriby are identified as Larger Rural Settlements within the Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire as set out in Policy SS2 of the Publication Plan. Part e of SS2 relates to these settlements, and notes that: Larger rural settlements will accommodate an appropriate level of development that supports their function. Sites of an appropriate scale and nature will be allocated in the plan. Non-allocated sites within the defined settlement development limit will also be supported. All development should take into account the nature and character of these settlements. Therefore, planning policy recognises that Larger Rural Settlements have a role to play in the growth of North Lincolnshire. Burton upon Stather In March 2018, Land off Tee Lane, Burton upon Stather (KD4T8) was submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential housing allocation. Consideration of the site is undertaken within the SHELAA 2021, which includes it within the list of discounted sites for the following reasons: Highways have concerns about impact of development on existing highway infrastructure. The site has a number of Tree Preservation Orders on site. The site is within 1000m of Burton Kennels so noise may be an issue. Further consideration of these matters is undertaken below: Highways have concerns about impact of development on existing highway infrastructure The information within the SHELAA 2021 does not expand upon these concerns so it is not possible to specifically address them, other than to note that the site is served by the public highway. It appears to have good visibility and whilst single carriageway at present, there are verges which could allow for it to be upgraded to serve development. The site is within 1000m of Burton Kennels so noise may be an issue. Burton Kennels are located on Stather Road, which is approximately 400m away from the nearest part of the site. However, between the kennels and the development site is a mature woodland, which itself is around 200m wide and would therefore provide a buffer to any potential noise. In addition, any development proposals for the site would be accompanied by an appropriate acoustic impact assessment to ensure that noise levels on the site would be acceptable.	Consistent with national policy	Comments and Amendments Burton upon Stather Burton upon Stather is a sustainable settlement which is suitable for growth as confirmed in policy SS2. Site KD4T8 presents an opportunity to secure housing for the village over the plan period which would have a positive impact on local services. KD4T8 should therefore be included as a housing allocation or within the settlement boundary of Burton upon Stather. Comments and Amendments – Wrawby Wrawby is a sustainable settlement which is suitable for growth as confirmed in policy SS2. Site K4XSR in particular, presents an opportunity for additional growth alongside the committed developments in the village. Whether developed in full or in part, the site can offer flexibility to the future development of the village. It should therefore be included as a housing allocation or within the settlement boundary. Including additional flexibility to the plan through the introduction of additional allocations would make the plan more effective over the plan period. Comments and Amendments - South Ferriby South Ferriby is a sustainable suitable for growth although no housing commitments or proposed residential allocations identified within the Plan nor are there are plans to extend the settlement boundary. The lack of growth proposed in the village means that the growth	yes	In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above settlements on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	View 031PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							The site has a number of Tree Preservation Orders The site is in agricultural use and any trees are located along the site boundary. They would not therefore represent a barrier to development. Burton upon Stather is identified as a Larger Rural Settlement and has a number of local facilities including a Primary School. The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper identifies a growth requirement of 63 dwellings in the village over the plan period. However, there are no housing commitments or proposed residential allocations identified within the Plan nor are there are plans to extend the settlement boundary. The lack of growth proposed in the village means that the growth strategy for Burton upon Stather is not positively prepared to enable the villages growth needs to be met. It is not effective and would place additional pressure on other settlements to accommodate growth. In addition, the approach is not consistent with national policy, specifically paragraph 79, which states: To promote sustainable development in rural area housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Restricting growth in this sustainable settlement would not support the existing local services and facilities. The matters identified about demonstrate that the approach in Burton upon Stather is therefore not justified. Wrawby In March 2018, four sites in Wrawby were submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential housing allocations: Land west of Barton Road XJDJZ Land east of Tunnel Road K4XSR Land North of Chapel Lane IKPI9 Land south of Chapel Lane 3FHDP Consideration of the sites is undertaken within the SHELAA 2021, which includes three of the sites within the list of discounted sites for the following reasons: IKPI9 Land north of Chapel Lane H490 The site is unable to form suitable access with adopted highway. 3FHDP Land south of Chapel Lane The site is unable to form suitable access with adopted Highway XJDJZ Land to the west of B1206 The site is isolated away from the main built up area. However, site K4XSR, Land East of Tunnel Road was included in the list of suitable sites in the SHELAA 2021 with a potential capacity of 157 dwellings. The following comments were made about the site: The site lies within SFRA Flood Zone 1. There may be potential contamination on the site.		strategy for South Ferriby is not positively prepared to enable the village's growth needs to be met. It is not effective and would place additional pressure on other settlements to accommodate growth. In addition, the approach is not consistent with national policy, specifically paragraph 79, which states: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Restricting growth in this sustainable settlement would not support the existing local services and facilities. The matters identified about demonstrate that the approach in South Ferriby is therefore not justified.			

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							The scale of the proposed site is large in comparison to the existing settlement, which will be considered when exploring development potential further. It is unclear why the Land East of Tunnel Road was not selected as a proposed housing allocation. The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper notes that only 36 dwellings are required for Wrawby, and these are to be delivered via existing commitments. It is considered that our clients site can provide flexibility of choice to the market if included as a housing allocation. Alternatively, as the site is larger than the proposed growth for the village over the plan period, it presents an opportunity to secure wider benefits to the village, through the inclusion of complementary facilities alongside housing. In addition, the site could come forward in phases, presenting an opportunity for incremental, planned growth which extends beyond the current plan, into future plan periods. South Ferriby In March 2018, Land to the south of Sluice Road, South Ferriby (T9E73) was submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential allocation for employment uses. The Proposed Plan shows that part of the site is located within a LWS. The remainder of the site outside the LWS is immediately adjacent to a residential area and may therefore be more suited to new housing which could be accessed via the existing access track.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0305	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	object	yes	no	yes	Savills is instructed by The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance to submit representations in response to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Plan (Regulation 19), October 2021. Specifically, these representations relate to land in North Killingholme, which is within the ownership of our clients. North Killingholme is identified as a Smaller Rural Settlement within the Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire as set out in Policy SS2 of the Publication Plan. Part e of SS2 relates to these settlements, and notes that: These settlements will accommodate small-scale development of a limited nature, within their defined settlement developments, that supports their vitality and viability. Small sites will have a role to play. All development should reflect the character and nature of these villages and give due consideration to the availability and capacity of infrastructure to support its growth. All proposals will be considered on their merits. Therefore, planning policy recognises that Smaller Rural Settlements can make a modest contribution towards the growth of North Lincolnshire. In March 2018, Land north of Church Lane (MU0ZI) was submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential housing allocation. Consideration of the site is undertaken within the SHELAA 2021, which includes it within the list of discounted sites for the following reasons: Access from Church Lane. However, there are issues with the residents to the north of the site and existing industrial uses on the North Killingholme Airfield. Localised improvements and widening to Church Lane may be required. Noise from commercial properties on Lancaster approach. The site is too large for this size settlement Whilst a larger area of land in our client's ownership was submitted, it is considered that a smaller parcel of this, closest to the centre of the village could present a valuable addition, if included within the settlement boundary. The site would be well placed to meet small scale incremental growth for North Killingholme. The lack of growth proposed in the village means that the growth strategy for North Killingholme is not consistent with national policy, specifically paragraph 79, which states: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Restricting growth in this settlement would not support existing services and facilities in the local area.	Consistent with national policy	Site MU0ZI presents an opportunity to secure housing for the village over the plan period which would have a positive impact on local services. MU0ZI should therefore be included within the settlement boundary of the village.	yes	In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above settlements on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	View PDF
0229	Lynette Swinburne,	POLICY H1P-21: LAND	support	yes	yes	yes	Savills is instructed by The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance to submit representations in response to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan		As noted above, policy H1P-21 and its criteria and growth	yes	In relation to the Examination in	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	OFF THE B1207					Publication Plan (Regulation 19), October 2021. Specifically, these representations relate to land in Broughton which is within the ownership of our clients. Policy H1P: Site Allocations Within the context of the above, we have put forward a number of sites for consideration though the Local Plan. Land in Broughton This site, which is within the ownership of the LDTBoF, is well located in relation to the village of Broughton is proposed as an allocation for 84 dwellings (H1P-21). The site was put forward for consideration alongside the land to the immediate north (SHELAA 2021 reference CFS0300010). Whilst the current proposed allocation can offer a sustainable growth option for Broughton, the inclusion of the land to the north presents an even greater opportunity for the settlement. Whilst the additional land could provide additional housing, there is a further, significant benefit that it could provide through its existing access onto Estate Avenue. The incorporation of CFS0300010 into allocation H1P-21 would mean that a direct pedestrian and cycle link could be created from the wider site to the centre of Broughton via an existing route. Draft policy H1P-21 Land off the B1207 specifies a number of criteria to support and shape the delivery of the allocation: Housing Mix and Tenure a. A mix of housing size and tenure should be provided on the site and developed at approximately 30-40 dwellings per hectare in accordance with Policy H2. b. Affordable housing will be provided on site in accordance with Policy H3, having regard to any abnormal cost, economic viability and other requirements associated with the development. Access and highways c. Vehicular pedestrian and cycle access points to the site will need to be agreed with the Local Highway Authority. d. Good footpath and cycle provision are to be delivered throughout the site, linking the development with the local services and facilities. A new footpath will need to be created alongside the B1207 linking to the existing footpath. e. A Transport Assessment and Residential Travel Plan will be required to demonstrate that the development will have no adverse impacts on the local highway network. Biodiversity and landscaping f. An Ecological Appraisal and possible Ecological Impact Assessment will be required at the planning application stage.		levels are supported. It is recommended that the allocation is extended to incorporate the land to the immediate north CFS0300010 to facilitate greater connectivity to the rest of the town.		Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above settlements on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							g. Any existing trees and hedges around the boundary shall be retained and enhanced. h. A comprehensive landscaping scheme, including biodiversity enhancement is required. Heritage i. A Heritage Assessment will be required to demonstrate that the development will have no adverse impact on the historic environment. Flood, drainage, and water management j. A Flood Risk Assessment should be prepared as part of the application process to assess and mitigate the risk of flooding from surface water drainage. Where practical Sustainable Drainage Systems should be incorporated into the development. Utility and service provision k. Early engagement will be required with the utility and service providers in order to establish available supply capacity to the site and, depending on the type of proposed development, what reinforcement will be required. Implementation l. Development of Policy H1P-21 is to be brought forward by the developer. The delivery of the site is expected in years 6-11 of the plan period. On behalf of LDTBF, the criteria are supported and considered appropriate in the context of the proposed scale of development. The site is suitable for development, as recognised through its proposed allocation. It is immediately adjacent to existing housing along all of its boundaries, with the exception of the land to the south. This land was granted outline planning permission for 79 dwellings in August 2021 (Reference: PA/2020/2046). The land is well screened from the properties on The Dell to the north by an existing dense belt of trees. Trees also screen the site from the property at the end of Church Lane. The northern part of the site is previously developed, although the building which was located there has now been removed. It is therefore considered that H1P-21 represents a natural extension to Broughton, it would also infill the gap between PA/2020/2046 79 dwellings and the rest of the town. The site remains available for development and LDTBF are already working closely with Savills development agency team who will be able to market the site to potential development partners as soon as the emerging Local Plan has further weight. There are no known constraints that would affect the site's achievability for development, and the proposed criteria of H1P-21 would ensure that appropriate technical considerations are taken on board early in the					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							planning process. It is therefore considered that the site presents a realistic and deliverable option for growth in this sustainable settlement within the earlier years of the Plan.					
0300	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	object	yes	no	yes	Savills is instructed by The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance to submit representations in response to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Plan (Regulation 19), October 2021. Specifically, these representations relate to land in Barnetby le Wold and Ulceby which is within the ownership of our clients. Barnetby le Wold and Ulceby are both identified as Large Service Centres within the Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire as set out in Policy SS2 of the Publication Plan. Criterion d of SS2 relates to these settlements, and notes that: To maintain and enhance their role as large service centres, that provide local employment opportunities, and key services and facilities for their surrounding areas, these settlements will be the focus for an appropriate level of growth. This will be through the provision of allocated sites within this plan, and through non-allocated sites within their defined development limits. Any development should reflect the character and nature of each settlement, together with infrastructure capacity. Therefore, planning policy recognises that Large Service Centres have an important role to play in the growth of North Lincolnshire. Barnetby le Wold In March 2018, Land off St Barnabas Road (reference) was submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential housing allocation. Consideration of the site is undertaken within the SHELAA 2021, which includes it within the list of discounted sites for the following reasons: Existing infrastructure is unsuitable to serve development of this size. The site is adjacent to a railway line so noise may be an issue. The site is isolated from the existing built up area Further consideration of these matters is undertaken below: Existing infrastructure is unsuitable to serve development of this size. It is unclear what this comment refers to. The site is served by a public highway, the capacity of which to accommodate growth is yet to be determined. There may also be access via the adjacent housing estate. The site is adjacent to a railway line so noise may be an issue. The railway line extends through the centre of Barnetby le Wold and the village is served by a station, which is an important facility for residents. The benefits of building near to railway stations is recognised within the NPPF and can be an important factor in ensuring the long term sustainability of rural services. Whether noise arising from the railway would be an issue is a	justified	Barnetby le Wold is a sustainable settlement which is suitable for growth as confirmed in policy SS2. Site 3TME presents an opportunity for additional growth alongside the proposed allocation at H1P-19. Whether developed in full or in part, the site can offer flexibility to the future development of the village. It should therefore be included as a housing allocation or within the settlement boundary. The comments about 3TME in the SHELAA are not justified for the reasons outlined above. Including additional flexibility to the plan through the introduction of additional allocations would make the plan more effective over the plan period.	yes	In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above settlements on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							development management matter that would be addressed via any future planning application. There are many ways to mitigate noise through site layout and careful design. However, much development in Barnetby le Wold is already in close proximity to the railway, including the recently permitted scheme on Victoria Road for 23 dwellings (ref: PA/2019/1454) which is recognised within the Proposed Plan as housing commitment H1C-32. The sustainability benefits of being in close proximity to a railway station and the importance of growth to the viability of rural services are considered to outweigh any perceived concerns about impacts on amenity. The site is isolated from the existing built up area Existing housing extends along the entire southern boundary of the site. Development would therefore offer a seamless extension to the existing built up area of Barnetby le Wold. The village is bisected by the railway line as noted above. However, the majority of services are located on the eastern side of the railway, where our clients land is located. These services include a shop, takeaways and Primary School.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0302	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	object	yes	no	yes	Savills is instructed by The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance to submit representations in response to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Plan (Regulation 19), October 2021. Specifically, these representations relate to land in Barnetby le Wold and Ulceby which is within the ownership of our clients. Barnetby le Wold and Ulceby are both identified as Large Service Centres within the Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire as set out in Policy SS2 of the Publication Plan. Criterion d of SS2 relates to these settlements, and notes that: To maintain and enhance their role as large service centres, that provide local employment opportunities, and key services and facilities for their surrounding areas, these settlements will be the focus for an appropriate level of growth. This will be through the provision of allocated sites within this plan, and through non-allocated sites within their defined development limits. Any development should reflect the character and nature of each settlement, together with infrastructure capacity. Therefore, planning policy recognises that Large Service Centres have an important role to play in the growth of North Lincolnshire. Ulceby In March 2020, an additional site was put forward for consideration as a housing allocation, in Ulceby (CFS0300078). A review of the SHELAA 2021 does not appear to show that this site has been assessed. It is also not considered within the Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper. The site is located at the western gateway into the village and is accessed via an existing farm track from the A1077. It is adjoined by residential development along its northern boundary and St Nicholas Church is adjacent to the west. The site is currently in use for agriculture. The scale and L-shape of the land means that its development could fit into the pattern of development in the village, contributing a modest scale of growth within a landscaped buffer. A site plan is included within Appendix 1 although an online map was submitted in March 2020.	justified	On behalf of our client, we are seeking to clarify the position in relation to site CFS0300078 and whether it has been assessed as part of the evidence base of the plan. Without this information, it is not possible to determine whether the approach to growth in Ulceby is justified and effective. Ulceby is a sustainable settlement which is suitable for growth as confirmed in policy SS2. Site CFS0300078 presents an opportunity for additional growth alongside the five committed housing schemes in the village, particularly as there are no new allocations proposed. The site can offer flexibility in the future development of the village and present a proactive way of securing growth should the committed sites be delayed or stall. It should therefore be included as a housing allocation or within the settlement boundary. Including additional flexibility to the plan through the introduction of additional allocations would make the plan more effective over the plan period.	yes	In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above settlements on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0310	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	object	yes	no	yes	Savills is instructed by The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance to submit representations in response to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Plan (Regulation 19), October 2021. Specifically, these representations relate to land in Burton upon Stather and Wrawby, which is within the ownership of our clients. Burton upon Stather, Wrawby and South Ferriby are identified as Larger Rural Settlements within the Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire as set out in Policy SS2 of the Publication Plan. Part e of SS2 relates to these settlements, and notes that: Larger rural settlements will accommodate an appropriate level of development that supports their function. Sites of an appropriate scale and nature will be allocated in the plan. Non-allocated sites within the defined settlement development limit will also be supported. All development should take into account the nature and character of these settlements. Therefore, planning policy recognises that Larger Rural Settlements have a role to play in the growth of North Lincolnshire. Burton upon Stather In March 2018, Land off Tee Lane, Burton upon Stather (KD4T8) was submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential housing allocation. Consideration of the site is undertaken within the SHELAA 2021, which includes it within the list of discounted sites for the following reasons: Highways have concerns about impact of development on existing highway infrastructure. The site has a number of Tree Preservation Orders on site. The site is within 1000m of Burton Kennels so noise may be an issue. Further consideration of these matters is undertaken below: Highways have concerns about impact of development on existing highway infrastructure The information within the SHELAA 2021 does not expand upon these concerns so it is not possible to specifically address them, other than to note that the site is served by the public highway. It appears to have good visibility and whilst single carriageway at present, there are verges which could allow for it to be upgraded to serve development. The site is within 1000m of Burton Kennels so noise may be an issue. Burton Kennels are located on Stather Road, which is approximately 400m away from the nearest part of the site. However, between the kennels and the development site is a mature woodland, which itself is around 200m wide and would therefore provide a buffer to any potential noise. In addition, any development proposals for the site would be accompanied by an appropriate acoustic impact assessment to ensure that noise levels on the site would be acceptable.	positively prepared	Comments and Amendments Burton upon Stather Burton upon Stather is a sustainable settlement which is suitable for growth as confirmed in policy SS2. Site KD4T8 presents an opportunity to secure housing for the village over the plan period which would have a positive impact on local services. KD4T8 should therefore be included as a housing allocation or within the settlement boundary of Burton upon Stather. Comments and Amendments Wrawby is a sustainable settlement which is suitable for growth as confirmed in policy SS2. Site K4XSR in particular, presents an opportunity for additional growth alongside the committed developments in the village. Whether developed in full or in part, the site can offer flexibility to the future development of the village. It should therefore be included as a housing allocation or within the settlement boundary. Including additional flexibility to the plan through the introduction of additional allocations would make the plan more effective over the plan period. Comments and Amendments South Ferriby is a sustainable suitable for growth although no housing commitments or proposed residential allocations identified within the Plan nor are there are plans to extend the settlement boundary. The lack of growth proposed in the village means that the growth strategy for South Ferriby is not positively prepared to enable	yes	In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above settlements on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							The site has a number of Tree Preservation Orders The site is in agricultural use and any trees are located along the site boundary. They would not therefore represent a barrier to development. Burton upon Stather is identified as a Larger Rural Settlement and has a number of local facilities including a Primary School. The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper identifies a growth requirement of 63 dwellings in the village over the plan period. However, there are no housing commitments or proposed residential allocations identified within the Plan nor are there are plans to extend the settlement boundary. The lack of growth proposed in the village means that the growth strategy for Burton upon Stather is not positively prepared to enable the village growth needs to be met. It is not effective and would place additional pressure on other settlements to accommodate growth. In addition, the approach is not consistent with national policy, specifically paragraph 79, which states: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Restricting growth in this sustainable settlement would not support the existing local services and facilities. The matters identified about demonstrate that the approach in Burton upon Stather is therefore not justified. Wrawby In March 2018, four sites in Wrawby were submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential housing allocations: Land west of Barton Road XJDJZ Land east of Tunnel Road K4XSR Land North of Chapel Lane IKPI9 Land south of Chapel Lane 3FHDP Consideration of the sites is undertaken within the SHELAA 2021, which includes three of the sites within the list of discounted sites for the following reasons: IKPI9 Land north of Chapel Lane The site is unable to form suitable access with adopted highway. 3FHDP Land south of Chapel Lane The site is unable to form suitable access with adopted Highway XJDJZ Land to the west of B1206 The site is isolated away from the main built up area. However, site K4XSR, Land East of Tunnel Road was included in the list of suitable sites in the SHELAA 2021 with a potential capacity of 157 dwellings. The following comments were made about the site: The site lies within SFRA Flood Zone 1. There may be potential contamination on the site.		the village's growth needs to be met. It is not effective and would place additional pressure on other settlements to accommodate growth. In addition, the approach is not consistent with national policy, specifically paragraph 79, which states: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Restricting growth in this sustainable settlement would not support the existing local services and facilities. The matters identified about demonstrate that the approach in South Ferriby is therefore not justified.			

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							The scale of the proposed site is large in comparison to the existing settlement, which will be considered when exploring development potential further. It is unclear why the Land East of Tunnel Road was not selected as a proposed housing allocation. The Housing Sites Selection Topic Paper notes that only 36 dwellings are required for Wrawby, and these are to be delivered via existing commitments. It is considered that our client's site can provide flexibility of choice to the market if included as a housing allocation. Alternatively, as the site is larger than the proposed growth for the village over the plan period, it presents an opportunity to secure wider benefits to the village, through the inclusion of complementary facilities alongside housing. In addition, the site could come forward in phases, presenting an opportunity for incremental, planned growth which extends beyond the current plan, into future plan periods. South Ferriby In March 2018, Land to the south of Sluice Road, South Ferriby (T9E73) was submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential allocation for employment uses. The Proposed Plan shows that part of the site is located within a LWS. The remainder of the site outside the LWS is immediately adjacent to a residential area and may therefore be more suited to new housing which could be accessed via the existing access track.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0320	Lynette Swinburne, Savills on behalf of The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	object	yes	no	yes	Savills is instructed by The Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance to submit representations in response to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Plan (Regulation 19), October 2021. Specifically, these representations relate to land in North Killingholme, which is within the ownership of our clients. North Killingholme is identified as a Smaller Rural Settlement within the Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire as set out in Policy SS2 of the Publication Plan. Part e of SS2 relates to these settlements, and notes that: These settlements will accommodate small-scale development of a limited nature, within their defined settlement developments, that supports their vitality and viability. Small sites will have a role to play. All development should reflect the character and nature of these villages and give due consideration to the availability and capacity of infrastructure to support its growth. All proposals will be considered on their merits. Therefore, planning policy recognises that Smaller Rural Settlements can make a modest contribution towards the growth of North Lincolnshire. In March 2018, Land north of Church Lane (MU0ZI) was submitted to the North Lincolnshire Call for Sites as a potential housing allocation. Consideration of the site is undertaken within the SHELAA 2021, which includes it within the list of discounted sites for the following reasons: Access from Church Lane. However, there are issues with the residents to the north of the site and existing industrial uses on the North Killingholme Airfield. Localised improvements and widening to Church Lane may be required. Noise from commercial properties on Lancaster approach. The site is too large for this size settlement Whilst a larger area of land in our clients ownership was submitted, it is considered that a smaller parcel of this, closest to the centre of the village could present a valuable addition, if included within the settlement boundary. The site would be well placed to meet small scale incremental growth for North Killingholme. The lack of growth proposed in the village means that the growth strategy for North Killingholme is not consistent with national policy, specifically paragraph 79, which states: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Restricting growth in this settlement would not support existing services and facilities in the local area.	Consistent with national policy	Site MU0ZI presents an opportunity to secure housing for the village over the plan period which would have a positive impact on local services. MU0ZI should therefore be included within the settlement boundary of the village.	yes	In relation to the Examination in Public, we consider it may be beneficial to attend the sessions relating to the above settlements on behalf of our client should the Inspector wish to discuss the matters further.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Gary **Tanswell**												
0794	Gary Tanswell	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0812	Gary Tanswell	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0871	Gary Tanswell	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Paul **Tattersfield** on behalf of GPM Group												
0653	Paul Tattersfield on behalf of GPM Group	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS					Hi, I've submitted an omission site form to offer a suitable site to make the policy sound as there is a demonstrable need for smaller affordable bungalows for older people within Scawby and the Scawby Development limit and allocations are unlikely to meet this requirement. I would be grateful if you could consider my comments below and on the form and if I could be heard by an Inspector if necessary. Best regards, Paul There is a demonstrable need for smaller affordable bungalows for older people within Scawby. QS103EW - Age by single year ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis on 1 August 2018] population All usual residents All categories: Age 2,243					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Total aged 50 and over 1,165 (Please see table below for age by year*) Because of ownership and locational constraints the currently allocated and proposed sites H1C-57p, H1C-58p & H1P-31p will almost certainly fail to address this specific need. Providing instead for larger, more profitable market level and indeed predominantly two storey properties in order to make those sites viable making the plan unsound. Whereas we are in a unique position where we not only own the land, have brought forward similar smaller (mainly 2 bedrooms) bungalow properties predominantly for older people on land adjacent to the site and only wish to develop specialist affordable bungalows for older residents to meet this targeted need. A need specifically identified in the local plan which will in turn free up larger properties in the village allowing those older residents to stay close to their family support networks. The area outlined within this submission provides a small logical incremental change to the development limit to allow this unmet need to be met. Further because of the tare of the land and the irregular shape of the field it will make the remaining land easier to farm. It will also remove heavy agricultural equipment from the area around a main sewer for Scawby which runs along the western boundary of the land together with the areas around the road level access chambers which are not possible to farm. QS103EW - Age by single year ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis on 1 August 2018] population All usual residents units Persons area type parishes 2011 area name E04000577 : Scawby rural urban Total Age 2011 All categories: Age 2,243 Total aged 50 and over 1,165 Age 50 27 Age 51 28 Age 52 33 Age 53 31 Age 54 23 Age 55 34 Age 56 35 Age 57 30 Age 58 35 Age 59 29 Age 60 43 Age 61 39 Age 62 38					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Age 63 53 Age 64 47 Age 65 39 Age 66 48 Age 67 44 Age 68 37 Age 69 39 Age 70 35 Age 71 25 Age 72 31 Age 73 37 Age 74 19 Age 75 28 Age 76 25 Age 77 29 Age 78 25 Age 79 19 Age 80 25 Age 81 12 Age 82 18 Age 83 7 Age 84 14 Age 85 8 Age 86 15 Age 87 12 Age 88 13 Age 89 9 Age 90 7 Age 91 7 Age 92 4 Age 93 2 Age 94 4 Age 95 2 Age 96 0 Age 97 0 Age 98 1 Age 99 0 Age 100 and over 0 Total aged 50 and over 1,165					
0654	Paul Tattersfield on behalf of GPM Group	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS					Hi I've been asked to submit a change to the development boundary to include the buildings along Bridge Road in Wressle. I submit ed an omission site form for the resident because the boundary comment function on was not working on my machine today. The comment on the Wressle development boundary is: Since the section on 18 request for submissions of sites, permission for a new house and separate garage block have been granted. The newly constructed property now fills the gap between the exist ng development boundary and the group of houses &commercial buildings out with the proposed development boundary. There is now continuous built form to (and beyond) the site limits shown on the submit ed plan.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							For the Local Plan to be sound development boundaries should not be arbitrary rather they are required to reflect what is physically on the ground. The eastern extent of the physical built form is likewise affirmed by the placement of the 30mphsigns designate ng the start of the main built area of Wressle as the natural place to lower speeds from the national 60mph speed limit of the road outside the settlement. If necessary I would be grateful if this matter could be heard at the examination on hearing sessions, thank you.					
Dave **Telford** on behalf of Wroot Parish Council												
0607	Dave Telford on behalf of Wroot Parish Council	POLICY H1P-33: LAND AT FIELD LANE					Good afternoon At its meeting held Tuesday 2 November 2021 the Parish Council considered the proposals contained in the current Local Plan 2020-2036 which indicated 3 possible sites for future development. However, Ward Councillor David Rose advised that only one of the 3 sites, the one between the last house on Field Lane and St Pancras Church was being considered by NLC. for the construction of 13/15 properties. Members expressed concern that the proposed development was too large as the village infrastructure was very limited, also the bus service was very limited. It was agreed that NLC Planning be informed of the Parish Council's concerns and that if the site was approved only frontage properties be built in keeping with the rest of the village, and that there should be some affordable housing included.					View PDF
Ziyad **Thomas**, Planning Issues Ltd on behalf of Churchhill Retirement Living and Mccarthy Stone												
0552	Ziyad Thomas, Planning Issues Ltd on behalf of Churchhill Retirement Living and Mccarthy Stone	POLICY DQE7: CLIMATE CHANGE & LOW CARBON LIVING					This policy looks for all development proposals to meet the Building Regulations optional higher water efficiency standard of 110 litre per person per day Under Building Regulations, all new dwellings must achieve a mandatory level of water efficiency of 125 litres per day per person, which is a higher standard than that achieved by much of the existing housing stock. This mandatory standard represents an effective demand management measure. If the Council wish to adopt the optional standard for water efficiency of 110 litres per person per day then the Council should justify doing so by applying the criteria set out in the PPG. The PPG1 states that where there is a clear local need, LPA can set out Local Plan Policies requiring new dwellings to meet tighter Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 litres per person per day. The PPG 2 also states it will be for a LPA to establish a clear need based on existing sources of evidence, consultations with the local water and sewerage company, the Environment Agency and catchment partnerships and consideration of the impact on viability and housing supply of such a requirement.			Yes	We would like to be kept informed of the Local Plan progress and given the opportunity to present their arguments at Examination in Public. This is required as the matters relate to development viability which is a complex matter that would benefit from being discussed at EiP.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0628	Ziyad Thomas, Planning Issues Ltd on behalf of Churchhill Retirement Living and Mccarthy Stone	POLICY H2: HOUSING MIX AND DENSITY					Policy HS is not considered to be sound as it is not justified or consistent with national policy for the following reasons: The policy should provide an exemption for specialist accommodation for older persons The housing mix and density of these schemes are clearly very different from open market housing and the policy should make this clear. The Council will also need to consider its approach to density in relation to other policies in the plan and those set nationally, policies in relation to open space provision, housing design and space standards, SuDs, biodiversity, future homes standard, trees and parking provision can all impact upon the density which can delivered upon site.			Yes	We would like to be kept informed of the Local Plan progress and given the opportunity to present their arguments at Examination in Public. This is required as the matters relate to development viability which is a complex matter that would benefit from being discussed at EiP.	View PDF
0630	Ziyad Thomas, Planning Issues Ltd on behalf of Churchhill Retirement Living and Mccarthy Stone	Policy H3: Affordable Housing					Policy H3. Affordable Housing sets a policy requirement for 10% affordable housing provision on residential housing developments of 10 or more dwellings in North Lincolnshire. North Lincolnshire Council Local Plan & Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment (2021) (hereafter referred to as the Viability Study) undertaken by NCS informs the planning obligations and the affordable housing requirement In assessing the aforementioned Viability Study, we note that no viability appraisals were undertaken for specialist older persons' housing typologies - namely Sheltered Housing and Extra Care accommodation. This is disappointing and considered to be contrary to both best practice and the typology approach detailed in Paragraph: 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509) of the PPG which states that: "A typology approach is a process plan makers can follow to ensure that they are creating realistic, deliverable policies based on the type of sites that are likely to come forward for development over the plan period. The viability of specialist older persons' housing is more finely balanced than that of 'conventional' apartments for several reasons. Build costs for are higher for supported housing, with the most recent BCIS build costs rebased to North Lincolnshire are 25% higher than estate housing and 9% higher than flats. Communal floorspace accounts for between 25% and 35% of the Gross Internal Area for specialist older persons' housing, compared to 15% for flats and 0% for houses. Sales rates for older persons' housing are nationally under 1 unit per month for both respondents In light of the above, we respectfully request the viability of specialist older persons' housing typologies We acknowledge the PPG does states that circumstances that justify the need for a viability assessment at application stage can include where			Yes	We would like to be kept informed of the Local Plan progress and given the opportunity to present their arguments at Examination in Public. This is required as the matters relate to development viability which is a complex matter that would benefit from being discussed at EiP.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							types of development are proposed which may significantly vary from standard models of development for sale (for example build to rent or housing for older people) (Paragraph ID: 10-007- 20190509). The guidance in the NPPF and the PPG does however clearly advise that the role for viability assessment is primarily at the Plan making stage: Where up-to-date policies have set out the contributions expected from development, planning applications that comply with them should be assumed to be viable. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage. The weight to be given to a viability assessment is a matter for the decision maker, having regard to all the circumstances in the case, including whether the plan and the viability evidence underpinning it is up to date, and any change in site circumstances since the plan was brought into force (paragraph 58.) Council Members, Officers and the general public will assume that applications for sheltered or extra care housing will be able to support a policy compliant level of affordable housing Burdening specialist forms of accommodation with an unrealistic affordable housing requirement on the presumption that viability will be considered on a site-specific basis, but not making this clear to either developers or Council Officers in the wording of the policy creates both uncertainty and a significant opportunity for conflict. This is particularly concerning as the NPPF and the PPG both make it clear that the weight attributed to a viability assessment is to at the discretion of the decision maker. The PPG however advises that 'Different (affordable housing) requirements may be set for different types or location of site or types of development' (Paragraph: 001 Reference ID 10-001-20190509) We are strongly of the view that it would be more appropriate to set a nil affordable housing target for sheltered and extra care development. This approach accords with the guidance of the PPG which states that 'Different (affordable housing) requirements may be set for different types or location of site or types of development' (Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 10-001- 20190509). Both McCarthy Stone and Churchill Retirement Living have struggled to bring forward specialist older persons' housing within North Lincolnshire historically as we have been unable to make development viable. The Authority is however of interest to both companies and we would appreciate the opportunity to work with Council Officers to help facility the delivery of specialist older persons' housing. To that end, we would like to draw the Council's attention to Paragraph 5.33 of Policy HPS Provision of Affordable Housing in the emerging Fareham Borough Local Plan which advises that 5.33 ... The Viability Study concludes that affordable housing is not viable for older persons and specialist housing. Therefore, Policy HPS does not apply to specialist housing or older persons housing A nil affordable housing rate could facilitate a step-change in the delivery of older person's housing in the Authority, helping to meet the diverse					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							housing needs of the elderly. The benefits of specialist older persons' housing extend beyond the delivery of planning obligations as these forms of development contribute to the regeneration of town centres and assist Council's by making savings on health and social care.					
0638	Ziyad Thomas, Planning Issues Ltd on behalf of Churchhill Retirement Living and Mccarthy Stone	POLICY H5: HOUSING FOR OLDER PEOPLE					Policy HS is not considered to be sound as it is not justified or consistent with national policy for the following reasons: a) While we are supportive of the Local Plan's aspirations to support the supply of homes for older people the policy needs to be broadened to support all forms of specialist accommodation for older people. b) Part le of this policy seeks to restrict 'an undue concentration' of such provision The need for such accommodation is critical and this part of the policy should be excluded to avoid the restriction of much needed specialist accommodation. c) Part 2 of this policy states that all new specialist homes designed for older people shall be built to M4(2) and M4(3) of the Building Regulations as a minimum. It is not clear if part 2 of the policy is requiring all homes to meet M4(2) or M4(3a) or M4(3b) standards, or whether it is suggesting all homes should meet M4(2) and M4(3a) or M4(3b) standards as it currently states. Paragraph 5.197 suggests that the policy should state M4(2) OR M4(3) There are significant differences in the costs of provision of these different standards, and this lack of clarity could have significant implications for the viability of these developments. d) Part 6 of the policy states that 'where appropriate, the council will consider the use of planning conditions to restrict occupancy and subsequent sale' of specialist accommodation for older people. While restrictions on occupancies are commonplace and necessary, care should be taken to allow the transfer of these units to family members if the original owner passes away.			Yes	We would like to be kept informed of the Local Plan progress and given the opportunity to present their arguments at Examination in Public. This is required as the matters relate to development viability which is a complex matter that would benefit from being discussed at EiP.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0667	Ziyad Thomas, Planning Issues Ltd on behalf of Churchhill Retirement Living and Mccarthy Stone	POLICY SS3: DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES	Support				McCarthy Stone and Churchill Retirement Living are independent and competing housebuilders specialising in sheltered housing for older people. Together, we are responsible for delivering approximately 90% of England's specialist owner-occupied retirement housing.We respond to the policies of the consultation insofar as they impact the delivery of specialist accommodation for older persons. We support this policy.This policy seeks to promote and encourage the effective use of previously developed (brownfield) land (providing it's not of high environmental value), whilst demonstrating the efficient use of land and resources by ensuring development is built at appropriate densities. We support the principle of the optimising the use of previously developed land in sustainable locations on smaller sites. Such sites are eminently suitable for specialist older persons' accommodation and the best use of such sites is a defining characteristic of this form of developmentIt is also well recognised that the delivery of specialist older persons' housing frees up under occupied housing stock. In accordance with the Government's bedroom standard in which people have at least two unused bedrooms, 57% of people aged over 55 were considered to be under occupying. Research by the Intergenerational Foundation in 2011 entitled 'Hoarding of Housing: The intergenerational crisis in the housing market' identified that there were 18 million surplus bedrooms in 2009/2010, 9 million of which were under occupied by those aged 60 and over. Shelter calculated in their research entitled 'A better fit? Creating Housing choices for an ageing population' (2012) that if 20% of older households currently under occupying were to downsize, around 840,000 family homes would be released, including 760,000 that were owner occupied in tenure.Increasing the delivery of specialist older persons' housing in the area would increase the diversity of available housing stock, not only by meeting the housing needs of older people but also families and first-time buyers through the release of under occupied housing stock.			Yes	We would like to be kept informed of the Local Plan progress and given the opportunity to present their arguments at Examination in Public. This is required as the matters relate to development viability which is a complex matter that would benefit from being discussed at EiP.	View PDF
0679	Ziyad Thomas, Planning Issues Ltd on behalf of Churchhill Retirement Living and Mccarthy Stone	Policy SS5: Overall Housing Provision					Policy 555 is not considered to be sound as it is not positively prepared, justified or consistent with national policy for the following reasons. Paragraph 1 of the PPG Housing for Older and Disabled people states: "The need to provide housing for older people is critical. People are living longer lives and the proportion of older people in the population is increasing ..... Offering older people, a better choice of accommodation to suit their changing needs can help them live independently for longer, feel more connected to their communities and help reduce costs to the social care and health systems. Therefore, an understanding of how the ageing population affects housing needs is something to be considered from the early stages of plan-making through to decision-taking". Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 63-001-20190626 It is clear from the supporting text of the local plan that that there is a critical need for specialist older persons' accommodation in the city area that needs to be addressed through the Local Plan and, unless properly planned for, there is likely to be a serious shortfall in specialist accommodation for the older population, which will have a knock-on effect in meeting the housing needs of the whole North Lincolnshire area			Yes	We would like to be kept informed of the Local Plan progress and given the opportunity to present their arguments at Examination in Public. This is required as the matters relate to development viability which is a complex matter that would benefit from being discussed at EiP.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							and wider policy objectives. While the plan later identifies housing for older person as a need this is not quantified by the plan Specialist older person's housing delivery should be monitored by the council and should be measured by both tenure and type to ensure the needs of North Lincolnshire's ageing population are both planned for and met over the plan period. The plan does not positively plan for the delivery of specialist accommodation for older people We submit that the council should set out in policy a target for the delivery of homes for older people and with a commitment to maintaining a supply of land to meet that target. An ageing population inevitably results in an increase in frail individuals and persons with long term health issues. There is a commensurate pressure on care and health services accordingly with many local authorities spending over a third of their budgets on adult social care currently. It is well established that poor housing can exacerbate health problems in old age, with enormous resultant costs to the NHS and social care. For example: Falls - Public Health England statistics show that in 2017/18 falls accounted for 335,000 hospital admissions in England of people aged 65 and over. Cold Homes - Millions of older people in the UK are living in homes that are too cold. A cold home can cause chronic and acute illnesses and lead to reduced mobility, falls and depression. Social Isolation - 1.5 million people aged 50 and over are always or often lonely, researchers have calculated. Loneliness makes it harder for people to regulate behaviours such as drinking, smoking, and over-eating, which in turn have their own significant negative outcomes. Specialist older persons' housing has been developed with the needs of the elderly in mind, enabling them to remain independent for longer These homes are designed to be warm and with features to alleviate the physical impact of ageing (such as level access throughout) and offer opportunities for residents to access support, care, and companionship The recently published Healthier and Happier Report by WPI Strategy (September 2019) calculated that the average person living in specialist housing for older people saves the NHS and social services £3,490 per year					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0729	Ziyad Thomas, Planning Issues Ltd on behalf of Churchhill Retirement Living and Mccarthy Stone	Policy T4: Parking					This policy states that for residential developments dwellings with secure parking should provide 1 electric vehicle charging point per dwelling and for dwellings with private allocated off curtilage parking 1 electric vehicle charging point should be provided per 10 parking spaces While we support initiatives to improve infrastructure for sustainable modes of transport, we have concerns over requirements for a quota of charging points in new development. The rate of innovation in the electric vehicle sector is such that the installation of charging points runs a risk of obsolescence. It is our view that the 1 ID: 56-014-20150327 2 ID: 56-015-20150327 provision of cabling to parking spaces to enable future installation in line with the wishes of residents is a more practical measure. I trust that the above comments will be taken into account and considered as part of the evolution of the Local Development Plan.			Yes	We would like to be kept informed of the Local Plan progress and given the opportunity to present their arguments at Examination in Public. This is required as the matters relate to development viability which is a complex matter that would benefit from being discussed at EiP.	View PDF
Nolan **Tucker** & Emma Gomersal on behalf of Church Commissioners for England												
0889	Nolan Tucker & Emma Gomersal on behalf of Church Commissioners for England	Paragraph 3.1	support		yes		Please see the accompanying document for further information regarding the context of representation and the Church Commissioners interests in the district, notably Land to the West of Humberside Airport. • Spatial Vision for North Lincolnshire The Spatial Vision reflects the wider ambitions for the future of NLC and the outcomes it will seek to achieve between 2020 and 2038. The vision produced for the Publication Plan is informed by the Council Plan (2018-2021), along with the NLC Economic Growth Plan and Skills & Employability Plan. The Spatial Vision seeks to deliver increased prosperity for the area in 2038, with a competitive and diverse economy with increased employment levels. The Spatial Vision notes that growth will take place in the most appropriate locations where it will support and create a vibrant network of “attractive, thriving and vibrant sustainable communities”. The Commissioners support the Spatial Vision and its intention to seek and deliver economic growth within North Lincolnshire. The Spatial Vision’s idea to make North Lincolnshire a location of choice for business, maximising the location of the area and in turn, the transport links within, is fully supported. The Commissioners also support NLC’s intentions to capitalise on its strategic locations in order to further this growth. The Spatial Vision is considered to be ‘sound’: it has been informed by NLC evidence relating to its wider aspirations regarding the Authority’s future growth (such as the Council Plan, Economic Growth Plan and Skills & Employability Plan); in relation to the economic growth ambitions it is considered deliverable over the Plan period and as such is effective; it is positively prepared and consistent with achieving sustainable development; and it is consistent with national planning policy in that it serves as clear purpose in the Publication Plan (as is required by paragraph					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							16 of the NPPF).					
0888	Nolan Tucker & Emma Gomersal on behalf of Church Commissioners for England	Paragraph 3.11	Support		yes		Spatial Objective 1: Growing our Economy The spatial objectives are derived from the Spatial Vision and provide the broad direction for the spatial strategy and detailed policies of the Publication Plan. Whilst not a specific policy within the Publication Plan, the Commissioners support Spatial Objective 1 in its promotion of economic growth within North Lincolnshire and its intention to utilise the strategic location adjacent to the Humberside Estuary and international connections, to highlight key locations for business, as well as promoting sufficient employment land in sustainable locations to meet the needs of existing and future business.					View PDF
0825	Nolan Tucker & Emma Gomersal on behalf of Church Commissioners for England	Policy EC1: Employment Land Supply	Support		yes		Within Policy EC1, the Commissioners Site is identified within the employment land supply as EC1-3 'Land to the West of Humberside Airport'. The Commissioners continue to support the allocation of this 12ha site for use class B1 and B8 development. The allocation of the Site for employment use is consistent with the spatial strategy of the Publication Plan and will help NLC in achieving its growth-led Spatial Vision for the district; it will make a positive addition to the employment needs and prosperity targets of the district. The Site is available, is in a suitable location which supports and is consistent with the Plan's spatial strategy and is deliverable within the Plan period to 2038. The inclusion of the Site is therefore considered sound. Commentary regarding the policy requirements of EC1-3 is provided in response to Policy EC1-3.					View PDF
0827	Nolan Tucker & Emma Gomersal on behalf of Church Commissioners for England	Policy EC1-3: Land to the West of Humberside Airport					EC1-3: Land to the West of Humberside Airport Emerging Policy 'EC1-3: Land to the West of Humberside Airport', relates to the emerging allocation of the Site for use class B1 and B8 development. Within the Publication Draft Policy EC1-3 is a non-strategic policy. Paragraphs 28-30 of the NPPF relate to such policies, identifying that non-strategic policies are used to set out more detailed policies for specific areas and can include: allocating sites, the provision of infrastructure and community facilities at a local level; establishing design principles; and setting out other development management policies. The identification of Policy EC1-3 as a non-strategic policy is consistent with paragraph 28 of the NPPF in that it relates to a proposed site allocation and sets detailed requirements for the future development of the Site. The principle of including the policy within the Plan is sound, as it is consistent with national planning policy. The Commissioners support the continued allocation of EC1-3 within the Publication Draft. The Site would promote economic growth and in turn, help realise the aims of the spatial strategy. However, the proposed implementation of the policy is lacking clarity. The policy states that the Site will be: "brought forward for development once the remaining undeveloped part of the existing Airport Business Park is substantially committed or when			Yes	The Church Commissioners for England wish to reserve their right to participate in the hearing sessions as the landowner of Land to the West of Humberside Airport which is an extant allocation within the development plan and an emerging allocation within the Local Plan Publication Draft.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							due to size restrictions proposed employment uses cannot be physically accommodated." It is not clear from the policy or supporting text as to how "substantial commitment" is defined, or the level of substantial commitment required at the undeveloped area of the Airport's Business Park before EC1-3 can be brought forward. The Airport Business Park was previously allocated as HUME-1 within the Allocations DPD, in which it detailed a proposal of 9.4ha of employment land for use classes B1 and B8. However, this employment land allocation is no longer identified within the emerging Local Plan. As such, it is not clear within the Publication Plan as to the area NLC is referring to when referencing the Airport Business Park. In order to provide the necessary clarity, the emerging Plan should include a definition detailing what is meant by "substantial commitment" and at what stage NLC will consider the substantial commitment to have been secured. Furthermore, the Plan should clearly articulate what is meant by the term "Airport Business Park" and the area of land this covers. Importantly, this will give developers/landowners associated or interested in EC1-3 greater clarity as to when the Site could be brought forward. Notwithstanding the above, there is no justification within the Publication Draft as to why NLC has included this restrictive implementation requirement within the policy. As the policy is currently worded, for the Site to be implemented, it is wholly reliant on the substantial commitment of the remaining undeveloped areas of the Airport Business Park to come forward. The reasoning for this is lacking within the Publication Plan. The Commissioners do not consider that there are any reasons as to why the Site could not be brought forward prior to the "substantial commitment" of development at the Airport Business Park. Whilst the principle and ethos of Policy EC1-3 is considered sound, the Commissioners suggest that NLC review the implementation requirements of the policy and if necessary, provides further justification as to why it identifies such requirement. In summary, the representations seek to re-confirm that EC1-3 remains wholly deliverable within the Plan period and as such, in this respect, its identification as an employment land allocation is justified. It will play an important role in NLC successfully achieving the strategic vision and objectives of the emerging Local Plan. The Commissioners do not consider that the implementation timescales set out within Policy EC1-3 are justified and that without justification, this element of the policy should be removed. Notwithstanding this, the representation seeks clarity as to what is meant by the term "substantial commitment" within the policy and at what point this will have been deemed to be secured by NLC. It would also be prudent to clearly define the area referred to when referencing Humberside Airport Business Park, this is currently missing from the Publication Draft and has the potential to result in ambiguity for future developers, as well as the decision-makers.					
0849	Nolan Tucker &	Policy SS1:	Support		yes		Policy SS1 sets out how the district will deliver intentional growth that					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	Emma Gomersal on behalf of Church Commissioners for England	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development					brings benefits for all sectors of the community. The policy notes that NLC will work proactively with applicants to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved, wherever possible and will take a positive approach when considering development proposals. The Commissioners support the approach of NLC to work proactively to approve proposals where possible, in order to bring prosperity to the district. This is considered reflective of paragraph 8 of the NPPF which identifies what achieving sustainable development means. In this regard the policy is considered sound, being consistent with national policy.					
0856	Nolan Tucker & Emma Gomersal on behalf of Church Commissioners for England	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	Support		yes		SS2 A Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire Policy SS2 sets out how the district's vision will be delivered through the spatial strategy and supports this with a key diagram. The focusses of the strategy are set out within the policy and on the key diagram. Within point 2c, reference is made to: "Develop at least 131.7ha of employment land in key locations that supports the delivery of housing growth, and provides opportunities for our priority sectors to grow, and meets the requirements of the commercial property market. Amongst these areas are South Humber Gateway; Scunthorpe; Humberside Airport; and strategic locations on Transport Corridors". The Commissioners support the approach of focussing employment land in key locations and also support the inclusion of Humberside Airport as a named key location within the strategic policy, this has increased the clarity on the position of Humberside Airport within the NLC's strategic plans. However, "key" locations are not annotated on the associated diagram, which would be helpful in providing a clear and consistent view on the intentions of the strategic policy. It is noted that 131.7ha of employment land is a minimum requirement that is subject to review (paragraph 4.65) and, to ensure flexibility, an additional buffer of 50% of the total requirement has been added to achieve the figure of 131.7ha. The Commissioners support the increase in the minimum employment land requirement from the Regulation 18 plan-making stage, in order to meet its Objectively Assessed Needs (as underpinned by the evidence as set out within the Employment Topic Paper) and maintain and enhance the district's vitality and viability. The clear identification of the requirement being a minimum figure rather than a fixed or maximum cap, provides a positively worded policy that does not restrict growth when and where this is appropriate. The Commissioners also support the use of a buffer (as evidenced within the Employment Land Review) to ensure flexibility and choice for occupiers, as it should enable the district to alter its response in accordance with evolving employment needs. This means that the policy is sound in that it complies with paragraph 83 of the NPPF, which requires planning policies related to building a strong and competitive economy to be flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the Plan and enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0886	Nolan Tucker & Emma Gomersal on behalf of Church Commissioners for England	POLICY SS8: EMPLOYMENT LAND REQUIREMENT (INCLUDING STRATEGIC EMPLOYMENT SITES)	Support		yes		This policy sets out the requirement for employment land in line with the overall development strategy in Policy SS2 ('A Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire') and identifies that it will be delivered by strategic allocations at South Humber Bank and North Killingholme, as well as the sites allocated under Policy EC1 ('Employment Land Supply'). For the reasons detailed in response to Policy SS2, the Commissioners support the employment land requirement of 131.7ha, which is considered to be sound. They also support the approach taken by NLC in identifying sites under Policy EC1, in order to meet the employment land requirement.					View PDF
Simon **Tucker** on behalf of Canal and River Trust												
0438	Simon Tucker on behalf of Canal and River Trust	Key Diagram					We note that amendments have been undertaken to now include the Stainforth & Keadby Canal on the Key Diagram. The waterway provides an important access to strategic walking and cycling routes and also provides a leisure resource. By including the resource on the Key Diagram, the Local Plan will be more effective, as its presence would become more apparent to decision makers and developers.					View PDF
0481	Simon Tucker on behalf of Canal and River Trust	Paragraph 2.60					North Lincolnshire benefits from the presence of the River Trent and the Stainforth & Keadby canal, which are both capable of handling waterborne freight. Both waterways provide a direct route to the Humber Ports (and marine sourced aggregate) and provide an alternative route for bulky freight materials without the need for HGV traffic. The use of waterways for the transportation of waterborne freight, especially bulk materials and of sustainable transport which can help in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion on the local highway network. Our previous consultation response to the Preferred Options stage highlighted that additional text to refer to the presence of the waterways would make the plan more effective, as it would better publicise the potential role of these assets to decision makers. We recognise that changes to add paragraph 2.59 within the 'Environment' chapter would help to highlight the presence and potential role of waterways in handling future freight. However, as this relates to future transport, we do request that consideration is given to placing this text within the 'Transport' section of the Plan. This could make the plan more effective as it would ensure that waterborne transport is fully considered by decision makers looking specifically at the transport chapter. With regards to figure 2.9, we advise that the Stainforth & Keadby canal should be included on the map. This change would help to make the presence and opportunities of waterborne freight apparent to future decision makers when exploring the transport connections within the Plan					View PDF
0526	Simon Tucker on behalf of Canal and River	Policy CSC1: Health and Wellbeing					Our towpaths provide public access to the Green Infrastructure network, which can promote active lifestyles and access to relaxing recreational spaces that provide benefits to wellbeing. The reference to blue infrastructure within part 1b of the policy text would help to ensure that					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	Trust						the role of waterways are fully considered as part of this policy.					
0528	Simon Tucker on behalf of Canal and River Trust	Policy CSC6: Water Based Leisure					The Stainforth & Keadby canal provides a waterspace that has the potential to be used for watersports, fishing and general boating leisure. Such activities can provide local economic employment and can also provide recreational facilities for local residents, which can help enhance their wellbeing. Changes to the policy text to reference the Stainforth and Keadby Canal would address our comments made at the Preferred Options Stage, and would ensure that the policy text is consistent with the recognition of the role that the canal can serve for eater based leisure activities.					View PDF
0537	Simon Tucker on behalf of Canal and River Trust	Policy DQE11: Green Infrastructure Network					To be consistent with the reference to 'green and blue' spaces in paragraphs 9.95 and 9.96, consideration could be given towards be re-titling the policy heading to "Green and Blue Infrastructure Network" (our emphasis). This could make it clearer to decision makers that waterspaces can form part of the wider Green Infrastructure network, and will make it clearer that the positive aims of the policy would accord to watercourses, lakes and canals.					View PDF
0555	Simon Tucker on behalf of Canal and River Trust	POLICY DQE7: CLIMATE CHANGE & LOW CARBON LIVING					Part 3 of this policy seeks to promote the use of decentralised, renewable and low carbon energy. We note that paragraph 8.94 provides examples of renewable and low carbon energy technology, which may provide more clarity to developers over how Part 3 can be achieved. We wish to highlight, for the record, that thermal energy for heating and cooling from water is a low carbon solution which contributes to UK Government targets to reduce the UK's greenhouse gas emissions by at least 80% (from the 1990 baseline) by 2050. The water flowing through the Trust's waterways contains enough thermal energy to produce approximately 640 MW of energy. This has attracted a number of businesses which now utilise this low carbon source to heat and cool their buildings. DECC too have acknowledged this potential in their Heat Map which includes a specific canal layer. The energy is extracted using water sourced heat pumps which are very efficient compared to conventional forms of heating and cooling. These efficiency improvements will help reduce the electricity demand and assist in balancing electricity supply.					View PDF
0666	Simon Tucker on behalf of Canal and River Trust	POLICY SS3: DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES					The Trust only own 4% of land adjacent to our waterways. Development in proximity to our network can have a significant impact upon how our spaces are perceived and enjoyed by the general public. Principles 1a, 1h, 1i and 1k proposed for this policy could help to ensure that new development respects the local character and seeks to enhance neighbouring green infrastructure assets. We note the addition of part 1o, which specifically refers to the amenity value of existing walking and cycling routes and green infrastructure networks. We believe this will make the Local Plan more effective in ensuring that the useability of walking and cycling routes are retained and enhanced. This would be in line with the principles of paragraphs 92 (part c) and 106 (part d) from the National Planning Policy Framework.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0731	Simon Tucker on behalf of Canal and River Trust	Policy T6: Freight					Moving Freight North Lincolnshire benefits from the presence of the River Trent and the Stainforth & Keadby canal, which are both capable of handling waterborne freight. Both waterways provide a direct route to the Humber Ports (and marine sourced aggregate) and provide an alternative route for bulky freight materials without the need for HGV traffic. The use of waterways for the transportation of waterborne freight, especially bulk materials and of sustainable transport which can help in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion on the local highway network. As discussed above, the River Trent and Stainforth & Keadby Canal are waterways capable of handling waterbourne freight, which is a more sustainable form of transport than road based transit, and a policy approach that recognises and promotes the use of waterborne freight would accord with the general aims of the NPPF. Policy T6: Freight Our previous consultation response to the Preferred Options stage highlighted that additional text to refer to the presence of the waterways would make the plan more effective, as it would better publicise the potential role of these assets to decision makers. We recognise that changes to add paragraph 2.59 within the 'Environment' chapter would help to highlight the presence and potential role of waterways in handling future freight. However, as this relates to future transport, we do request that consideration is given to placing this text within the 'Transport' section of the Plan. This could make the plan more effective as it would ensure that waterborne transport is fully considered by decision makers looking specifically at the transport chapter. With regards to figure 2.9, we advise that the Stainforth & Keadby canal should be included on the map. This change would help to make the presence and opportunities of waterborne freight apparent to future decision makers when exploring the transport connections within the Plan.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
C **Turnbull** on behalf of DWD Property and Planning												
0335	C Turnbull on behalf of DWD Property and Planning	Paragraph 3.10	support	yes	no	yes	Keadby Generation Limited (KGL), part of SSE plc (SSE), is promoting a DCO application for the Keadby 3 Low Carbon Power Station Project (Keadby 3). This incorporates carbon capture plant from the outset, to provide a significant amount (910MW) of reliable and dispatchable low carbon electricity generation, capable of capturing around 2Mt CO2e per year from the mid to late 2020s. The construction of Keadby 3 Low Carbon Power Station could (subject to the necessary consents being granted and an investment decision being made) start as early as Quarter 4 of 2022 or more likely during 2023. This would in turn allow operation to start in 2027. The Humber is currently home to the UK's largest and most carbon intensive industrial cluster and has been identified by the government as a prime location for Carbon Capture, Utilisation and Storage (CCUS). The Humber is also proximate to an internationally significant offshore geological resource for the storage of carbon emissions . The Keadby 3 Low Carbon Power Station Project responds to this context and the following legislation and policy drivers, among others: The national government commitment to achieving a net zero electricity system by 2035 was announced on 7 October 2021 . This is fifteen years earlier than the general 2050 net zero legislation (the Climate Change Act 2008 as amended); The Net Zero Strategy (HM Government, October 2021) which includes a requirement for 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. The written ministerial statement of 19 October 2021 by the minister of state for energy, clean growth and climate change confirming that the East Coast (Humber) cluster has been successful for funding support to deploy CCUS rapidly (by the mid 2020s). All of the above dates are well within the North Lincolnshire Plan period. Paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states one of the soundness tests as 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 reference to 'other statements of national planning policy' was added in the 2021 revision to the NPPF and we regard this as meaning that in some situations a Local Plan for soundness purposes must be consistent with: National Policy Statements designated under the Planning Act 2008, such as the Energy National Policy Statements (EN-1 to EN-6), 2011, and, once published, the amended Energy National Policy Statements (EN-1 to EN-5). The governments water preferred policy . The existing Energy NPS EN-1 explains at paragraph 3.6.5 that government is leading international efforts to develop CCS with demonstration	Consistent with national policy	The North Lincolnshire Local Plan should demonstrate support for the East Coast Cluster (or equivalent non specific wording for a CCUS cluster centred on the Humber) and describe the types of infrastructure this will require, such as carbon dioxide transport pipelines connecting to existing and proposed emitters such as Keadby 3. We request that this is accommodated in the Spatial Vision and the strategic objectives noted above, due to the importance of decarbonising the local economy and the potential for CCUS in safeguarding existing jobs while generating economic activity and new jobs for the local area.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							projects that will demonstrate the full chain of CCS involving the capture, transport and storage of carbon dioxide in the UK. These demonstration projects are therefore a priority for UK energy policy. The draft amended NPS EN-1 has an entire section entitled the need for new nationally significant carbon capture and storage infrastructure which notes there do not appear to be any realistic alternatives to new CCS infrastructure for delivering net zero by 2050. SSE is supportive of the aims and ambitions encompassed in the Spatial Vision and in particular spatial objectives 1 (Growing Our Economy), 4 (Delivering Infrastructure for Growth: A Connected North Lincolnshire), 5 (Supporting Our Rural Areas and Countryside) and 11 (Planning for Climate Change) but given the Humber Cluster announcements, its proximity to the internationally significant carbon store, and the status of the Keadby 3 Low Carbon Power Station Project (having completed a range of statutory consultation and a DCO application having been lodged), consistency with the existing and draft amended NPSs is required.					
0337	C Turnbull on behalf of DWD Property and Planning	POLICY EC5: 1.	object	yes	no	yes	Keadby Generation Limited (KGL), part of SSE plc (SSE), is promoting a DCO application for the Keadby 3 Low Carbon Power Station Project (Keadby 3). This incorporates carbon capture plant from the outset, to provide a significant amount (910MW) of reliable and dispatchable low carbon electricity generation, capable of capturing around 2Mt CO2e per year from the mid to late 2020s. The construction of Keadby 3 Low Carbon Power Station could (subject to the necessary consents being granted and an investment decision being made) start as early as Quarter 4 of 2022 or more likely during 2023. This would in turn allow operation to start in 2027. The Humber is currently home to the UKs largest and most carbon intensive industrial cluster and has been identified by the government as a prime location for Carbon Capture, Utilisation and Storage (CCUS). The Humber is also proximate to an internationally significant offshore geological resource for the storage of carbon emissions . The Keadby 3 Low Carbon Power Station Project responds to this context and the following legislation and policy drivers, among others: The national government commitment to achieving a net zero electricity system by 2035 was announced on 7 October 2021 . This is fifteen years earlier than the general 2050 net zero legislation (the Climate Change Act 2008 as amended); The Net Zero Strategy (HM Government, October 2021) which includes a requirement for 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. The written ministerial statement of 19 October 2021 by the minister of state for energy, clean growth and climate change confirming that the East Coast (Humber) cluster has been successful for Track 1 funding	Consistent with national policy	The North Lincolnshire Local Plan at Policy EC5 should for soundness reasons provide clear support for jetty and wharf retention and improvement where this facilitates water freight usage for major infrastructure development.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							support to deploy CCUS rapidly (by the mid 2020s). All of the above dates are well within the North Lincolnshire Plan period. Paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states one of the soundness tests as 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 wording in bold was added in the 2021 revision to the NPPF and we regard this as meaning that in some situations a Local Plan for soundness purposes must be consistent with: - National Policy Statements designated under the Planning Act 2008, such as the Energy National Policy Statements (EN-1 to EN-6), 2011, and, once published, the amended Energy National Policy Statements (EN-1 to EN-5) The governments water preferred policy . The existing Energy NPS EN-1 explains at paragraph 3.6.5 that government is leading international efforts to develop CCS with demonstration projects that will demonstrate the full chain of CCS involving the capture, transport and storage of carbon dioxide in the UK. These demonstration projects are therefore a priority for UK energy policy. The draft amended NPS EN-1 has an entire section entitled the need for new nationally significant carbon capture and storage infrastructure which notes there do not appear to be any realistic alternatives to new CCS infrastructure for delivering net zero by 2050 NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.13.10 states water-borne or rail transport is preferred over road transport at all stages of the project, where cost-effective The North Lincolnshire Local Plan does not provide clear support for jetty and wharf retention and improvement where this facilitates water freight usage for major infrastructure development that recognises the finite number of wharves available in the district, and is not sufficiently consistent with the policy support for this form of transport in the government's water preferred policy and NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.13.10.					
0336	C Turnbull on behalf of DWD Property and Planning	POLICY SS3: 1a.	object	yes	no	yes	Keadby Generation Limited (KGL), part of SSE plc (SSE), is promoting a DCO application for the Keadby 3 Low Carbon Power Station Project (Keadby 3). This incorporates carbon capture plant from the outset, to provide a significant amount (910MW) of reliable and dispatchable low carbon electricity generation, capable of capturing around 2Mt CO2e per year from the mid to late 2020s. The construction of Keadby 3 Low Carbon Power Station could (subject to the necessary consents being granted and an investment decision being made) start as early as Quarter 4 of 2022 or more likely during 2023. This would in turn allow operation to start in 2027. The Humber is currently home to the UKs largest and most carbon intensive industrial cluster and has been identified by the government as a prime location for Carbon Capture, Utilisation and Storage (CCUS). The Humber is also proximate to an internationally significant offshore	Consistent with national policy	The policy should: recognise that elements of this infrastructure may be large and tall and have visual impacts across wider areas (see NPS EN-2 and draft amended NPS EN-2 both at 2.6); such infrastructure should be attractive, durable, and adaptable (including taking account of natural hazards such as flooding) (see NPS EN-1 and draft amended NPS EN-1, both	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							geological resource for the storage of carbon emissions . The Keadby 3 Low Carbon Power Station Project responds to this context and the following legislation and policy drivers, among others: The national government commitment to achieving a net zero electricity system by 2035 was announced on 7 October 2021 . This is fifteen years earlier than the general 2050 net zero legislation (the Climate Change Act 2008 as amended); The Net Zero Strategy (HM Government, October 2021) which includes a requirement for our carbon capture usage and storage (CCUS) clusters, capturing 20-30 MtCO2 across the economy, including 6 MtCO2 of industrial emissions, per year by 2030. The written ministerial statement of 19 October 2021 by the minister of state for energy, clean growth and climate change confirming that the East Coast (Humber) cluster has been successful for ˜Track 1 funding support to deploy CCUS rapidly (by the mid 2020s). All of the above dates are well within the North Lincolnshire Plan period. Paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states one of the soundness tests as 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 wording in bold was added in the 2021 revision to the NPPF and we regard this as meaning that in some situations a Local Plan for soundness purposes must be consistent with: National Policy Statements designated under the Planning Act 2008, such as the Energy National Policy Statements (EN-1 to EN-6), 2011, and, once published, the amended Energy National Policy Statements (EN-1 to EN-5) . The government's water preferred policy . The existing Energy NPS EN-1 explains at paragraph 3.6.5 that government is leading international efforts to develop CCS with demonstration projects that will demonstrate the full chain of CCS involving the capture, transport and storage of carbon dioxide in the UK. These demonstration projects are therefore a priority for UK energy policy. The draft amended NPS EN-1 has an entire section entitled the need for new nationally significant carbon capture and storage infrastructure which notes there do not appear to be any realistic alternatives to new CCS infrastructure for delivering net zero by 2050. The North Lincolnshire Local Plan should for soundness reasons recognise the good design policy in NPS EN-1 and recognise the visual impact attributes identified in NPS EN-2 within given that many elements will be located outside of settlement boundaries in relatively flat landscapes.		at 4.6) We request this is incorporated through amended wording within Policy SS3, or in supporting text since it would explain and make more sound the existing wording unless in practical terms they are not considered relevant by the case officer.			

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
W B **Turner**												
0749	W B Turner	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	object				Good Evening, The development limit is tightly drawn at the west end of the village and even runs through domestic gardens. However, at the eastern end of Kirmington the limit is much looser and even runs through a field to stretch out to include a listed building (the Old Rectory) and tree lined grounds on its westerly frontage. As the village is not selected for development and currently has 7 houses under construction (with 9 more under consideration) I suggest the boundary should be further considered and drawn more tightly. Yours faithfully,					View PDF
Zoe **Tuxworth**												
0422	Zoe Tuxworth	General	Object				Sorry to be negative but all the picturesque green areas which enhanced our lives have been sold off by your Council in the last 2/3 years. ALSO, nearly a million £'s has been wasted on the 'Lakes' development which has now been scrapped. The Council is also a laughing stock as we have a beautiful roundabout that doesn't go anywhere					View PDF
Gregg **Tyers**												
0332	Gregg Tyers	POLICY H1P-12 LAND AT PASTURE ROAD	object	yes	no	yes	The land includes SFRA Flood Zone 3a. With recent climate news it is not sound to build this close to the Humber	justified	Please use land off Caistor Road, Barton upon Humber CFS0300119. (eastern half of Regulation 18 site reference G4HLU, Grid Reference: TA 03886 20973, X (Easting) , Y (Northing): 503886, 420973, Latitude , Longitude: 53.674910, -0.42884424, What3Words: tangible. unpainted. astounded) which is greenfield agricultural land. The site was allocated as proposed housing in Reg 18 preferred options document but is currently absent from Reg 19. The land is a 0.991 hectare small deliverable site located on the eastern side of Barton upon Humber. This site consists of one agricultural field with residential properties to the north and agricultural land to the south and west. The site is currently available for	yes	To voice an opinion	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
									development and is in SFRA Flood Zone 1 a			
Ruth **Tyers**												
0324	Ruth Tyers	POLICY H1P-12 LAND AT PASTURE ROAD	object	yes	no	yes	The HIP-12 proposal is in a higher than necessary flood risk area. I present as an alternative the plot of land formerly included in the recently amended plan off Caistor Road near to Princess Drive (eastern half of Regulation 18 site reference G4HLU) When HIP-12 considered against this reasonable alternative the Caistor Road site is more appropriate.	justified		no		
0330	Ruth Tyers	POLICY H1P-13: LAND OFF BARROW ROAD	object	yes	no	yes	The HIP-13 proposal adds hundreds of vehicles to an already excessively busy junction. The Link Road (currently proposed to pass through HIP-13 directly opposite Falkland Way junction onto Barrow Road) is to assist with the issue of additional traffic resulting from the Wren Development. Can it be sound judgement to add hundreds more vehicles to this already congested area? Exiting Falkland Way at early evening is already horrendous. It takes a huge amount of time to exit. So, we then add the Wren traffic. Then add the Link Road. Great! Then add a huge development???? I present as an alternative the plot of land formerly included in the recently amended plan off Caistor Road near to Princess Drive (eastern half of Regulation 18 site reference G4HLU) When HIP-13 is considered against this reasonable alternative the Caistor Road site is more appropriate.	justified		no		
Mike **Upton** on behalf of Earn Design Services Limited												
0113	Mike Upton on behalf of Earn Design Services Limited	POLICY H1P-32: LAND SOUTH OF DONCASTER ROAD	object	yes	no	yes	In relation to the listing of sites for Westwoodside, we note that Site HIP-32 is listed as being Flood Zone2/3a in the SFRA however Site CFS0300064 is listed as Flood Zone 1. Our understanding is that HIP-32 would fail the Exception Test as there is an alternative site which is considered to comply with the flood risk basic criteria and should therefore take preference. With regard to Land Quality, we think more should be acknowledged that the Grade of Land for our site CFS0300064 has Grade 3 land as against HIP-32 being Grade 2, ie contrary to the guidance within the National Planning Policy. See Page 141 of the Local Plan 2020 - 2038 and Pages commencing 319 & 325 of the SHELAA document referred	Consistent with national policy	yes	yes		View PDF
0114	Mike Upton on behalf of Earn Design Services Limited	POLICY SS11: 2a.	support	yes	yes	yes	In relation to Westwoodside Village Boundary, we support the proposed change to include properties to the south of the west end of Cove Road.	positively prepared	yes	yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Josh **Van Den Bos**												
0463	Josh Van Den Bos	Paragraph 14.47	object				The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0503	Josh Van Den Bos	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0694	Josh Van Den Bos	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage					View PDF
Ursula **Vickerton**												
0032	Ursula Vickerton	Paragraph 1.1	object	no	no	no	Consider views of RAID Why are Barton Town Council seeking views on local plan (Nov 27)after public consultation has closed? PUBLIC consultation for a Town of over 11,000 people FOR ONLY 3.5 hours, 3.45 to 7.15pm on a working day... inadequate venue with lack of suitable parking on a dark and unlit site out of the town centre. Building works were ongoing and the path and steps to side door unlit and unsafe. Once inside no document was explained... a few large Maps not included in the plan spread around and the NLC planning staff making no attempt to take down record views and were generally not given direct and straight answers.	Consistent with national policy	The consultation opportunities all at late afternoon early evening to around 7 pm were designed to give little fair opportunity for members of the public, especially working, with children and needing to travel home or prepare eat an evening meal.. At Baysgarth School the parking area was inadequate unsafe and unlit. Making the experience feel like a Box ticking exercise.	no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0022	Ursula Vickerton	Paragraph 1.4	object	no	no	no	Local proposed plans were shown at the Barton public consultation but do not appear in the local plan document all 362 pages you are seeking views on now.	effective	Wishes to develop a sustainable high quality natural & built environment. Barton between 2001 and 2011 Popn grew from 9,334 to 11,066 in ONLY 10 years population growth of 18% in TEN years. Figures to 2021 not yet available but given the continued high level of house building planning consents granted I expect it may well be another 1,700.. to Bring Popn to in the order of 13,000. Relief road to South, direct short route directly South to B1206 needed now so WREN and other HGV do not continue to drive thought central Barton and its central conservation number and high number of Listed buildings and Population.	no		
0031	Ursula Vickerton	Paragraph 14.32	object	no	no	no	The central public car parks off cottage lane and Chapel Lane... are officially for 2 hours only.. in central Barton. However no ticket machine and parking is not monitored by NLC parking officers... The local NLC Councillors who run businesses locally have done a side deal to prevent enforcement.. Car parking in central Barton does not in these car parks, turn over and this adds to the traffic problems people face parking to go to Doctors, chemists Post Office Churches etc... I have lived in Queen Street Central conservation area and seen the congestion and lack of suitable parking get worse and worse since we moved her in 1988.	effective	Whilst the text states parking and public transport will be provided and infrastructure improved as population and house numbers grow in last 30 years... This has not happened partly due to NL councillors for Barton actions.	no		
0023	Ursula Vickerton	Paragraph 2.20	object	no	no	no	Barton upon Humber has since 2001 to 2021 experienced a massive increase in houses and Population. Much of this has been to house people formerly living on North Bank of Humber with Jobs still on the North Bank. Major stresses put on road and buses and schools in Barton, no new schools built since before 2000 despite a population rise of over 18% between 2001 and 2011 and I expect a similar growth to 2021,.. figures outstanding. Given the heavy reliance on high energy use by making steel, are the job projections and growth estimates for next 20 years reasonable?	justified	see above	no		
0024	Ursula Vickerton	Paragraph 2.54	object	no	no	no	Barton upon Humber is a beautiful special town with many SSS1s and I believe the highest number of listed buildings and the only Grade I in NL. However this environment is not protected with WREN and other HGV and other traffic pounding its streets day and night without a relief road	effective	Please accept the proposed relief road short route proposed by RAID and do not let further houses to be built	no	n/a	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							long promised.		outside the suggested built up line. I e No building to South of Horkstow Road and around... the odd proposed relief road shown by NLC on their Maps at consultation... Such extension does not have support of Barton Population.			
0025	Ursula Vickerton	Paragraph 2.66	object	no	no	no	The cycle track path between Barrow and Barton is too narrow and badly maintained forcing cyclists and runners on to a busy narrow single carriageway road. Hedges allowed to brow across path which is low and narrow and clipping have thorns.	effective	NL needs to improve the cycle/ path between Barton and Barrow	no		
0027	Ursula Vickerton	Paragraph 4.39	object	no	no	no	Given COVID difficulties at end of 2021 it is far more likely we will see growth decline, people lose employment and a major downturn in 2022. This plan should not assume significant need for more homes.	justified	see above revise your assumptions for economic growth	no		
0030	Ursula Vickerton	Paragraph 5.175	object	no	no	no	In making provision for rural exception sites... you allow sites not shown on maps and in this plan for the next 20 years to be developed.	Consistent with national policy	See above... say NO to long many junctioned relief road and above route suggested by RAID and other local people.	no		
0029	Ursula Vickerton	POLICY H2: 3	object	no	no	no	This plan appears to allow same housing density of 40-45 dwellings per hectare in Scunthorpe the major built up area and Barton... a rural town. A lower density to reflect the rural nature of the existing town should be set.	positively prepared	see above lower density of housing in Barton	no		
0028	Ursula Vickerton	POLICY SS6: 1.	object	no	no	no	Page 49 8% or 583 dwellings new in Barton but Map had over 1,000 new house builds shown? is the difference the "banks" 400 plus houses to south of existing building line which no longer appear to be included in this version of local plan?	effective	See above your charts and maps are inconsistent for Barton house building numbers.	no		
Curtis **Walker**												
0799	Curtis Walker	Paragraph 14.47	object				(3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0517	Curtis Walker	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				(2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0878	Curtis Walker	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
David **Walker**												
0774	David Walker	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0796	David Walker	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0814	David Walker	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0873	David Walker	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Georgina **Walker**												
0401	Georgina Walker	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0791	Georgina Walker	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0809	Georgina Walker	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					View PDF
0868	Georgina Walker	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Ian **Walker**												
0229	IAN WALKER	POLICY SS11: 1.	support	yes	yes	yes	I SUPPORT THE PLAN'S DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY FOR OWSTON FERRY. IT WILL ENABLE SMALL INFILL SITES TO BE USED, WHILST PREVENTING LARGE SCALE EXPANSION THAT OUR LIMITED LOCAL SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE WOULD BE UNABLE TO COPE WITH.	justified				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Susan **Walker**												
0769	Susan Walker	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF
0795	Susan Walker	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					
0813	Susan Walker	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g.					
0872	Susan Walker	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comments, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					
David **Walters**												
0348	David Walters	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	support	yes	yes	yes	Comment that we are happy for no development - Support and that the plan is sound INSET 45 is as it should be.	Consistent with national policy				

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
David **Walton** on behalf of Sustainability Manager Sibelco												
0848	David Walton on behalf of Sustainability Manager Sibelco	POLICY MIN6: MINERAL SITES					POLICY MIN6: MINERAL SITES We support policy M6 and welcome the allocations of MIN6-9 and MIN 6-16. We notice at 1 there is a typo in referencing the Local Plan year – this should read 2038.					View PDF
0843	David Walton on behalf of Sustainability Manager Sibelco	POLICY MIN1: MINERAL SUPPLY REQUIREMENTS	Support				POLICY MIN 1: MINERAL SUPPLY REQUIREMENTS We support the principles identified in this policy. We however draw attention to the inconsistency in the text. Point 1 quotes national policy in respect of maintaining crushed rock and sand and gravel landbanks. Point 3 simply references that silica sand and brick clay land banks will be maintained in line with national policy. Whilst reference is provided in the supporting paragraph at 12.9 it would be more consistent if this were identified in the policy. I.e. “at least 10 years for individual silica sand sites and at least 15 years for silica sand sites where significant new capital is required.”					View PDF
0845	David Walton on behalf of Sustainability Manager Sibelco	POLICY MIN2: MINERAL SAFEGUARDING					POLICY MIN 2: MINERAL SAFEGUARDING We support the principles of mineral safeguarding but consider part 5 of the policy is ineffective as drafted. There is no logic to excluding dormant sites and has no policy justification. The NPPF requires all known minerals to be safeguarded which must therefore include dormant sites. As drafted the policy is unsound. Proposed Changes (deletions in strikethrough; new text in bold) Mineral sites (excluding dormant sites) and associated infrastructure that supports the supply of minerals **(railheads, wharves) and added value products(concrete batching, coated stone, aggregate recycling operation**) in North Lincolnshire will be safeguarded against development that would unnecessarily sterilise the sites and infrastructure or prejudice or jeopardise their use by creating incompatible land uses nearby. **All these sites will have buffer zones of 500 m established to maintain proximal safeguarding around these operations. In respect of transport and added value operation ‘the agent of change’ will apply in line with National Policy.**					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
Nicola **Ward** on behalf of Doncaster Council												
0424	Nicola Ward on behalf of Doncaster Council	General	Support				Dear Sir/Madam Thank you for consulting Doncaster Council on the North Lincolnshire Local Plan – Publication Draft (Regulation 19). We have viewed the document and have no comments to make at this time. I trust the above is sufficient. Kind regards Nicola					View PDF
Spencer **Warren**, Heaton planning on behalf of The Lapwing Estate												
0428	Spencer Warren, Heaton planning on behalf of The Lapwing Estate	General					We are writing in response to the consultation of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan, Publication Plan on behalf of our client The Lapwing Estate (the Estate). The Estate owns circa 5,000 acres of freehold land in Nottinghamshire and North Lincolnshire, and throughout its 130 year history has continuously evolved and innovated in response to changing market and social needs. Presently, the group includes: • Diverse organic farming producing excellent quality, healthy food in tune with the environment; • The Estate is powered by floating solar panels, wind turbines and has planning permission for an Anaerobic Digestion facility to be implemented in the near future; and, • Earth Rover – agri tech start up has been formed to make chemical-free fresh produce the norm for all. The Lapwing Estate philosophy is one of continuously working to reinvent the produce growing model. This innovative way of working will enable the Estate to sustainably intensify production of high quality, healthy food, whilst at the same time delivering significant gains, of potential national importance, for the environment. It is this new vision and the opportunities that it provides that we wish to make the following representations to the Local Plan. The vision for this transformative scheme could be as dramatic as when Charles I appointed Cornelius Vermuyden in 1621 to drain the land upon which The Lapwing Estate now sits. The project, discussed below, over time will aim to return substantial areas to its original state as Carr land (a rare type of waterlogged reed and wooded terrain) thereby restoring a lost piece of English heritage, landscape and habitat. Returning lowland farmed peatlands to a functioning natural state is fully aligned with the UK's Clean Growth Strategy (Policy 43) and the Chancellor's announcement at the last budget to restore 35,000 hectares of peatland in England as part of the Nature for Climate Fund. This project offers a private sector solution for the restoration of farmed peatland, without reducing food production nor requiring taxpayer subsidisation. Importantly, it could provide a blueprint for replication on					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							farmed peatland across the UK and around the world, helping to solve one of the most intractable challenges for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from land-use. Professor Evans (UK Centre for Ecology and Hydrology) estimates that there is up to 2,000 million tonnes of CO2 storage potential in England's lowland wasted peat. To help realise this ambitious vision, the Estate are evolving their business model with outcomes to include: • Changing from seasonal organic to carbon negative, chemical free year round fresh produce. This will result in a new consumer brand where like organic the premium is derived by the values of the business and its production process; • Clean water – the addition of biochar and the recreation of carr land (wet woodland) could help water companies meet their obligations; • Biodiversity net gain – meeting set biodiversity targets; • Carbon abatement; • Carbon sequestration; • Water availability and flood alleviation – working in partnership with the Environment Agency (EA) and Internal Drainage Boards; and, • Heritage asset restored – restoration of a lost landscape. The proposed solution – Reverse Coal Over the last two years the Estate have been testing in theory, a number of basic concepts relating to carbon creation and capture. These are now being developed in to field scale trials. The basic principle is to grow a certain type of crop on those areas that can be rewet; harvested and converted to a chipped product, which is then fed in to a pyrolysis process to become a stable form of carbon. The carbon is then used to raise levels across the farm, recreating as noted above, historic landscapes and biodiversity. Furthermore, the energy created during the process, will be used to power vertical and standard greenhouses, which in themselves, captures further carbon. A project team was set up over two years ago, and is made up of a blend of scientific/technical advisers and engineering/delivery specialists. The team has recently been expanded to include members with a land management and Town and Country Planning specialisms. The team is currently developing a programme of field trials, which it has discussed with both Central Government and the local LEP. On behalf of the Estate, the project team would like to invite officers to a field trip, to hear and view first hand, the significant potential this project has to address not only many of your own policy ambitions but also those of other agencies, locally and nationally. It is the aim of our client to now bring forward a number of developments required to support the Reverse Coal vision during the forthcoming Plan period. We understand that at this stage of the Local Plan our Client is not able to bring forward elements of the proposed project for allocation, but we feel that it is important that there is recognition within the Plan and support from Policies to enable this Vision to come to fruition in the foreseeable future.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0378	Spencer Warren, Heaton planning on behalf of The Lapwing Estate	Paragraph 2.1					Chapter 2 of the Plan sets out key challenges. For the Natural Environment it is stated: Protect and enhance our biodiversity and geodiversity sites and wider ecological network that supports them addressing the need for Nature Recovery Networks which allow biodiversity to survive, thrive and move throughout the countryside, building in resilience to impacts from climate change or development and through mandatory biodiversity net gain. Agricultural / Rural Economy Promote a prosperous rural economy through sustainable business growth, agricultural diversification and rural growth that respects the character of the countryside. Minerals Ensure we meet the needs for aggregates and other minerals and protect existing resources from sterilisation, whilst managing the impacts of extraction on our landscape and communities. We are supportive of the Key Challenges. The Vision for the Estate can ensure that these key challenges for North Lincolnshire are met.					View PDF
0740	Spencer Warren, Heaton planning on behalf of The Lapwing Estate	Paragraph 3.11					To address and reduce the causes and impacts of climate change in North Lincolnshire, contributing to achieving safer environments and communities. This will be achieved by reducing flood risk to (existing and new) communities by identifying and supporting implementation of necessary flood risk infrastructure, locating new development, where possible, away from areas at risk of flooding, and ensuring that new development is safe from flooding/securing sustainable flood management in new development. We will also increase the use of low and zero carbon technologies and decarbonisation by encouraging appropriate building design, supporting businesses to adapt and decarbonise and promoting sustainable land management, including habitat protection and the creation of new habitats as natural solutions to climate change (i.e. Nature Recovery Networks and mandatory biodiversity net gain). We will also deliver an ambitious tree and hedge planting programme. Within one project, Reverse Coal makes significant headway in addressing the Net Zero agenda, UK Government's peatland strategy, food strategy, objectives of the Strategic Defence Review and "levelling up" job creation strategy, and National Flood Resilience Review 2016. We are supportive of Spatial Objective 11 and believe the Reverse Coal project will secure its delivery.					View PDF
0741	Spencer Warren, Heaton planning on behalf of The Lapwing Estate	Paragraph 3.11					To support strong and flourishing rural communities and countryside by encouraging diversification of the rural economy and retaining and enhancing key local facilities, infrastructure and services whilst promoting appropriate sustainable development in rural settlements which meets local needs and reflects the surrounding environment. The Reverse Coal project secures an innovative new way of working that will enable the Estate to sustainably intensify production of high quality,					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							healthy food, whilst at the same time delivering net gains for the environment, of national significance. We support Spatial Objective 5 and believe the Reverse Coal project will go a long way towards its delivery.					
0539	Spencer Warren, Heaton planning on behalf of The Lapwing Estate	POLICY DQE2: LANDSCAPE ENHANCEMENT					Policy DQE2 sets out requirements for development to provide opportunities for landscape enhancement. We are supportive of this Policy, and the Reverse Coal project can provide multiple opportunities for numerous, significant environmental benefits.					View PDF
0545	Spencer Warren, Heaton planning on behalf of The Lapwing Estate	POLICY DQE5: MANAGING FLOOD RISK					Policy DQE5 sets out the Plan's policy approach for managing flood risk and is supported. The Reverse Coal project has the ability to provide significant flood alleviation benefits by increasing flood storage capacity within the wider area.					View PDF
0549	Spencer Warren, Heaton planning on behalf of The Lapwing Estate	POLICY DQE7: CLIMATE CHANGE & LOW CARBON LIVING					Policy DQE7 addresses Climate Change and Low Carbon Living. This policy is geared towards securing Climate Change improvements to new build developments for commercial / residential uses. The benefits that can be derived from Reverse Coal should be included within Policy DQE7. The land of the Lapwing Estate is part of the Humberhead levels. Since they were drained 400 years ago, significant erosion has led to land loss of typically 4m from original ground level. Our proposal is to rebuild that ground by a reversal of the field lowering that has resulted here from peat drainage, and using a reversal of techniques from activities such as strip mining, seen across the Midlands in the 19th and 20th centuries. This offers the capacity for substantial levels of solid carbon storage, and a corresponding CO2 equivalent of 1 MtCO2e in only 45 hectares. This concentration exceeds all other on-land storage capacity that we are aware of, and is far higher than the total carbon stock of any UK natural ecosystem (including the original deep peat).					View PDF
0568	Spencer Warren, Heaton planning on behalf of The Lapwing Estate	Policy EC5: Wharves					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: a. designated sites and protected and priority species as well as the need to account for measurable biodiversity net gain; b. high quality agricultural land; c. the landscape of river corridors and coastal margins; d. the flood defence system; e. the strategic and local road network; and, f. the amenity of settlements. Policy EC 5 is supported.					View PDF
0569	Spencer Warren, Heaton planning on behalf of The Lapwing Estate	Policy EC6: Supporting the Rural Economy					The council will seek to develop a sustainable rural economy by supporting appropriate, small scale rural enterprise. Proposals to diversify the range of economic activities on a farm or in a rural area will be supported, where proposals: a. benefit the local community and do not adversely affect quality of life or the amenity of local residents; b. conserve and enhance local character; c. are consistent in scale and environmental impact with their rural					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							location; d. involve the conversion of an existing building. New build only schemes will be considered as an exception; e. have no detrimental impact on existing village shops and business; f. demonstrate traffic generation can be satisfactorily accommodated by the existing or planned local road network, ensuring access arrangements are acceptable to the scale and type of development with no adverse effect on highway safety; g. have no unacceptable effect on water quality or flooding, watercourses, biodiversity or important Wildlife habitats and do not increase the risk of flooding; and h. enhance the natural environment through the provision of measurable net gains to biodiversity We are encouraged that Policy EC6 is supportive of the rural economy. However, we believe the policy only supports small scale rural enterprise. The ambitions of the Reverse Coal project are on a large scale resulting in significant environmental net gains. Policy EC6 as currently worded would restrict the level of development being proposed, the words appropriate, small scale should be removed from the Policy. Policy EC6: Supporting the Rural Economy The council will seek to develop a sustainable rural economy**.** Proposals to diversify the range of economic activities on a farm or in a rural area will be supported, where proposals:					
0642	Spencer Warren, Heaton planning on behalf of The Lapwing Estate	POLICY MIN2: MINERAL SAFEGUARDING					Policy MIN2 sets out the approach for Mineral Safeguarding and is supported. There are potential areas where biochar could be placed as part of the Reverse Coal project that are within a Minerals Safeguarded Area. In addition, the development of a new quarry could provide a purpose built repository for biochar. Land within the Estate has proven resources of silica sand and sand & gravel. As part of any proposals the need to ensure that minerals are not needlessly sterilized will be pursued.					View PDF
0645	Spencer Warren, Heaton planning on behalf of The Lapwing Estate	POLICY MIN8: RESTORATION, AFTERCARE & AFTERUSE OF MINERAL EXTRACTION SITES					Policy MIN8 sets out the restoration, aftercare and after use of mineral extraction sites. We believe that any mineral extraction that may take place within the Estate to facilitate biochar placement will provide a positive contribution in accordance with Policy MIN8. Policy MIN8 is supported. We trust that the above support and suggested amendments are helpful. We would welcome the opportunity to explain in greater detail the vision for The Lapwing Estate and derived benefits to North Lincolnshire. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any further queries.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0647	Spencer Warren, Heaton planning on behalf of The Lapwing Estate	POLICY RD1: SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE					1. Outside settlement development limits land will be regarded as the countryside and the following forms of development supported, where proposals respect the intrinsic character of their surroundings: a. Conversion of buildings for employment related development (including work-live units), tourism or community uses; g. Employment uses where it is an appropriate scale to its location and it respects the character of the surrounding landscape. Proposals should: i. Be within or adjacent to an existing industrial estate or business park; or ii. Involve the expansion of an existing business; or iii. Involve the conversion of an existing building; or iv. Have a functional need to be in that particular location that cannot be met either on a nearby allocation, or on a site that satisfies any of the above criteria. h. Agricultural, horticultural and forestry uses; i. New and enhanced infrastructure; j. Sports, equine, recreation, community facilities and tourism development; k. Intensive livestock units where it can be demonstrated that (individually or cumulatively) the proposal will not result in an unacceptable environmental impact on its surroundings; and l. Mineral extraction in accordance with Policy MIN3.2. Development will be expected to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. Areas of lower quality agricultural land should be used where the proposals result in the significant development of agricultural land in preference to the best and most versatile agricultural land. 3. All development proposals should demonstrate that soil resources will be managed and conserved in a viable condition and used sustainably in line with accepted best practice and only permitted where it safeguards and enhances the natural environment and considers biodiversity through the provision of measurable net gains to biodiversity and links to coherent ecological networks. Within North Lincolnshire and the UK, large areas of best and most versatile land are on reclaimed peatlands and there continues to be a negative carbon impact if farming of peatlands continues. The Reverse Coal project will seek to re-use existing agricultural buildings where feasible, but there will be a need for new buildings. The proposals include for the rewetting of large areas of agricultural land resulting in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land and a loss of soil resource. However, the rewetting of peatland provides significant CO2 abatement. The Vision for the Estate looks to develop Paludiculture and Vertical Farming to ensure that there is a net gain in agricultural production from the land. The agriculture sector is changing in response to the climate change agenda and net zero targets. The Plan needs to be flexible in its approach to facilitate innovations in the agricultural industry. The principal wider societal benefits of a change in land use are: • Abatement. Significant CO2 emissions are associated with drained peat farmland: 26 t per ha pa (agricultural peatlands produce 3% of total UK GHG emissions). • Biodiversity. Wetland crop planted in an agricultural dominated area					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							form an additional habitat and can increase regional structural diversity. • Water Resources. Peatlands play an important role in landscape hydrology. Lowland peat can act as a reservoir in the landscape storing and subsequently releasing flood water and maintaining stable water levels in adjacent areas. At present, areas of peatland are pump-drained in winter and subject to intensifying water scarcity in summer; our approach would help to mitigate both challenges, thereby reducing pumping costs, energy use and economic losses during droughts. • Flood Alleviation. With a wetland crop, we are able to use this land as a natural floodplain for retaining flood water during a storm event, in a way that would destroy most conventional crops. This has the potential to significantly reduce flood risk to adjacent urban areas, many of which have been flooded within the last 5 years. The Internal Drainage Board (IDB) and EA operate a highly managed system of pumps and dykes facilitating this novel form of natural flood management, and will be able to make use of the additional capacity as it becomes available. Overall, we are supportive of Policy RD1 but we feel that Part 2 should be amended as follows to be more positive and supportive of other development opportunities.2. Development should seek to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land, where appropriate. Areas of lower quality agricultural land should be used where the proposals result in the significant development of agricultural land in preference to the best and most versatile agricultural land. The policy should also include a clause being supportive of innovative agricultural techniques.					
Richard **Webster**												
0008	Richard Webster	POLICY HP1-25: LAND AT YEALAND FLATS	support	yes	yes	no	Please note that I would like to suggest the potential for extension of this proposed build area onto adjacent land to the west of the area defined in the plan. The land belonging to both 32 Tottermire (Mr & Mrs Webster) and that of 22a (Mr & Mrs Bacon) is within the proposed build limits and is also available for development should the scheme be deemed suitable please contact 01427 330822 (Mr Webster)			no		
0010	Richard Webster	POLICY HP1-25: LAND AT YEALAND FLATS	support	yes	yes	yes	We live at 32 Tottermire lane, Epworth and our land (Total of 5 acres) is at the back, facing north and adjacent to both the proposed Yewland flats development (H1P-25) and Travis Perkins. We have previously submitted an amendment to the build limits to include a large part of this land with a view to our land being built on with housing. I can see from the following document that this has been included. : https://m.northlincs.gov.uk/public/localplan/stage_4_insets/A3%20-%20Landscape/18%20-%20Epworth.pdf When you look at the plan we have housing to all sides of us with the new	positively prepared		no		

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							proposed Yewland flats to our right, Travis Perkins and also Harris gardens coming further up the side offering a strip of land that could also provide access to ours. This means that our property and land will be further surrounded by new housing. It seems sensible to extend any housing development by using our land accordingly and planning for this now seems to make sense from a financial and strategic forecasting/longevity point of view. The main benefits are that this would be an infill, not use of new fields or any extension on the boundary build limits thus not affecting any green belt. It could be accessed from a number of ways including around the top end via Harris gardens or from the new Yewland flats side or even coming through our front way by knocking down our current house. Our Neighbour living at 22A (Mr Tony Bacon) is also willing to join any scheme for building should this be needed. thank you Mr R Webster					
Brian **Wesley**												
0342	Brian Wesley	Paragraph 8.1	support	yes	yes	yes	I find the local plan as a whole and in particular POLICY RD1: SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE - as Sound and agree to all areas as Protection of low growth settlements and grade 1 agricultural land is vital to health and well being and the rural way of life. POLICY RD1: SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE Noting also that the protection of out of development limits and grade 1 agricultural land included in many of the policies also being Consistent with national policy and current and future main stream Government policies. being of brownfield first. Development will be expected to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. Areas of lower quality agricultural land should be used where the proposals result in the significant development of agricultural land in preference to the best and most versatile agricultural land Smaller Rural Settlements Alkborough; Althorpe; Appleby; Bonby; Burringham; East Butterwick; Eastoft; Elsham; Flixborough; Garthorpe & Fockerby; Howsham; Kirmington; Luddington; North Killingholme; Redbourne; West Halton; Wootton & Worlaby These settlements will accommodate small-scale development of a limited nature, within their defined settlement developments, that supports their vitality and viability. Small sites will have a role to play. All development should reflect the character and nature of these villages and give due consideration to the availability and capacity of infrastructure to support its growth. All proposals will be considered on their merits.	Consistent with national policy				
0343	Brian Wesley	POLICY RD1: 1.	support	yes	yes	yes	I support the POLICY RD1: SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE We must protect our Best and Most Versatile agricultural land and open countryside outside defined development limits.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
0344	Brian Wesley	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	support	yes	yes	yes	I find the local plan as a whole and in particular POLICY SS6:Spatial Distribution of housing - as Sound and agree to all areas as Protection of low growth settlements and grade 1 agricultural land is vital to health and well being and the rural way of life. Noting also that the protection of out of development limits and grade 1 agricultural land included in many of the policies also being Consistent with national policy and current and future main stream Government policies. being of brownfield first. Development will be expected to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. Areas of lower quality agricultural land should be used where the proposals result in the significant development of agricultural land in preference to the best and most versatile agricultural land. Smaller Rural Settlements " Alkborough; Althorpe; Appleby; Bonby; Burringham; East Butterwick; Eastoft; Elsham; Flixborough; Garthorpe & Fockerby; Howsham; Kirmington; Luddington; North Killingholme; Redbourne; West Halton; Wootton & Worlaby. These settlements will accommodate small-scale development of a limited nature, within their defined settlement developments, that supports their vitality and viability. Small sites will have a role to play. All development should reflect the character and nature of these villages and give due consideration to the availability and capacity of infrastructure to support its growth. All proposals will be considered on their merits.					
Lisa **White**												
0750	Lisa White	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	Support				I am in support of development limit in set 3 and also support SS3 and SS11.		N/A	N/A		
0751	Lisa White	POLICY SS3: DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES	Support				I am in support of development limit in set 3 and also support SS3 and SS11.		N/A	N/A		
Nicolas **White**												
0775	Nicolas White	Evidence Base	Object				My additional comments are: The additional "Evidence Base" document was dated May 2021. It was not incorporated in the full consultation window and was released after the cut-off date of 26/11/21. It also appears to be incomplete. Even as a text addendum, no mention has been made of a proposal made by RAID (Residents Against Inappropriate Development) that NLC is fully aware of and has agreed to incorporate in a subsequent review/consultation process.					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
C **Wilkinson**												
0765	C Wilkinson	Paragraph 14.47	object				3) The current text of Item 14.47 offers a NLC opinion that that could potentially stifle open debate and discussion. This item is still under consultation and I request that the text be revised to: "To support the growth of the manufacturing sector in Barton upon Humber and unlock land for future development, a new road is recommended . This should commence at the A1077/Falkland Way junction, connect to the existing Caistor Road route and ultimately enable traffic flow to/from the A15 via a cost effective route that minimises unnecessary construction, disruption and ecological damage. In conjunction with other traffic management measures, this is anticipated to reduce traffic flows, particularly HGV,s, through the town centre. Route options to be subject to full and proper consultation."					View PDF
0766	C Wilkinson	POLICY DQE1: PROTECTION OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VIEWS	object				(2) Section 9.4.8, (Item f) refers to Deepdale as an area of High Landscape Value. I see no reason why the adjacent Barton Southern Gateway should be considered any differently and I request that this is added as Item g					View PDF
0768	C Wilkinson	POLICY SS6: SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING SITES	object				I have reviewed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) document and would make the following comment, with regard to Barton upon Humber: (1) I object to Banks Property pursuing a developer-led Outline Planning Application for "up to 400 homes" on greenbelt land between the B1218 and the A15. Reasons include that it is outside of the current development line, current housing targets are already forecast to be exceeded and it will cause unwarranted ecological damage.					View PDF
Sue **Williamson**												
0618	Sue Williamson	POLICY H1P-4: LAND AT FORMER SOUTH LEYS SCHOOL ENDERBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object				Kimberley School of Performing Arts is a well established centre for all aspects of dance drama and music in an area of Scunthorpe that is still lacking in community facilities. KPAC provides numerous activities for all age groups. Over the years the school have built up a wealth of knowledge and developed relationships locally that has helped them respond to local needs and successfully shape the services they currently provide. The School wishes to develop further provision that would add to the health and wellbeing of the community. For example a mother and baby group and resume special needs classes. This can best be achieved by staying in the area and using the knowledge and relationships already established. KPAC have also provided special scholarships to talented pupils from the local estate schools if their parents circumstances are such that they are unable to finance their child's local training. Among successes are a young man now dancing with the Birmingham Royal Ballet and a young lady at the prestigious Performers College in London. As far as the present building is concerned it appears at this time there are no suitable alternatives on the horizon in this area. KPAC activities run from early morning to late evening seven days a week in four studios one					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							of which has vital gymnastic equipment for the special ariel work which in volves hoops and silks suspended from a strengthened beam at height. South Leys has all this. I also believe John Leggott College was offered to KPAC as an alternative but because of the extensive hours the present premises are used and the number of studios needed JLC could not meet these requirements. The staff ,pupils, supporters and community of KPAC love where they are, and it would be such a disaster if no amicable solution could be found so they could continue with their future plans.					
Alex **Willis**, BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of Associated British Ports												
0106	Alex Willis, BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of Associated British Ports	Paragraph 2.69	object	no	no	yes	BNP Paribas Real Estate is instructed by Associated British Ports (ABP), to submit representations to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation, in respect of the Port of Immingham, which is owned and operated by ABP. The northern section of the Port of Immingham lies within the jurisdiction of North Lincolnshire Council, with the remainder within North East Lincolnshire.As set out in more detail on pages 5 and 6 of ABP's April 2017 representations to the North Lincolnshire Plan Initial Consultation, the Port of Immingham plays a vital role in terms of attracting new investment and creating jobs within the North Lincolnshire and wider regional economies. The port also facilitates energy generation (including from renewable and low carbon sources), as well as the more sustainable movement of goods by sea and rail rather than road. In light of the above, and its key role as an international gateway to the UK, it is important that the North Lincolnshire Local Plan both supports and safeguards the continued future operation and development of the Port of Immingham ABP therefore welcomes the Key Challenge - International Connections included after paragraph 2.69 of the Publication Draft Local Plan. However, the challenge should encourage and support the development of the ports and airports themselves in line with national policy.More specifically, the National Policy Statement for Ports (NPSP) recognises and supports the vital role the UK's ports play in local, regional and the national economies, as well as the compelling need for substantial additional port capacity over the next 20 to 30 years. The NPSP is clear in its support for judgments about when and where new developments might be proposed to be made on the basis of commercial factors by the port industry or port developers operating within a free market environment.	Consistent with national policy	In light of the Additional Comments set out above, ABPs proposed modifications to ensure the ˜Key Challenge - International Connections is sound are set out below (see bold typeface):Encourage and support our international connections through the development of our ports and airports, including ensuring that transport access to them is improved and maintained, in order to support increased growth.	yes	To discuss the Additional Comments and Proposed Modifications set out above further with the Inspector and Council	View PDF
0105	Alex Willis, BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of Associated British Ports	POLICY DQE11: GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORK	object	no	no	yes	BNP Paribas Real Estate is instructed by Associated British Ports (ABP), to submit representations to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation, in respect of the Port of Immingham, which is owned and operated by ABP. The northern section of the Port of Immingham lies within the jurisdiction of North Lincolnshire Council, with the remainder within North East Lincolnshire. As set out in more detail on pages 5 and 6 of ABP's April 2017 representations to the North Lincolnshire Plan Initial Consultation, the Port of Immingham plays a vital role in terms of attracting new investment and creating jobs within the North Lincolnshire and wider regional economies. The port also facilitates energy generation (including from renewable and low carbon sources), as well as the more sustainable	Consistent with national policy	In light of the Additional Comments set out above, ABP's request the as Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Opportunity allocations within the Port Operational Boundary shown on the Policies Map extracts above are deleted to ensure Policy DQE11 is sound.	yes	To discuss the Additional Comments and Proposed Modifications set out above further with the Inspector and Council	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							movement of goods by sea and rail rather than road. In light of the above, and its key role as an international gateway to the UK, it is important that the North Lincolnshire Local Plan both supports and safeguards the continued future operation and development of the Port of Immingham Notwithstanding this, parts of ABP's operational estate at the Port of Immingham are proposed to allocated as Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Opportunity (see green and brown shading on the extracts from the Policies Map submitted separately by email to localplan@northlincs.gov.uk). As shown on the extracts from the Policies Map above, parts of the proposed Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Opportunity allocations include operational land within the Port of Immingham (i.e. within the blue dashed line on the Policies Map extracts submitted separately by email to localplan@northlincs.gov.uk). Allocating this land as Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity Opportunity is therefore factually inaccurate, as it is operational port land. It is also contrary to national policy given the restrictions Policy DQE11 (Green Infrastructure Network) would place on future development proposals on this operational land within the Port of Immingham. The relevant national policy is the National Policy Statement for Ports (NPSP) which, as set out in more detail on page 2 of ABP's April 2017 representations to the North Lincolnshire Plan Initial Consultation, recognises and supports the vital role the UK's ports play in local, regional and the national economies, as well as the compelling need for substantial additional port capacity over the next 20 or 30 years. The NPSP is clear in its support for judgments about when and where new developments might be proposed to be made on the basis of commercial factors by the port industry or port developers operating within a free market environment.					
0103	Alex Willis, BNP Paribas Real Estate on behalf of Associated British Ports	POLICY EC5: WHARVES	object	no	no	yes	BNP Paribas Real Estate is instructed by Associated British Ports (ABP), to submit representations to the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation in respect of the Port of Immingham, which is owned and operated by ABP. The northern section of the Port of Immingham lies within the jurisdiction of North Lincolnshire Council, with the remainder within North East Lincolnshire. As set out in more detail on pages 5 and 6 of ABP's April 2017 representations to the North Lincolnshire Plan Initial Consultation, the Port of Immingham plays a vital role in terms of attracting new investment and creating jobs within the North Lincolnshire and wider regional economies. The port also facilitates energy generation (including from renewable and low carbon sources), as well as the more sustainable movement of goods by sea and rail rather than road. In light of the above, and its key role as an international gateway to the UK, it is important that the North Lincolnshire Local Plan both supports and safeguards the continued future operation and development of the	Consistent with national policy	In light of the Additional Comments set out above, ABP's proposed modifications to ensure Policy EC5 is legally compliant and sound are set out below: Proposals for new or extended port, wharf and jetty facilities on the Rivers Humber and Trent will be permitted provided that they minimise any adverse impact (including through mitigation or compensation where appropriate) on the following: a. designated sites and protected and priority species	yes	To discuss the Additional Comments and Proposed Modifications set out above further with the Inspector and Council	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Port of Immingham ABP therefore welcomes the inclusion of reference to the Port of Immingham in paragraph 6.88 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. However, ABP objects to Policy EC5 as currently worded, as it includes the requirement that proposals for port and wharf facilities will be permitted provided that there is no adverse impact in respect of various matters. This is a very onerous and absolute policy requirement and one which is not supported by the approach taken in the NPPF, including the following paragraphs: 32 which states that where significant adverse impacts are unavoidable, suitable mitigation measures should be proposed (or, where this is not possible, compensatory measures should be considered). 104 which states that early consideration should be given to appropriate opportunities for avoiding and mitigating any adverse effects of the environmental impacts of traffic and transport infrastructure. 185 which states planning policies and decisions should mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development. ABP is also concerned that current wording of Policy EC5 goes beyond the requirements of the Habitats Regulations, and, on strict interpretation, would not allow for the full legal process to be followed in accordance with the Habitats Regulations. More specifically, should a proposal have an adverse effect upon integrity, the Habitats Regulations would allow it to be permitted, subject to there being no alternative solution and imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest for the development (IROPI). The current wording of Policy EC5 also therefore contradicts Policy DQE3 of the Publication Draft North Lincolnshire Local Plan, which refers directly to the tests of the Habitats Regulations and therefore allows for the full process to be applied. In light of the above, as currently worded, Policy EC5 is neither legally compliant nor sound.		as well as the need to account for measurable biodiversity net gain; b. high quality agricultural land; c. the landscape of river corridors and coastal margins; d. the flood defence system; the strategic and local road network; and, f. the amenity of settlements.			
Dr Christopher **Wilson**, BE Group on behalf of Mr Tim Lumley												
0111	Dr Christopher Wilson, BE Group on behalf of Mr Tim Lumley	Paragraph 5.5	object	no	no	yes	See Below BE GROUP IS SEEKING THE ALLOCATION OF SITE S8MLX: LAND NORTH OF WINH-3 LAND AT TOP ROAD (44-1), OFF A1077 TOP ROAD, DN15 9TE WINTERTON FOR HOUSING. THIS SUBMISSION RELATES TO SITE REF. CFS0300123 SUBMITTED AS AN OMMISSION SITE. This submission, made by BE Group on behalf of landowner Tim Lumley, seeks to have the site S8MLX: Land north of WINH-3 Land at Top Road (44-1), off A1077 Top Road, DN15 9TE Winterton allocated for housing as a Proposed Site in the emerging Local Plan, under Policy H1: Site Allocations. Site S8MLX is located immediately north of Committed Housing Site H1C-	justified		yes	To further outline our case for why S8MLX: Land north of WINH-3 Land at Top Road (44-1), off A1077 Top Road, DN15 9TE Winterton (SHELAA ref.) allocated for housing as a Proposed Site in	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							64: Land at Top Road, Winterton and comprises 3.60 ha of unconstrained agricultural land which could provide 144-166 dwellings at a rate of 40-45 dwellings/hectare identified for Large Service Centres in the 2021 Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). Site S8MLX was reviewed in that SHELAA but dismissed for two reasons: The site is too remote from the built-up area The site needs a Heritage assessment as the site is within 250m of an Archaeological site (Page 395). BE Group are critical of these reasons for dismissal, and this is discussed here: The site is too remote from the built-up area While site S8MLX is outside of the settlement boundary of Winterton, as defined in the Publication Draft Local Plan Map, it is to the immediate north of H1C-64: Land at Top Road. H1C-64 is identified as a commitment under Policy H1. It is an area of agricultural land identical to S8MLX, and previously under the common ownership of Mr Tim Lumley, which is now under development by Gleeson Homes as Meadowcroft, a scheme of 110 properties. Gleeson have provided an endorsement of this submission, included separately. In this, Gleeson Homes highlight the success of Meadowcroft, namely that since formal marketing commenced in May, 21 of the 110 plots have been reserved off Plan, with four completions of sale in October 2021. Demand for homes at Meadowcroft remains strong with substantial interest in the surrounding area from first time buyers. Gleeson also confirms its interest in delivering housing on S8MLX as a logical extension and phase II of the H1C-64: Land at Top Road/Meadowcroft development. An access point is available in the Meadowcroft development, which could link H1C-64: Land at Top Road to S8MLX, without requiring an additional access onto the A1077 Top Road and any further changes to the A-Road infrastructure, speed limits, etc., if that was judged the best way to access the phase II land. We would argue that with the completion of the Meadowcroft scheme, Site S8MLX will no longer be remote from the built-up area, rather will directly border it. In this regard it is no different to many of the Committed/Proposed Sites identified under Policy H1. The Committed/Proposed Sites of Winterton are reviewed in Table 1 while the equivalent sites in the 12 other Large Service Centres in North Lincolnshire are reviewed in Table 2. In all of these settlements there are Committed/Proposed Sites which can be described as being edge of settlement and many which extend out of the existing lines of settlement far more prominently than S8MLX would. Although in all cases the settlement boundaries have now been adjusted to include them, this was clearly not the case when the initial planning consents were sought. A strong example of this in Winterton is H1C-63: Land to the rear of North Street and Cemetery Road. At 6.62 ha, H1C-63 is nearly double the size of S8MLX and extends some 250 metres east from the existing line of				the emerging Local Plan, under Policy H1: Site Allocations. To respond to any critiques of that case.	

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							settlement on North Street, out into the countryside. An application for 135 homes was initially refused here as it was felt too significant an extension out of the settlement boundary and would harm the character and appearance of the area. However, at the subsequent appeal, in 2017, the site was judged to be of low landscape quality, relatively self-contained by adjoining uses and important for focussing housing development into Winterton, a key growth location. Four other edge of settlement sites in the Large Service Centres were initially refused planning consent for similar reasons and then were consented at appeal on the grounds that: The affected, edge of settlement agricultural land is invariably of low quality. The visual and landscape impacts of any development can be mitigated by modern and sympathetic design The benefits of the scheme in terms of meeting housing needs, construction jobs created, etc. far outweigh any impacts. H1C-64: Land at Top Road was also an extension out of the settlement area, comparable to S8MLX, and an extension out onto identical agricultural land. Yet in the initial planning application, subsequent appeal and resubmission, this was not identified as a concern. H1C-64: Land at Top Road has local conveniences and services (supermarkets, pubs, Post Office, health centres), public transport links and schools (Winterton's Infant School, Junior School and Community Academy) all within five minutes drive and 20 minutes walk of the site, all things accepted through the planning/appeal process. Such services would be equally available to S8MLX and accessible through the Meadowcroft development. The site needs a Heritage assessment as the site is within 250m of an Archaeological site The Archaeological Site referred to here is understood to comprise a range of Iron Age/Roman field systems and a roundhouse/burial mound from this era, located east of the A1077 Top Road. It should first be noted that the Publication Draft Local Plan proposes the allocation of five other sites with a similar constraint identified on them in the 2021 SHELAA, in the Large Service Centres (see Table 2): H1P-19: Land at King`s Road, Barnetby-le-Wold Allocation requires a Heritage Impact Assessment: Archaeological field evaluation comprising geophysical survey and trial trenching (underway) H1P-21: Land off the B1207, Broughton The site needs a Heritage assessment as the site is within 250m of an Archaeological site. H1P-23: Land off Mill Road, Crowle Heritage assessment required H1P-24: Land off Fieldside, Crowle Heritage assessment required H1C-53: Land to the West of Station Road, Hibaldstow Development of the site will require a Heritage assessment as the site is within 250m of an Archaeological site.					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							It is clearly assumed that the constraint can be successfully mitigated on these sites. H1C-64: Land at Top Road is similarly within 250 metres of an Archaeological site. To address this, the applicant, Gleeson Homes, undertook an archaeological field evaluation in accordance with then National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 189 and local planning policy, following North Lincolnshire District Council Historic Environment Record (HER) advice. The evaluation comprised a geophysical survey confirmed by the excavation of trial trenches which revealed a number of archaeological features representing a field system of late Iron Age/Roman date across the eastern half of H1C-64. A roundhouse or burial mound of this date was also identified. The proposed development will impact on these remains. However, it was the view of North Lincolnshire District Council HER that the archaeological remains did not merit preservation in situ and a programme of archaeological monitoring and recording during construction groundwork in this area would be appropriate mitigation for the loss of the archaeological evidence. Gleeson Homes was asked to submit a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for such archaeological mitigation to be considered with this application. Completion of the mitigation measures set out in this WSI ultimately became part of Condition Three of Full Planning Consent PA/2020/324. Throughout the process Gleeson worked with the Council HER to explore and understand the archaeological remains on site and agree how they should be treated moving forward. As a result, heritage was not identified as a barrier to consent in the original or revised planning applications, or at appeal. Should Gleeson, or an equivalent housebuilder, be able to develop S8MLX it would repeat the same process to again successfully mitigate this constraint.					
Jess **Wilson**												
0761	Jess Wilson	POLICY H1P-4: LAND AT FORMER SOUTH LEYS SCHOOL ENDERBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object				To whom it may concern, I have taught at KPAC for the last 7 years and I am emailing you to object the plan of action regarding the allocation of Kimberley Performing Arts Centre at South Leys Campus on Enderby Road for housing. The centre creates a warm welcoming community for children and young adults in Scunthorpe and the surrounding areas and aims to inspire them to be the best dancers and performers they can be. The building and location itself is not only hugely important to the growth of the individuals who attend it, but also to the growth and longevity of the business. The reception area enables a warm and welcoming atmosphere and the number and size of studios themselves enables large class sizes and the ability for students to be encouraged to grow to their full potential. In particular, the stage area in our main studio is a massive asset to the school. Members can perform to an audience of 200 and experience theatre etiquette which is greatly important for those who would like to pursue a career in the performing arts industry. In the gym,					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							we can facilitate aerial and circus skills through silks and hoop training. The nearest one like us here in Scunthorpe is Leeds, making this class a great asset to not only the school but also the town. We have used the other spaces to create a staff office which is used by up to 8 members of staff, a costume cupboard to store all our costumes and accessories and a sewing room where "Classically Kay" makes costumes from scratch. The storage facilities are also well used throughout the centre. The gym is also used to hire out to a local football group and our drama studio is equipped for another community group - the camera club. In the space at the back of the centre, another community group Men In Sheds have chosen our facility to create their own workshop space. Men in Sheds aim is to bring men together to provide a safe space to talk as well as work. We also provide gentle fitness and bingo classes for the elderly. KPAC is so much more than just a performing arts school. Four of the teachers, including myself, have all been taught personally by Miss Kim when we were younger. After leaving Scunthorpe to attend and train at professional dance conservatoires and performing professionally around the world we have all returned to Scunthorpe to pursue teaching careers and pass on our knowledge to the next generation. I have friends from the industry who have also opened their own dance schools in Liverpool, Norwich and Milton Kenes who have all contacted me to request information on how the KPAC business is run. In the performing arts world, this centre is a great example and pioneer to other schools in the country, another reason why I strongly feel we need a building which reflects our work. Alongside our teaching at KPAC we also partner with John Leggott College to deliver the single and triple BTEC in dance. This has been an amazing opportunity for the centre, not only from a business point of view but also from a community point of view and to enable us to build our relationships with other local establishments. The location of KPAC is vital to reaching pupils who would not otherwise have the opportunity to experience performing arts on their doorstep. Not only are we the most affordable dance school in the area, we are also the only dance school in the region which offer such a wide variety of classes and performance opportunities. This in itself speaks volumes as to why we feel so passionately about being in this area and reaching the young people that we do. A lot of the members refer to us as their "KPAC Family" a place where they feel safe, included and where they make memories to last a lifetime. The lessons learnt in the studio can be taken with the children no matter what career pathway they choose in life. Teamwork, commitment, drive, ambition, confidence, discipline are just a few of these skills. One of our members who attended Willoughby Road School was scouted by Miss Kim and given a scholarship for KPAC. She has gone on to be 3rd in the world at the Dance World Cup and is currently training with one of the most prestigious performing arts colleges in the country. This is just one success story of many who have attended KPAC. Our social media following has grown to over 2360 proving that there is great interest from the web community to follow and support what we do too. With the plan to develop new housing on the field behind us, I strongly believe that our centre will be an asset to the development rather than a					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							hindrance and give the families in this ever-growing community a chance to experience performing arts. Miss Kim opened the dance school almost 40 years ago and it has gone from strength to strength and grown to almost 320 pupils as well as all the other community groups who use our centre. The business caters for all ages and there are few places I can think of that do such a thing from a creative aspect. The centre creates a space for people to be artistic, expressive, sociable and much more! We want to support children who come as a hobby, to build their confidence and to make friends whilst also pushing the ones who want to pursue performing arts as their career path to be the best they can possibly be. Please consider my objection with the thought that this centre is so much more than just a building with walls and floor where people come to dance. The centre is a community hub for all ages to come together and celebrate successes and achievements of the local youngsters. Where that shy little child thrived and found their self-belief up on the stage and the elderly pensioner rediscovered their passions and made new friends. This centre means so much to so many and I for one would be devastated to see it go, along with the HUNDREDS of families and children who attend. Thank you for your consideration. Kind regards					
Megan **Wilson**, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd												
0377	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd	Appendix 7: Housing Trajectory	Object				Whole Plan delivery Local Plan Appendix 7 It is noted that while the Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement 2021-2026 provides a detailed trajectory for the period up to 2026 which appears to support the trajectory in appendix 7 of the Local Plan there is no other information in either this document or the SHLAA that supports the years from 2026/27 to 2038/37. In order to demonstrate that the plan is deliverable then further evidence is required to demonstrate how the distribution of development in SS6 and the allocations in the following policies will deliver the minimum requirement in the plan period to 2037. POLICY SS7: STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION – LINCOLNSHIRE LAKES a. 1,275 dwellings in Northern Strategic Allocation b. 875 dwellings in Southern Strategic Allocation POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS Committed sites 2,189 Proposed allocation 5,301 (including 2150 on Lincolnshire lakes). It is noted that despite assurances being provided in the lead up to the original identification of the Lincolnshire Lakes in the Cire Strategy this area has never performed in accordance with the promoters or councils' delivery statements. Over the last decade there have been very few permissions granted on this site. Planning application PA/2019/1088 is a full permission granted 19th February 2021 of 88 units and while development has commenced at the time of writing a stop notice had been served. There continues to be multiple site constraints as indicated by the response in the proforma on the five year land supply including					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							adjacent adoption agreements. In particular the is still an outstanding issue with the SW outfall which impacts on all units across the entire Lakeside development. While Lichfield's "Start to finish" (second Edition) states that the average annual build-out rate for a schemes of 2,000+ dwellings is 160 dpa and the median of 137dpa not all sites will deliver at this rate. The most appropriate way to describe the Lincolnshire Lakes sites at the present time is that they are "stalled". In order to deliver the claimed 2,150 by 2038 over the next 19 years then delivery would need to be at an average of 113 dpa. This would require a number of different developers on the site and it is our understanding that the site has been offered to all the major national housebuilders since the allocation was secured and none are presently engaged to deliver it. As such achieving the average required to deliver the amount suggested by the plan is extremely likely. The lack of the detail to support the trajectory the assessed shortfall in the 5 year housing land supply and the over reliance on the stalled Lincolnshire Lakes sites render the plan unsound as it is not justified and will not deliver.					
0385	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd	General	Object				CONCLUSION The preparation of a new Local Plan for North Lincolnshire is fully supported and given the datedness of the existing Development Plan is considered necessary. The Council are currently claiming that they can just demonstrate a 5-years supply of deliverable land. Following an assessment of the sites contained within this supply, we consider that a number of sites do not meet the definition of deliverable as is set out in Planning Policy and Guidance and as such, we consider the Council to be able to demonstrate just 2.85 years housing land supply. The land the Glebe, Scunthorpe, is currently available and suitable for development in the short-term, both to address the immediate shortfall in the provision of land for housing, but also to contribute to meeting the housing need for the plan period. Insufficient evidence has been presented that demonstrated the consideration has been given to applying a more meaningful uplift to the standard method figure to account for economic growth and in particular the urgent need to address an aging population. Given the persistent record of poor delivery, additional flexibility should be established in the housing requirement, in part to address the potential delays surrounding delivery of some of the largest allocations in the District. The Council recognise in particular the complexities associated with delivery at Lincolnshire Lakes and so as to ensure that a supply can be maintained post adoption of the Local Plan, the Council need to consider the allocation of additional land, that can deliver in the early parts of the Plan period. A number of the draft Policies contain overly prescriptive requirements, that could act to prevent otherwise sustainable development from coming forward. The Council should consider additional flexibility in the wording of these policies so as to ensure that decision makers can have regard to local circumstances, market conditions and local need at the time of an application.			Yes		View PDF
0437	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd	General	Object				INTRODUCTION This Local Plan Representation has been prepared by DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Onward Holdings Limited in response to the publication of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (Regulation 19) for consultation. This representation relates to 'Land at The Glebe, Scunthorpe' (Site ref SCUH-3). This representation should be read alongside the formal response form that has also been completed and			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							submitted in relation to the site. Representations in respect of this site have been previously submitted to the Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation. In addition to giving consideration to the development potential at the land at The Glebe, these representations provide a response in respect of the draft policies relating to the scale and distribution of housing. We object to a number of the draft Policies contained within the publication version of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan and consider that in their current form, they would not be found sound at a Local Plan Examination. In addition to setting out details of the site at The Glebe and providing a review of the draft Policies, we have also provided details of our assessment of the Councils current 5-year housing land supply position. Following an assessment of the deliverability of the sites contained within the Councils claimed supply, there is a significant shortfall against requirement that result in the Council not being able to demonstrate a sufficient supply of deliverable land for housing					
0486	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd	Paragraph 5.1	Object				Planning Practice Guidance The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) was first published by the Government to provide clarity on how specific elements of the NPPF should be interpreted. The PPG has been updated to reflect the changes introduced by subsequent revisions to the NPPF. The most significant changes to the PPG relate to defining housing need, housing supply and housing delivery performance. The PPG confirms that for the purpose of calculating Local Housing Need, an affordability adjustment is applied in order to ensure that the calculation is consistent with the policy objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. This is provided in response to concerns that relying on projected household growth alone is insufficient to address household formation issues and indeed the desire of people to live in areas in which they do not currently reside (for example to be close to work and reduce commuting distances)1. In some instances, and as is the case in Oxfordshire, the affordability uplift to the standard methodology is insufficient. In this instance, and as is set out in more detail in the following sections, this is on account of jobs growth significantly exceeding both the number of dwellings delivered and growth in the working age population resident in the County. PPG confirms the Framework's position that the Standard Method forms only the minimum level of housing need for a local authority area2. PPG also sets out that will be circumstances where the housing requirement could be increased to a level which is higher than that identified through the application of the Standard Method3. These circumstances include (but are not limited to): • Where growth strategies are in place, particularly where those growth strategies identify that additional housing above historic trends is needed to support growth or funding is in place to promote and facilitate growth (e.g. housing deals); • Where strategic infrastructure improvements are planned that would support new homes; • Where an authority has agreed to take on unmet need, calculated using the standard method, from neighbouring authorities, as set out in a statement of common ground; • Previous delivery levels, where these have exceeded the minimum figure identified; and			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							• Recent assessments of need, such as a SHMA, where these suggest higher levels of need. If a policy-making authority can adequately demonstrate that a need in excess of the standard method reflects future demographic trends and market signals, for the purpose of examining Local Plans, the approach will be considered sounds as it will have exceeded the minimum starting point4. Indeed, this is expanded upon in the PPG, where it is confirmed that Plan making authorities will need to take account a wide range of data, which is considered to be current and robust, including, but not limited to; • Employment forecasts and projections; • An assessment of current and future local labour supply; • An assessment of past take-up of employment land and property; and Consultation with relevant organisations and an understanding of business, economic and employment statistics5.					
0487	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd	General	Object				NATIONAL POLICY CONTEXT The National Planning Policy Framework (“the Framework”) sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. Those policies that are relevant to the plan-making process and subject of discussion in this Report in respect of the draft North Lincolnshire Local Plan.a) Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should apply to both plan-making and decision taking (paragraph 11). For plan-making, this meansa) Plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area, and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change;b) Strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, unless;I) The application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan areas; orii) Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework – taken as a whole.b) Plan-making Paragraphs 15 to 37 of the Framework relate specifically to ‘plan-making’. Paragraph 15 states that the planning system should be genuinely plan-led. Plans should provide a positive vision for the future of each area including addressing housing needs. Paragraph 20 requires that strategic policies should set out an overall strategy for the pattern, scale and quality of development, making sufficient provision for housing (including affordable housing). Paragraph 31 requires that the preparation of policies should be underpinned by relevant, up-to-date, adequate and proportionate evidence and take into account relevant market signals. Paragraph 35 states that plans and spatial development strategies are examined to assess whether they have been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements, and whether they are sound. Plans are ‘sound’ if they are;a) Positively prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodates where it is practical to do so and is			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							consistent with achieving sustainable development.b) Justified – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;c) Effective – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; andd) Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with policies in this Framework.c) Planning for housing Paragraphs 60 to 80 relate specifically to 'delivering a sufficient supply of homes'. Paragraph 60 requires Local Planning Authorities to ensure that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay. Paragraph 61 states that in determining the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance as a starting point, unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals. In addition to the local housing need figure, any neds that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for. Paragraph 66 requires policy-making authorities to establish a housing requirement figure for their whole area, which shows the extent to which their identified housing need (and any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas) can be met over the plan period. Paragraph 68 states that planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. Planning policies should identify a supply of; Specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan period; andb) Specific, developable site or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the Plan. Paragraph 69 requires local planning authorities to identify land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown that there are strong reasons why this target cannot be achieved. Paragraph 73 states that supply of large numbers of new homes can be achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns. Provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities. Working with the support of their communities, and with other authorities if appropriate, strategic policy-making authorities should identify suitable locations for such development where this can help to meet identified needs in a sustainable way. In doing so, they should:a) Consider the opportunities presented by existing or planned investment in infrastructure, the area's economic potential and the scope for net environmental gains;b) Ensure that their size and location will support a sustainable community, with sufficient access to services and employment opportunities within the development itself (without expecting an unrealistic level of self-containment), or in larger towns to which there is good access;c) Set clear expectations for the quality of the development and how this can be maintained (such as by following Garden City principles), and ensure that a variety of homes to meet the needs of different groups in the community will be provided;d)					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Make realistic assessment of likely rates of delivery, given the lead-in times for large scale sites, and identify opportunities for supporting rapid implementation (such as through joint ventures or locally-led development corporations); ande) Consider whether it is appropriate to establish Green Belt around or adjoining new developments of significant size. Paragraph 74 states that strategic policies should include a trajectory illustrating the expected rate of housing delivery over the plan period, and all plans should consider whether it is appropriate to set out the anticipated rate of development for specific sites. Local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific sites, sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies. The supply of specific deliverable sites should in addition include a buffer (moved forward from later in the plan period) of:a) 5% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land; orb) 10% where the local planning authority wishes to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable sites through an annual position statement or recently adopted plan40, to account for any fluctuations in the market during that year; orc) 20% where there has been significant under delivery of housing over the previous three years, to improve the prospect of achieving the planned supply At paragraph 104, the Framework requires LPAs to consider transport issues from the earliest stages of the plan-making process and development proposals, encouraging:"…opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use…" . It follows therefore, that the Council should seek to allocate and support development proposals in sustainable locations that are within walking distance of services and facilities. Paragraph 120 criterion d of the Framework recognises that in decision making, substantial weight should be given to the use of under-utilised land that can help to meet an identified need for housing.					
0550	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd	POLICY DQE7: CLIMATE CHANGE & LOW CARBON LIVING	Object				Policy DQE7: Climate Change & Low Carbon Energy We object to this draft policy. Policy DQE7 requires that development should be designed to mitigate the impacts of climate change and minimise carbon emissions. We support the Council in seeking to achieve these objectives. However, the policy seeks to implement additional requirements beyond those required by the current Building Regulations, in respect of water efficiency standards and the use of renewable and/or low energy sources. In an area that already is subject to viability issues, careful consideration should be given to imposing additional requirements, beyond those required nationally, that could act to render an otherwise sustainable development unviable. Additional flexibility should be established in draft Policy DQE7 so as to avoid a 'one-size fits all approach' and again allow decision makers to reflect local and site specific circumstances as required.			Yes		View PDF
0580	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	Object				SITE SELECTION AND SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL We object to the Sustainability Appraisal process and the identification and assessment of reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal and SA reporting invariably requires a substantial amount of work. However, legislation on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), and also SA of Local Plans, is very specific and detailed about the required contents of the SA Report. As a result, SA Reports can often be long and complex, and are also regularly scrutinised and sometimes challenged through Local Plan examinations on their contents, also through legal challenge in the High					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Court on the process of preparation. It is therefore essential that the legislation is followed very carefully and that the SA Report is examined fully to ensure compliance. To this end, we have made an assessment of the SA Report and have identified a degree of legal non-compliance. If the SA Report in its current form were to be challenged in the courts, in our view a challenge may succeed, with potential ramifications for the Local Plan itself. Ultimately this could strike out all or specific policies of an adopted Plan from use in decision-making and determining planning applications. The most significant of these areas of non-compliance are as follows: The reasons for selecting the preferred land use allocations and the rejection of alternatives is not given, nor is the Council's site selection process in doing so. In Save Historic Newmarket v. Forest Heath DC [2011] J.P.L. 1233: The primary ground of the challenge was that the Core Strategy and accompanying SA/SEA environmental report did not explain what reasonable alternatives to the proposed policies [or sites] had been considered and why they had been rejected. Collins J considered the requirement to consider alternatives in the context of an iterative plan making process (various drafconsulted upon, sifting the options, then final draft consulted upon, examined and adopted):i. For there to be compliance with Article 5 of the SEA Directive, the public must be presented with an accurate picture of what reasonable alternatives there were to the proposed policies and why they were not considered to be the best option. The North Lincolnshire SA only describes the assessment of alternative sites and does not set out why they were not considered to be the best option;ii. In an iterative plan-making process, it is not inconsistent with the SEA Directive for alternatives to the proposed policies to be ruled out prior to the publication of the final draft plan, but if that does happen, the environmental report accompanying the draft plan must refer to, summarise or repeat the reasons that were given for rejecting the alternatives at the time when they were ruled out and those reasons must still be valid. There are no reasons for alternative sites being rejected at this stage or an earlier stage. Further to the similarities between the North Lincolnshire SA and Save Historic Newmarket v. Forest Heath DC, there is no clear site assessment process undertaken by the Council. The reasoning and justification for allocating sites is not clear from the SA. There are also several aspects which, while not an issue of legal compliance, do not follow standard good practice on SA. This has resulted in the publication of an unsound Local Plan Submission document. We have noted substantive changes in the assessment of sites across the separate SA's against the same evidence base, with no explanation for such changes. Therefore, the Local Plan is unsound because it has not been positively prepared, it is not justified, it is not effective, and it is not consistent with national policy. This is a requirement of the NPPF (paragraph 16).					
0581	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd	POLICY H1: SITE ALLOCATIONS	Object				LAND AT THE GLEBE, SCUNTHORPE The subject site comprises of land at The Glebe, Scunthorpe (Figure 1). The site is located 350m north of the main centre of Scunthorpe and is closely related to a range of local shops, services and employment opportunities. Figure 1: Aerial view of the site (Please see attached PDF emailed in for			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							Map)The site is bounded by Glebe Road, Normanby Road, Warren Road and Winterton Road. It situated within the built-up area, with existing residential dwellings located along the south west boundary, and employment development bordering the other site boundaries. The site comprises a commercial plantation woodland in the northern and central areas. The developable area of the site comprises a large meadow in the south with a small area of less dense woodland at the southern site boundaries. There are also shops, supermarket, commercial premises, schools, bars, parks and places of employment within a short walking distance. The site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1 and is identified as being at very low risk of flooding There are no listed buildings or scheduled monuments on the site or in close proximity. The site is not located within or adjacent to a Green Belt or Conservation Area. The draft Local Plan and accompanying Policies Maps does not seek to allocate the site for residential development. The site is listed in the SHELAA under Appendix 2 Discounted Sites for the following reasons: • The site is a former landfill which also has significant geotechnical constraints. • Surrounded by noisy industry with potential for odour/dust issues: not compatible with residential development particularly on Warren Road/Winterton Road. • Complaints have been received that are difficult to resolve. The site is located over a landfill which present ground gas and geotechnical constraints. The site has been subject to previous planning enquires, which have considered in detail the geotechnical and contamination status of the subject site. Numerous ground condition documents were prepared between 2004 and 2016 which thoroughly assessed ground conditions of the site. The scope of the assessments were agreed with the Council and the reports provide a detailed overview of site conditions and recommendations for further investigations and monitoring to take place. The work undertaken to date provides a detailed analysis of the ground conditions of the site and provides sufficient information to collate a strategy for the excavation and remediation of the site that would allow for residential development in this location. The discussions have established that an appropriate remedial strategy can be prepared for the site and that, subject to implementation of the strategy, the site is acceptable for housing development. No concerns have been raised by the Environment Agency nor the NHBC that remediation of the site would result in a significant impact to the environment. The remediation of this site will inevitably result in some localised nuisance, during construction and remediation but these are matters which can be addressed by suitable construction management plans. As with the above, there have been numerous assessments of the impact of surrounding uses. The latest Noise Assessment, dated June 2020, confirms that the known noise levels are relatively low and indicate that careful design of the development could adequately control noise levels. Full requirements for mitigation can be determined following additional noise survey and assessment work at the detailed design stage. The landowner is committed to implementing a full programme of mitigation as required. The Framework encourages Council to utilise brownfield land for housing					

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							development, and given that the concerns in respect of geotechnical and contamination constraints have been explored extensively in the past, we consider that the site should be reconsidered for the allocation. Despite regular promotion of the site, it doesn't appear that the subject site has been considered as a reasonable alternative and has simply been disregarded without sufficient assessment of the development potential it holds. The subject site is sustainably located, within a reasonable walking distance of a range of local services and facilities, including the adjacent Asda supermarket. The site is immediately available and can make a meaningful contribution to the Council housing land supply in the next 5-years.					
0625	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd	Policy H2: Housing Mix and Density	Object				Policy H2: Housing Mix and Density We object to this draft policy. Whilst we support the Council in seeking to achieve an appropriate mix of housing on sites throughout the District, it is essential that housing delivery is not delayed as a direct response of the mix requirements being overly prescriptive. Additional flexibility should be established in the policy so as to ensure that site specific conditions, market conditions and local need at the time can all be considered in determining the mix of housing to be delivered.			Yes		View PDF
0661	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd	POLICY SS2: SPATIAL STRATEGY FOR NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE	Object				The below sets out our response to the draft Policies of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan. These comments should be read in the context of support for the preparation of a Local Plan, especially in light of the datedness of the current Development Plan. a) Policy SS2: Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire We object to Policy SS2. Draft policy SS2 sets out the spatial strategy for North Lincolnshire and states that at least 7,128 new homes will be delivered over the plan period. The policy provides a 'settlement hierarchy' that will guide development and decisions across the District. The hierarchy groups the settlements of North Lincolnshire into the following groups; • Major Sub-Regional Centre; • Principle Towns; • Large Service Centres; • Large Rural Settlements; • Smaller Rural Settlements; and • Rural Hamlets & Villages. The earlier Issues and Options consultation set out four options for growth. Option A (Scunthorpe and Market Towns) and Option B (Six Market Towns and Scunthorpe) looks to concentrate development in already highly urbanised areas, avoiding impacts on more environmentally sensitive areas. Option C (Six Market Towns, Scunthorpe and Larger Service Centres) disperses development across the area leading to a wide spread of lower-scale development. Option D (New Settlement) involves major new development in likely a rural area. Option E (Balanced Approach) was decided upon. This policy has been assessed and no significant negative impacts have been identified. This policy is likely to cause an increase in employment opportunities, improved access to facilities, the protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment and the delivery of new housing. There may be negative			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							impacts on water quality and flood risk due to large number of developments. The Scunthorpe and Bottesford Urban Area is defined in the publication version of the Local Plan, as the top tier 'major sub-regional centre. Of the Major sub-regional centre, the policy states that development and investment will act; a. "To maintain and strengthen its role as a key sub-regional centre, the Scunthorpe and Bottesford urban area will be the priority focus for growth in North Lincolnshire. b. It will be the focus for the large-scale residential development through the provision of allocations in this plan, including sustainable urban extensions. Non-allocated sites within the defined development limit will also contribute accordingly. Appropriate use will be made of previously developed land and greenfield sites. Major opportunities for employment will be provided in key locations within the urban area, whilst it will be the main centre for higher order services and facilities, retail, cultural activities, leisure, and commercial development. Opportunities for regeneration will be supported where they contribute to the spatial vision and objectives" The subject site at The Glebe is located within the Scunthorpe development limit and as such is considered suitable for residential development. We support the overarching spatial strategy set out in Policy SS2 which seeks to focus the majority of growth on the most sustainable settlements within the District. We explore the proposed distribution of growth further in our assessment of draft Policy SS6.					
0670	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd	Policy SS3: Development Principles	Object				Policy SS3: Development Principles We object to draft Policy SS3. Policy SS5 sets out a housing requirement of 7,128 dwellings over the plan period to 2028 and for the purpose of ensuring sufficient flexibility, applies an uplift of just 198 dwellings within the first five-years of the plan period. In total this equates to a proposed housing requirement of 7,326 dwellings. As is set out in the North Lincolnshire Council Five Year Housing Land Supply (2021)and the Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) the Standard Method calculation would require a minimum of 383 dpa (as per NPPF (2021) paragraph 6 1). For the plan period 2020 to 2038 this would generate a minimum requirement of 6,894. As such the proposed requirement of 7,326 dwellings would represent just a 6.3% buffer. Whilst it is considered appropriate to provide this additional flexibility beyond the minimum local housing need figure, an additional 198 homes only represents a very small level of flexibility, which is insufficient in the context of an authority with a persistent record of under delivery as is set out in the Council's own evidence. There is little by way of evidence to confirm if the Council have considered sufficiently the potential need to consider a more meaningful uplift to the local housing need figure given the provisions of the PPG set out above. It is noted that the LHNA states at section 13.3 that Oxford Econometrics have reviewed the implications of the expected jobs growth on housing numbers and have concluded that the High Growth Scenario will not result in a requirement for housing beyond the existing local housing need figure. This review does not appear to be available for public review and as such it is unclear if the outcome is justified. In particular regard should be had to maintaining jobs growth in			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							the District in the context of an aging population, which would necessitate an appropriate level of housing growth to support younger workers moving into the area. The LHNA sets out the net additional dwelling completions in North Lincolnshire and demonstrates the rate of residential development in the District has clearly fluctuated during this period, with highest growth seen in 2010/11 when almost 460 dwellings were delivered within the reporting year. Since this point however supply has generally fallen, with fewer than 400 dwellings delivered annually throughout this decade up to 2018/19 (bar 2010/11). However, more recently there has been an upturn in house building rates across North Lincolnshire, with over 400 homes completed last year. This recent trend in delivery should be given due regard when considering a justified housing target. Turning to affordable housing, the LHNA identifies a total gross annual need for affordable housing of 739 dwellings (Figure 37). Figure 41 shows the overall calculation of annual affordable housing need over the plan period 2020-2038. The analysis shows that for period 2020-2038 there is a need for 115 dwellings per annum. As is set out at paragraph 5.183 of the publication version of the Local Plan, the Council has recognised that this requirement will not be met in full by draft policy H3. The supporting text to the policy states that this is resultant of some proposed allocations being located within lower cost market areas that generates viability issues. The outline application for 2,500 dwellings at Lincolnshire Lakes, which is discussed in further detail below, will only deliver 5% affordable housing due to issues of affordability associated with this high-risk venture. Even this level of provision is only possible with a considerable level of grant funding for the development. This means that within the plan period the 3,000 dwellings identified to contribute to the supply are only likely to deliver some 150 affordable dwellings. This is only a year's supply of affordable housing. In recognition of this, the adoption of a higher housing requirement and subsequent allocation of additional land for residential development, would work to increase the delivery of affordable housing in line with the identified need. In light of the above commentary, it is considered that insufficient consideration has been given to potential economic drivers, such as offsetting the impact of an aging population, along with the need to deliver the requisite level of affordable housing across the District. As such draft policy SS5 is not considered justified or indeed capable of being found sound.					
0675	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd	POLICY SS5: OVERALL HOUSING PROVISION	Object				5-YEAR HOUSING LAND SUPPLY a) 5-Year Housing Land Supply As is set out in the 2021-2026 Five Year Housing Land Supply Statement, the Council are currently claiming a 5.64 years' worth supply of deliverable housing. We have considered in detail the assessment set out by the Council and consider that there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate the deliverability of a number of the sites listed in the Councils supply. These sites are as follows; (please see attached PDF response with Table in)Accordingly, against a supply of 1,145 dwellings, we consider that the Council can only demonstrate a 2.85 years supply of deliverable housing. The council are placing their plan at considerable risk of being found out of date on the grounds of a lack of a five year supply of housing land soon after adoption in light of our own assessment. The details of this assessment have been submitted to the council in terms of appeal statements and so are not replicated in full in					View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							this submission. The reason for the calculated lack of five year housing land supply is the current choice of allocations.					
0720	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd	POLICY SS7: STRATEGIC SITE ALLOCATION – LINCOLNSHIRE LAKES	Object				Policy SS7: Strategic Site Allocation We object to this draft policy. As is set out above, we have serious concerns about the deliverability of Lincolnshire Lakeside, and in particular its ability to deliver the identified capacity within the early parts of the Plan period. The site has a persistent record of delay and is faced with constraint complexities, including unresolved issues in respect of Flood Management. Further, the outline planning permission, granted earlier this year, will deliver under 5% affordable housing (120 dwellings) with the potential for this to reduce yet further if additional viability concerns are noted at the detailed stage. The Council should consider how an overreliance on development of this scale has caused issues for other Local Planning Authorities across the country. Indeed, as was confirmed at the Sonning Common, South Oxfordshire (APP/Q3115/W/3265861) appeal, the recently adopted Local Plan, started failing almost immediately post adoption, with a lack of 5-year housing land supply being confirmed, largely as a result of poor or delayed delivery on strategic allocations. Accordingly, we suggest that the Council seek to identify additional land that can come forward to compliment the delivery of Lincolnshire Lakes, whilst ensuring that a sufficient supply of homes can be maintained post adoption.			Yes		View PDF
0715	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf on Onward Holdings Ltd	Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites	Object				Policy SS6: Spatial Distribution of Housing Sites We object to this draft Policy. Building on the hierarchy set out in draft Policy SS2, draft Policy SS6 sets out the level of housing growth to be attributed to each settlement within the District. The Scunthorpe and Bottesford Urban Area is expected to take 51.3% of the minimum housing requirement and accommodate at least 3,758 dwellings. It is noted that Lincolnshire Lakes is included within this Urban Area. Whilst outline planning permission was granted for 2,500 dwellings in August 2015, there remains natural constraints, such as flood risk, that will act to both delay the delivery of dwellings on the site and could act to reduce capacity. The sites constraints and associated viability concerns have already acted to reduce the delivery of affordable housing on site, with just 120 dwellings to be delivered in total. This represents just 4.8% of the total yield, and is Lichfield's "Start to finish" second edition suggests that on average there is 3 years between the granting of outline planning permission and the completion of the first dwelling on the site. It is noted however that there remains considerable uncertainty around the flood mitigation scheme, which is likely to result in delays beyond this 3-years. Accordingly, it is not expected that the site will deliver any growth within the next 5-years. Again Lichfield's "Start to finish" second edition suggests an average build out rate of 160 dpa. What has been clear since DLP's participation in the Core Strategy is that Lincolnshire Lakes is not an average strategic allocation. There are exceptional circumstances surrounding the proposal not least the costly infrastructure and the fact that the site remains in flood zone 3. These factors impact on the overall viability of the scheme. This is demonstrated that despite the promoters seeking the support of national housebuilders for over a decade now there are still no actual housebuilders committed to delivering the scheme. This contrasts with other locations which have lower development costs and are in more attractive market areas. The failure of this single site to deliver in the next decade (as it failed in the			Yes		View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
							last decade) would have a significant impact on the distribution of growth around the district with the majority of growth being delivered outside of Scunthorpe in the Market Towns and Rural Areas. The over reliance on a single site with a proven history of non-delivery places the overall strategy and proposed distribution at considerable risk and is not justifies on the available evidence base. As is set out above, we consider it appropriate to attribute the highest level of residential growth to the most sustainable settlements in the District. However, caution should be given to placing an over-reliance on strategic scale development, such as that at Lincolnshire Lakes. This exposes the Plan to a greater degree of uncertainty and risk. To remedy this, arguably the Plan should propose the allocation of further, non-strategic sites that could be delivered quicker and would ensure contingency and a rolling five-year supply of sites that may otherwise not be achieved. In distributing the growth, whilst focusing on the most sustainable settlements, the Plan could also act to maximize housing supply across the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location, so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products. The key to increased housing supply is the number of sales outlets. A wider variety of sites in the widest possible range of locations ensures all types of house builder have access to suitable land which in turn increases housing delivery and the success of the Plan. Accordingly, we note significant caution in respect of the inclusion of Lincolnshire Lakes in this strategy.					
Megan **Wilson**, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Cyden Homes												
0288	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Cyden Homes	Paragraph 1.1	object	no	no	yes	Detailed representations submitted to localplan@northlincs.gov.uk under reference Li5116/2PS	positively prepared	See submitted representation.	yes	Site Assessment process not justified. Housing requirements not sufficiently demonstrated.	View PDF
Megan **Wilson**, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Glenrock												
0289	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Glenrock	Paragraph 1.1	object	no	no	yes	Detailed representations submitted to localplan@northlincs.gov.uk under reference Li5044/3PS	positively prepared	See submitted representation.	yes	Site Assessment process not justified. Housing requirements not sufficiently demonstrated.	View PDF
Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Mr G Jewitt												
0290	Megan Wilson, DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of	Paragraph 1.1	object	no	no	yes	Detailed representations submitted to localplan@northlincs.gov.uk under reference Li72/5PS	positively prepared	See submitted representation.	yes	Site Assessment process not justified.	View PDF

Rep ID	Name	Document Reference	Object / Support	Legally Compliant	Sound	Complies With Duty	Comments	Soundness	Modifications	Hearing Sessions	Hearing Session Comments	Additional Files
	Mr G Jewitt										Housing requirements not sufficiently demonstrated.	
Trudie **Wilson**												
0611	Trudie Wilson	POLICY H1P-4: LAND AT FORMER SOUTH LEYS SCHOOL ENDERBY ROAD PHASE 1	Object				Please keep KAPC (Kimberley Performing Arts Centre),a performing arts centre in the Riddings area as it has taken years of hard work from the Director Kim Gribben to develop a well attended dance school. The area and environment allows the local community, which is well populated, to access a welcoming established school. It is ideal for all ages to get involved with performing arts. Those attended come from Westcliff , Bottesford, Scotter and the population is higher in Riddings then those who live in Scunthorpe area. Please don't build houses replacing KAPC it would be devastating for the community. Thank you					View PDF
Mark **Wood**												
0220	Mark Wood	POLICY SS11: DEVELOPMENT LIMITS	support	yes	yes	yes	n/a	effective		yes		
0219	Mark Wood	POLICY SS2: 2.	support	yes	yes	yes	I have no reason to suspect that the revised Local Plan will not be legally compliant.	Consistent with national policy		no		
Richard **Wright** on behalf of North East Lindsey Drainage Board												
0423	Richard Wright on behalf of North East Lindsey Drainage Board	General	Support				Dear Sir/Madam, North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2020 to 2038) - Publication Draft (Regulation 19) Consultation 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 (See attached file). Although Flood Risk and Land Drainage is not the focus of this document the references to it are appropriate. The Board will continue to comment on individual planning applications.					View PDF