

1 Introduction	2
2 - North Lincolnshire: Facts & Figures	2
4 A Spatial Strategy For North Lincolnshire	4
5 Meeting Our Housing Need	5
6 Delivering Jobs & Supporting Our Economy	6
7 Prosperous Town Centres	11
11 Creating Sustainable Communities and Better Places	12
12 Planning for a Sustainable Supply of Minerals	13
13 Sustainable Waste Management	14
14 Connecting North Lincolnshire	14
15 Development Management	28
Appendix 1: Mineral Site Details	28
Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework	28
Inset Plans	29
Evidence Base	29
General	30
Habitats Regulations Assessment	31
Infrastructure Delivery Schedule April 2022	33
Infrastructure Delivery Plan April 2022	33
Sustainability Appraisal	34
Spatial Vision	35

* Where no consultation response link is provided, the whole content of the response is contained within the 'representation' column of the table. Where there is a link to the full response, this is because the response might include content that was difficult to fit into the table, such as:-

- Being very long
- Having graphics or maps that couldn't be inserted
- In a format incompatible with going in a table, eg excel sheet

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
--------	------------	-----------------------------------	----------------	---	------------------	------------------------

1 Introduction

370	Jess Lowden	Paragraph 1.16	100% support for traffic to divert via Caistor road	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	
404	Holly Hanson - Clerk to Worlaby Parish Council	Paragraph 1.32	"Hi,The Draft Local Plan, published in October 2021, includes two paragraphs that refer to the submitted status of the Worlaby Neighbourhood Plan. However, since the Draft Plan was published in October, the Neighbourhood Plan has been adopted (December 2021). If the final version the Local Plan is to be published dated 2022, can references to the Worlaby Neighbourhood Plan in sections 1.26 and 4.31 be amended to refer to it as an adopted plan rather than a submitted plan?. Section 1.26 reads: 'In North Lincolnshire Appleby has an adopted Neighbourhood Plan and a further fourteen communities have designated Neighbourhood Areas including Worlaby, whose Plan and supporting documents have been submitted to North Lincolnshire Council in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012	Comments noted. The plan was updated to update the status of Worlaby Neighbourhood plan to state adopted rather than submitted.	Proposed modification to include this change to include Worlaby as a place with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. See Additional Modification ref AM15.	View PDF
405	Holly Hanson - Clerk to Worlaby Parish Council	Paragraph 1.32	"If the final version the Local Plan is to be published dated 2022, can references to the Worlaby Neighbourhood Plan in sections 1.26 and 4.31 be amended to refer to it as an adopted plan rather than a submitted plan?. Section 4.31 reads: 'In North Lincolnshire, Appleby has an adopted Neighbourhood Plan and a further fourteen communities have designated Neighbourhood Areas including Worlaby whose Plan and supporting documents have been submitted to North Lincolnshire Council in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.....'"	Comments noted. Worlaby Neighbourhood Plan will be included in section 4.31 alongside the Appleby Neighbourhood Plan.	See Additional Modification ref AM15.	View PDF
408	Paul Foster on behalf of Egdon Resources	Paragraph 1.38	The inclusion of Policy MIN5 (Energy Minerals) as a strategic policy is welcomed.	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
412	Emilie Carr on behalf of Historic England	Paragraph 1.38	"Policy HE1 should also be included as a strategic policy, in accordance with para 20, criteria d) of the NPPF."	Policy HE1 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment is already listed in this section as a strategic policy.	No proposed changes.	View PDF

2 - North Lincolnshire: Facts & Figures

377	Jason McElhoney on behalf of Aecom	"Our Transformation So Far, Paragraph 2.4 2	"At paragraph 2.4 of the Publication Draft Addendum document a list of the investment projects anticipated within the area over the plan period is provided. The publication draft addendum document includes two new projects; the South Humber Industrial Investment Plan and The Humber Low Carbon Pipelines Project (HLCP) Harbour Energy consider that, as a National Significant Infrastructure Project, the V Net Zero pipeline scheme should also be included within this list of investment projects. The scheme scoping report has been submitted to PINS and an initial round of consultation has taken place within the local community. The scheme will be cross-boundary located within North Lincolnshire, North-East Lincolnshire, Lincolnshire County, East Lindsey District and West Lindsey District Councils. Alternatively if the Council do not see fit to include reference to this important investment in the region we respectfully request the wording is generalised to remove reference to other projects but remain supportive of the carbon capture industry and associated infrastructure."	Paragraph 2.4 included a new paragraph which states 'Humber Low Carbon Pipelines Project. The proposals are to create an onshore network of underground pipelines to transport captured carbon dioxide and hydrogen. The pipelines are intended to connect to major emitters and power stations in the Humber region, such as Drax, the new power station at Keadby, British Steel in Scunthorpe, Uniper's Killingholme site near Immingham and Equinor's proposals for hydrogen production at Saltend.	Paragraph was updated at this stage to include text around carbon capture clusters in the area.	
385	Colin Turnbull - DWD on behalf of Humber Zero (VPI Immingham LLP and Phillips 66 Limited)	"Our Transformation So Far, Paragraph 2.4 2"	"The NPPF 2021 broadened the soundness test around national policy to go beyond the NPPF: the test reads consistent with national policy " enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant. The 2011 adopted national policy statements and the 2021 consultation draft energy national policy statements, along with the 2021 Net Zero Strategy, all require the delivery of carbon capture clusters, with the Net Zero Strategy (October 2021) stipulates the delivery of four carbon capture usage and storage (CCUS) clusters, capturing 20-30 MtCO2 across the economy, including 6 MtCO2 of industrial emissions, per year by 2030. Carbon capture clusters are inherently spatial, being agglomerations of existing industry and power development also possessing proximity to potential carbon storage sites: the Net Zero Strategy also refers to them as SuperPlaces (page 21). The Humber region is the UKs biggest industrial cluster and biggest industrial emitter, emitting 40% of the UKs industrial emissions. There is a plan to invest substantially in industrial clusters in areas such as the Humber. These clusters will be the starting point for a new carbon capture industry, which could support up to 50,000 jobs in the UK by 2030.It is therefore considered that this section	Paragraph 2.4 included a new paragraph which states 'Humber Low Carbon Pipelines Project. The proposals are to create an onshore network of underground pipelines to transport captured carbon dioxide and hydrogen. The pipelines are intended to connect to major emitters and power stations in the Humber region, such as Drax, the new power station at Keadby, British Steel in Scunthorpe, Uniper's Killingholme site near Immingham and Equinor's proposals for hydrogen production at Saltend.	Paragraph was updated at this stage to include text around carbon capture clusters in the area.	

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			of the Local Plan should more comprehensively describe the projects and plans underway that relate to this national policy, which has evolved at pace (and largely since the reg 18 stage of local plan development)."			
386	David Jones on behalf of Arcadis Consulting (UK) Ltd	"Our Transformation So Far, Paragraph 2.4 2"	"The statement is a recognition of the transformational nature of the proposed project, in supporting the delivery of sustainable development in line with national policy."	Paragraph 2.4 included a new paragraph which states 'Humber Low Carbon Pipelines Project. The proposals are to create an onshore network of underground pipelines to transport captured carbon dioxide and hydrogen. The pipelines are intended to connect to major emitters and power stations in the Humber region, such as Drax, the new power station at Keadby, British Steel in Scunthorpe, Uniper's Killingholme site near Immingham and Equinor's proposals for hydrogen production at Saltend.	Paragraph was updated at this stage to include text around carbon capture clusters in the area.	
371	Kevin Ibbertson	Key Challenge – Natural Environment	<p>"I am referring to the proposed Development Plan for Broughton, and in particular the area highlighted for proposed housing H1P-21. On the plan you will see the current field boundary that runs immediately below where H1P-21 is typed. This boundary line comprises an ancient hawthorn hedge, with numerous very old mature trees and live electricity cables. In addition, immediately to the north of this boundary there are some 200 well established trees that were planted about 5 years ago. To destroy these trees for housing development goes against the government policy of increasing forested areas in the UK, and will negatively affect the local wildlife, removing habitats.</p> <p>In addition, PA/2020/2046 was approved in 2021, which is outside the proposed Development Plan, but does not affect the hedge or trees. A previous revised Development Plan I have a copy of, brought in this approved development, but did not include the land to the north of the field boundary, which appears to be more sensible.</p> <p>I would like to kept advised and included in any meetings where the proposed new Broughton Development plan is considered with regard to this particular site.</p> <p>I have been told that the proposed plan went to public consultation in November 2021, but I and none of the residents of The Dell, Broughton were aware of this, which is strange considering we are the immediate neighbours to the site."</p>	<p>The proposed housing site at Broughton (H1P-21) has been highlighted as an appropriate site for the allocation of 84 dwellings as it offers the option to develop the village of Broughton sustainably.</p> <p>Biodiversity and landscaping requirements of the policy allocating the site require an Ecological Appraisal and possible Ecological Impact Assessment at the planning application stage. Any existing trees and hedges around the boundary will be retained and enhanced. Vegetation going through the middle of the site is not as substantial, but is also largely likely to be retained and enhanced as part of net gain in biodiversity for the site.</p> <p>The addendum consultation carried out in June 2022 was a narrow one, focused on specific issues pertaining to proposed changes to the Publication Draft (Regulation 19) stage of the Local Plan development, consulted on in November 2021. As such, the proposed housing site H1P-21 was not being consulted on in the session carried out in Barton Upon Humber in June 2022.</p> <p>Additionally, the wider consultation carried out at the Reg. 19 stage of the Local Plan development was advertised online, via the council website, people who were contained on the Local Plan database were also emailed to notify them of the sessions. Furthermore, the various sessions were advertised via social media and Town and Parish Councils also made their residents aware.</p>	No proposed changes.	
373	Mr & Mrs Hanson	Key Challenge – Natural Environment	"Having attended the Local Plan public consultation in Barton upon Humber yesterday, we were able to discuss various points of concern regarding the local plan in Broughton. We did not receive notification for Broughton's public discussion, and were therefore not able to voice our opinions. The particular area of concern is south and adjacent to our houses in The Dell, off Scawby Road (HIP-21 on the new local plan). We see from the new proposed plan that this area is now included in that plan and would be a designated area	The proposed housing site at Broughton (H1P-21) has been highlighted as an appropriate site for the allocation of 84 dwellings as it offers the option to develop the village of Broughton sustainably.	No proposed changes.	

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>for potential development, whereas previously it was excluded.</p> <p>Some years, about 5, several hundred trees were planted in this area, a good majority of them are now established and the area has been left to go wild, therefore enhancing the wildlife, it's habitat and the environment. It is also bounded by a mature hawthorn hedge and includes several mature trees. To include this in the new plan would be detrimental to the country's conservation plan, of everyone planting trees and protecting wildlife areas. We therefore feel it would not be appropriate to include this area in the new plan.</p> <p>Also noted is the proposed building area to the south which has been awarded outline planning permission (PA/2020/2046) is not include in the new local plan.</p> <p>We would therefore wish to be kept advised of any future meetings with regards to Broughton and this particular site"</p>	<p>Biodiversity and landscaping requirements of the policy allocating the site require an Ecological Appraisal and possible Ecological Impact Assessment at the planning application stage. Any existing trees and hedges around the boundary will be retained and enhanced. Vegetation going through the middle of the site is not as substantial, but is also largely likely to be retained and enhanced as part of net gain in biodiversity for the site.</p> <p>The addendum consultation carried out in June 2022 was a narrow one, focused on specific issues pertaining to proposed changes to the Publication Draft (Regulation 19) stage of the Local Plan development, consulted on in November 2021. As such, the proposed housing site H1P-21 was not being consulted on in the session carried out in Barton Upon Humber in June 2022.</p> <p>Additionally, the wider consultation carried out at the Reg. 19 stage of the Local Plan development was advertised online, via the council website, people who were contained on the Local Plan database were also emailed to notify them of the sessions. Furthermore, the various sessions were advertised via social media and Town and Parish Councils also made their residents aware.</p>		
409	Paul Foster on behalf of Egdon Resources	Paragraph 2.72	"We support the inclusion of Wressle as an operational oil well. However, the following text should be added after "Wressle" to state "where oil has been produced since early 2021."	Comment noted.	See Main Modification ref MM4	View PDF
413	Emilie Carr on behalf of Historic England	Policy SS3:	Criteria j) and the additional reference to settings as suggested is welcomed	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF

4 A Spatial Strategy For North Lincolnshire

434	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	Policy SS7: Question 9	"Severn Trent are supportive of the inclusion of point 9, which highlights the need for early engagement with the utility companies, to ensure that there is sufficient infrastructure capacity and initiate further investigations into capacity improvements where required to meet the needs of a development."	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
428	Simon Jones on behalf of Highways England	Policy SS7: Strategic Site Allocation Lincolnshire Lakes	<p>"Lincolnshire Lakes-The Addendum states that this will now comprise of 2,150 dwellings, although this is not shown in red text as an amendment. This compares with 3,000 dwellings at the time of the SRN Evidence Base report and 2,000 dwellings at the time of the SRN Evidence Base Addendum.</p> <p>Given that we have already agreed the infrastructure required at this location, based on 3,000 dwellings coming forward at this location, the reduction in dwellings at this location should create less of an impact at the M181 terminating junction, as well as on the local road network within its vicinity.</p> <p>In our previous response and as noted above, we have stated that the proposed infrastructure at the M181 terminating junction does not necessarily accommodate the quantum of development within the Plan throughout the plan period and that the detrunking of the M181 places the onus of infrastructure provision onto the council. In addition, it was also concluded that this location may require a more detailed analysis through the plan period to ascertain if any further mitigation needs to be provided at this location.</p> <p>We also note that the AAP (adopted in 2016) references delivery of up to 6,304 new homes. Whilst we assume that the numbers provided to us in February 2021 (2,150) are the most up to date numbers for delivery in the plan period, referencing the AAP suggests that there are potentially up to 4,154 more dwellings to be provided post plan. In 2021, NPPF was updated and, in paragraph 22, states that: "Where</p>	Policy SS7 was changed from 3000 dwellings at the Preferred options stage to 2150 dwellings not at the Publication Draft consultation stage which is why it is not shown in red as this change was consulted on at the Preferred Options consultation stage.	No proposed changes.	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>larger scale developments such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns form part of the strategy for the area, policies should be set within a vision that looks further ahead (at least 30 years), to take into account the likely timescale for delivery". Clarification is therefore sought on the status of the AAP, the full anticipated quantum of housing delivery on the site, and how the impacts of any further post plan development will be assessed in accordance with NPPF.</p> <p>We have recently provided a consultation response on an Environmental Impact Assessment screening opinion in relation to the erection of 599 dwellings (planning reference: PA/SCR/2022/1) and the reduction of the permitted red line boundary in relation to PA/2015/0396 (planning reference: PA/SCR/2022/2) on land north of Burringham Road. We are aware that the development is located within the Lincolnshire Lakes Area Action Plan. We have noted the provision of a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, and would request to be consulted at the earliest opportunity on these documents.</p> <p>This review has highlighted that the issues which are required to be considered in association with the Publication Draft Addendum Plan remain largely the same as previously advised, and that our previously presented evidence bases remain robust subject to clarification of any post plan impacts of Lincolnshire Lakes.</p> <p>Our evidence base has identified that the M180 Junction 5 and the A160 / Habrough Road junction is approaching capacity in 2038.</p> <p>We therefore require that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan makes reference to the need for these junctions to be monitored over the plan period, and we look forward to continuous regular liaison on this matter."</p>			
414	Emilie Carr on behalf of Historic England	Policy SS7: Strategic Site Allocation Lincolnshire Lakes	<p>" Due to the archaeological importance of the site, a heritage criteria is required, building on our previous engagement. The Lincolnshire Lakes Development offers opportunities for the better understanding of North Lincolnshire's dynamic wet / dry landscapes - characterised by natural and artificial flooding and silting events across millennia. A staged process of archaeological investigation based upon deposit modelling is essential. A deposit modelling led approach is essential to the effective management of archaeological risks given the complex character of buried landscapes below the superficially flat modern ground surface. See https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/deposit-modelling-and-archaeology/ and https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/technical-advice/archaeological-science/preservation-in-situ/ ."</p>	Evidence base document HE02 North Lincolnshire Local Plan Heritage and Archaeology Impact Assessment and its supporting assessments (HE03) consider the heritage impacts on all sites. Further assessments may also be required at any planning application stage which would be dealt with at that stage.	See Main Modification ref MM12	View PDF

5 Meeting Our Housing Need

376	Neil Taylor-Matson on behalf of Kirton in Lindsey Town Council	Table 5.1 Housing Delivery	<p>"The soundness of proposals for Kirton in Lindsey are of concern as they only consist of housing developments and no allocations for commercial development, in effect the proposal is for the creation a commuter town with expansion of commerce not specified. For soundness, Brownfield sites in the area should be reserved for commercial use and not approved for housing stock in order to give provision for employment opportunities."</p>	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	
388	Robert Ian Stuart on behalf of Avoca PLD	Policy H1P-20: Land off Ferry Road	<p>"One questions why it is regarded as necessary to add further detail to the requirement for a heritage assessment? This site is well situated to offer an obvious extension of the settlement and whilst heritage issues must be taken due note of, the additional wording implies the possibility of a negative approach to the assessment of the proposed development.</p> <p>It is noted that the assessed potential allocation of 54 dwellings remains unchanged which leads one to think that heritage [and possibly other] constraints have not been properly assessed in other proposed allocations. Certainly many, such as the Brigg sites H1P 14/15/16 and 17, require a heritage assessment and reference to proposed Policy HE1 suggests that consequences might be significant in terms of the development potential of some sites. This would have a knock on affect in respect of overall housing numbers.</p> <p>Please note that the form does not allow more than one box below to be ""ticked"" but it is also considered that the tests of being justified and effective are not met."</p>	<p>A heritage assessment is required through consultation with the councils Historic Environment officer and comments from Historic England supported this also through their suggested comments through the consultation stages. The text was strengthened through text recommended by Historic England at the Addendum stage which they supported.</p> <p>Point I states i. 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.</p>	No proposed changes.	View PDF
416	Emilie Carr on behalf of Historic England	Policy H1P-20: Land off Ferry Road	The addition of the criteria "including protecting and enhancing the important approach views of the tower of the Grade I church of the Holy Trinity." As suggested is strongly welcomed.	Comments and support noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
417	Emilie Carr on behalf	Policy H1P-23: Land	"The addition of the criteria "including for the retention and sympathetic reuse of the pair of cottages on the	Comments and support noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
	of Historic England	off Mill Road	site, which are non-designated heritage assets." is welcomed."			
467	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	Paragraph 5.153	The text has been corrected to state that the site is in SFRA flood risk zone 1. The following text regarding the need for the Exception Test should be removed accordingly.	The text has been proposed to be corrected through a proposed modification to state that the site is in SFRA flood risk zone 1. The following text regarding the need for the Exception Test should be removed accordingly.	See Main Modification ref MM35	View PDF

6 Delivering Jobs & Supporting Our Economy

468	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	Paragraph 6.12	"This has been correctly updated. However, in the first sentence, 'is' is not needed."	Comment noted. The word is had been proposed to be deleted anyway as the proposed text states Due to its location, North Lincolnshire is was previously aligned with two Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs), the Humber and the Greater Lincolnshire	No proposed changes.	View PDF
453	James Rigby on behalf of Brocklesby Estate	Policy EC1-: Employment Land Supply	Reinsert site reference EC1-7 as an allocated employment site (specifically for a service station and lorry park).	Policy EC-1.7 allocated land to the south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the west of the A18 for development as a service station and lorry park. This allocation is no longer required as policies TC1 and T6 have now been amended to provide a policy framework supporting any suitable proposals for roadside retail, lorry parking and other facilities essential to support the safety and welfare of motorists. This allows a range of suitable proposals to come forward wherever the need arises.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
365	Simon Morgan	Policy EC1-6: Land at North West of the A15 Barton Interchange	"Appendix 8 of the Publication Addendum states this change has been made following a meeting with Severn Trent Water. However Barton Upon Humber falls under the remit of Anglian Water. My overall support for this policy, as provided during the publication draft consultation (stage 4), reference R190400045, remains."	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	
424	William Mollett on behalf of Hemex LLP	Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to The West of The A18	Supportive of this amendment to the local plan	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
378	William Mollett on behalf of Hemex LLP	Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to The West of The A18	This allows better public consultation and planning consideration for alternative roadside sites which may come forward in the area and be better suited to serve the M180 directly.	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
382	Martin Haworth	Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to The West of The A18	"I support the amendment to remove from the local plan the land at Barnetby Top from the local plan. This land should remain as agriculture land, it is not a suitable location for any development."	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	
395	Rachael Reddin on behalf of Barnetby Parish Council	Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to The West of The A18	"Barnetby le Wold Parish Council strongly support the amendment to remove EC1-7 as this site is completely unsuitable for the purposes of any development. The parish council in consultation with residents, would support that the site is completely removed from the local plan and not used for any other developments and that the area is retained as Farm land / Open countryside. The site is not suitable for employment in the interests of traffic safety it is important that the area remains free flowing for traffic when accidents occur on the M180. Traffic can often back up in all direction from M180 and A180 using Barnetby top as the diverted route. Adding further congestion to this in the form of	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			employment site or the presently proposed lorry park is not supported. In relation to EC1-7 and EC 1-8 two employment sites / business parks would not be favourable."			
396	Nigel Nutting	Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to The West of The A18	This land should be left as farmland to be used to grow much needed crops. At no time should this land be considered for any form of industrial or commercial development.	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	
454	James Rigby on behalf of Brocklesby Estate	Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the West of the A18	Reinsert site reference EC1-7 as an allocated employment site (specifically for a service station and lorry park).	Policy EC-1.7 allocated land to the south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the west of the A18 for development as a service station and lorry park. This allocation is no longer required as policies TC1 and T6 have now been amended to provide a policy framework supporting any suitable proposals for roadside retail, lorry parking and other facilities essential to support the safety and welfare of motorists. This allows a range of suitable proposals to come forward wherever the need arises.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
379	William Mollett on behalf of Hemex LLP	Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to The West of The A18	Allows better public consultation and planning consideration for alternative roadside sites which may come forward in the area and be better suited to serve the M180 directly.	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
456	James Rigby on behalf of Brocklesby Estate	Policy EC1-7: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to The West of The A18	"Wording to be amended (see covering letter). The Publication Draft Addendum deletes Site Reference EC1-7 as a draft Allocated Employment Site from emerging Policy EC1 and Inset 05 - Barnetby le Wold. 1.5. The deletion of Site Reference: EC1-7 is explained at Pages 371 and 373 of Publication Draft Addendum with the following statement added: "Policy EC-1.7 allocated land to the south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the west of the A18 for development as a service station and lorry park. This allocation is no longer required as policies TC1 and T6 have now been amended to provide a policy framework supporting any suitable proposals for roadside retail, lorry parking and other facilities essential to support the safety and welfare of motorists. This allows a range of suitable proposals to come forward wherever the need arises". 1.6. Specifically, these representations OBJECT to the deletion of Site Reference EC1-7 as a draft Allocated Employment Site from emerging Policy EC1 & Policy EC1-7 and Inset 05 - Barnetby le Wold. 1.7. These representations also suggest modifications to Publication Draft Addendum Policy TC1 (Retail Hierarchy and Town Centre and District Centre Development) and Policy T6 (Freight) to provide additional clarity and bring the policies in line with National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 109. The National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF) states at Paragraph 106 e) that planning policies should "provide for any large-scale transport facilities that need to be located in the area, and the infrastructure and wider development required to support their operation, expansion and contribution to the wider economy". 2.2. A related footnote (FN44) indicates that "policies for large scale facilities should, where necessary, be developed through collaboration between strategic policy-making authorities and other relevant bodies. Examples of such facilities include ports, airports, interchanges for rail freight, public transport projects and roadside services. The primary function of roadside services should be to support the safety and welfare of the road user (and most such proposals are unlikely to be nationally significant infrastructure projects)". 2.3. Providing safe and secure overnight parking for HGVs is a priority for the Government with the following statement provided at NPPF Paragraph 109 (emphasis added): "Planning policies and decisions should recognise the importance of providing adequate overnight lorry parking facilities, taking into account any local shortages, to reduce the risk of parking in locations that lack proper facilities or could cause a nuisance. Proposals for new or expanded distribution centres should make provision for sufficient lorry parking to cater for their anticipated use". 2.4. Alongside the NPPF, Written Ministerial Statements (WMS) are also capable of being considered by the	Policy EC-1.7 allocated land to the south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the west of the A18 for development as a service station and lorry park. This allocation is no longer required as policies TC1 and T6 have now been amended to provide a policy framework supporting any suitable proposals for roadside retail, lorry parking and other facilities essential to support the safety and welfare of motorists. This allows a range of suitable proposals to come forward wherever the need arises, rather than focus on one particular site.	No proposed changes.	View PDF

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

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>changes to the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime, and empowering New Local Plan Commissioners who may be deployed to support or ultimately take over plan-making if local planning authorities fail to meet their statutory duties.</p> <p>2.12. Pertinently, the Transport Committee Road Freight Supply Chain report (HC 161 incorporating HC 828 of Session 2021-22, Published on 1 June 2022) notes the following: 35 Overnight parking facilities for HGV drivers are insufficient, especially on key road freight routes. This lack of capacity is not new; the Department’s previous lorry parking survey identified it five years ago.</p> <p>2.13. And 37. Without clear direction from the Government’s planning legislation and guidance, building desperately-needed new driver’s facilities, and even upgrading old ones, is a tortuous process. Local authorities in Kent, and other parts of the country where supply chain movements are prominent, face an impossible task and cannot be expected to elect to provide for lorry parks in their local plans in the face of opposition from residents impacted by such large projects. This is a national issue which requires a national Government fix.</p> <p>2.14. Strategically, the Site is very well positioned on the motorway network relative to Scunthorpe, Immingham, Grimsby, and Hull. The Humber currently accounts for 23% of all goods travelling through English ports (source: Greater Lincolnshire Local Economic Partnership). It is also anticipated that the recent Humber Region Freeport status and associated economic incentives will encourage more businesses to use the Humber and, more locally, the Port of Immingham, as their core logistics port for customs processing. Alongside this, the Council’s Economic Growth Plan focuses on the opportunities of both the energy corridor stretching from the coast to South encompasses growing, logistics, processing and research and development. For North Lincolnshire to build on its strengths and locational advantages it is essential that additional Yorkshire, encompassing energy production and consumption, steel and process engineering, chemicals and associated logistics, and the food belt corridor from York to Lincoln which infrastructure is provided to support these sectors and the efficient movement of goods – HGV driver welfare is critical to this aim.</p> <p>2.15. The location of a lorry park adjacent to Junction 5 of the M180 will reduce the need for HGVs to travel greater distances away from the M180 to find places to park overnight or for rest breaks –they currently travel to locations such as industrial estates from west Scunthorpe to Grimsby Docks. These are considered inappropriate locations, conflict with other road users, and present highway safety concerns.</p> <p>2.16. There is increasing recognition that the existing infrastructure, both nationally and locally, fails to meet the needs of HGV drivers. Workloads and driving patterns are increasingly governed by a rest and recuperation approach with driver welfare at its heart. However, the shortage of safe and secure off-road parking facilities for HGVs on key transport corridors, alongside the provision of hygienic catering and bathroom facilities for HGV drivers is a major challenge facing the haulage industry. Current legislation relating to driver rest periods, combined with a proven lack of adequate rest facilities, results in many drivers having to stop in inappropriate locations – this situation creates safety and welfare issues for HGV drivers.</p> <p>2.17. In accordance with the above, it is argued that the deletion of Site Reference EC1-7 as a draft Allocated Employment Site from emerging Policy EC1 & Policy EC1-7 and Inset 05 - Barnetby le Wold is not justified and not effective.</p> <p>2.18. Paragraph 1.17 of the Publication Draft Addendum is a newly inserted paragraph under ‘What have we done so far’ and states:“The Publication Version of the Local Plan was the preferred strategy, and the plan that it is intended to submit to the Planning Inspectorate for examination. However, in response to a handful of representations made during the consultation a focused number of changes are proposed to the Local Plan”.</p> <p>2.19. Having discussed the above further with the Council’s officers it is understood that, in the case of the Site, representations objecting to the allocation were received from Barnetby le Wold Parish Council, the Council for the Preservation of Rural England (North Lincolnshire), and a single member of the public. It is, therefore, considered that 3 no. comments arising from the consultation exercise do not provide sufficient justification to delete the draft Allocated Employment Site. A representation from a single member of the public does not indicate a groundswell of opinion objecting to the principle of a service station and lorry park at this location. Furthermore, any objection should be balanced and considered against the strong representations made by Brocklesby Estate in support of Policy EC1 & Policy EC1-7 during the NLLPPD consultation.</p> <p>2.20. Site Reference EC1-7 is deliverable in the next 5 years and is under the control of a willing landowner.</p>			

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>The Council will be aware that the Site is currently subject to an undetermined planning application (Planning Application Reference: PA/2021/2273) which is supported by a substantial volume of technical evidence. Accordingly, the Site is considered capable of providing up to 200 no. dedicated lorry parking spaces; an amenity building to provide rest and recuperation facilities alongside a food and beverage offer; and a fuel filling station which can easily adapt to further shifts towards electric vehicles and other renewable fuel alternatives, such as hydrogen, in the medium-to-long term.</p> <p>2.21. Whilst the permissive nature of the additions comprising Part (8) of Policy TC1 and Part (4) of T6 are welcomed, it is considered questionable whether the absolute need for additional lorry parking facilities would be delivered without a specific allocation to provide certainty of delivery. Accordingly, the strategy adopted by the Publication Draft Addendum is not considered to be effective, as the required infrastructure necessary to support the haulage industry may not be delivered over the plan period given the deletion of Site Reference EC1-7 as a draft Allocated Employment Site from emerging Policy EC1 & Policy EC1-7 and Inset 05 – Barnetby.</p> <p>It is considered that it is imperative that the Local Plan can support the provision of development that meets the changing need of the freight and logistics sector – the reinsertion of Site Reference EC1-7 as an Allocated Employment Site (specifically for a “service station and lorry park”) is critical to achieving this, alongside the permissive policy additions comprising Part (8) of Policy TC1 and Part (4) of Policy T6. "</p>			
397	Nigel Nutting	Policy EC1-8: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the East of the A18	<p>"The land is good agricultural land and should remain farmland. NLC were applying for AONB Status for this area, yet are considering industrial development, not exactly an aspect of beauty in the most peoples understanding of what an AONB consists of.</p> <p>The increased traffic on an already busy section of road is a consideration which it seems has not been considered. At times it is very difficult to gain access onto the roundabout leaving Barnetby le Wold and a development of this nature will only add to that difficulty.</p> <p>It is also very apparent that there are areas where land has been put aside for industrial development with road access, yet still remains undeveloped, so that would strongly indicate the industrial development of this site is not needed."</p>	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	
425	William Mollett on behalf of Hemex LLP	Policy EC1-8: Land at South of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the East of the A18	On the mapping change EC1-7 to EC1-8 On the mapping change EC1-8 to EC1-7 Remove Site EC1-7 'Land at south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the west of the A18' Response: Supportive of this amendment to the local plan.	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
479	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	Policy EC4: South Humber Bank - Landscape Initiative	Natural England notes and welcomes the addition of criterion g) of Policy SC4 and amendments to paragraph 6.81 (formally 6.86) of the supporting text in line with the comments set out in our letter dated 26 November 2021 (our ref 371224). However we are disappointed that there is no reference to biodiversity net gain in the context of this policy.	Biodiversity net gain is mentioned in several areas of the Local Plan and a number of policies therefore it was felt it was no necessary to repeat this again in this policy.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
469	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	Paragraph 6.85	Policy DQE6p' has been corrected to 'Policy DQE5p': '5' is correct but 'p' is a residue from the Reg 18 plan and should be removed.	Comment notes and reference to the 'p' will be proposed as a minor modification to be removed.	See Additional Modification ref AM19	View PDF
442	Alex Willis on behalf of Associated British Ports (ABP)	Policy EC5: Wharves	<p>"ABP therefore welcomes the inclusion of reference to the Port of Immingham in paragraph 6.83 of the Local Plan and a Policy within it that deals with the potential development of new or extended port, wharf and jetty facilities on the Rivers Humber and Trent (Policy EC5). However, ABP objects to the proposed revised wording of Policy EC5 reproduced below (see red and underlined text):</p> <p>1. Proposals for new or extended port, wharf and jetty facilities on the Rivers Humber and Trent will be permitted provided that there is no adverse impact on:</p> <p>a. designated sites and protected and priority species as well as the need to account for measurable biodiversity net gain;</p> <p>b. high quality agricultural land;</p> <p>c. the landscape of river corridors and coastal margins;</p> <p>d. the flood defence system;</p> <p>e. the strategic and local road network; and,</p>	<p>The policy was updated to include comments received at the Publication Regulation 19 stage. Comments received stated the policy does not safeguard existing wharf and jetties from development which could prejudice the use of the sites for the handling of cargo. A new paragraph was added. At the addendum stage which states- Existing wharf and jetty facilities on the Rivers Humber and Trent are safeguarded for cargo handling facilities. Any development which will prejudice the use of these sites for the handling of cargo will not be permitted, unless it can be proven that the use is no longer viable and that the site is not required for such purposes.</p> <p>Part g of the policy was added at the request</p>	No proposed changes.	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>f. the amenity of settlements.</p> <p><u>g. any SAC, SPA or Ramsar Sites, or proposals will only be permitted where there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest, there is no alternative and compensatory measures are provided for the loss of designated habitat in line with the Habitats Regulations.</u></p> <p><u>Existing wharf and jetty facilities on the Rivers Humber and Trent are safeguarded for cargo handling facilities. Any development which will prejudice the use of these sites for the handling of cargo will not be permitted, unless it can be proven that the use is no longer viable and that the site is not required for such purposes."</u></p>	of Natural England, who advised the policy 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).		
480	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	Policy EC5: Wharves	<p>"Natural England notes and welcomes the updates to policy EC5 and supporting paragraph 6.84 (formally 6.89) however consider that the new criterion g), while technically correct, may prove confusing for users of the Plan. We advise that the criterion is rephrased to improve clarity. For example along the lines of the following:</p> <p>"g) any SAC, SPA or Ramsar Sites, or Any such proposals will only be permitted where there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest, there is no alternative and compensatory measures are provided for the loss of designated habitat in line with the Habitats Regulations.""</p>	It is deemed the policy does not need rewording. It was amended at the Publication Addendum stage following Natural England's comments.	No proposed changes.	View PDF

7 Prosperous Town Centres

426	William Mollett on behalf of Hemex LLP	Paragraph 7.21 - additional paragraph after Paragraph 7.20	<p>"Roadside retail and other facilities will be permitted where they are necessary and provide for basic needs such as fuel, food, drink, public conveniences and parking..."</p> <p>Response: Supportive of this amendment to the local plan.Suggested Modifications to Paragraph 7.21: A presumption in favour of supplementary EV charging and accompanying driver service facilities where immediate access to the motorway network is available."</p>	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
380	William Mollett on behalf of Hemex LLP	Paragraph 7.21 - additional paragraph after Paragraph 7.20	Allows better public consultation and planning consideration for roadside sites which may come forward in the area dedicated to serve the needs of M180 exclusively.	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
391	James Rigby on behalf of Brocklesby Estate	Paragraph 7.21 - additional paragraph after Paragraph 7.20	<p>"Roadside retail and other facilities will be permitted where they are necessary and provide for basic needs such as fuel, food, drink, public conveniences and parking, which are essential to support the safety and welfare of motorists and lorry drivers. The scale and nature of roadside facilities would need to be appropriate to their location, and safely accessible and, where possible, located within a settlement. They should not become a destination in their own right. Proposals would need to meet an identified need in a particular location, which means demonstrating that no suitable alternative facilities exist that could meet those needs. For example, it is unlikely a mobile food outlet would be appropriate close to a village which already has a service station providing for basic food needs.</p> <p>3. SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS</p> <p>SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS TO PUBLICATION DRAFT ADDENDUM POLICY TC1 (RETAIL HIERARCHY AND TOWN CENTRE AND DISTRICT CENTRE DEVELOPMENT)</p> <p>3.1. Notwithstanding Brocklesby Estates objection to the deletion of Site Reference EC1-7 as a draft Allocated Employment Site from emerging Policy EC1 & Policy EC1-7 and Inset 05, the permissive policy addition comprising Part (8) of Policy TC1 is generally welcomed should the Site not be reinserted as an Allocated Employment Site.</p> <p>3.2. Newly inserted Paragraph 7.21 is considered to be poorly drafted and onerous, therefore, Brocklesby Estate object to this paragraph. Department for Transport Circular 02/2013 sets out the roadside facilities perform an important road safety function by providing opportunities for the travelling public to stop and take a break in the course of their journey . It goes on to state that the network of service areas on the strategic road network has been developed on the premise that opportunities to stop are provided at intervals of approximately half an hour . Compliance with DfT Circular 02/2013 and driver welfare considerations dictate that the location of roadside facilities should be located either on-line or within close</p>	It is proposed that paragraph 7.21 be amended to reflect the objector's suggested changes.	Amend Paragraph 7.21 to read – "Roadside retail and other facilities will be permitted where they are necessary and provide for basic needs such as fuel, food, drink, public conveniences and parking, which are essential to support the safety and welfare of motorists and lorry drivers. The scale and nature of roadside facilities would need to be appropriate to their location, and safely accessible and, where possible, located within a settlement. They should not become a destination in their own right. Proposals would need to meet an identified need in a particular location, which means demonstrating that no suitable alternative facilities exist that could meet those needs. For example, it is unlikely a mobile food outlet would be appropriate close to a village which already has a service station providing for basic food needs."	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>proximity to a junction. When considering Paragraph 7.21 it is important to draw a clear distinction between roadside related services “ such as drive-thru units “ and more conventional town centre uses defined in NPPF Annex 2. Of particular relevance is an appeal decision relating to a proposed drive-thru restaurant in Oxfordshire to be operated by McDonalds Restaurants Limited “ in this case the application was refused by Cherwell District Council and considered at a Hearing led by Inspector Amanda Blicq . Inspector Blicq allowed the appeal and makes the following statement immediately after the formal decision at the start of the appeal decision notice (emphasis added):</p> <p>Procedural Matters</p> <p>2. The development is categorised as a town centre use in the Glossary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). As the appeal site is within the countryside, the appellant has carried out a sequential test to support the application at the appeal site as required by Paragraph 24 of the Framework. However, the purpose of the sequential test is to demonstrate that there are no alternative sites within a town centre or edge of centre locations. Given that the purpose of this development is to provide roadside facilities for motorists on the A43, which by definition is unlikely to be within a town centre, I consider the sequential test to be of little relevance to this appeal and this was confirmed by the Council at the hearing. Furthermore, the Councils statement notes that disputing whether or not there are alternative sites available will not be beneficial to either party. The Council also confirmed at the hearing that the question of alternative sites does not arise in this case, as there are none under consideration.</p> <p>3.3. Accordingly, it is considered that Paragraph 7.21 is not consistent with national policy and, consequently, is not sound. Specifically, placing a requirement for facilities to be where possible located within a settlement fails to recognise the needs of motorists are best served by facilities which are either online or close to a junction. It is suggested that where possible, located within a settlement is deleted. Similarly, the final sentence of Paragraph 7.21 incorrectly infers that opportunities for the travelling public to stop and take a break in the course of their journey can be met through an existing facility in a nearby settlement. This is contrary to national policy and the guidance within DfT Circular 02/2013.</p> <p>3.4. The nearest designated centre to the Site (and associated edge of centre) is Brigg town centre as defined by Inset 10 (Brigg, Scawby Brook & Castlethorpe) of the Housing and Employment Land Allocations Development Plan Document (HELA DPD), located approximately 6 kilometres (straight-line distance) south-west of the Site “ this amounts to a 7-minute drive and a 6.5km drive distance from the Site and Junction 5 of the M180. East-bound traffic on the M180 would essentially have to double-back this distance, adding approximately 13km to their onward journey and, in turn, resulting in further unnecessary vehicle emissions. Consistent with the reasoning applied by Inspector Blicq in relation to the Oxfordshire appeal, it is well established that roadside related services such as the proposed drive-thru units need to be convenient and accessible to the passing motorist. Any detour from the main motorway or trunk road network should be minimal with traffic contained to avoid mixing and adding unnecessarily to local traffic flows.</p> <p>3.5. In summary, it is suggested that Publication Draft Addendum Paragraph 7.21 is modified in accordance with the wording below. Text to be deleted is shown in strikethrough and new text is in bold underlined.</p> <p>7.21. Roadside retail and other facilities will be permitted where they are necessary and provide for basic needs such as fuel, food, drink, public conveniences and parking, which are essential to support the safety and welfare of motorists and lorry drivers. The scale and nature of roadside facilities would need to be appropriate to their location, and safely accessible and, where possible, located within a settlement. They should not become a destination in their own right. Proposals would need to meet an identified need in a particular location, which means demonstrating that no suitable alternative facilities exist that could meet those needs. For example, it is unlikely a mobile food outlet would be appropriate close to a village which already has a service station providing for basic food needs. " "</p>			

11 Creating Sustainable Communities and Better Places

484	Ian Stuart on behalf of Keigar Homes	Policy CSC2 Health Care Provision	<p>"The Addendum proposes a change to the policy by reducing the “cut-in” point from 11 or more dwellings to 10 or more and by increasing S.106 contributions by approximately £56 per dwelling. This is an additional cost which will have to be passed on to the purchasers of dwellings. There appears to be no evidence to justify such an increase whilst the policy lacks the flexibility to take account of changing circumstances. It is noted that the inclusion of such a precise figure is not in line with other infrastructure requirements in policies relating to such things as education.</p> <p>Objection: For these reasons we object on the grounds that it fails the test of soundness in not being</p>	The Health S106 contribution proposal in Policy CSC2 has been calculated using the Evidence base paper SUSCO7 North Lincolnshire Local Plan Housing and Primary Health Care Analysis which was updated October 2021. The future clinical space requirements are developed using a range of factors, such as estimated population	No proposed changes.	View PDF
-----	--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--	----------------------	--------------------------

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>positively prepared and not justified.</p> <p>Modification: The present text of sub paragraph 7 should be deleted and replaced with the following: "The level of S 106 contributions per dwelling should be calculated on an analysis of future requirements and standardised BCIS building rates for health centre accommodation".</p> <p>Hearing Sessions: Keigar Homes wishes to participate in hearing sessions because as a very experienced local company it feels well able to contribute to the debate.</p>	<p>growth, proposed new housing quanta, healthcare resource availability and patient activity levels. The purpose of considering the future primary care accommodation requirements may help inform any negotiations around section 106 contributions towards health facilities. This has also been used in the HOU09 Draft Developer Contributions supplementary planning document (SPD) which is still to go out for further consultation before the SPD is adopted.</p>		
366	Simon Morgan	Policy CSC12: 1h	<p>"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.</p> <p>The allocation in Barton Upon Humber is fully supported, and fully addresses the objection I made in the publication draft (Stage 4) consultation, reference R190400083."</p>	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	
470	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	Policy CSC17: Camping and Caravan Sites	We note point d has been added in line our representation on the Regulation 19 Plan.	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF

12 Planning for a Sustainable Supply of Minerals

402	Mike Daley on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council	Chapter 12 Planning for a Sustainable Supply of Minerals	"Thank you for including Lincolnshire County Council in the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2020 – 038) – Publication Draft Addendum Consultation. Further to our previous consultation response, we have taken account of the findings of the updated Minerals Background Paper (March 2022) in conjunction with the amendments to the minerals related policies in the North Lincolnshire Local Plan_ Publication Draft Addendum Plan (May 2022). The updated evidence and policies provided set out an appropriate and sound approach to the provision of Minerals for the duration of the plan period. Consequently, the issues identified in our previous consultation response(s) have been satisfied."	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
411	Paul Foster on behalf of Egdon Resources	"Policy MIN6: Mineral Sites, point 1 MIN6-14a"	"We welcome the inclusion of the Wressle wellsite in the policy as MIN6-14a: Wressle (Oil). However, the appeal decision granting planning permission allowing for the production of both oil and gas. Therefore, we wish to see "and Gas" added after "Oil"."	Comments noted.	See Main Modification ref MM90	View PDF
418	Emilie Carr on behalf of Historic England	"Policy MIN6: Mineral Sites, point 1 MIN6-14a"	Please see detailed comments for MIN6-17 and MIN6-18 within Appendix B of the previous response.	<p>Comments noted. In respect of allocation MIN6-17 our historic environment officers noted that Archaeology present. Heritage assessment required including archaeological evaluation. It was also noted the site was within 20m of Scheduled Monument (DLS1729). These comments did not apply to allocation MIN6-18.</p> <p>Further consideration has been given Historic England comments regarding need for assessment of whether the setting / related remains of the scheduled roman site extending into MIN6-17 and potential impacts. Concern the Roman town may continue into MIN6-17 and in terms of aesthetic impacts. Also objection to allocation 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</p>	See Main Modification ref MM90	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
				<p>successfully mitigated.</p> <p>The Council has also given further consideration that these were allocations for extraction of silica sand resource- an industrial mineral. The NPPF requires a stock of permitted reserves of this resource is maintained to support the level of actual and proposed investment required for new or existing plant, and the maintenance and improvement of existing plant and equipment. As of 7/1/23 no plant and equipment were present on either site or the site most recently worked there.</p> <p>Furthermore, the possible and also historic use for the sand was at the South Ferriby Cement Plant, the indication of resource was unknown and the proposed working lifespan was also unknown. Operations at South Ferriby Cement Plant have ceased, other than storage and onward distribution of products indicating some doubt as to a possible market for the material.</p> <p>Therefore, it is proposed to delete both allocations MIN6-17 and MIN6-18 from the Plan. It may still be possible for the prospective operator to bring forward the working of sand from the sites via the development management process.</p>		

13 Sustainable Waste Management

471	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	Paragraph 13.15	The additional text states that the assessment takes into account the Waste Framework Directives (2008) and the NPPF and National Planning Policy for Waste. You may wish to note whether it takes into account the Environment Act 2021 to move towards a circular economic model.	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
-----	---	-----------------	---	-----------------	----------------------	--------------------------

14 Connecting North Lincolnshire

367	Simon Morgan	Policy T2: Promoting Public Transport	"The proposed change fully addresses the objection I made in the consultation on the publication draft (stage 4), reference R190400085."	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	
392	James Rigby on behalf of Brocklesby Estate	Policy T6: Freight	<p>"SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS TO PUBLICATION DRAFT ADDENDUM POLICY T6 (FREIGHT)</p> <p>3.6. Notwithstanding Brocklesby Estates objection to the deletion of Site Reference EC1-7 as a draft Allocated Employment Site from emerging Policy EC1 & Policy EC1-7 and Inset 05, the permissive policy addition comprising Part (4) of Policy T6 is welcomed should the Site not be reinserted as an Allocated Employment Site.</p> <p>3.7. Whilst the spirit of Part (4) of Policy T6 is supported, Brocklesby Estate wish to object to the current wording of the policy. Specifically, it is suggested that Part (4) should be revised so it is consistent with national policy and, in particular, NPPF Paragraph 109 and DfT Circular 02/2013 which sets out lorry parking facilities should be located within close proximity to the strategic road network .</p> <p>3.8. It is suggested that Publication Draft Addendum Policy T6 (Freight), Part (4) is modified in accordance with the wording below.</p> <p>4. Overnight lorry parking facilities located within close proximity to the strategic road network and essential to support the safety and welfare of drivers will be permitted, where they are of an appropriate scale, meet an identified need, and can be accessed safely."</p>	Whilst the spirit of the comment is understood, the Council would need to support appropriate lorry parking facilities wherever the need arises, and not just close to National Highways Strategic Road Network. Given the shift patterns of some lorry drivers, the parking may also be needed during the daytime too and not just overnight.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
457	James Rigby on behalf of Brocklesby	Policy T6: Freight	"Whilst the spirit of Part (4) of Policy T6 is supported, Brocklesby Estate wish to object to the current wording of the policy. Specifically, it is suggested that Part (4) should be revised so it is consistent with national policy and, in particular, NPPF Paragraph 109 and DfT Circular 02/2013 which sets out lorry parking facilities should	Whilst the spirit of the comment is understood, the Council would need to support appropriate lorry parking facilities	No proposed changes.	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
	Estate		<p>be located within close proximity to the strategic road network. It is suggested that Publication Draft Addendum Policy T6 (Freight), Part (4) is modified in accordance with the wording below. Text to be deleted is shown in strikethrough and new text is bold underlined.</p> <p>Off road Overnight lorry parking facilities located within close proximity to the strategic road network and essential to support the safety and welfare of drivers will be permitted, where they are of an appropriate scale, meet an identified need, and can be accessed safely."</p>	<p>wherever the need arises, and not just close to National Highways Strategic Road Network. Given the shift patterns of some lorry drivers, the parking may also be needed during the daytime too and not just overnight.</p>		
372	Ursula Vickerton	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"Over 30 years ago our Council was consulting on a relief road for Barton upon Humber. Since 2020 the council has allowed a massive number of more houses to be built mainly in NE of town, on the last plan zoned for industry without a junior school or adequate infrastructure.</p> <p>The central core, of an old town with 200 plus listed buildings mainly in the central conservation area, has been pounded day and night by extra heavy and light traffic as a result of NLC actions.</p> <p>I support the new route of the relief road but THIS IS NEEDED NOW... since the planning permissions and extra funding from council tax and WREN manufacturing site, doubling in size has already been received. To be told at the consultation evening, that an application for this funding would be made for the period to 2032 is not FAIR or GOOD ENOUGH.</p> <p>Barton upon Humber has a special/ unique built environment and it and the residents needs the RELIEF ROAD As Soon As Possible and not decades away. The original consultation was over 30 years ago.</p> <p>NLC promised and purchased a site for a 4th infant junior school in the NE of the town where the majority of these houses were built. Instead of building this 4th infant/ junior school, NLC SOLD this site for more building and in the current proposal intends to extend Bowmandale School in the SW and with no public transport services and the most distant from the new housing. Requiring even more vehicle traffic and not providing a school local to the children living in the new housing area of the town."</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No proposed changes.	
374	Phil Vickerton	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"Barton Link Road.</p> <p>I have attended several poorly presented, vague ""public Consultations"" on this matter. My comments are;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) this latest proposal is probably the better route. 2) However detail is lacking. proposals to use the existing Caistor Road and B1206 look fine on paper, but take no account of the narrow width of the roads, bends (B1206) and gradients (Caistor Road). These roads are barely adequate for 2 lorries to pass currently. Try cycling along them. 3) Being country roads, these routes also have significant farm traffic. 4) How is current traffic (particularly Wren lorries, often articulated and with double trailers) to be persuaded to take this longer route rather than directly through Barton Centre? 5) The interchange with the A15 is already a poor design, with poor visibility of, and for, traffic joining the A15 (both directions). Increased traffic use with worsen this situation." 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No proposed changes.	
375	Lorraine Stanley	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"I support the proposed new route via Caistor Road and to the existing junction with A15, which, although needing some new Road and road improvements in some areas, would utilise existing HGV- suitable roads.</p> <p>In addition, a weight limit through Barton would ensure that all HGV traffic except loading would be pushed</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up</p>	No proposed changes.	

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>out of the town, leaving more space for cars, further reducing congestion and improving safety for pedestrians and cyclists and the environment for all.</p> <p>Vehicle and noise pollution would also be reduced."</p>	<p>Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>		
383	Timothy Woollard	Paragraph 14.47	<p>I support the modification to change the Barton Link Road indicative route to the Updated Option 1 on the proposals map. The provision of a roundabout at A1077/Falkland Way/Link Road should be the first priority. I believe that the upgrading of the the section of Caistor Road from the proposed Link Road to B1206 should take place before the construction of the new Link Road itself from the A1077 to Caistor Road.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No proposed changes.	
384	Neil Jacques	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"The aim of a relief road for Barton is to move the optimum amount of car and lorry traffic from using the A1077 through the Town Centre. The revised route will not achieve this for the traffic heading north as nobody with climate change and fuel costs in mind will travel south to go north.</p> <p>The route was chosen by a questionable public vote which should not be binding as it was open to fraud. The on line survey enabled people to vote multiple times. The final decision should be made on what is best for the Town to achieve the aim of having a relief road, not a small sample of the population swayed by a pressure group with vested interests."</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with</p>	No proposed changes.	

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
				landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan. Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)		
387	Ian Lawless	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"It is regrettable that the consultation with some of the people of Barton resulted in the decision of North Lincolnshire Council deciding not to run with either of the Councils past proposals. The manner of the consultation which allowed 2 self interest groups to be involved with the proposal without publicly inviting any other groups to be involved, does not seem right. There has been no public invitation for people to be involved in working with the Council in making a proposal to the consultation. Further, we never seemed to have any support from our own politicians for the Councils proposal which would eventually lead to a proper town bypass connecting to the A15. How the votes were counted also appears open to fraud. Once phase 2 of WREN is open, which will create 1100 new jobs, Barton roads will become more clogged with this additional car traffic. The new relief road only creates a truck bypass which the Council will force the lorry drivers to use. This will add an additional 2-3 miles of journey and use much extra diesel. How environmentally friendly is this, not to mention the thousands of cars driving through our town centre and other residential roads. And don't forget the 500+ homes being added out by the WREN factory. So this is not meeting the overall objective of removing traffic from the town centre, only some lorries, if the Council can force them off an A road. There is also an additional technical note 2 (25/03/2022) from Local Transport Projects, a consultant hired by North Lincs Council, making a comment on the legality of making trucks use the route, which states: Where operators can demonstrate that their costs would exceed the scheme benefits, they would be potentially able to successfully object to the making of the TRO on the basis of the scheme being inequitable.</p> <p>Do you think WREN will want to add the additional mileage charges to their delivery costs? There might be a fight on with a legitimate claim. I would ask that the final approving authority investigate how the consultation case was organized, without full involvement of the residents of Barton. I would also ask that a proper vote, which was what the consultation turned out to be, be run like an election or referendum with a simple question: Do you want a bypass of Barton connecting eventually to the A15 as originally suggested by the Council? If North Lincolnshire Council really wants a true opinion of the people of Barton, this is the way forward. So spending £12 million of tax payers funds on a non effective route in ludicrous and I would ask the final approval authority to look at how public funds might be spent in arriving at a solution which does not address the issue of the thousands of cars coming through the centre of Barton every day.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No proposed changes.	
390	Wendy Bannerman on behalf of The British Horse Society	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"The revised relief road plans appear to cross the Viking Way, a promoted route and national trail, Bridleway Thornton/Barton 34. the PRoW is severed by the current road network. How does the authority plan to protect the vulnerable road users following the trail and provide safe passage for them to connect from BW 34 Thornton Curtis to BW 34 Barton Upon Humber?</p> <p>The North Lincolnshire ROWIP commits to promoting recreational routes for walkers, horse riders and cyclists eg bridleways. The Active Travel agenda provides for vulnerable road users: Jesse Norman in House of Commons debate on Road Safety, 5 November 2018 said:</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No proposed changes.	

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
393	Christopher Snell	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"The process to arrive at the decision not to go with the Council's first plan is flawed. If you want a vote on the issue it should be done as a ballot so that all the people of Barton can vote. The way in which the vote was done was an open vote in which you could repeatedly vote by pressing a button online and it did not require a postcode. It is a system set up to be unfair and abused.</p> <p>The manner in which the consultation was conducted allowed 2 interested groups to be involved with the proposal without publicly inviting any other groups to be involved.</p> <p>Additional comments</p> <p>You have no confirmation that you can force the trucks onto a B road. As per the technical report by your consultants.</p> <p>The current proposal does not solve the problem of the traffic in the town, there are hundreds of cars that will not use the truck relief road, cars which start to arrive after 5am. This proposal is inadequate and pointless."</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No proposed changes.	
394	Ralph Worfolk	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"There seems to be no indication that HCV can be forced to use the relief road. Unless this can be guaranteed, with the current route encompassing a 10 km journey extension foot traffic heading North, and a longer journey time I think that the development of this road will not accomplish its aims."</p>	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	
398	Colin Ronald McCorkindale	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"As a resident of Barton, I have issue with the proposed link road choice.</p> <p>The current and future traffic volumes (following the opening of Wren phase 2) are not addressed by this option.</p> <p>Whilst in theory HGVs will be forced to utilise the route, the additional 1100 Wren employees will not.</p> <p>Even at current traffic levels they represent a nuisance in both morning and evening, this will be further exacerbated as the proposed route is not joined up with the wider needs for traffic control in the town.</p> <p>The previous proposal supported by the local council was a better option as it linked to the A15 close to town and would be more attractive for the Wren traffic to utilise."</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No proposed changes.	
399	Carol Brandrick-Dyke	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"All of the people were not asked to vote for the council's original plan. It was called a consultation which was turned into a vote by the council. This was not explained to the people at the beginning. Also, the consultation allowed 2 self interest groups to be involved without allowing or informing anyone else that they could be involved.</p> <p>To correct this, a vote for the scheme should be sent to all residents, similar to an election. This way the many</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road,</p>	No proposed changes.	

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			people who cannot use the internet can make comments and vote."	<p>almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>		
400	Alison Jenkins	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"The consultation for the truck relief road did not involve all residents of Barton. A consultation is not a vote, but it was turned into a vote. For such a major issue all of the people should have been asked to vote, like a referendum or election.</p> <p>Further, the Council has not provided any written confirmation saying that they can force trucks to use a B road from an A road. Why would we spend this amount of money without knowing this answer.</p> <p>The council never invited any parties to participate in the planning consultation, only 2 self interest groups, who were self serving?"</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No proposed changes.	
401	Adrian Branderick	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"At no time were, other parties invited to participate in the writing of the consultation documents, like the 2 self interest groups were.</p> <p>At no time were people residing in Barton told the consultation would result in a final plan. The council's previous plans did not. Why not have a full vote for all residents (as many do not have internet skills) like an election.</p> <p>Lastly, the Council's own consultants state that they might not have a case to force trucks onto a B road from an A road. Is this not the first step before spending 12 million pounds?"</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is</p>	No proposed changes.	

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
				delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan. Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)		
440	Peter Dixon	Paragraph 14.47	Is anything actually happening? I don't care which plan is being suggested as long as something happens to stop this relentless traffic crashing through Barton.	Comments noted. During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding. The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan. Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)	No proposed changes.	View PDF
445	Ian Stuart on behalf of Keigar Homes	Paragraph 14.47	"It is now proposed that the link road should merely run from Barrow Road to Caister Road. In principle this is supported although the precise alignment and funding arrangements are questionable. Hearing Sessions: Keigar Homes wishes to participate in hearing sessions because as a very experienced local company it feels well able to contribute to the debate. In particular the company is currently developing land in the locality and has a continuing interest in the area."	Comments noted. During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding. The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan. Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)	No proposed changes.	View PDF
447	David Medd	Paragraph 14.47	"Having read a random newsletter delivered to my property on Ferriby Road, Barton upon Humber, I'm dismayed and disgusted months of meetings and proposals have failed, to provide Barton with a much needed relief road.	Comments noted. During February 2023 the Government	No proposed changes.	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>Comments from Wren Kitchens of apparent additional fuel costs by trucks adding mileage to their journey. Wren Kitchens must generate millions in revenue annually. Owned by the Healey's who reside near Hull, probably wouldn't want the same heavy traffic near their residence especially the sleepy village of Hotham where Malcom Healey himself resides. The wealthy businessman worth over £1 billion!</p> <p>Barton doesn't need the added traffic to an already chaotic town centre. To read the findings that a relief road is now looking to be not happening is preposterous. I shall personally now seriously be thinking of selling my property in a bid to escape the mayhem in the town centre caused by Wren Kitchens and their employees."</p>	<p>announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>		
452	Helen Wilkinson	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"I wish to make some short representations in regards to the current consultation on the proposed Barton Link Road.</p> <p>I understand that the proposals to safeguard the Barton Link Road route would form a link road through a proposed development forming part of a housing allocation, to join the A1077/Falkland Way to Caistor Road and connect to the A15 Bonby Lodge interchange via the B1206.</p> <p>I have a number of concerns with this proposal, including the effects on the area around the proposed upgrading of Caister Road. The hamlet of Deepdale is likely to bear the brunt of the proposed works, especially during any upgrading or installation of a new roundabout, despite lying within a Special Landscape Area; this designation and any potential impacts upon it, should be considered in full prior to the route being safeguarded to ensure there are no negative impacts, or that any impacts can be effectively mitigated. Additional landscaping along the safeguarded route should be considered, providing screening, reducing travelling noise but also enhancing biodiversity.</p> <p>I appreciate that currently, the Local Plan is only seeking to safeguard the proposed route, however the currently proposed link road could act as a precursor to wider development in this area, leading to urban sprawl beyond current development limits to the south-east of Barton, negatively impacting the Special Landscape Area and the open countryside. Developments shouldn't be considered in isolation, and a more holistic approach should be considered as to the wider and longer term impacts of safeguarding this route. Indeed, the Barton Link Road Technical Note 2 Final Issue 25.03.2022 document, which I note is not subject to this consultation, considered that the proposed link road in its current form could 'unlock potential future development land to the south-east and east of Barton.'</p> <p>One less invasive option could be to upgrade the existing Burnham Road/Caistor Road junction, rather than commit to a new roundabout, which will be of a significant expense and cause significant disruption. Whatever the solution, if the proposed route is safeguarded, mitigation measures to reduce through traffic, such traffic calming measures and weight limitations are essential along Burnham Road to not only protect residential amenity, but to also help to conserve the Special Landscape Area and the associated ecology. Burnham Road is a country lane with no road markings and is not suitable for an increase in traffic.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No change proposed	View PDF
458	Ian Lawless on behalf of Jane Kirkby	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"Having been informed that final plans for a Barton relief road would be put forward by North Lincs own consultants, at a town meeting, I question how did it evolve that 2 self interest parties were allowed to present and advise on the subject.</p> <p>The relief road being considered fails to provide the infrastructure needed to relieve the traffic problems within the town. WREN personnel commuting from the North bank, are as much an issue as the trucks. Even when in place there is no promise that lorries can be removed from the town centre. Surely a road to the south of the town to Brigg road and then which can eventually connect to the A15 can provide the infrastructure necessary for future industrial and residential growth of the town.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the</p>	No proposed change	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>Unless internet savvy, it has been virtually impossible to follow the course of this enquiry. Reflecting in a vote of (700) surely does not represent a fair portion of the towns population. Proposed traffic signals at Holydyke/ Ferriby Road:</p> <p>When traffic lights have been erected during recent roads works, it has caused huge backlogs through the town and distressing noise/ pollution problems from some residents. The present system works better. Three lanes of traffic would force vehicles even closer to the cottages on North Holydyke."</p>	<p>Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>		
461	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"a) Positively prepared – there is no objectively assessed need for the road and this would therefore be inappropriate development in the countryside that is not outweighed by evidence.</p> <p>b) Justified – Proportionate evidence in relation to Ecology impact; heritage, the costs of the road; light pollution; Landscape impact has not been provided.</p> <p>c) Effective – the road is not deliverable as the costing is inaccurate and incomplete. The source of finance for this road is also undefined therefore it is unclear who will pay for this road, and when.</p> <p>d) Consistent with national policy – The proposed Link road would contradict NPPF 130, 131, 153, 174, 185. Amongst other impacts, landscape and climate change have not been considered."</p> <p>"Unsustainable pattern of growth into Countryside Policy area, away from main arterial transport corridor.</p> <p>New carriageway section in consistent with national policy (longer journey times, undesirable; economic impact on Town centre of banning HGVs (deliveries); environmental impact of building a physical structure on Grade 2 agri land; landscape impact has not been properly assessed</p> <p>Climate change – NPPF 8c) aims to minimise pollution. The elongated vehicular routes that would be created by the proposed link road would unnecessarily extend vehicle journeys and would therefore be contrary to this point. The 'disposal of unacceptable material' and associated haulage would have a significant environmental impact in terms of creation of waste and air pollution – this environmental impact has not been properly considered in the context of climate change. there has been no comparison of the increased journey times/ carbon impact versus the environmental impact of keeping HGVs in the town. The focus of the assessment centres around traffic numbers albeit the conclusions of the report are not conclusive. No consideration has been given to any carbon offsetting for the new road nor to the associated costs. Further justification in terms of pedestrian/ cyclist/ AQ benefits in the town centre should be evidenced/ reported as they are necessary in order to substantiate the logic behind the road.</p> <p>Tree-lined streets – "Planning policies ... should ensure that new streets are tree-lined" – this cost has not been considered by the Council. This should encompass the initial cost of the trees being bought and planted, as well as the ongoing maintenance costs which would inevitably fall to the Council. Whilst proving that the proposal is economically unsustainable, it also demonstrates that NLC have ignored NPPF policies.</p> <p>Landscape - the proposed upgrade to the section of Caistor Road would fall within the protected "Deepdale" (policy DQE1 8.f) Landscape area. Insufficient consideration has been given toward the light pollution that would arise from the proposed road alignment; the increase in light pollution would cause detriment to the wider countryside policy area and to the 'Deepdale' Landscape designation. The topography of the proposed link road, and the NPPF requirement (131) for new streets to be treelined would introduce a significant new feature in the landscape. As the proposed development of a new link road would introduce large physical features and introduce more traffic, intensifying the use of the existing road (hence more noise and pollution); it would blatantly contradict the Council's own policy wording under DQE1 1. The proposed link road would also contradict NPPF 20 d (conservation of landscapes); 130 c; 153, 174; 185 c.</p> <p>Ecology – planning application 2021/0151 was refused due to its impacts upon the Humber Estuary. The impact of the proposed link road upon the Humber Estuary have not been proportionately assessed. The loss of hedgerows associated with the proposed link road have also not been properly quantified or considered.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No proposed change.	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>HCV restrictions would have inevitable impacts upon businesses in Barton town Centre that would be limited in receiving deliveries and would have impacts on locations to the east of Barton, such as Barrow upon Humber. A weight restriction was not deemed to be necessary at the time of consideration of the Wren Kitchen site planning application, therefore there is no justifiable need at this point. "4 HCV's per hour" in the peak hour would not necessitate a weight restriction and would undermine the Council's assertion as to the necessity of this link road. The enforcement of a restriction is unrealistic and uneconomical.</p> <p>The need for the road has not been robustly justified; the purpose of the scheme seems to be to displace lorries from the Town Centre rather than to meet an identified lack of capacity in the town. This scheme is more of a highway environmental scheme rather than a scheme necessary as a result of development and there is no explanation in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan about this road or how it will be financed. It appears that the evidence has been retrofitted to respond to the political ambition, rather than using an evidence-led approach to determine local requirements</p> <p>The proposed link road is inherently unsustainable due to the environmental and economic impacts. Suggested actions--</p> <p>Publish all referenced documents for a full consultation in accordance with the Local Plan Regulations.</p> <p>Provide a robust justification for the road, including a detailed costing of all aspects.</p> <p>Provide detailed assessments for the impacts of the road in relation to: ecology; landscape; heritage trees/hedgerows and climate change.</p>			
464	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Paragraph 14.47	<p>"Banks Property object to the assertion in paragraph 14.47 that Barton upon Humber can only accommodate an additional 583 dwellings prior to any link road being implemented and operational. As set out in our representations to the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan, we do not believe that the town's highways capacity is restricted to such a quantum of new housing growth. This position is reinforced by a general lack of evidence provided by the Council. Despite the additional information being made publicly available through the local plan addendum, there remains documents referred to that have not been published and reliance on an evidence base which is not properly justified.</p> <p>5.2 Furthermore, there is little explanation as to the change in route proposed for the link road. The new alignment has been drawn precisely and the assertion that only an 'indicative route' has been identified does not appear to be accurate. It appears that the alignment is referred to as an 'indicative route' to ensure less scrutiny is placed on the route.</p> <p>5.3 As previously stated in our representations to the pre-submission draft local plan, Banks Property support a Barton link road in the future once a clear requirement for the road has been established to support future housing growth in the town and following an alignment which has been carefully considered taking into account environmental constraints and detailed costings for the delivery of the road. As set out in our representations to the pre-submission draft local plan, proposed housing site H1P-13 (Land off Barrow Road) appears to be reliant on the delivery of the first section Barton link road. The proposed alignment would place a burden upon the H1P-13 housing site through the need to build an overengineered route through their site or to provide funding to support the delivery of a road which is yet to be objectively justified in planning terms. It is likely that further sites, adjacent to the proposed road, will come forward in the future. H1P-13 (319 dwellings) makes insufficient reference to a Link Road in the Local Plan; it does not include a trigger for funding or a mechanism for bringing forward the road, it is also ambiguous as to what an 'appropriate financial contribution' comprises. The financial contribution has not formed part of the viability assessment for this site and the site has not been properly assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal. Additional access points (H1P-13.1.c) are likely to cause detriment to highways safety due to the proximity with the proposed A1077 roundabout on the proposed road alignment. It is also unclear what proportion of the link road will draw funding from this site - whether it is just the new section, the upgrade or the associated works such as tree planting.</p> <p>- The Council acknowledge that "there is a risk that new house building (and associated population increase) would not be matched by an increase in provision of local services, placing existing facilities under increased pressure". This therefore alludes to the necessitates locating new housing close to existing services where there is capacity to accommodate and scope to improve to meet the needs of an increased population."</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No proposed change.	View PDF
369	Simon Morgan	Paragraph 14.48	<p>"North Lincolnshire Council have very regrettably chosen to change the route of Barton Link Road following a consultation exercise in January and February 2022 (not formally part of the local plan process). A proposal from a local campaign group (RAID) was selected, however the proposal was a just a concept, with no detailed technical information or external validation available during the consultation process. This is a</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up</p>	No proposed change.	

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>questionable basis on which to amend the route in the local plan documentation.</p> <p>As part of this stage of the local plan process, a Barton Link Road Technical Note #2 has been made publicly available for the first time, which undermines some of the arguments in favour of the currently proposed Barton Link Road alignment via Caistor Road and the B1206. The details of improvements to Caistor Road state that a cycleway would not be provided, which presents a serious safety risk given that the route is currently used by cyclists. A combination of heavy lorries and cyclists, along with generally increased traffic levels, on a windy hilly road could be extremely dangerous. No assessment of safety risks has been made publicly available so I would have to assume that this element of the local plan is being proposed without considering road safety implications?</p> <p>It is also further proposed that no changes would be made to the B1206, which raises further road safety concerns that have not been reviewed. The B1206/Burnham Road junction is a steep uphill junction with poor visibility. Any increase in traffic, be that on the B1206 or from rat-running along Burnham Road through Deepdale, will add to the existing risks here, yet neither the technical note nor any other local plan supporting document addresses this. Between Burnham Road and the A15, the B1206 has two sharp bends that no assessment has been made of during the technical note. The ability of these bends to safely accommodate extra traffic, including extra HGVs, has not been reviewed before amending the Barton Link Road route in the local plan.</p> <p>The technical note then addresses the issue of prohibiting HGVs from travelling through Barton Upon Humber Town Centre post the completion of the Barton Link Road. The proponents of the currently proposed Barton Link Road alignment used the potential to relatively quickly significantly reduce HGVs in Barton Town Centre as a key element of their proposal. However the technical note concludes that implementing a prohibition may be difficult to implement. This highlights the questionable process North Lincolnshire Council have followed to change the Barton Link Road route in the local plan this key point was only raised after the January/February route consultation was concluded and this local plan consultation is the first time that the public have been able to respond to this key point.</p> <p>Table 3 of the technical note then highlights how the proposed Barton Link Road alignment will mean traffic heading to/from the Humber Bridge or South Ferriby would face a 4 minute 14 second longer journey via the proposed Barton Link Road alignment compared to using the current A1077 route via Barton Town Centre and a 10.01km increase in distance travelled. The end result is that the new link road would unlikely to be used for many journeys, with significant amounts of traffic still heading through Barton Town Centre on the A1077. The currently proposed alignment is effectively a half measure, only provided relief for traffic heading south on the A15. Local Transport Projects, the authors of the technical note conclude. Based on this delay penalty, it is considered unlikely that trips from A15 (North) or A1077 (West) would reassign to the Option 1 route. Even if traffic did reassign to the currently proposed route, there would be a significant increase in carbon emissions from the increased distance travelled. The earlier proposed alignment in Stage 4 (publication draft) would have significantly minimised these increases in time, distance and carbon emissions by taking a far more northerly route to the A15. In turn more traffic would have likely used the new relief road, relieving capacity on the current A1077 through Barton Town Centre.</p>	<p>Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>		
403	Veronica Pettifer	Paragraph 14.48	<p>The new proposed road is certainly better than no relief road but I am concerned that the distance involved may mean little use is made of it unless there is a positive prohibition of heavy traffic through the town centre. The upgrade of Caistor Rd appears to lack any safe provision for cyclists or pedestrians. This defect need to be remedied.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p>	No proposed changes.	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
				Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)		
406	Ian Burnett	Paragraph 14.48	<p>"Looking at the new revised route it is obvious that this will "direct" much of the diverted traffic due south down Burnham Road- a National Cycle Route. Why would you divert along Caistor Road to the new roundabout with the B1206 when you can whizz down Burnham Road?</p> <p>There isn't a mention in the plan of a weight limit through Deepdale and this definitely needs implementing. The aforementioned weight limit wouldn't deter cars from using this route, so surely traffic calming measures/speed limit changes would be essential. A part-solution to this may be to exclude the roundabout at the top of Burnham Road (reducing costs) and simply swing the new carriageway in an arc to join Caistor Road – heading south-east."</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No proposed changes.	View PDF
437	John French	Paragraph 14.48	I believe the plan is unsound because the proposed route for a link road is not fit for purpose. The option 2 route - both phase 1 and phase 2 should be reinstated in the plan for the reasons set out in my previous representation.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No proposed changes.	View PDF
441	Gillian Judge	Paragraph 14.48	"Barton needs a relief road to take the through traffic out of the town however the proposed route will not solve the issue, only causing more problems. The road from Caistor Road to the B1206 will need to be widened and dangerous bends straightened to accommodate heavy lorries. A large roundabout will be needed at the junction of the B1206 and at the Deepdale junction if cars are expected to use the road through the hamlet. The present road through Deepdale is a route one cycle route , which is the only quiet	<p>Comments noted</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road,</p>	No proposed change	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			road out of Barton up to the Wolds. It is very popular with cyclists many coming from over the Humber Bridge and from the North sea Ferry. The roads are also used by runners, the Deepdale Dash being very popular with runners from all over the North of England- this will not be able to take place with heavy traffic. A different route from caistor Road to Brigg Road would be the best route with connection to the Humber bridge hen funds allow. Barton will not benefit from Wrens lorries taking a longer route to the A15 junction. The cars are causing the problem and will not use the proposed route, adding more time and field to their journey. Barton needs a relief road connection to the Humber Bridge eventually and the route through to Brigg Road is 3 quarters of the way there. "	almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding. The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan. Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)		
443	Pete Adams on behalf of RAID	Paragraph 14.48	<p>"(1) Areas of High Landscape Value</p> <p>Policy DQE1 specifies Deepdale (para 8f) in this category. Rightly so, we believe. NLC has previously been asked, via several routes (including in writing) why the directly adjoining and equally attractive Southern Approach to Barton upon Humber should be any different to this rating. No response or explanation has been forthcoming. This is a highly relevant and important question as a Developer (Banks) is seeking to build on this greenbelt land that is currently outside of current/proposed development areas - and that would fall within the proposed AONB area extension application referred to in the Local Plan.</p> <p>(2) Relief Road (aka Link Road)</p> <p>Subsequent to a major (and fully democratic) Consultation exercise, Sections 14.47 and 14.48 now describe the road route preferred by circa 75% of those who responded. Having proposed this route, RAID continues to support its early implementation. Important associated issues include NLC's acknowledgement that Barton's services and infrastructure are already seriously overloaded and that building development should be carefully regulated pending the opening of this route. This acknowledged need for regulation raises severe concerns about the Developer-led outline planning application (currently refused), referred to in (1), above.</p> <p>(3) Relief Road Technical Support Document - Previous</p> <p>There have been various road schemes evaluated and there is potential for confusion when referring to the numbering system.</p> <p>History In the most recent consultation (Q1, 2022) Relief Road Option 2 - skirting relatively close to the Southern boundary of Barton, connecting to the B1218 and with eventual intent to connect to the A15 - is similar, in principle, to a route previously tabled for consultation in mid 2021. The validity of this earlier consultation was challenged. There was absolutely no mention of housing development and the Banks outline application materialised soon after the mid 2021 road consultation had closed. Subsequent to FOI (and other) requests, a previous Local Plan consultation period was extended on the verge of its originally proposed cutoff date - when a Technical Note (May 2021) relating to the Relief Road was released. This indicated that various routes - none like the one now covered via Section 14.47 and 14.48 - were focused on building development rather than prioritising early traffic relief.</p> <p>Facts It's not thought that anybody would argue that the exponential increase in traffic travelling through Barton is primarily due to Wren's site to the East of Barton. Also, that the A1077 route through Barton between the Wren site and the A15/A1077 interchange is the shortest road distance available, in practical terms.</p> <p>(4) Relief Road Technical Document - Current</p> <p>This was released as a supporting document for the current (Stage 5) Local Plan consultation. We consider it's not difficult to conclude that the Consultants seem to be rather keen to identify reasons why the ""peoples choice"" (quote from Barton Civic Society newsletter) route described in Section 14.47 and 14.48 may not work, as opposed to wanting to make it work. This is despite it being similar, in principle, to a</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan. Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No proposed change.	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>route proposed by Humberside County Council in the 1990s. Is this a case of ""not invented here""? Or some other agenda?</p> <p>It raises issues including the Authorities potentially not being able/bothered to enforce weight/access restrictions. That's equally applicable to the previous options they covered - yet never highlighted at the time of the report's release. That's curious, and the reality is that such issues are increasingly addressed via CCTV/ANPR nowadays. Also of concern is that the Consultants appear to have a somewhat blinkered view. Have they even considered that routing (at least) the Wren HGV traffic via Bonby Interchange would encourage such travel to/from Scunthorpe via the A15/M180/M181 and mainly distant from dwellings?</p> <p>That is, instead of using the A1077 (Barton/South Ferriby/Winterton/Roxby) and negotiating noise and pollution-generating routes and inclines along the way. Plus negotiating the chicane frequently created via (perfectly legitimate) vehicles parked at South Ferriby Post Office. Wren (and others) should encourage using (or be encouraged to use) major trunk roads for (at least) HGVs. Wren have previously stated that they would support any relief road solution. We don't recall that important claim being mentioned in the report. The reality is that many private/smaller vehicles would still use their own preferred route through Barton. Because they can. However, sensible traffic controls and Wren applying robust Transport Plans and ""Good Neighbour"" policies (as utilised by other community-sensitive companies in the area) could provide at least some mitigation. In summary, we consider it to be a somewhat negatively biased document with selective content. >></p>			
438	Nick Turner	Paragraph 14.49	<p>"Everything should be done to keep Wren generated traffic off the streets and roads of this historic market town. At the present time the traffic levels are intolerable and the prospect of increasing the Wren – generated traffic significantly is intolerable. The construction of a southern relief road would seem to us to be the right course of action and if it means that costs would rise as a result, so be it</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No proposed changes.	View PDF
439	Gill Turner	Paragraph 14.49	<p>"Everything should be done to keep Wren generated traffic off the streets and roads of this historic market town. At the present time the traffic levels are intolerable and the prospect of increasing the Wren – generated traffic significantly is intolerable. The construction of a southern relief road would seem to us to be the right course of action and if it means that costs would rise as a result, so be it</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the</p>	No proposed changes.	

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
				local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan. Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)		

15 Development Management

472	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	Paragraph 15.38-15.41 Additional paragraphs.	"We welcome the inclusion of this section on Water Environment, which we proposed in our Regulation 19 comments."	Comments and support noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
435	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	Paragraph 15.38-15.41 Additional paragraphs.	"Severn Trent are supportive of the principles outlined within paragraph 15.39, but would recommend that a minor amendment to the wording to support Severn Trent and Anglian Water's River Pledge."	Comments and support noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
446	Ian Stuart on behalf of Keigar Homes	Paragraph 15.38-15.41 Additional paragraphs.	"At paragraph 10.a of the Addendum it now states that development proposals should include an assessment of whether an adequate supply of water would be available to support the proposed development. This Policy purports to be about protection of the environment but this form of wording could be construed as relating to the availability of a water supply which is a very different thing. As such it could improperly be used as a tool to undermine and potentially prevent the provision of housing as otherwise provided for in the draft Local plan. Paragraph 10 f of the policy effectively offers protection to aquifers and groundwater sources so paragraph 10 a is unnecessary. Objection: For these reasons we object on the grounds that it fails the test of soundness in not being justified and inconsistent with national policy."	This was not a proposed change as this was also included in the Publication Draft consultation plan therefore this text was not up for consultation as only those proposed changes in red were being consulted upon. The text included at the Publication Draft was at the request of the Environment Agency.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
436	Chris Bramley on behalf of Severn Trent Water	DM3: Environmental Protection Question 10	"Severn Trent are supportive of the principles outlined within Policy DM3, in particular the inclusion of the additional text on Bullet point 10 b, highlighting that infrastructure capacity can be provided for new development. We are also supportive of the approach to reduce household demand to 110 l/hd/d. and the need to protect groundwater and prevent contamination."	Comments and support noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
473	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	DM3: Environmental Protection Question 10	"In line with our advice, the heading 'Water Environment' has been moved to include point 9 and the text of point 10 has been amended. However, point 10f reads 'protecting aquifers and groundwater are protected in sensitive'... 'protecting' should be removed."	Comments noted. Agree the duplication of the word protecting should be removed.	See MM99. See Main Modification ref MM98	View PDF
477	Ian Stuart on behalf of Keigar Homes	DM3: Environmental Protection Question 10	"At paragraph 10.a of the Addendum it now states that development proposals should include an assessment of whether an adequate supply of water would be available to support the proposed development. This Policy purports to be about protection of the environment but this form of wording could be construed as relating to the availability of a water supply which is a very different thing. As such it could improperly be used as a tool to undermine and potentially prevent the provision of housing as otherwise provided for in the draft Local plan. Paragraph 10 f of the policy effectively offers protection to aquifers and groundwater sources so paragraph 10 a is unnecessary. Objection: For these reasons we object on the grounds that it fails the test of soundness in not being justified and inconsistent with national policy."	This was not a proposed change as this was also included in the Publication Draft consultation plan therefore this text was not up for consultation as only those proposed changes in red were being consulted upon. The text included at the Publication Draft was at the request of the Environment Agency.	No proposed changes.	View PDF

Appendix 1: Mineral Site Details

407	Paul Foster on behalf of Egdon Resources	Appendix 1 MIN6-14a	"Appendix 1 – Site Ref MIN6-14a – Wressle Oil Well: We welcome the inclusion of the Wressle Oil Well as a Mineral Site in Appendix 1. The appeal granting planning permission allowed for the production of both oil and gas at Wressle. Therefore, we wish to see the title amended to "Wressle Oil and Gas Wellsite". The following information is missing and should be included: - Mineral: Oil and Gas - Gross Site Area: 1.85ha	Comments noted.	See Main Modification ref MM90	View PDF
-----	--	---------------------	---	-----------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------

Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework

430	Simon Jones on behalf of Highways	Appendix 6: Monitoring	"Appendix 6 contains additional items added to the monitoring framework, of note are:	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
-----	-----------------------------------	------------------------	---	-----------------	----------------------	--------------------------

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
	England	Framework Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> T1: Promoting Sustainable Transport T2: Promoting Public Transport T3: New Development and Transport T4: Parking T7: Safeguarding Transport Infrastructure <p>We welcome the inclusion of these additional items and would request to have sight of the monitoring data surrounding these additional items, when available. These monitoring items will be of assistance in managing impacts on the SRN in the plan period."</p>			

Inset Plans

455	James Rigby on behalf of Brocklesby Estate	Map Inset 05 - Barnetby le wold	Reinsert site reference EC1-7 as an allocated employment site (specifically for a service station and lorry park).	Comments noted. Policy EC-1.7 allocated land to the south of Barnetby Top Interchange and to the west of the A18 for development as a service station and lorry park. This allocation is no longer required as policies TC1 and T6 have now been amended to provide a policy framework supporting any suitable proposals for roadside retail, lorry parking and other facilities essential to support the safety and welfare of motorists. This allows a range of suitable proposals to come forward wherever the need arises.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
421	Emilie Carr on behalf of Historic England	Map 07a Barton Upon Humber Proposed Link Road	"Archaeology should be fully considered and the advice of NLC's heritage officer followed for a staged program of investigation to inform the minimisation of impact through design as well as mitigation. Beacon Hill within the area enclosed by the bypass line is noted, this and the historic turnpike heading south are important landscape features and should be carefully considered."	Comments noted. Archaeology will be taken on board when confirmed details of the proposed link road are taken forward. This proposed link road is at the early stages and the route was shown to future safeguard any proposed road.	No proposed changes.	View PDF

Evidence Base

460	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Evidence Base Barton Link Road Technical Note #2	<p>"a) Positively prepared – irrespective of the final proposed route, the need for this link road has not been objectively assessed, the justification is based on political ambition rather than evidence.</p> <p>b) Justified – The evidence used is not 'proportionate' as it has not been properly scrutinised by the public hence has contravened the processes set out in the Local Plan Regulations.</p> <p>c) Effective – the Local Plan is ineffective as it does not demonstrate a need for the link road</p> <p>d) Consistent with national policy – all policies should be underpinned by up-to-date evidence (NPPF 31.). The Barton Highways Masterplan (LTP, 2018) has not been published on the Council's Evidence Base therefore cannot be relied upon in this Local Plan. The date of publication (2018) would also suggest that this document precedes much of the development in recent years in Barton Upon Humber and the document therefore is out-of-date. "</p> <p>"According to the Council, the following documents have been used to inform the 'BARTON LINK ROAD TECHNICAL NOTE #2 (25/03/2022)':</p> <p>'Barton Highways Masterplan (LTP, 2018), Barton Link Road Preliminary Design Layout Briefing Note (LTP, 2020a), Barton Southern Access Road, North Lincolnshire Feasibility Design Assessment Summary Note (LTP, 2020b), Barton Link Road Technical Note (LTP, 2021a) and A1077 Corridor Improvements Technical Note (LTP, 2021b).'</p> <p>The only documents from this list that have been published in the Evidence Base are the Barton Link Road Technical Note (May 2021) and A1077 Corridor Improvements Technical Note (LTP, 2021b). None of the remaining documents in this list documents have been published to the Council's evidence base nor have they been subject to proper consultation they therefore should not form the basis on which this technical note is written. Documents referenced in a Local Plan should form part of the evidence base and should follow the formal consultation process. This lack of proper process therefore undermines the integrity of the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>During February 2023 the Government announced through the latest Levelling -Up Funding that Barton upon Humber is to receive £20M which will build a new link road, almost nine miles of new cycle routes built and transform the train station. The council has demonstrated a commitment to delivering the Barton Link Road which is substantiated by the Evidence based documents (TRA01, TRA02, TRA10-TRA13) and now the latest Levelling -Up Funding.</p> <p>The council will continue to work with landowners, statutory consultees, and the local community to ensure the link road is delivered, however it has only been identified as an indicative route within the plan.</p> <p>Transport revolution in Barton confirmed as further levelling-up details revealed - North Lincolnshire Council (northlincs.gov.uk)</p>	No change proposed.	View PDF
-----	--------------------------------------	--	--	--	---------------------	--------------------------

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			Barton Link Road policy that forms part of the emerging Local Plan. Suggested Actions-Publish all referenced documents for a full consultation in accordance with the Local Plan Regulations. These documents should be subject to a separate 6 week consultation in order to substantiate the assumptions made in the Technical Note. Any valid points made in response to this consultation should be addressed through amendments made by the Council."			

General

423	Guy Hird on behalf of North East Lindsey Internal Drainage Board	General	"Dear Sir/Madam, North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2020 to 2038) - Publication Draft (Regulation 19) Addendum 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. The Board has no further comment on the Addendum.The Board will continue to comment on individual planning applications."	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
427	Nicola Ward on behalf of Doncaster Council	General	"Dear Sir/Madam Thank you for consulting Doncaster Council on the North Lincolnshire Local Plan – Publication Draft (Regulation 19) Addendum. This is an email to confirm that Doncaster Council will not be commenting on this stage of the Local Plan.	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
432	Simon Jones on behalf of Highways England	General	"Thank you for consulting us on the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2020 – 2038) Publication Draft Addendum (May 2022). We acknowledge the consultation no longer seeks views on alternative options, but instead presents the opportunity to comment on focussed, proposed changes within a specific remit. We have reviewed the Addendum, taking into account our previous advice provided within the following documents issued to the LPA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Lincolnshire Local Plan – GraHAM Analysis and SRN Evidence Base (July 2020); and • North Lincolnshire Local Plan SRN Evidence Base – Addendum (February 2021). • For reference, our conclusion stated within these documents was that: • It is considered that the proposed infrastructure at the M181 terminating junction does not necessarily accommodate the quantum of development within the Plan throughout the plan period; and that the de-trunking of the M181 places the onus of infrastructure provision onto the council. As such, this location may require a more detailed analysis through the plan period to ascertain if any further mitigation needs to be provided at this location; • The eastbound merge at M180 Junction 5 approaches capacity in the 2038 morning peak and this may require a more detailed analysis through the plan period to ascertain if any mitigation needs to be provided at this location; and • Given the flows generated in the 2038 scenarios, it is considered that the A160 /Habrough Road roundabout may require a more detailed analysis through the plan period to ascertain if any mitigation needs to be provided at this location." 	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
433	Corinna Dietz on behalf of Marine Management Organisation	General	"Thank you for your invitation to participate in the consultation for the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2020 to 2038) - Publication Draft (Regulation 19) Addendum. 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 12/03/2018 and the Preferred Options stage on the 26/03/2020. Further, the MMO has provided a response to the Duty to Cooperate on the 06/04/2020 and signed the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Statement of Common Ground on the 26/11/2020. Lastly, a response was provided in November 2021 during the Publication Draft (Regulation 19) consultation. The MMO is aware of the limits to respond to consultation comments during the latest plan development stages and notes the endeavours of the council to comply with the Duty to Cooperate, but note that following the responses provided, North Lincolnshire Council has not made reference to the MMO or the East Marine	We note the MMO's continued engagement With the development of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan. In the statement of common ground the Council have made specific reference to the East Marin Plan, stating that "it is noted that specific policies, cited as relevant throughout the Statement of Common Ground and Appendix 1, must be read in the context of all other provisions within the East Marin Plans as appropriate". Furthermore, the SoCG highlights that the Council will continue its engagement with the MMO in relation to flood risk mitigation, working in partnership with the	No proposed changes.	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>Plans in the next stage of the plan development and has not provided a reasoning.</p> <p>We advise that you consider any relevant policies within the East Marine Plan Documents in regard to areas within the plan that may impact the marine environment, including the tidal extent of any rivers. We recommend the inclusion of the East Marine Plans when discussing any themes with coastal or marine elements.</p> <p>When reviewing the East Marine Plans to inform decisions that may affect the marine environment, please take a whole-plan approach by considering all marine plan policies together, rather than in isolation.</p> <p>For further information, a copy of the standard response is attached. Please note when considering the MMO as a consultee in the future to send correspondence directly to the consultation mailbox (cc'd in) to ensure the right person will pick it up."</p>	<p>Environment Agency.</p> <p>The MMO East Inshore Marine Plan has been considered in both the SFRA and plan-making process in relation to the impact on the marine environment. As part of this engagement the Council will actively consult with the MMO to ensure conformity with the East Martin Plans and the North Lincolnshire Local Plan.</p> <p>Section 5.67 of the SoCG states that "the marine environment is important, and the Council will continue to liaise with the MMO to ensure that there is strategic overlap in the plan making process. The East Marine Plans Policies BIO1 and BIO2 are of particular relevance to policies in the Local Plan which seek to secure biodiversity net gain. The MMO attends meetings with the Local Nature Partnerships and others, and this engagement ensures that there is no conflict between the natural and marine environment".</p>		
450	Melanie Lindsley on behalf of The Coal Authority	General	<p>"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.</p> <p>Although our records indicate that there are three mine entries present in the North Lincolnshire area none of these appear to be related to past coal mining activity. On this basis I can confirm that the Planning team at the Coal Authority have no specific comments to make on the consultation document.</p>	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
459	Chris Cole on behalf of East Riding of Yorkshire Council	General	The Publication Plan document is comprehensive and the overall approach complements the East Riding's Local Plan. There are limited functional housing and economic market connections between the two Authorities and we have responded to previous versions of the plan. We have no matters of soundness or legal compliance to raise. The following matters have been identified for consideration in making any further minor amendments to the Plan as it progresses through its examination process.	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF

Habitats Regulations Assessment

463	Joe Perkins	Habitats Regulations Assessment	"4.1 Banks Property support the HRA Addendum which identifies that the existing policies and provisions in the of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan Publication Draft Addendum, in relation to recreational pressures, urbanisation, atmospheric pollution, water pollution/siltation and flood and water management will ensure that the Local Plan will have no adverse effects on these European sites either alone or in combination with any other plans or projects."	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
482	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	Habitats Regulations Assessment	<p>"2.1 Recreational Pressures</p> <p>2.1.1 Natural England notes that the assessment relies on Footprint Ecology studies which were carried out at an estuary scale and in 2012 and 2014 so are now getting quite out of date. We recommend that you consider the approach undertaken by East Riding of Yorkshire Council to update these studies with more bespoke evidence for your plan area specifically.</p> <p>2.1.2 This will specifically assist in understanding the impacts of recreation (arising from new housing development and tourism) upon European sites within the Humber Estuary and be in line with the work East Riding of Yorkshire Council have used to underpin their evidence base and provide detailed and up to date visitor information (including the activities undertaken on site, reasons for site choice, and routes taken on site) on the parts of the Humber Estuary likely to be used for recreation by residents of North Lincolnshire.</p> <p>2.1.3 The visitor data can identify where new housing might result in increased recreation use of the estuary and provide the necessary information to underpin the HRA of the North Lincolnshire Plan.</p>	Production of a Statement of Common Ground is underway between the Council and Natural England to address this response. Further proposed modifications to the Plan will arise out of the Statement.	Proposed changes will arise out of the Statement of Common Ground which is underway between the Council and Natural England.	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>2.1.4 We consider that it would be of great benefit to join up the approach to recreational disturbance across the Humber Estuary so recommend that consideration is given to the approaches being undertaken by East Riding and North East Lincolnshire Council.</p> <p>2.1.5 Proposals that have the potential to increase recreational pressures on designated biodiversity assets should provide mitigation in the form of blue/green infrastructure provision. This could include provision of additional green spaces to provide choice and deter an increased number of visitors from using designated assets for recreational purposes.</p> <p>2.1.6 The potential impact of recreational pressure on international (habitats) sites should be considered in proximity to sensitive sites. Proposals for residential and/or tourism accommodation key sensitive locations may consider zoning, recreational pressure zone of influence which could contribute towards strategic programmes aimed at managing the impact of tourism and residents on international (habitats) sites.</p> <p>2.1.7 We have been unable to find any addition assessment regarding the impact of allocations on Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA, Thorne Moor SAC and Hatfield Moor SAC and refer you to our response dated 26 November 2021 (our ref 371224) regarding this matter.</p> <p>2.2 Urbanisation (functionally linked land for SPA/Ramsar birds)</p> <p>2.2.1 Natural England notes the updated assessment regarding the potential for a loss of functionally linked land for Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar and Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA birds in para 6.2 of the updated assessment. While we welcome the additional detail provided regarding the approach we consider that there is insufficient evidence for how this approach has been utilised in the screening and Appropriate Assessment stages of the assessment where little evidence of the approach is presented.</p> <p>2.2.2 Natural England advises that the assessment should include a table of allocations and policies relevant to this matter with details about how each one has been assessed in line with the criteria.</p> <p>2.2.3 Regarding the methodology employed Natural England has a number of questions about the approach set out in para 6.2 as follows:</p> <p>For points 1) to 4) for sites related to the Humber Estuary to be screened in, is it considered LSE if a site meets any of these characteristics or only if multiple characteristics are met?</p> <p>We note that the Humber Estuary High Tide Roosts Review and South Humber Bank bird data is now quite dated. Mitigation has already been agreed for the South Humber Bank sites however for sites which may be high tide roosts we would advise seeking further evidence from the Local Records Centre and local experts such as the RSPB to compensate for the age of the data.</p> <p>We would like to see a definition for 'Large Fields'.</p> <p>Is it the gigantic one Hughes, James has been looking at?</p> <p>Regarding indicators 1) to 4) to rule out LSE in relation to functionally linked land on the Humber Estuary, is it considered not LSE if a site meets any of these characteristics or only if multiple characteristics are met?</p> <p>For the indicator regarding the enclosure of land we advise that, if the site is of a sufficient size the enclosure of the land will be less of a factor.</p> <p>2.2.4 We strongly advise that local records centre data and evidence held by local groups such as the Wildlife Trust, RSPB and Local Nature Partnerships etc are taken into consideration and that, where uncertainties remain regarding whether a site is functionally linked or not, that bird surveys are undertaken.</p> <p>2.2.5 It may be helpful to use a risk based or traffic light assessment of allocations in order to assess the relative risk of different sites based on, for instance:</p> <p>Distance to the designated site;</p> <p>Habitat type/ land use, current and recent habitat;</p> <p>Size of the ecological unit where development site is located. (for example, whole field/ open area); and</p> <p>Current and recent human disturbance levels.</p> <p>2.2.6 Regarding Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA we would like to see further details of the screening assessment undertaken for sites in proximity to the SPA and consideration of taking a policy approach similar to Doncaster Local Plan Policy 30 for windfall development.</p>			

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>2.3 Atmospheric Pollution</p> <p>2.3.1 Natural England notes the reference to traffic modelling studies in Table 7-1 and 7-4 of the Appropriate Assessment however we are unable to find any data or description of what study has been undertaken. Natural England would need to see this evidence in order to satisfy the concerns set out in our letter dated 26 November 2021 (our ref 371224).</p> <p>2.3.2 We welcome the reference to guidance NEA001 Natural England's approach to advising competent authorities on the assessment of road traffic emissions under the Habitats Regulations (Natural England, 2018) however we would recommend only judicious use of Highways Agency (2019) Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) LA 105 Air Quality as we do not recommend some of the methods set out. On a precautionary basis we would recommend the use of a 200m buffer distance around roads rather than the 20-100m distance.</p> <p>2.3.3 Natural England is unclear how in-combination assessment has been undertaken and advises that where traffic data is available for neighbouring plans and programmes this should be considered in the in-combination assessment. Furthermore we advise, in line with Wealden v SSCLG [2017] ('the Wealden Judgment 2017'), in combination assessment should consider the combined effects of predicted traffic levels below the significance thresholds (eg 1000AADT or 200 AADT for HDV).</p> <p>2.3.4 Finally we note that the Appropriate Assessment relies on mitigation in policy DM3 for point source emissions and a wider requirement under Policy MIN6. Natural England notes that DM3 is concerned only with AQMA's which are for human receptors and as such will not provide mitigation for ecological impacts while MIN6 makes only a very brief reference to air quality and is concerned with specific minerals sites only.</p> <p>2.3.5 Natural England advises that these policies do not provide appropriate mitigation for the issues identified in the Appropriate Assessment. We advise that the Plan should include specific policy wording and supporting text in order to ensure that adequate assessment is undertaken and that appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures are incorporated in projects that come forward."</p>			

Infrastructure Delivery Schedule April 2022

476	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	Infrastructure Delivery Schedule April 2022	"Item 16 Flooding and Drainage – South Humber Bank – 2020-2038: Site developer in consultation with NLC and EA: 'Food defence enhancement scheme to land north of Humber Sea Terminal' – typo, should be 'Flood'."	Comments noted. A minor amendment has been listed to address this spelling mistake.	A minor amendment will correct the evidence base spelling mistake.	View PDF
-----	---	---	--	---	--	--------------------------

Infrastructure Delivery Plan April 2022

429	Simon Jones on behalf of Highways England	Infrastructure Delivery Plan April 2022	"This review has highlighted that the issues which are required to be considered in association with the Publication Draft Addendum Plan remain largely the same as previously advised, and that our previously presented evidence bases remain robust subject to clarification of any post plan impacts of Lincolnshire Lakes. Our evidence base has identified that the M180 Junction 5 and the A160 / Habrough Road junction is approaching capacity in 2038."	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
475	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	Infrastructure Delivery Plan April 2022	"Spelling error on front cover - 'Infrastructure'. Page 19 - 'H2100' - 'due to be submitted to Defra for approval at the end of 2021'. The Local Plan Addendum on page 224, 9.45 has a more recent target: 'due to be submitted to Defra for approval at the end of 2023.'"	The word Infrastructure will be updated so it is spelt correctly.	A minor amendment will correct the evidence base spelling mistake.	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
Sustainability Appraisal						
462	Joe Perkins on behalf of Banks Group	Sustainability Appraisal	<p>"a) Positively prepared – The strategy does not meet the OAN for housing as the strategy is discordant with NPPF. New homes should be ‘Well located’, meaning that they are located in the most sustainable locations adjacent to high levels of service provision. The submitted site to the South of Horkstow Road in Barton upon Humber would improve ‘the scope for access ... by public transport’, whilst delivering up to 400 homes in one of the most sustainable locations in the Local Authority – these credentials have been ignored by the Council due to political ambitions.</p> <p>b) Justified – Proportionate evidence in relation to Ecology impact; the costs of the road; light pollution; Landscape impact has not been provided.</p> <p>c) Effective – The Council has erred when stating it has allocated development in ‘the most appropriate locations’. The allocated site in the plan fail to respond to local service provision and seem to ignore the settlement hierarchy. Other questions of deliverability arise when looking at sites that strongly relate to, or are dependent upon, the delivery of a relief road. The Council have asserted that only 583 dwellings can be delivered over the plan period, however this figure has not been robustly justified with objective evidence. As stated in our previous representations, we therefore fundamentally disagree with the Council’s spatial strategy and choice of housing sites.</p> <p>d) Consistent with national policy – NPPF (15) requires plans to ‘provide a positive vision for the future of each area’. The Council’s vision is too restrictive and does not promote growth.</p> <p>"The draft Local Plan vision and spatial objectives were set out by North Lincolnshire Council at the Issues & Options (Regulation 18) stage, during which they were assessed against the SA framework and were subject to public and stakeholder consultation. At this stage the Vision and Objectives were found to be acceptable in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>“Sustainable growth will be at the heart of all policies in the Local Plan” And “Growth will take place in the most appropriate locations”. Barton upon Humber is the second most sustainable location in the Local Authority, yet the Council have significantly reduced the number of houses in this location on the basis of Local objections and political aspirations, rather than an objective assessment of the suitability of each site and the sustainability of the settlement.A78.Suggested Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publish all referenced documents for a full consultation in accordance with the Local Plan Regulations. • The wording of the Council’s vision should be amended to be more positive and promote growth. • Amend allocations to comply with the Council’s vision of allocating sites in the ‘most appropriate locations’." 	The Council has published all referenced documents for consultation. The Plan does plan positively for future growth.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
465	Joe Perkins	Sustainability Appraisal	<p>"Spatial Objective 3 scores weakly against the SA objectives. (table 5-2), suggesting that significant changes need to be made to housing related policies. The most notable (table 6-1) are policies SS5 and SS6, additionally the affordable housing policy scored weakly (6-2), which suggests that additional housing sites are required.</p> <p>Table 7-4 highlights that all the highlighted sites in Barton create Heritage issues. These issues have not been properly addressed within the policy wording. More suitable alternative sites are available, name land to the South of Horkstow Road.</p> <p>Table 7-5 highlights the high level of service provision in Barton upon Humber – this, again, confirms that more homes should be allocated in Barton.</p> <p>Figure 7-2 and table 5-15 have failed to assess several reasonable alternative sites that have been confirmed to be available via the submission of planning applications outwith the Local Plan process. These sites, including land to the S of Horkstow Road in Barton upon Humber, should be assessed as reasonable alternatives in the Sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>In appendix A of this document, Policy SS2 is not fully assessed. Whilst the different options are mentioned, there is no assessment of which is the best option for the spatial strategy and no robust justification has been provided for the spatial strategy.</p> <p>In the Appendix A of this document, Policy SS5.3 is incorrectly assessed as automatically creating a greater flood risk. This should be amended to confirm that a property mitigated scheme can actually potentially alleviate flood risk in some circumstances. Policy SS5.7 is incorrectly omits that fact the suitably located sites with proper mitigation strategies can actually help to combat climate change, for example the planning</p>	The Evidence base topic paper Settlement Hierarchy and Growth topic paper (HOU07) also explains the growth options and reasons for these decisions. This states The proposed growth in Barton upon Humber has been reduced since the Preferred Options Stage (2020) due to capacity issues and constraints on the existing local highway network. The Council commissioned Local Transport Planning (LTP) to undertake an assessment of capacity of the local highway network with specific focus on the A1077 (the principal road running east/west through the town). This study identified the number of dwellings that could be delivered in the town without significant impact on the operation of the A1077 and local highway network. It identified that a maximum of 583 homes could be delivered within the town without any connection to the A15 dual carriageway. The report also identified additional highways improvements that would be	No proposed changes.	View PDF

Rep no	Respondent	Paragraph/Policy/Figure/Table ref	Representation	Council response how will issue be addressed?	Changes to Plan?	*Consultation Response
			<p>application at Land S of Horkstow Road in Barton proposed a bus route extension that would provide a sustainable transport option for all new residents in addition to 600 existing residents who previously did not live within walking distance of a bus stop. Scheme can also be designed to promote the sustainable travel hierarchy through cycle and pedestrian facility provision.-</p> <p>Paragraph 14.47 refers to the reduced numbers of housing in Barton, however no robust justification for this reduction in numbers has been published anywhere. This therefore appears to be a political whim to respond to local objections, rather than an objectively assessed methodology in relation to the Spatial Strategy and Location of new homes."</p>	<p>required to deliver the 583 dwellings, and these included a new roundabout at the junction of Falkland Way and the A1077 and changing the replacing the mini-roundabout on the A1077 (Hungate, Holydyke and Ferry Road junction).</p> <p>The proposed site mentioned at land to the West of Brigg Road, Barton upon Humber deals with an omission site as all proposed sites are shown on the relevant proposal map. The council have set out the proposed housing proposals in Policy H1 Site Allocations. All proposed sites were assessed through the Strategic Housing and Economic Land availability assessment (SHELAA). All proposed housing sites were also justified in the Evidence paper Housing sites selection topic paper (HOU03).</p>		
474	Nicola Farr on behalf of Environment Agency	Sustainability Appraisal	<p>"Overall, we support the content of the Sustainability Appraisal. However, we have the following comments on Table 2-1: Summary of the key sustainability issues in North Lincolnshire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Water environment' currently only includes one key challenge - flood risk and development. Given there are several sustainability issues listed relating to water • quality, should another key challenge be added relating to this? • 'Land' has several sustainability issues noted relate to risk to the water environment. Should a key challenge be added relating to these issues?" 	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
483	Merlin Ash on behalf of Natural England	Sustainability Appraisal	<p>"3.1 Natural England advises that concerns regarding the Habitats Regulations Assessment set out above should be taken into account in the Appraisal. For example we would expect SSSI's to be a part of the traffic modelling study and for this to be taken into account in the assessment against objectives SA2 and SA6.</p> <p>3.2 Notwithstanding these matters, however, Natural England is broadly content with the Sustainability Appraisal and offer the following advice. We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us. "</p>	Production of a Statement of Common Ground is underway between the Council and Natural England to address this response. Further proposed modifications to the Plan will arise out of the Statement.	Proposed changes will arise out of the Statement of Common Ground which is underway between the Council and Natural England.	View PDF

Spatial Vision

431	Simon Jones on behalf of Highways England	Spatial Vision	<p>"At the time of undertaking the SRN Evidence Base report (July 2020), 8,666 dwellings were considered within the report based on information provided by the council. At the time of the most recent previous assessment undertaken by us (February 2021), the information provided by the council stated that there were to be 7,986 dwellings built out over the plan period.</p> <p>The new information provided in the Publication Draft Addendum Plan states in paragraph 5.8 that there are to be 7,937 dwellings built out over the plan period.</p> <p>However, we have identified that Chapter 3 states that there will be 7,128 dwellings delivered over the plan period. While either of the above figures presents an overall reduction (and hence no new assessments are needed), we would request confirmation on which figure is correct. We acknowledge that Chapter 5 provides details of the housing allocation sites, with no changes to site locations or quantum. However, we would expect to see changes to allocations considering the reduction in the housing allocation figure stated in Chapter 3 (which requires clarification). We would request a list of allocations with up to date information on the quantum of development at each site."</p>	Comments noted.	No proposed changes.	View PDF
-----	---	----------------	---	-----------------	----------------------	--------------------------