

Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Proposed Submission Draft (March 2022)

Appendix 8: SA Consultation Responses



| | |
|---|---|
| Appendix 8.1: Comments Received on the SA Scoping Report (June 2019)..... | 3 |
| Appendix 8.2: Comments Received on the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Consultation Draft SA Report (June 2021)..... | 8 |

Appendix 8.1: Comments Received on the SA Scoping Report (June 2019)

A draft version of the SA Scoping Report was consulted on between 6th June and 18th July 2019. The table below summarises all comments received and provides details of any resultant changes to the Scoping Report. A Final SA Scoping Report was published in July 2020. This has been updated and re-published alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan (March 2022).

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|--------------------|--|---|
| Environment Agency | <p>The Report should include consideration of the Greater Lincolnshire LEP document "Water for Growth, Water Management Plan 2015-2040", which considers the effective management of flood risk and water resources to be a critical factor in enabling economic growth across the area.</p> | <p>Comments noted. Reference to the LEP document "Water for Growth, Water Management Plan 2015-2040" is now referenced.</p> |
| | <p>Para 2.7.14 states that "<i>There are also a number of Source Protection Zones (SPZs) (for groundwater sources such as wells, boreholes and springs used for public drinking water supply), concentrated down the centre of the Plan area, from Kirton in Lindsey in West Lindsey to the north down to Walcot in North Kesteven to the south. These zones show the risk of contamination from any activities that might cause pollution in the area. The closer the activity, the greater the risk</i>". We advise this be amended by deleting the text indicated above and replacing it with the text below to give greater clarity on this matter: "Groundwater Source Protection Zones (SPZs) are areas of groundwater where there is a particular</p> | <p>Comments noted. Para 2.7.14 has been amended to include the suggested revised text.</p> |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|-------------------|--|--|
| | <p>sensitivity to pollution risks due to the closeness of a drinking water source and groundwater flows. They are used to protect abstractions used for public water supply and other users such as mineral and bottled water plants, breweries, and food production plants. Generally the closer the activity is to a groundwater source, then the greater the risk."</p> | |
| | <p>Para 2.9.12: CLR11 'Model Procedures for Management of Land Contamination' is being replaced by 'Land contamination: risk management' (LCRM).</p> | <p>Comments noted. Paragraph 2.9.12 has been amended to make clear that is guidance is currently being updated.</p> |
| | <p>2.12.7 states that "<i>During 2017/18, there were 32 planning permissions granted contrary to EA advice on the grounds of flood risk and 13 on the grounds of or water quality. Many of these issues are likely to have been resolved before a final decision is made</i>". This statement is incorrect. There were no permissions granted contrary to EA advice.</p> | <p>Data was taken directly from the gov.uk website. Updated information regarding these applications is welcomed. Para 2.12.7 has now been amended.</p> |
| | <p>SA Framework: SA Objective 12, Decision Making Criteria 12b - "<i>encourage the adaptability of people, property and wildlife to the impacts of climate change?</i>"</p> | <p>Comments noted. There is other criteria that covers what 12b was trying to achieve, such as 6g. Does the Plan promote high quality design and sustainable construction? 12b has been deleted.</p> |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|-------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Can this be reworded as it is not clear what is meant by this and so judgement against this criteria will be difficult.</p> | |
| | <p>Page 115-6: We don't agree with the SA criteria in respect of assessing sites (Housing and mixed use, gypsy and traveller sites and employment sites) and flood risk. We suggest that allowing development within FZ2 and FZ3 will not contribute to/accord with criteria 12d, which asks "<i>Does the Plan seek to avoid development in areas at risk of flooding?</i>" The inclusion of the stated assessment criteria would not adequately test this.</p> <p>We suggest the following criteria should apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites with any proportion of developable land within FZ3 should be significant negative effect (--) • Sites with any proportion of developable land within FZ2 should be minor negative effect (-) • Sites within FZ1 should be neutral effects (0) | <p>Concern noted.</p> <p>The SA criteria and Site Assessment criteria have been closely aligned to ensure a consistent approach and avoid duplication of work.</p> <p>These comments are inconsistent with the comments made by the Environment Agency on the Site Assessment Methodology, where no objections were raised to the proposed approach.</p> <p>The Environment Agency will be consulted on all sites.</p> <p>No change.</p> |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Historic England | <p>Pages 41- 43 and Objective 6 of Table 4.4 are welcomed.</p> <p>Reference to the built and historic environment within Appendix 2 is welcomed. This would be strengthened by referencing heritage assets and their settings.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The first column of the table within Appendix 2 refers to the titles of the SA Objectives. Heritage assets and their settings are covered by the full objective. No change.</p> |
| | <p>There is strong concern regarding the 'Assumptions and Approach' within Appendix 3, in particular the reference to a distance of 200 metres. A specified distance or proximity is strongly discouraged. It is important to understand the significance of any heritage assets, and their settings that would be affected by a potential site allocation.</p> | <p>Concern noted.</p> <p>The assumptions have been amended to make it clearer that the assessment will be undertaken in two stages: the first is to use GIS to identify heritage assets that could be potentially affected by a site allocation. The second stage will involve consultation with Conservation Officers and Archaeologists within the Central Lincolnshire Authorities on individual sites, to ascertain the significance of the heritage assets involved and the nature of potential effects.</p> <p>Acknowledge that it is not possible to provide a definitive, measurable impact test on a heritage asset as it depends on the significance of the asset, which involves a qualitative appraisal. Criteria has been amended to reflect this.</p> |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Within the site assessment criteria for Appendix 3, settings should be referenced together with non-designated heritage assets and archaeology. Historic England would be very happy to advise further regarding site assessment methodology criteria.</p> | <p>Comments noted. Reference to archaeology and settings now added to third column 'Assumptions and Approach'.</p> |
| <p>Natural England</p> | <p>Natural England has reviewed the document and considers that it generally covers our interests in the Natural Environment.</p> <p>We particularly welcome the section on biodiversity which recognises the importance of identifying opportunities to extend the ecological network and strategic green infrastructure network within the local plan.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> |
| | <p>We are also pleased to note that the section on health and well-being includes the provision of green spaces within neighbourhoods.</p> <p>We suggest that the benefits to health of accessing nature in general could also be further strengthened within this section.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted. An additional paragraph (2.2.6) has been added to the policy context under section 2.2 Health and Wellbeing.</p> |

Appendix 8.2: Comments Received on the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Consultation Draft SA Report (June 2021)

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|---|--|--|
| Natural England | The Plan is supported by a draft Sustainability Appraisal (June 2021). We note that a full Sustainability Appraisal will be prepared to inform and accompany the next plan making stage. Natural England considers that the key environmental issues pertinent to our remit are being acknowledged and addressed in the draft. This includes consideration to biodiversity, landscape, soils, and access to nature. | Noted |
| Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership | COL/BOU/001 Western Growth Corridor Mormon Field LWS is not referenced within Appendix 3.1: Sustainability Appraisal of Preferred Housing Site Allocations and Reasonable Alternatives of the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Draft Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (June 2021). This site should be taken into consideration within the sustainability appraisal and included within proposed mitigation measures. | This LWS has now been included in the appraisal of COL/BOU/001. |
| | COL/ABB/001 North East Quadrant, Land at Greetwell area, Lincoln Greetwell Quarry LWS/SSSI is located within this allocation and therefore needs to be taken into consideration in the design of any development. This site should be included within the sustainability appraisal with proposed mitigation measures. | This LWS/SSSI has now been included in the appraisal of COL/ABB/001. |
| | WL/Gain/001 Gainsborough Northern Neighbourhood SUE Appendix 3.3 Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Draft Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (June 2021) states that the allocation site boundary is within 500m of Somerby and Hornby Wood LWS and Ancient Woodland. However the site in fact overlaps the eastern half of the LWS and Ancient Woodland. This must be recognised within the sustainability appraisal entry for the site and the commitment to manage impacts on the irreplaceable habitats made clear. | This has been corrected in the appraisal of WL/GAIN/001. |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>NK/SLEA/014 Sleaford South Quadrant (“Handley Chase”)</p> <p>The allocated site is within 500m of Mareham Pastures LWS. This needs to be recognised with the site being included within the sustainability appraisal with proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>WL/GAIN/021 Former Castle Hills Community College site, The Avenue, Gainsborough</p> <p>The allocation site is adjacent to Pitt Hills Plantation LWS. This can be seen on the supporting on line mapping, but is not referred to within the site’s entry in Appendix 3.3</p> <p>NK/AUB/002 Land north of 48 Thorpe Lane, South Hykeham</p> <p>NK/AUB/002 is adjacent to North Hykeham Gravel Pit LWS, as such, this allocated site should be included within the sustainability appraisal</p> | <p>This LWS has now been included in the appraisal of NK/SLEA/014.</p> <p>This LWS has now been included in the appraisal of WL/GAIN/021.</p> <p>The site has planning permission, is under construction and is nearing completion. It is therefore no longer suitable to allocate and has been removed from the SA.</p> |
| Cyden Homes Limited (Mr Andrew Burling) | We note that the Sustainability Assessment published as part of the current consultation assesses our client’s site as a reasonable alternative site. Our client’s site is at least comparable in sustainability terms with the allocated sites. When mitigation is taken into account, the site is demonstrably sustainable, and we feel strongly that it should be scored equal to or better than the existing allocated sites. This, alongside the availability and deliverability of sites, should be taken into account in the consideration of site allocations in the new Local Plan. | <p>All sites have been assessed using the SA Framework for sites and therefore a consistent approach has been adopted for all sites, whether reasonable alternatives or selected sites for allocation in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Sites are assessed “policy off”, i.e. the appraisal does not take into account proposed masterplans or other policies within the Local Plan which may mitigate any identified negative effects.</p> |
| Historic England | There is very strong concern regarding the ‘Assumptions and Approach’ for SA Objective 6, in particular the reference to a distance of 200metres. A specified distance or proximity should not | Concern noted. The assumptions in the SA Framework for sites clearly state, in italics and underlined, that |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|--------------------|---|---|
| | <p>be utilised. It is important to understand the significance of any heritage assets, and their settings that would be affected by a potential site allocation. This involves more than identifying known heritage assets within a given distance, but rather a more holistic process which seeks to understand their significance and value. The proximity buffer of 200 metres should be removed from the 'Assumptions and Approach'.</p> <p>Non-designated heritage assets and battlefields should be included within the Site Assessment Criteria, together with settings.</p> | <p>distance is only an indication of potential effects: "<u>However, proximity to a heritage asset only provides an indication of potential effects. Where a site is within 200m of a heritage asset, professional judgement and available evidence will also be used to inform decisions on the nature of effects. Such evidence is likely to include the Historic Environment Record and Conservation Area Appraisals.</u>"</p> <p>Conservation Officers and Archaeologists at the Districts have provided comments on the sites and these have been reflected in the commentary for SA Objective Built and Historic Environment.</p> |
| Environment Agency | <p>Appendix 4 indicates that the majority of our suggested amendments have been made.</p> <p>It is stated that 'Reference to the LEP document "Water for Growth, Water Management Plan 2015-2040" is now referenced' but I have not located this in the document.</p> <p>Land contamination: risk management' (LCRM): a reference to this has been added as requested but now needs updating as LCRM has now been published on gov.uk: Land contamination risk management (LCRM) - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</p> | <p>Reference to Water for Growth, Water Management Plan 2015-2040 is now included in the Final SA Scoping Report under Other plans and programmes in the Natural Resources – Water section.</p> <p>Reference to LCRM has been updated.</p> |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Church Commissioners | <p>COL/ABB/001: North East Quadrant SUE (NEQ) – Greetwell Area.</p> <p>Whilst all of the other sites we provide commentary on in this representation have been assessed and are included within the Sustainability Appraisal, it is not clear where the assessment for COL/ABB/001 is located. Central Lincolnshire should ensure that this evidence is clearly set out within the evidence base document.</p> | <p>Agreed. An SA has been undertaken for COL/ABB/001 and has been included in Appendix 4.1</p> |
| | <p>Policy S79: Housing Sites in Large Villages - NK/BBH/003: Land South of Bracebridge Heath.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal notes that the development of the site may have some minor negative effects in relation to health and wellbeing (due to access to healthcare facilities), built and historic environment and access to services and facilities. We have addressed each of these points within the pending planning application and a summary is included below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Wellbeing – A Health Impact Statement was submitted in support of the application in relation to the proposed development and concludes that the proposed development has the potential to create many positive health impacts on people who would be directly and remotely connected to it. • Built and Historic Environment – The site is an element of the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Farm Buildings at the Manor House, however it is considered that the proposed development will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of these assets due to the changes to their agricultural landscape setting and views. The public benefits are outlined within the Planning Statement and Chapter 13 Socio-economics of the Environmental Statement which were submitted in support of the application. | <p>Sites are assessed “policy off”, i.e. the appraisal does not take into account proposed masterplans or other policies within the Local Plan which may mitigate any identified negative effects.</p> |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to Services – the submitted Illustrative Masterplan has been designed so that safe and suitable access to the site and its facilities has been incorporated. In addition to this, the proposed flexible commercial floorspace within the employment generating uses will be suitable to provide a range of services to existing and future residents. | |
| <p>Upper Witham, Witham First, Witham Third & North East Lindsey Internal Drainage Boards</p> | <p>COL/BOU/001 Western Growth Corridor The board has objected to the current application, but continues a dialog with the developer because the location is part of the board's pumped drainage system that serves Lincoln.</p> <p>COL/BOU/003 Former Victory Public House, Boultham Park Road, Lincoln. This states the location is in Flood Zone 1, it is in Flood Zone 3.</p> <p>COL/BR/001 Land rear of 2151-237 Calder Road, Lincoln. Development in this area adjacent to the River Witham has always been intended to above flood level, any houses should be above this level.</p> <p>COL/CAR/002 Farmland South of Long Leys Road. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones. This area has very poor drainage and development in this area must include provision to investigate and provide a viable sustainable solution.</p> <p>NK/BBS/006 Land west of High Street, Brant Broughton. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>SA has been amended from Flood Zone 1 to 3.</p> <p>Proximity to River has been added to the commentary in the SA.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation has been expanded to recognise this.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this: Development should minimise the risks from flooding through appropriate layout, design and use of drainage and water management strategies and SuDs.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|-------------------|--|--|
| | <p>NK/SKEL/010 Land east of Western Lane, south of Beaver Close, Skellingthorpe. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>NK/SKEL/011 Land north of Stoney Yard, east of High Street, Skellingthorpe. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>NK/SKEL/013 Land north of Ferry Lane, Skellingthorpe. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>NK/SKEL/014 Land north of Ferry Lane, adj pumping station, Skellingthorpe. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>NK/WAD/001 Land to rear of 320 - 378 Brant Road, Waddington. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>NK/WAD/002 Site Address: Land to the rear of 382 - 418 Brant Road, Waddington. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>NK/DIG/003 Land at 38 North Street, Digby. This area has been subject to flood, this must be taken into account in the drainage strategy.</p> <p>NK/DIG/005 Land to the east and south of Beck Street, Digby. Beck Street has flooding issues, a significant development of 353 houses may have a negative impact or it may be able to provide an improvement to local flood risk, this should be investigated should the site be considered. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> | <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation has been amended to include preparation of a drainage strategy.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation has been amended to add: Development should minimise the risks from flooding through appropriate layout, design and use of drainage and water management strategies and SuDs.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation has been amended to add: Development should minimise the risks from</p> |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|-------------------|--|--|
| | <p>NK/LEAS/006 Land north of Moor Lane, Leasingham. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>WL/BUR/002 Land at Burton Waters. Potentially unsuitable site (The site is approx. 50% within Flood Zone 2 and 50% within Flood Zone 3.)</p> <p>WL/SAXI/003 Land to the north of Church Lane, Saxilby. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>WL/SAXI/006a Land south of Mays Lane, north of Lincoln Road, Saxilby. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>WL/SAXI/008 Site Address: Land west of Sykes Lane, Saxilby. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones. Byelaw consent will be required for works adjacent to board scheduled watercourses.</p> <p>WL/BARD/005 Land north of Station Road, Bardney. Unsuitable site. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones. (The site is within Flood Zone 2 and 3, with more than 50% of the site in Zone 3).</p> <p>WL/BARD/010 Land to east of Bartholomew Close, Bardney. Unsuitable site, area is subject to flooding. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones. (The majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 2 and 3.)</p> <p>WL/BARD/013 Land to west of Wragby Road, Bardney.</p> | <p>flooding through appropriate layout, design and use of drainage and water management strategies and SuDs. Noted. Proposed mitigation as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>Noted re byelaw consent. The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>Noted. Proposed mitigation as above.</p> <p>Noted. The proposed mitigation has been amended to add: Development should minimise the risks from flooding through appropriate layout, design and use of drainage and water management strategies and SuDs. The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|-------------------|---|--|
| | <p>Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>WL/BARD/015 Land west of Wragby Road and to east of Abbey Road, Bardney. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>WL/BARD/017 Land to north of Scotgrove Farm, Henry Lane, Bardney. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>WL/BARD/018 Land north of Henry Lane, east of Bardney. Primary School. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>WL/BARD/019 Land west of Abbey Road, Bardney. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>NK/CW/009 Land at Eastfield Farm, Fiskerton Road, Cherry Willingham. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones. (More than 50% of the site is within Flood Zone 3.)</p> <p>WL/DUNH/001 Land North of Market Rasen Road, Dunholme. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>WL/DUNH/002 Land North of Market Rasen Road, Dunholme. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>WL/REEP/002 Land to the north of Reepham Manor, The Green, Reepham. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones.</p> <p>WL/SC/003 Land to the southwest of Main Street, Scothern. Any houses should be placed outside flood zones. Access for watercourse maintenance should be made available.</p> | <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation reflects this as above. Mitigation has been amended to include access for watercourse maintenance.</p> |
| Lindum Group Ltd | NK/HEI/003 | The SA now includes the consideration of a small site (NK/HEI/003A) in Appendix 4.2. |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|-------------------|---|--|
| | <p>This site was promoted in its entirety to allow for different scales of development to be considered, subject to the demands of Heighington.</p> <p>The HELAA and SA have only considered this larger site and have not allowed for consideration of different elements of development.</p> <p>Although the SA highlights the distance to a designated employment area on Great Northern terrace, this analysis ignores the proximity of other employers within Heighington and the surrounding area, including the Five Mile Lane employment site and Potterhanworth Road, Heighington: both of these established sites were allocated for employment use in previous Local Plans and continue to offer employment opportunity.</p> | <p>The SA Framework for sites sets out the criteria for appraising sites in relation to the SA Objective for Employment (SA14). Proximity to designated employment areas (i.e. Important Established Employment Areas and Strategic Employment Sites) as well as City/Town Centres in the Local Plan have been used as an indication of the potential effects in relation to access to work opportunities.</p> <p>This approach is considered to be proportionate. To try and take into account proximity to all employers would make the assessment unwieldy and could lead to inconsistencies.</p> |
| | <p>Site NK/WAD/004a</p> <p>The assessment of the site in the Sustainability Assessment (SA) refers to the site as part of Waddington Low Fields, which is described as a “large Village”. Waddington Lowfields is, however, within the Lincoln Urban Area. The SA should be updated to reflect the fact that Waddington Lowfields is part of the Lincoln Urban Area and is not a “Large Village”.</p> <p>The text in draft policy S76 and the SA refers to issues relating to surface water drainage, transport, views into and out of the “Area of Great Landscape Value” and the Waddington Cliff Conservation Area, as well as infrastructure requirements.</p> | <p>The SA of site NK/WAD/004a has been amended to identify the site as being located within the Lincoln Urban Area.</p> |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>These matters will, of course, be addressed through any planning application and the required supporting information.</p> | <p>Noted</p> |
| | <p>NK/NAV/004</p> <p>The main objection to the site in the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) and the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) appears to be the limited access afforded by the existing field access from the A607 to the west. This ignores the fact, however, that access has been retained from the allocated site to the south by Lindum Group, so a further access from the A607 is not required.</p> | <p>Sites are assessed individually and “policy off”, i.e. the appraisal does not take into account proposed masterplans or other policies within the Local Plan which may mitigate any identified negative effects.</p> |
| <p>Mr Paul Bainborrow</p> | <p>Appendix 1 SA Framework for Sites.</p> <p>The Assumptions and Approach criteria in Section 14.2 (Training and Learning contains an error in the Likely Effects designation. The minor positive effect and minor negative effect have the same designation (see below). I believe the minor negative one should be (-/?) not (+/?).</p> <p>Sites within 400m of one primary school or 800m of one secondary school, but not both, may have a minor positive effect (+/?)</p> <p>Sites between 400-800m of one primary school or between 800-1600m of one secondary school, but not both, may have a minor negative effect (+/?)</p> <p>This error has propagated into Appendix 3 - e.g. Site Ref NK/WAD/001 has the likely negative effect as +/? when it should be -/?</p> | <p>Thank you for bringing the error in the Sites SA Framework to our attention. This has now been rectified and the impacts for NK/WAD/001 checked. +/? is the correct impact as the nearest primary school is approx. 380m from the site.</p> |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>The Sustainability Appraisal for site NK/WAD/001 contains the following error:</p> <p>The commentary for SA Objective 9.1 incorrectly states that the site is located in Urban Land. This is not the case - the site is actually located in agricultural land and is part of the Witham Valley Green Wedge. As a consequence the likely effect is also incorrect (should be -- not ++). I have not looked at the other sites in detail but the same mistake seems to have been made on NK/WAD/002.</p> | <p>The SA criteria for SA Objective 9 uses the Agricultural Land Classification, prepared by Natural England, which classifies agricultural land into five grades using a set of consistent criteria, including soils and climate (available to view at Magic Map Application (defra.gov.uk)).</p> <p>NK/WAD/001 falls within the Urban Land category, therefore no change is proposed.</p> |
| Tom Barton Farms Ltd | <p>Site WL/LEA/002 has been considered as a reasonable alternative for allocation at Lea, but ultimately site WL/LEA/003 has been chosen for allocation. However, the reasoning for this decision is not borne out in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Site WL/LEA/002 should receive higher scores in the SA under a number of objectives.</p> | <p>All sites have been assessed using the SA Framework for sites and therefore a consistent approach has been adopted for all sites, whether reasonable alternatives or selected sites for allocation in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The SA Report has been amended to include an Appendix (Appendix 6) setting out an overview of the reasons for selecting the preferred options above all the reasonable alternatives. Further detail on the process for the selection of sites can be found in the Evidence Report for Policies S75 – S81.</p> |
| Lockwood Estates (Mr George Lockwood) | <p>The Sustainability Appraisal and Housing & Economic Land Availability Assessment do not separate out the new allocations for assessment and therefore do not explain why choices have been made to allocate sites at only a handful of Medium Villages, or why</p> | <p>The SA matrices for each site (Appendix 4) include a sub-heading in the table header called “Site Status”, which clearly identifies</p> |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|-------------------|---|---|
| | <p>such sites have been chosen for new allocations instead of other potential sites at the Medium Villages.</p> | <p>whether a site is a new allocation or existing allocation and also whether allocated sites have planning permission, or not. The use of colour also helps to identify allocations and reasonable alternatives: allocations are green and reasonable alternatives are amber.</p> <p>The SA Report has been amended to include an Appendix (Appendix 6) setting out an overview of the reasons for selecting the preferred options above all the reasonable alternatives. Further detail on the process for the selection of sites can be found in the Evidence Report for Policies S75 – S81.</p> |
| | <p>My client's site WL/ING/005 - Land east of Saxon Way, Ingham – should be considered for allocation for 10 dwellings. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) assesses only one site at Ingham, which is proposed for allocation (and which in fact already has planning permission for development so by the terms of the SA should not be included in the SA), and does not assess any reasonable alternatives. The Sustainability Appraisal is therefore lacking and does not demonstrate that the most sustainable option for growth at Ingham has been chosen.</p> | <p>The approach to the SA of sites with planning permission was to include them for appraisal but to exclude those sites under construction. This approach has been agreed with Inspectors' at least two recent Local Plan examinations (Peterborough and East Cambridgeshire), as sites with planning permission may lapse. WL/ING/006, the proposed allocation in Ingham, has planning permission but is not under construction. It is therefore correct that it should be included in the SA.</p> |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | <p>The SA Report has been amended to include an Appendix (Appendix 6) setting out an overview of the reasons for selecting the preferred options above all the reasonable alternatives. Further detail on the process for the selection of sites can be found in the Evidence Report for Policies S75 – S81.</p> |
| <p>Marine Management Organisation</p> | <p>SA section 3.3</p> <p>Section 3.3 details the relationship between the Local Plan and other relevant plans or programmes. We also recommend considering the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans.</p> | <p>Reference to the East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans has been added to the SA Scoping Report under the theme Natural Resources – Water.</p> |
| <p>Gladman</p> | <p>The CLJSPC should ensure that the results of the SA process clearly justify its policy choices. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed, and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, the draft CLLP’s decision-making and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>All sites have been assessed using the SA Framework for sites and therefore a consistent approach has been adopted for all sites, whether reasonable alternatives or selected sites for allocation in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The SA Report has been amended to include an Appendix (Appendix 6) setting out an overview of the reasons for selecting the preferred options above all the reasonable alternatives. Further detail on the process for the selection of preferred policies and sites can be found in the Evidence Report for each policy.</p> |

| Name of Consultee | Summary of Response | Action Taken |
|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| | | |