



**LINCOLNSHIRE MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN
Site Locations Document – Pre-Submission (Publication)
Draft**
(‘Regulation 19’ Consultation)

Consultation Outcomes Statement

November 2016

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Statement of Community Involvement.....	4
3. Sustainability Appraisal	4
4. Submitted Minerals and Waste Sites Consultation (June 2010)	5
5. Informal Consultation on Submitted Minerals and Waste Sites (June 2014)	7
6. Draft Site Locations Document (Preferred Sites and Areas) (December 2015) ..	8
7. Conclusion	10

Appendix One: Summary Report of Representations to Draft Site Locations Document (Preferred Sites and Areas) (December 2015).....	11
---	----

Appendix Two: List of Respondents to Draft Site Locations Document (Preferred Sites and Areas) (December 2015).....	43
---	----

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Lincolnshire County Council is responsible for minerals and waste planning in the County and is in the process of preparing the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, which is being developed in two parts:
- A **Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (CSDMP)** document, adopted on 1 June 2016, which sets out the key principles to guide the future winning and working of minerals and the form of waste management development in the County up to 2031. It also sets out the development management policies against which planning applications for minerals and waste development will be considered.
 - A **Site Locations** document (currently under preparation) which will include specific proposals and policies for the provision of land for mineral and waste development.
- 1.2 The adopted CSDMP replaces the Lincolnshire Minerals Local Plan (1991) and the Lincolnshire Waste Local Plan (2006), with the exception of Policies WLP2, WLP6 and WLP12 of the Lincolnshire Waste Local Plan (2006). These policies are saved until the second part of the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan, the Site Locations document, has been adopted.
- 1.3 Lincolnshire County Council has a statutory responsibility to identify potential sites and areas suitable for minerals and waste development within the county. The Pre-Submission Draft Site Locations document follows the principles set out in the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies document, identifying allocations for minerals and waste development based on a comprehensive process of site assessment and selection. This document supports the Pre-Submission Draft Site Locations document.
- 1.4 The following work has been undertaken as part of the preparation of the Site Locations document:
- An Issues and Options paper was published in 2008, which set out a range of key “Issues and Options” that the County Council considered are likely to influence the future strategy for minerals and waste planning in Lincolnshire.
 - A revised Issues and Options paper was published in 2009 setting out the spatial options for minerals and waste development in more detail. A ‘call for sites’ exercise was carried out in conjunction with this paper.
 - In June 2010, the Council’s Preferred Strategy for future minerals and waste development was published for consultation. Alongside this, a

separate consultation was carried out on the minerals and waste sites submitted during the call for sites, together with a proposed site assessment methodology.

- Work on the Site Locations was subsequently put on hold until Spring 2014 in order to focus resources on the Core Strategy and Development Management Policies document. At this point a review was undertaken of the information received during the original 'call for sites' exercise and 'submitted sites' consultation in 2009/2010, and a second call for sites 'refresh' exercise was undertaken in order to update the list of sites to be considered for allocation.
- Following this, an informal, targeted consultation was undertaken in SpJune and July ring 2014 in relation to the updated list of sites to be considered for allocation.
- In December 2015, a Draft Site Locations (Preferred Sites and Areas) document was published for consultation. The outcome of this consultation has subsequently informed the final list of allocated sites and areas in the Pre-Submission Draft Site Locations document.

1.5 Consultation on emerging local plans is a requirement of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. This Consultation Outcomes Statement sets out the main issues raised during the 2010, 2014 and 2015 consultations and the County Council's response to them. In addition to the consultation required under the 2012 Regulations, the Duty to Cooperate Statement, which also supports this Pre-Submission Draft Site Locations document, provides information on consultation and engagement the County Council undertook in the production of the document.

2. Statement of Community Involvement

2.1 All formal stages of consultation have been carried out in accordance with the County Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) in place at the time the consultation was undertaken. The SCI forms the basis for the County Council's procedures for community engagement in the preparation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan as well planning applications.

3. Sustainability Appraisal

3.1 Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is integral to the preparation of the Site Locations document. The purpose of the SA is to promote sustainable development by integrating sustainability considerations into the preparation, adoption and

implementation of Local Plans. It involves the identification and evaluation of the social, environmental and economic impacts of the plan. Specifically, SA seeks to identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects of implementing 'the plan, and reasonable alternatives'. In doing so, it provides an opportunity to consider ways in which a plan can make an effective contribution to sustainable development and provide a means of avoiding or reducing any adverse effects that the plan might have. It is a requirement of Section 19(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 3.2 Due to the time passed following the initial stages of plan preparation, Lincolnshire County Council prepared an updated Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report which was completed in July 2015 and set out the framework to guide the Sustainability Appraisal process. The County Council consulted the Environmental Bodies on a draft of this Scoping Report between 16 April and 21 May 2015. Following consultation on this report, the contents of the Scoping Report were revised to reflect, where appropriate, the consultation findings.
- 3.3 Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out at each stage of the preparation of the Site Locations document. Each site proposed has been assessed against each of the sustainability objectives. This information has been compiled into a report which has been made available as part of consultation at each stage in the preparation of the Site Locations document.

4. Submitted Minerals and Waste Sites Consultation (June 2010)

- 4.1 A Submitted Minerals and Waste Sites Consultation document was published in June 2010. This document followed on from the Call for Sites consultation which took place between October 2009 and January 2010.
- 4.2 The document was in three parts; the first set out the background to the consultation and outlined the programme and process by which sites will eventually be allocated; the second part consisted of a list submitted by industry and landowners; and the third part comprised a proposed site assessment methodology to be used to assess the sites. Comments were invited particularly in parts 2 and 3 of the report.
- 4.3 The main purpose of this document was to advise the public, landowners, industry and other interested parties of potential sites for minerals and waste development within the County and to seek comments on the proposed methodology for assessing the submitted sites.

Site Specific Comments:

- 4.4 A total of 69 people or organisations made representations and a total of 209 separate comments were made. Respondents ranged from statutory bodies, neighbouring local authorities, parish councils, environmental groups, minerals and waste industry and individuals and local businesses.
- 4.5 Overall there were a wide range of issues raised in submitted comments with matters relating to biodiversity and the quality of the environment being particularly high. Matters relating to traffic and access and local amenity issues were also particularly high.

Proposed Site Assessment Methodology Comments:

- 4.6 A total of 19 people or organisations made representations and a total of 20 separate comments were made. Respondents ranged from statutory bodies, neighbouring local authorities, parish councils, environmental groups, minerals and waste industry and individuals.
- 4.7 Overall the comments received were positive in relation to the proposed methodology. However, suggested changes were made in relation to flood risk, heritage and biodiversity.

Lincolnshire County Council's Response to Comments:

- 4.8 In response to the issues raised to specific sites, the County Council incorporated further information into the site assessment process relating to:
- nature conservation designations;
 - existing infrastructure;
 - heritage assets;
 - Ministry of Defence bird safeguarding zones;
 - highways impacts;
 - borehole data;
 - amenity and pollution;
 - landscape and visual impacts;
 - flood risk; and
 - Public Rights of Way.
- 4.9 A number of representations referred to potential restoration schemes for minerals sites, however, these were proposed to be explored further once the sites had been assessed and reduced in number.

- 4.10 In response to the comments received in relation to the site assessment methodology, the County Council significantly revised the assessment approach, moving away from an individual issue “Red, Amber, Green” scoring system to adopt a more holistic approach, incorporating a wide range of matters.

5. Informal Consultation on Submitted Minerals and Waste Sites (June 2014)

- 5.1 Due to the time that had elapsed since the original call for sites it was considered necessary to update the list of sites to be considered for allocation and therefore the County Council carried out a ‘refresh’ of the Call for Waste and Mineral Sites exercise in Spring 2014. This resulted in a small number of new sites being proposed by landowners/developers. The sites previously put forward in 2009/10 were retained and assessed further unless the landowner/developer stated that they no longer wish the site to be considered or that the site was subject to planning consent.
- 5.2 Following the call for sites ‘refresh’, informal, targeted consultation was carried out on an updated list of submitted sites in June and July 2014. A total of 31 people or organisations made comments and a total of 257 separate comments were made. Respondents ranged from internal LCC colleagues, statutory bodies, neighbouring local authorities, parish councils and environmental groups.
- 5.3 Overall there were a wide range of issues raised in comments received with matters relating to biodiversity and the quality of the environment being particularly high. Matters relating to traffic and access and local amenity issues were also particularly high. Further details of the comments made can be found in the Consultation Outcomes Report November 2015 which accompanied the Draft Site Locations (Preferred Sites and Areas) document (December 2015).

Lincolnshire County Council’s Response to Comments:

- 5.4 Many of the comments received at this stage provided additional information regarding nature conservation and heritage asset designations, highways and access, flood risk and the water environment. This information was subsequently included within the site assessment process through the generation of standardised site assessment forms for every minerals site and waste site or area put forward for consideration.

5.5 The information provided and constraints identified were used in the selection of sites to be taken forward as preferred sites and areas for consultation.

5.6 As previously, a number of comments again referred to potential restoration schemes for minerals site, however, restoration was proposed to be explored further once the preferred sites and areas had been selected.

6. Draft Site Locations Document (Preferred Sites and Areas) (December 2015)

6.1 The Draft Site Locations (Preferred Sites and Areas) document was published by Lincolnshire County Council for a period of consultation between 4 December 2015 and 29 January 2016. This followed further information being sought from mineral industry representatives and clarification meetings with them between April and July 2015. Further details of this can be found in the Duty to Cooperate Statement, which also supports the Pre-Submission Draft Site Locations document.

6.2 The consultation at this stage sought comments in relation to each of the Council's preferred minerals sites and waste sites and areas. In addition to this, comments were sought on the accuracy of the details in the site and areas profiles, whether any additional sites were proposed for consideration and whether there was agreement with the minerals sites and waste sites and areas which were proposed to be discounted from the process.

6.3 A total of 97 respondents made 368 representations to the Draft Site Locations (Preferred Sites and Areas) document. Respondents included statutory bodies, local authorities, parish councils, proponents of sites and individuals. A large number of the preferred sites and areas attracted comments from bodies with nature conservation and heritage interests, highlighting the need to protect these assets, providing further information about them, or stating that further information should be provided, and seeking reassurance that they would be protected. Concerns were also raised that the Sustainability Appraisal, Sequential Test and Habitat Regulations Assessment were flawed.

6.4 One proposed minerals site allocation received 58 representations in relation to whether the allocation was agreed with and a further 29 representations regarding the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites profiles. Objections were raised in relation to a wide range of matters including amenity, pollution, highway safety, impacts on heritage assets, the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land, damage to the water environment and flooding, landscape and impacts on Public Rights of Way.

- 6.5 A number of representations were received from respondents promoting minerals sites which had been discounted. No additional waste sites or areas were put forward.
- 6.6 A more detailed summary of the representations received to the Draft Site Locations (Preferred Sites and Areas) document is set out in Appendix One.

Lincolnshire County Council's Response to Comments:

- 6.7 In response to the comments received, the County Council revisited all of the sites and areas which were put forward for consideration. This involved revising the site assessment form and refining the questions posed in relation to minerals sites, waste sites and waste areas. Further information was sought from site promoters where details were missing or inadequate and meetings were held in June and July 2016 with site promoters to discuss these matters.
- 6.8 Key statutory consultees were asked for further comments on any outstanding matters and clarification where particular issues had been resolved. Where further information was provided by proponents of sites in response to representations made, the relevant consultees were subsequently re-consulted on the additional information. Further details of the approach adopted can be found in the Duty to Cooperate Statement which also accompanies the Pre-Submission Draft Site Locations document.
- 6.9 One way the County Council sought to address a number of comments made by statutory consultees was to propose a series of development briefs to accompany proposed minerals and waste allocations, which would detail relevant constraints and issues that any subsequent development proposals would need to consider. The County Council sought input from the relevant consultees on the content of the development briefs, in particular working closely with local nature conservation bodies when looking at the restoration objectives for sites. Meetings took place with the local nature conservation bodies in May 2016 and June 2016 and it was agreed that the County Council would liaise with a single representative acting as contact for six organisations in order to ensure consistent advice and priorities with respect to nature conservation.
- 6.10 Following on from the above, in July 2016, the County Council carried out an informal consultation on a suite of draft development briefs, sending them to key statutory consultees, local nature conservation bodies, and District Councils in order to seek final comments and feedback before their inclusion in the Pre-Submission Draft Site Locations document.

- 6.11 In response to concerns raised regarding the Sustainability Appraisal, the criteria for assessment were reviewed and amended and the sites and areas re-assessed. A more comprehensive approach to the Sequential Test was adopted to ensure sites were appropriately assessed to address concerns raised. The results of the revised Sustainability Appraisal and Sequential Test were then fed into the site selection forms for analysis to inform the final selection of proposed allocations for the Pre-Submission Draft Site Locations document.
- 6.12 Further information was incorporated into the Habitat Regulations Assessment to provide details and further clarification and explanation of the conclusions reached. This further detail was first agreed with the respondent who had raised the concern.

7. Conclusion

- 7.1 In the preparation of the Pre-Submission Draft Site Locations document the County Council has carried out extensive consultation and engagement in accordance with the requirements of the Regulations and our adopted SCI. The outcome of this consultation and engagement has informed the contents of the Pre-Submission Draft Site Locations document at each stage.

Appendix One
Draft Site Locations Document (Preferred Sites and Areas)
December 2015
Summary Report of Representations

1. Introduction

The Draft Site Locations Document (Preferred Sites and Areas) December 2015 was published by Lincolnshire County Council for a period of consultation between 4 December 2015 and 29 January 2016.

The Draft Site Locations Document (Preferred Sites and Areas) December 2015 was approved for consultation by the Executive on 1 September 2015.

2. Summary of the Main Issues Raised

A total of 97 respondents made 368 representations to the Draft Site Locations Document (Preferred Sites and Areas) December 2015. This report sets out a summary of the representations made in relation to each policy, broken down into each proposed allocation and the questions asked for each allocation. The report also includes comments which were non-site specific and general comments which relate to the whole document or the plan making process.

The report is divided into the representations relating to minerals, those relating to waste and then general comments are dealt with at the end of the report. As such, responses to questions 1, 2, 3 and 7 of the consultation paper are under the Minerals section and responses to questions 4, 5, 6 and 8 are under the Waste Section.

Minerals Representations

Policy SL1: Mineral Site Allocations

Site Reference MS01-LT Lea Marsh, Gainsborough

Q.1 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred mineral site allocations? If not, provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

Four representations were received in relation to this question, including one from Tarmac (79(2)) who are promoting the site and state that it would make a substantial

contribution to the supply of sand and gravel in the Lincoln/Trent Valley Production Area.

One respondent (75(2)) states that the inclusion of the site needs to be challenged and questions the deliverability of the site, together with raising concerns regarding impacts on Lea Marsh Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), highway safety impacts and impacts on the Public Right of Way (PRoW).

Historic England (37(2)) identifies this as a site where archaeological considerations need to be addressed.

Nottinghamshire County Council (38(4)) highlights the potential ecological impacts associated with the development of the site and provides details regarding the restoration opportunities for biodiversity. Nottinghamshire County Council also states that there is an opportunity to realign the existing floodbank along the eastern boundary of the site and state that any application to develop the site which would be visible from Nottinghamshire to the west of the River Trent must be accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

Q.2 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites profiles?

Seven representations were received in relation to this question, four of which are from nature conservation bodies (Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(5)), Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(2)), Natural England (82(7)) and RSPB (83(4))). Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust, Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership and Natural England highlight that the site is immediately adjacent to the Lea Marsh SSSI, an important area of unimproved floodplain meadow and wet pasture, and concerns are raised regarding impacts on the site through hydrogeology and hydrology. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust seeks assurance that no adverse impact would be caused to either the SSSI or Lea Meadow Local Wildlife Site (LWS). Natural England requests this information is produced prior to the site being allocated. All of the nature conservation bodies state that if the site is allocated, its restoration should be considered at a landscape scale and be biodiversity led, in line with the Trent and Tame Valleys Futurescapes initiative and the Central Lincolnshire Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping (BOM) Study.

The Environment Agency (99(8)) states that the site lies within the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) of the River Trent. It is stated that flood risk issues in such sites can usually be managed by a suitably informed flood risk assessment which in this case considers risks to third parties and should be more detailed and robust than usual due to the potential impacts on public highways (A156 Gainsborough Road) and proposed new development in the locality. It is recommended that options for reducing flood risk to others are explored and a 50

metre standoff from the top of the bank of the Main River to any mineral excavation should be maintained. The Environment Agency also states that the Council may wish to consider the merit of undertaking an Exception Test in relation to this site to inform a decision in respect of its allocation.

The site promoter, Tarmac (79(3)) set out why the site is considered appropriate to be allocated and highlight that they are aware of constraints such as the nature conservation sites identified above, together with access and PRoW issues, and state that the constraints can be overcome with mitigation. Tarmac query why this site has been categorised as Band B and C and consider that it should be Band B as other Band B sites have a range of constraints.

A promoter of an alternative site echoes the concerns raised by Natural England and calls for further information regarding access routes and hydrological issues prior to the allocation of the site.

Site Reference MS04-LT Swinderby Airfield, Witham St Hughs

Q.1 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred mineral site allocations? If not, provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

Three representations were received in relation to this question. The site promoter, Cemex (30(1)), welcomes the site's inclusion as a future extension. Historic England (37(3)) identifies this as a site where archaeological considerations need to be addressed. Highways England (70(2)) state that the site is located adjacent to the A46 and could result in vehicle trip impacts on the strategic road network. As such, they state that a Transport Assessment needs to be undertaken.

Q.2 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites profiles?

Five representations were received in relation to this question, four of which were from nature conservation bodies (Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(6)), Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(3)), Natural England (82(6)) and RSPB (83(11))) and one of which was from Cemex (30(4)), promoting the site. Cemex confirmed that the s.278 access improvement works to the site have been completed and that the existing site is operational.

The nature conservation bodies seek a more positive approach to a biodiversity led restoration of this site as part of the Witham Valley Country Park and Central Lincolnshire BOM.

Site Reference MS05-LT Norton Bottoms Quarry, Norton Disney

Q.1 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred mineral site allocations? If not, provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

Three representations were received in relation to this question. Historic England (37(4)) identifies this as a site where archaeological considerations need to be addressed. Highways England (70(3)) state that the site lies in close proximity to the A46 and should be subject to a Transport Assessment.

Natural England (82(5)) recommends greater detail is provided regarding the restoration of the site and that this should be biodiversity led, providing links to the adjacent Stapleford Moor Woodland LWS, Witham Valley Country Park and the Trent and Tame Valley Futurescapes initiative.

Q.2 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites profiles?

Three representations were received from nature conservation bodies in relation to this question and one from the Environment Agency (99(9)). Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(7)) and Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(4)) raise concerns regarding the accuracy of the information and indicate that the site could negatively impact on Stapleford Wood LWS which is designated on the Natural England Ancient Woodland Inventory. The impacts on hydrogeology and hydrology in relation to the ancient woodland are of concern and the Wildlife Trust seeks assurance that there would be no adverse impacts. They recommend that the site is restored in a manner beneficial to biodiversity and that it links to the aims of the Witham Valley Country Park and Central Lincolnshire BOM Study. The RSPB (83(12)) recommend a restoration priority of connecting and promoting a variety of distinct and individual public green spaces.

The Environment Agency states that this site is adjacent to an ordinary watercourse which has a flood plain that extends into the site. The Environment Agency is confident that any flood risk issues associated with this site can be managed by a suitably informed flood risk assessment at the planning application stage and recommend that restoration works should consider making space for water / slowing the flows of the River Witham.

Site Reference MS07-CL Kettleby Quarry, Bigby

Q.1 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred mineral site allocations? If not, provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this question.

Q.2 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites profiles?

Four representations were received in relation to this question. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(8)) objects to this allocation as the site is within an existing woodland (Wellholmes Holt) and raise concerns that it may not be possible to mitigate the impacts on the woodland. Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(5)) also raise concerns regarding this site as it is adjacent to Kettleby House Farm Local Geological Site (LGS) and state that this is a material consideration. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust states that if impacts on nature conservation would not be significant and the site is allocated, restoration should create priority habitats in line with the Central Lincolnshire BOM Study. Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership calls for geodiversity led restoration and the RSPB (83(14)) suggests that chalk grassland is the restoration priority.

The Environment Agency (99(10)) states that this site is adjacent to an ordinary watercourse which has a flood plain that extends into the site. The Environment Agency is confident that any flood risk issues associated with this site can be managed by a suitably informed flood risk assessment at the planning application stage and recommend that restoration works should consider making space for water/slowing the flows of the River Ancholme.

Site Reference MS08-CL Kettleby Quarry, Bigby

Q.1 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred mineral site allocations? If not, provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this question.

Q.2 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites profiles?

Three representations were received in relation to this question. Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(6)) highlights that this site is adjacent to Kettleby House Farm Local Geological Site (LGS) and states that this is a material consideration. Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership calls for geodiversity led restoration and the RSPB (83(14)) suggests that chalk grassland is the restoration priority. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust recommends that restoration should create

priority habitats such as heathland and acid grassland, in line with the Central Lincolnshire BOM Study

Site Reference MS09-CL North Kelsey Road, Caistor

Q.1 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred mineral site allocations? If not, provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

One representation was received in relation to this question from Historic England (37(11)) which raises concerns that there is no reference to heritage impacts in the Sustainability Appraisal for this site, yet there is potential archaeological significance, as well as impacts on the setting of heritage assets at Caistor.

Q.2 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites profiles?

Two representations were received in relation to this question. Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(7)) states that the details are inaccurate and that the site is adjacent to Fonaby Sand Pit LGS. They recommend that if allocated, restoration of the site should be geodiversity led. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(10)) recommends that restoration should create priority habitats such as heathland and acid grassland, in line with the Central Lincolnshire BOM Study

Site Reference MS13-CL Kirkby on Bain (Phase 1), Tattershall Thorpe

Q.1 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred mineral site allocations? If not, provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

Two representations were received in relation to this question. Historic England (37(5)) raises concerns that the setting of heritage assets has not been considered and refer to a previous submission in 2014, stating that this issue needs to be addressed.

The National Trust (39(1)), which owns Tattershall Castle, does not object to the site on the basis of heritage impacts but stress the importance of conserving the significance Tattershall Castle derives from its setting and ensuring its ongoing attractiveness to residents and visitors.

Q.2 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites profiles?

Five representations were received in relation to this question. Four were from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(11)), Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(8)), Natural England (82(8)) and RSPB (83(9)). Between these bodies they highlight the proximity of the site to Tattershall Carrs SSSI, Kirkby Moor SSSI, Fulsby Wood SSSI, Troy Wood SSSI, Coningsby Meadow SNCI, Kirkby on Bain Pits LWS, Kirkby on Bain Gravel Pits LGS and Kirkby Airfield LWS. Concerns are raised in relation to the hydrogeological and hydrological impacts of development on these sites and Natural England specifically state that hydrological and ecological studies are required prior to the site being considered as an allocation and that there should be no impact on water levels in the River Bain. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust seeks assurance that there would be no adverse impacts on the nature conservation interests of the SNCI, LWSs or SSSIs. If the site is allocated these bodies seek biodiversity led restoration, recommending heathland, wet woodland and acid grassland as priorities.

The fifth representation was from the Environment Agency (99(11)) stating that this site is adjacent to the Horncastle Canal Main River which has a flood plain that extends into the site. The Environment Agency is confident that any flood risk issues associated with this site can be managed by a suitably informed flood risk assessment at the planning application stage and recommend that restoration works should consider making space for water to reduce flood risk to third parties. The Environment Agency also specify a 30 metre standoff from the top of the bank to any mineral excavations will be required to protect the stability of the main river bank and ensure flood risk is not increased.

Site Reference MS15-CL Kirkby on Bain (Phase 2), Tattershall Thorpe

Q.1 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred mineral site allocations? If not, provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

Two representations were received in relation to this question. Historic England (37(6)) raises concerns that the setting of heritage assets has not been considered and refer to a previous submission in 2014, stating that this issue needs to be addressed.

The National Trust (39(2)), which as stated above, owns Tattershall Castle, does not object to the site on the basis of heritage impacts but stress the importance of conserving the significance Tattershall Castle derives from its setting and ensuring its ongoing attractiveness to residents and visitors.

Q.2 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites profiles?

Five representations were received in relation to this question. Four were from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(12)), Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(9)), Natural England (82(9)) and RSPB (83(10)). Natural England and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust highlight that the site is close to Tattershall Carrs SSSI and Natural England also state that it is in close proximity to Fulsby Wood SSSI and Troy Wood SSSI. Concerns are raised in relation to the hydrogeological and hydrological impacts of development on these sites and Natural England specifically states that hydrological and ecological studies are required prior to the site being considered as an allocation and that there should be no impact on water levels in the River Bain.

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust states that the site includes a large area of floodplain grazing marsh priority habitat and that they object to the loss of this habitat. If the site is taken forward for allocation they request that the area of priority habitat is removed from the allocation boundary.

In general, if the site is allocated these bodies seek biodiversity led restoration, recommending heathland, wet woodland and acid grassland as priorities.

The Environment Agency (99(12)) states that this site is adjacent to the Horncastle Canal Main River which has a flood plain that extends into the site. The Environment Agency is confident that any flood risk issues associated with this site can be managed by a suitably informed flood risk assessment at the planning application stage and recommend that restoration works should consider making space for water to reduce flood risk to third parties. The Environment Agency also specify a 30 metre standoff from the top of the bank to any mineral excavations will be required to protect the stability of the main river bank and ensure flood risk is not increased.

Site Reference MS17-SL Red Barn, Castle Bytham

Q.1 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred mineral site allocations? If not, provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

One representation has been received in relation to this question which came from Historic England (37(7)) which raises concerns that the setting of heritage assets has not been considered and refers to a previous submission in 2014, stating that this issue needs to be addressed. Historic England is particularly concerned due to the impacts on an extensive conservation area and numerous heritage assets at Castle Bytham. They note that the Sustainability Appraisal in relation to this site cites non-

visual impacts relating to HGV movements but that the summary does not suggest or justify how these can be overcome or by what type of mitigation.

Q.2 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites profiles?

Two representations have been received in relation to this question from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(13)) and RSPB (83(13)). Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust states that the site is close to Cabbage Hill Wood candidate LWS, which is designated on Natural England's Ancient Woodland Inventory, and Potter's Hill Road Verges LWS. As such, there is potential for negative impacts on nature conservation. Concern is expressly raised regarding the impacts on hydrogeology and hydrology through dewatering and the impacts of HGVs on verge habitats through overrunning. The Wildlife Trust seeks assurance that nature conservation would not be adversely impacted and that impacts can be mitigated.

Both Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and RSPB recommend biodiversity led restoration, including limestone grassland and enhancements for wildlife habitats.

Site Reference MS26a-SL Urn Farm, Baston (Central)

Q.1 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred mineral site allocations? If not, provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

58 representations were received in relation to this question, all of which raised concerns about the site and the majority explicitly stated that they objected to its allocation. 49 of the respondents stated that they are local residents and these representations objected to the allocation for a wide range of reasons, including: the close proximity of the site to residential properties; detrimental impacts due to noise and dust; concerns regarding highway safety in relation to the existing road network, which is stated to include a number of dangerous junctions where accidents frequently occur, and the location of schools in the vicinity; the ability of the highway network to accommodate the associated vehicle movements; impacts on heritage assets in the area; the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land; damage to the water environment and potential flooding, with particular concerns being raised regarding impacts on the River Glen; increased disease due to increases in insects such as mosquitoes; impacts on PRow; the over-intensification of minerals operations in the area; and concerns regarding the quality of any restoration scheme. In addition to this, personal health concerns were raised by a number of local residents and others indicated that the development would reduce the value or saleability of their property.

Amongst the representations were Baston Parish Council (47(1)) and Greatford Parish Council (20(1)). Baston Parish Council disagrees with the allocation due to its close proximity to the local community and raise a number of issues which have also been cited by local residents. Whilst Greatford Parish Council doesn't agree with the allocation, they request a number of mitigation measures are put in place if the site is taken forward. The nearby Waterside Garden Centre (97(1)) raises objections largely due to the impacts on their business through increased traffic problems, the use of King Street, which their customers are advised to use, and the potential impacts due to flooding.

Historic England (37(8)) raises concerns, stating that the site is likely to have impacts on the setting of heritage assets, particularly the two Grade II listed Fletland Watermill Buildings and that this is not identified in the Sustainability Appraisal.

Q.2 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites profiles?

29 representations were received in relation to this question, of which 17 were from local residents of Baston or Greatford. Nine of the local residents answered “no” to the question that they didn't have any comments to make, however, eight local residents indicated concerns with the information provided, raising concerns regarding the adequacy of the assessment of noise, the need for full consideration to be given the highways and dust impacts, the need to consider impacts on users of the PRoW and that the perceived problems appear to be vaguely documented. One local resident specifically highlighted two conflicting statements within the Sites and Areas Report in relation to traffic and access. Another queried the accuracy of the maps provided, in particular in relation to the exhausted quarries in the area.

Baston Parish Council (47(2)) stated that they had no comments to make, whereas Greatford Parish Council (20(2)) considers that the suitability of roads adjacent to the site to accommodate HGV traffic is over-stated. Baston Environment Group (25(2)) states that more work is needed on the underlying strata and effects on the aquifer and ground water to the east.

South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership (93(2)) considers that there are omissions in relation to this site as it has hydrological connectivity to Baston Fen Special Area of Conservation (SAC). They acknowledge, along with Natural England (82(11)) and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(14)), that the Habitats Regulations Assessment screened out this site and agree that any development should be subject to close scrutiny and control to avoid any potential harm to the SAC. South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership seeks assurance that if the site is allocated it wouldn't adversely impact on Baston Fen SAC, Baston and Thurlby Fen SSSI, Langtoft Gravel Pits SSSI, Cross Drain SSSI or a large number of LWSs and LGSs.

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust, Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(10)), Natural England, RSPB (83(5)) and South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership all seek a strategic, landscape scale approach to be taken to the restoration of the site with priority being given to restoration to maximise biodiversity benefits, in line with the South Lincolnshire Fenlands Project. A Mineral Restoration Opportunities Vision is recommended. South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership provided very detailed recommendations for integrated, landscape scale restoration of the site.

(Please also see comments from RSPB in the general comments section at the end of this report.)

The Environment Agency (99(14)) is confident that any flood risk issues associated with this site can be managed by a suitably informed flood risk assessment at the planning application stage. They also specify a 30 metre standoff from the top of the bank to any mineral excavations will be required to protect the stability of the main river bank and ensure flood risk is not increased.

One respondent supported this allocation (91(2)) and confirmed that further information will be provided about the site in due course.

Site Reference MS27-SL Baston No.2, Langtoft (Phase 2)

Q.1 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred mineral site allocations? If not, provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

Two representations were received in relation to this question, both from local residents who support this allocation. One stated that they support it as there are no residential properties adjoining or overlooking the site and access arrangements are already in place.

Q.2 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites profiles?

Five representations were received in relation to this question from the nature conservation bodies Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(15)), Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(11)), Natural England (82(3)), South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership (93(3)) and RSPB (83(6)). Natural England raise concerns that neither the site report nor the Sites and Areas Report acknowledge the presence of the Baston Fen SAC, Thurlby Fens SSSI (to the north) or Cross Drain SSSI (to the east) which are in close proximity to the site (Cross Drain is adjacent). These respondents state that the site has hydrological connectivity to Baston Fen SAC and seek assurance that if the site is allocated it wouldn't have adverse impacts on Baston

Fen SAC. South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership also states that there should be no adverse impacts on Baston and Thurlby Fen SSSI, Langtoft Gravel Pits SSSI, Cross Drain SSSI or a large number of LWSs and LGSs.

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust, Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership, Natural England and South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership acknowledge that the Habitats Regulations Assessment screened out this site.

All of the respondents seek a strategic, landscape scale approach to be taken to the restoration of this site and state that priority should be given to a restoration scheme to maximise biodiversity benefits, in line with the South Lincolnshire Fenlands Project. A Mineral Restoration Opportunities Vision is recommended. South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership provided very detailed recommendations for integrated, landscape scale restoration of the site.

(Please also see comments from RSPB in the general comments section at the end of this report.)

Site Reference MS28-SL Baston No.2, Langtoft (Phase 3)

Q.1 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred mineral site allocations? If not, provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this question.

Q.2 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites profiles?

Six representations were received in relation to this question. Five were from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(16)), Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(12)), Natural England (82(2)), South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership (93(4)) and RSPB (83(7)). Natural England raise concerns that neither the site report nor the Sites and Areas Report acknowledge the presence of designated sites in the vicinity, including Cross Drain SSSI. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership state that the site has hydrological connectivity to Baston Fen SAC and acknowledge that the Habitats Regulations Assessment screened out this site. Both seek assurance that if the site is allocated it wouldn't have adverse impacts on Baston Fen SAC. In addition, South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership also states that there should be no adverse impacts on Baston and Thurlby Fen SSSI, Langtoft Gravel Pits SSSI, Cross Drain SSSI or a large number of LWSs and LGSs.

All of the respondents seek a strategic, landscape scale approach to be taken to the restoration of this site and state that priority should be given to a restoration scheme to maximise biodiversity benefits, in line with the South Lincolnshire Fenlands Project. A Mineral Restoration Opportunities Vision is recommended. South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership provided very detailed recommendations for integrated, landscape scale restoration of the site.

(Please also see comments from RSPB in the general comments section at the end of this report.)

The Environment Agency (99(15)) is confident that any flood risk issues associated with this site can be managed by a suitably informed flood risk assessment at the planning application stage. The Environment Agency also specify a 30 metre standoff from the top of the bank to any mineral excavations will be required to protect the stability of the main river bank and ensure flood risk is not increased.

Site Reference MS29-SL West Deeping

Q.1 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred mineral site allocations? If not, provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

Three representations were received in relation to this question. Cemex (30(2)) welcome the promotion of this site as a future extension.

Historic England (37(9)) has raised significant concerns in relation to the proposed allocation of this site and the approach taken. It is stated that a number of sites have been identified where archaeological considerations need to be taken into account but this is not dealt with in the Plan. Reference is made to a previous submission in 2014 which suggested that the site should not be allocated due to historic environment impacts and so they are disappointed it remains in the Plan. Historic England is extremely concerned at the deferral of assessment of impacts to the planning application stage and describes this as a fundamentally unsound approach as should impacts be identified which render the principle of any extraction in this location impossible, the plan would fail to be effective in the delivery of minerals. In light of the lack of evidence in relation to critical historic environment considerations to justify the allocation, Historic England recommends that this allocation should be removed. Market Deeping Town Council (50(1)) also raise concerns regarding impacts on local heritage. They are also concerned about the restoration of the site and the number of water bodies in the area.

Q.2 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites profiles?

Six representations were received in relation to this question. Five were from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(17)), Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(13)), Natural England (82(10)), RSPB (83(8)) and South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership (93(5)).

Natural England states that the site is in close proximity to Langtoft Gravel Pits SSSI and in the catchment risk zone of Cross Drain SSSI and state that there is a need to ensure there would be no adverse impacts on the interest features of these sites. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust adds that it is also close to Tallington Lakes candidate LWS and seek to protect this. In addition, South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership also states that there should be no adverse impacts on Baston and Thurlby Fen SSSI, Langtoft Gravel Pits SSSI, Cross Drain SSSI or a large number of LWSs and LGSs.

These respondents all seek a strategic, landscape scale approach to be taken to the restoration of this site and state that priority should be given to restoring the site to maximise biodiversity benefits, in line with the South Lincolnshire Fenlands Project. A Mineral Restoration Opportunities Vision is recommended. South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership provided very detailed recommendations for integrated, landscape scale restoration of the site.

The Environment Agency (99(13)) states that the site is not situated within the floodplain but it is adjacent to a Main River. The Environment Agency is confident that any flood risk issues associated with this site can be managed by a suitably informed flood risk assessment at the planning application stage and state that unless otherwise agreed on a site-specific basis, it wishes to see a 30 metre standoff from the top of the bank of the Main River to any mineral excavations.

Non-Site Specific Representations – Minerals

In addition to the comments summarised above relating to the specific sites identified as minerals allocations, a number of respondents made non-site specific or general comments regarding the minerals allocations part of the plan. Some of these comments have been included within this part of the report as they relate to a number of sites and were presented by the respondent as a representation on the collective issues.

Q.1 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred mineral site allocations? If not, provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

13 representations have been received from twelve respondents which make general comments in relation to this question.

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(1)) and South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership (93(1)) responded in general terms stating that because no ecological surveys have been undertaken, and the sites have not been shown to not be of significant value, it is not possible to assess potential impacts on protected habitats and species and therefore sites may not be suitable for development, however, this wouldn't be known until the planning application stage. It is recommended that surveys are undertaken prior to allocation.

Whilst Nottinghamshire County Council (38(2)) has stated their agreement with the methodology used to identify future demand for mineral, following the NPPF, they highlight that there are a number of discrepancies in the figures used in the plan. Errors in the figures used are also stated by two other respondents (Tarmac (79(1)) and (91(6))).

Highways England (70(1)) welcomes the approach of extending existing sites where possible as a means of reducing vehicle trips associated with the development.

Cemex (30(7)) agrees with Policy SL1 but suggest it needs to be supported by safeguarding policies, documentation and maps.

The promoter (71(1)) of a site known as Newton's Farm and Mick George Ltd (75(1)) argue that policies M2 and M4 (of the Core Strategy) are anti-competitive as they would restrict new operators entering the market by having preference for extensions over new sites and that this is not acceptable. Mick George Ltd argues that if an extension site and a new site score the same in sustainability terms, the Plan should be flexible enough to allow for a new entrant to establish a new site or the new entrant be given the allocation to demonstrate the County Council does not favour incumbents over new entrants.

Sibelco (87(1)) seeks to ensure that any silica sand sites which may come forward are dealt with under Policy M8 and in accordance with the NPPF.

Q.2 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites profiles?

Seven representations have been received which make general comments in relation to this question, three of which are from the nature conservation bodies Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(2)), Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(1)) and South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership (93(12)). Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership made very similar representations raising concerns regarding the lack of detail and strategic thinking for restoration. They consider the restoration of minerals sites to provide significant opportunities for biodiversity enhancements and recommend a strategic, landscape scale approach to restoration is taken. They recommend that the following should have a priority for biodiversity led restoration:

- Trent and Tame River Valley Futurescape - Lea Marsh (MS01-LT)
- South Lincs Fenlands Project area - Baston sites (MS26a-SL, MS27-SL, MS28-SL and MS29-SL)
- Kirkby Moor and Bain Valley Living Landscape - Kirkby on Bain sites (MS13-CL and MS15-CL)
- Witham Valley Country Park - Swinderby and Norton Bottom sites (MS04-LT and MS05-LT).

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust states that the Council has a duty under s.40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in exercising its functions

Anglian Water Services (92(2)) requests that the County Council considers the implications of mineral extraction for their assets and provide details of required easements in relation to their assets.

The Environment Agency (99(17)) states that unless otherwise agreed on a site-specific basis, it wishes to see a 30 metre standoff from the top of the bank of a Main River to any mineral excavations in order to protect the stability of the main river bank and ensure that the excavation will not increase flood risk. Any proposal to reduce the standoff will need to be supported by evidence that the stability of the main river bank will be maintained.

Q.3 Do you have any additional sites you wish to put forward for consideration?

23 representations were received in relation to this question. Twelve of these representations were from residents of Baston or Greatford who said that they did not have any additional sites to put forward. Baston Parish Council (47(3)),

Greatford Parish Council (20(3)) and Swinderby Parish Council (74(3)) all responded to answer “no” to this question. One resident of Greatford suggested that the existing sites east and south of Baston and south east of Langtoft should be extended away from sensitive receptors.

One respondent (71(3)) promoted a site known as “Newtons Farm”, setting out the attributes of this site and stated that it has advantages over other proposed sites such as Lea Marsh.

Q.7 Do you agree with the minerals sites to be discounted from the process?

32 representations were received in relation to this question from 29 respondents. 21 representations state that they agree with the minerals sites discounted from the process, nine state that they do not agree and two representations stated “no comments”. Of the 21 representations which agree with the discounted sites, eleven of these were from residents of Baston or Greatford. In addition, Baston Parish Council (47(7)), Greatford Parish Council (20(5)) and Swinderby Parish Council (74(7)) responded that they agree with the discounted site, with Swinderby Parish Council specifically referring to the discounting of site MS03-LT. Ancaster Parish Council (89(1)) raised concerns about the inclusion of site MS06-LT but the reasons given for this clearly indicate that they object to the site being allocated as they raise concerns regarding highway impacts and object to quarry traffic going through the village.

Six of the nine representations stating that they did not agree with the discounted sites were promoting sites which were to be discounted. One respondent (6(1) and (2)) submitted two representations, one promoting site MS19-SL and one promoting MS20-SL. A further respondent (26(1)) stated that site MS25-SL should not be discounted due to deliverability and argue that the site can indeed be delivered. A large amount of documentation was submitted to accompany this representation to support this site being allocated and it is stated that the negative attributes of the site which have been identified can be overcome or are not real.

Cemex has made two representations (30(5) and (6)) promoting sites MS12-CL and MS25-SL. In relation to MS12-CL, it is argued that this site would be an extension to Tattershall Park Farm Quarry and would use the existing access, plant site, offices and weighbridge and that the existing operation demonstrates that the site could be worked with appropriate measures and mitigation to reduce adverse impacts. Cemex argues that MS25-SL would be a logical replacement to Cemex’s site at West Deeping and should be allocated. They state how potential impacts could be overcome and the lack of constraints.

The site promoter (71(4)) for MS03-LT disagrees with its inclusion on the discounted sites list and argues that the primary reason for discounting the site is due to its lack of deliverability, however, they state that this is not the case and that they are at an advanced stage of negotiation with an established mineral operator. Mick George Ltd (75(3)) considers site MS03-LT to be a significantly preferable option to the Lea Marsh site and acknowledge that further sites may be deleted in the Lincoln/Trent Valley Area as the Proposed Modifications to the Core Strategy significantly reduce mineral requirements.

One respondent made two representations (91(5) and (7)), one stating that whilst they agreed with the sites to be discounted, there was a degree of inconsistency within the reasoning for not including sites around Baston and Greatford. The other representation relates to site MS26B-SL and makes the point that South Kesteven District Council has just undertaken a call for sites as part of the Local Plan review and land south of Baston and west of King Street has been put forward for consideration for housing (MS26B-SL). It is considered that there may be an opportunity to allocate both sites and deliver a range of benefits to Baston such as open space, sustainable drainage, a bypass and adequate supply of housing.

South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership (93(10)) agree with the discounted sites but make the point that a number of comments attributed to it in relation to sites MS18-SL, MS19-SL and MS20-SL were not made by them.

Waste Representations

Policy SL2: Waste Site Allocations

Site Reference WS14-SK Mid UK Recycling, Caythorpe

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this question.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

One representation was received from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(18)) in relation to this question, stating that the site is adjacent to Caythorpe Old Quarry SNCI and seeking assurance that the nature conservation interest of this SNCI would not be adversely affected. It is recommended that the Site Profile states that impacts on the SNCI need to be mitigated.

Site Reference WS17-SK Vantage Park, Gonerby Moor

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this question.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

No representations have been received in relation to this question.

Policy SL3: Area Allocations

Area Reference WA01-WL Heapham Road, Gainsborough

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this question.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

Two representations have been received in relation to this question from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(19)) and Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(14)). They state that the site is adjacent to the White's Wood SNCI and candidate LWS, which is also on Natural England's Ancient Woodland Inventory. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust seeks assurance that the site would not be adversely affected and suggest that the Area Profile refer to the need for mitigation. Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership recommends that an ecological survey should be undertaken to inform appropriate mitigation and compensation with biodiversity led restoration and monitoring.

Area Reference WA02-CL West of Outer Circle Road, Lincoln

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this question.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

One representation was received in relation to this question from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(20)). This raises concerns regarding the impact of additional development on Bishop's Road North Brownfield LWS and Bishop's Road South Brownfield LWS, which are located within the site. They oppose the loss of LWS habitats and recommend that if the allocation is taken forward the LWSs are removed from the boundary. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust seeks assurance that the site would not be adversely affected and suggests that the Area Profile refers to the need for mitigation or compensation.

Area Reference WA03-CL Allenby Road Trading Estate (North), Lincoln

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this question.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

Three representations were received in relation to this question. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(21)) and Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(15)) highlight that this site is adjacent to the Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI, LWS and LGS and that if allocated, the Wildlife Trust seeks assurance that the development would not adversely impact on the nature conservation interest of these designated sites. Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership recommends that the results of biodiversity and geological surveys should be taken into account and seeks biodiversity and geodiversity benefits in the restoration of the site. Both nature conservation bodies seek appropriate mitigation measures.

The City of Lincoln Council (22(1)) objects on the basis that this site has been assessed differently to WA02-CL and specifically that the implication is this site is less sensitive and as such would be acceptable for both open and enclosed waste facilities. The sensitivity of the site should be acknowledged and any waste should only be enclosed, as is the case for WA02-CL. It should also be noted that this site is proposed for allocation as a Sustainable Urban Extension and that this would be a constraint.

Area Reference WA04-CL Allenby Road Trading Estate (South), Lincoln

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this question.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

Two representations were received in relation to this question, one from Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(22)) and one from Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(16)). They highlight that this site is adjacent to the Greetwell Hollow Quarry SSSI, LWS and LGS to the north and Willingham Fen West LWS to the south. If allocated, Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust seeks assurance that the development would not adversely impact on the nature conservation interest of these designated sites. Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership recommends that the results of biodiversity and geological surveys should be taken into account and seeks biodiversity and geodiversity benefits in the restoration of the site. They both seek appropriate mitigation measures.

Area Reference WA05-CL Great Northern Terrace, Lincoln

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this question.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

Three representations were received in relation to this question. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(23)) and Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(17)) highlight that this site is adjacent to and includes part of the Witham Corridor, East of City Centre LWS and is close to Cow Paddle LWS and Cow Paddle Railway Embankment East LWS and that these designations have not been considered. Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership objects to this site and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust seeks assurance that the development would not adversely impact on the nature conservation interest of these designated sites. However, if allocated, both seek appropriate mitigation and Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership seeks a biodiversity led restoration of the site.

The Environment Agency (99(4)) is confident that any flood risk issues associated with this site can be managed by a suitably informed flood risk assessment at the planning application stage.

Area Reference WA09-NK Woodbridge Road Industrial Estate, Sleaford

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this question.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

One representation was received in relation to this question from National Grid (53(4)). This states that the site is crossed by, or is within close proximity to, High Pressure Gas Pipelines or Intermediate Pressure Gas Pipelines and draws attention to the requirements for protecting pipelines which may impact on development.

Area Reference WA11-EL A16 Grimsby Road, Louth

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this area.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

No representations have been received in relation to this area.

Area Reference WA12-EL Wragby Industrial Estate, Wragby

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

One representation was received in relation to this question from East Lindsey District Council (45(1)) drawing attention to outline planning permission reference S/216/1020/13 for industrial use and up to 100 residential units at Millbrook Business Park, Wragby, which can constrain this proposal.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

No representations have been received in relation to this question.

Area Reference WA14-EL Holmes Way, Horncastle

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this area.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

No representations have been received in relation to this area.

Area Reference WA16-SK North of Manning Lane and West of Meadow Drove, Bourne

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this area.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

No representations have been received in relation to this area.

Area Reference WA22-BO Riverside Industrial Estate, Boston

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

One representation has been received in relation to this question from Boston Borough Council (46(3)). This states that some parts of this area may be affected by surface water flooding and all of the area is affected by a high flood hazard. Boston Borough Council does not accept that this is a suitable location for open composting as wind would spread odours across the residential areas of Boston town, unacceptably affecting amenities and that a flood event would spread material and add to the impacts of floods on existing buildings and dwellings. It is requested that this is removed as a potential use. Concerns are also raised that some Hazardous Waste is buried in the landfill site which is now closed and the impacts of this in a

flood event on existing buildings and dwellings. Clarification is sought regarding why hazardous use is listed.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

Two representations were received in relation to this question. National Grid (53(5)) states that the site is crossed by, or is within close proximity to, High Pressure Gas Pipelines or Intermediate Pressure Gas Pipelines and draws attention to the requirements for protecting pipelines which may impact on development.

The Environment Agency (99(1)) states that this site lies within the "danger for all" category for the current day breach risk and climate change scenarios and will need to be mitigated appropriately. The Environment Agency is confident that any flood risk issues associated with this site can be managed by a suitably informed flood risk assessment at the planning application stage. It states that as part of the Boston Barrier works it is expected that some locations will require bank raising which often requires widening of the flood defence footprint in a landward direction and this should be borne in mind at the detailed planning stage. It is requested that the site is reviewed in relation to potential hazardous waste use, as this type of waste facility is classed as "more vulnerable" and in Flood Zone 3 should be subject to the Exception Test due to the possible consequences of flood waters becoming contaminated with hazardous materials. The Sequential Test Paper published to support the choice of allocated sites misrepresents this point and should be updated. Other suitable sites at a lower risk of flooding might provide a better location for the storage of hazardous substances but it is for the Council to decide.

Area Reference WA25-SH Wardentree Lane/Enterprise Park, Spalding

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this question.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

Five respondents made five representations in relation to this question. Natural England (82(4)) notes that the site report states that the site is close to the Welland SAC, however, this is not the case, but it is close to a number of LWSs. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(24)) states that the site is adjacent to and includes part of Vernatt's Drain LWS, Vernatt's LNR/LWS, Blue Gowt Drain, West Marsh Road LWS and is close to Pinchbeck Marsh LWS, River Welland in Spalding LWS and Spalding

Cemetery LWS. Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(18)) objects to the allocation as the site includes part of Vernatt's Drain LWS. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust seeks assurance that if the site is allocated it would not adversely impact the nature conservation interests of the LWS and both organisations seek to secure mitigation measures if the site is allocated. Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership recommends biodiversity led restoration.

National Grid made two representations to this question (53(2) and 53(3)) highlighting that the site is crossed by or is within close proximity to overhead line apparatus and that it includes a National Grid substation. In relation to the overhead line apparatus, guidance is provided regarding the requirements to be met by any future development to ensure available access and statutory safety clearance measures. In relation to the substation, it is stated that there is no objection to development in the surrounding area of substations but that there may be a future operational need for essential utility development at the site.

The Environment Agency (99(2)) states that a small area of the site lies within the tidal hazard area in the event of a breach to the tidal defences in the climate change scenario which will need to be mitigated appropriately. It is confident that any flood risk issues associated with this site can be managed by a suitably informed flood risk assessment at the planning application stage.

Area Reference WA26-SH Clay Lake Industrial Estate, Spalding

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this question.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

Three representations were received in relation to this question. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(25)) and Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (76(19)) state that the site is adjacent to Coronation Channel LWS. The Wildlife Trust seeks assurance that development would not adversely affect the nature conservation interests of the LWS and both organisations recommend mitigation measures. Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership seeks biodiversity led restoration of the site.

The Environment Agency (99(3)) states that the site lies within the hazard extent for the climate change breach scenario and is adjacent to the fluvial River Welland and that this will need to be mitigated appropriately. It is confident that any flood risk issues associated with this site can be managed by a suitably informed flood risk

assessment at the planning application stage. It is requested that the site is reviewed in relation to the potential hazardous waste use, as this type of waste facility is classed as "more vulnerable" and in Flood Zone 3 should be subject to the Exception Test due to the possible consequences of flood waters becoming contaminated with hazardous materials. The Sequential Test Paper published to support the choice of allocated sites misrepresents this point and should be updated. Other suitable sites at a lower risk of flooding might provide a better location for the storage of hazardous substances but it is for the Council to decide.

Area Reference WS03-WL Gallamore Road, Market Rasen

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this area.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

One representation from the Environment Agency (99(5)) stating that it is confident that any flood risk issues associated with this site can be managed by a suitably informed flood risk assessment at the planning application stage.

Area Reference WS08-NK Sleaford Enterprise Estate, Sleaford

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this area.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

One representation from the Environment Agency (99(6)) stating that it is confident that any flood risk issues associated with this site can be managed by a suitably informed flood risk assessment at the planning application stage.

Area Reference WS09-NK Bonemill Lane, Sleaford

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this area.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

No representations have been received in relation to this area.

Area Reference WS12-EL A158 Burgh Road West, Skegness

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

No representations have been received in relation to this area.

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

One representation from the Environment Agency (99(7)) stating that the site lies within the tidal hazard area following a breach to the tidal defences in the current day and climate change scenario which will need to be mitigated appropriately. It is confident that any flood risk issues associated with this site can be managed by a suitably informed flood risk assessment at the planning application stage.

Non-Site Specific Representations – Waste

In addition to the comments summarised above relating to the specific waste sites and areas, a number of respondents made non-site specific or general comments regarding the waste allocations part of the plan.

Q.4 Do you agree with the draft policies for development on preferred waste site and areas? If not, please provide reasons why and suggest an alternative.

17 representations have been received which made general comments in relation to this question, although six of these representations stated “no comment”. Baston Parish Council (47(4)), Swinderby Parish Council (74(4)) and Baston Environment Group (25(4)) all answered “yes” to the question, whereas two local residents of Baston and Greatford answered “no”.

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(3)) stated that the preferred course of action is that all allocation sites are subject to ecological surveys and shown not to be of significant value before being allocated.

Cambridgeshire County Council (29(1)) states that it isn't clear whether the level of waste management provision accords with the identified need in the Core Strategy and request that any amendments to the Core Strategy are reflected in the Site Locations Plan. Nottinghamshire County Council (38(1)) welcomes the continued provision of an appropriate range of waste management facilities and recognises the reciprocal roles played by sites to enable waste to be managed at one of the nearest appropriate facilities in light of the inevitable cross border movements between Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire. It is also stated that the waste sites do not raise any strategic concerns to Nottinghamshire County Council.

Historic England (37(10)) raises concerns that the site summaries do not refer to historic environment impacts and query the nature of the "areas" allocations as different types of waste can have different impacts and so it is difficult to comment on the acceptability of these sites.

Highways England (70(4)) welcomes the strategy of new sites being directed to the largest settlements to reduce the number of miles waste travels, ensure waste is managed as close as possible to the source and reducing impacts on the strategic road network. Highways England does not consider that the sites would impact on the strategic road network.

Anglian Water Services (92(4)) refer to their general response to question 5 (see below).

Q.5 Do you have any comments on the accuracy of the details in the preferred sites and areas profiles?

16 representations have been received making general comments in relation to this question. Of these, eight representations answered "no" to the question, including from Baston Parish Council (47(5)) and Swinderby Parish Council (74(5)) and five representations stated "no comment".

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust (3(4)) reiterate their previous comments recommending that all sites put forward for allocation should be subject to an ecological survey prior to allocation and state that from aerial photographs it appears that some sites are developed or previously developed and so may have important open mosaic habitats present or buildings to be demolished that may be used by bats. They seek to safeguard protected or important habitats and species and secure net gains in biodiversity to be incorporated into the site designs.

Anglian Water Services (92(5)) requests that the implications of the waste allocation sites for Anglian Water's assets are considered, providing details of easements to be

adhered to. Whilst the letter states that a schedule of assets has been provided this appears to have been omitted.

Q.6 Do you have any additional sites or areas you wish to put forward for consideration?

19 representations have been received in relation to this question, although no additional sites have been suggested. Respondents included Greatford Parish Council (20(4)), Baston Parish Council (47(6)) and Swinderby Parish Council (74(6)). Five of the respondents stated that they had no comments to make, whereas the others all answered “no” to the question.

Q.8 Do you agree with the waste sites / areas to be discounted from the process?

19 representations were received from 16 respondents in relation to this question. Eleven representations agreed with the waste sites and areas to be discounted, including Baston Parish Council (47(8)) and Swinderby Parish Council (74(8)). One representation (90(8)) disagreed with the sites and areas to be discounted but provided no further details in this regard. Seven representations answered “no comments” to the question.

Boston Borough Council made four separate representations (46(1), 46(2), 46(4) and 46(5)) agreeing with the discounting of areas WA19-BO, WA20-BO, WA21-BO and WA23-BO. Gorse Lane Action Group (GOLAG) (62(2)) support the discounting of site WS18-SK but consider that the reasons given for discounting the site are inadequate and set out a range of additional reasons which should form the basis for why the site should be discounted, including the need to prioritise the movement of waste up the waste hierarchy, the proximity to a SSSI, the site is underlain by a major aquifer of high vulnerability and the proximity to Ancient Woodland at Willowbank.

General Comments and Other Issues Raised

24 further representations were made from 20 separate respondents which raised either general issues or other issues not addressed by the questions in the consultation.

Cemex (30(3)) states that given the gap of five years between consultation documents there should have been a review of the sites updated during the 2014 call for sites. They also raised concerns that the additional or amended sites in the 2014 call for sites process did not provide comparable information to the 2010 sites.

It is also recommended that a schedule of reserves anticipated to commence during the plan period would be beneficial and support the proposed allocations.

Witham First Internal Drainage Board (31(1)), Witham Third Internal Drainage Board (34(1)) and Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board (57(1)) acknowledge they have been involved in discussions during the plan process and have no specific comments to make. Witham Fourth District Internal Drainage Board (54(1)) confirms that none of the proposed sites for mineral extraction or waste development are within the Board's area so they have no comments.

Historic England makes two general representations (37(1) and (12)). The first raises significant concerns that the approach taken towards heritage is inconsistent as it is sometimes omitted, sometimes mentioned in broad terms and sometimes very detailed. In order to ensure the plan is sound it must be much clearer and consistent. They state that impacts on setting are not taken into account. In their second representation, Historic England states their disappointment that previous concerns regarding the Sustainability Appraisal have not been addressed relating to combined landscape and heritage objectives, as the assessment has been entirely landscape focussed with no specific criteria for assessment of heritage assets. This is considered to be a significant flaw. Historic England argues that heritage is not adequately assessed and in order to comply with various pieces of legislation and a European Directive, this must be done for the plan to be legally compliant.

Nottinghamshire County Council (38(3)) makes the general point that minerals and waste development in Lincolnshire has the potential to impact on the highway network in Nottinghamshire, either on an individual or cumulative basis. This needs to be taken into account and it is requested that Nottinghamshire County Council is consulted on specific planning applications for minerals and waste, especially where it is forecast to generate significant HGV movements along routes into Nottinghamshire.

The Government Pipeline and Storage System (GPSS) (48(1)) submitted information in order for Lincolnshire County Council to check the location of GPSS apparatus. National Grid (53(1)) also provided details of their assets in Lincolnshire and provided guidance for working near to their apparatus.

Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Service (51(1)) states that the sites have been reviewed but they have no comments in relation to the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

West Stockwith Parish Council (52(1)) responded to state that they had no major comments to make. Ancaster Parish Council (89(2)) notes that the Sudbrook site has not been included and although it has not been quarried for 50 years, it cannot be considered to be a new site which they find very misleading.

The Marine Management Organisation (56(1)) submitted a standard response relating to marine licensing, marine planning, mineral and waste local plans and local aggregates assessments and recommended that reference to marine aggregates is included in the plan.

GOLAG (62(1)) support the general approach to the identification of sites and areas for future waste management development across Lincolnshire which is consistent with the draft Core Strategy and Development Management Policies document.

The Mayor of London (66(1)) had no comments to make.

An alternative site promoter (71(6)) considers that the 2.68 million tonnes shortfall figure used in Table 2 for the Lincoln/Trent Valley area is a gross underestimation and should be reviewed on the basis of industry expert opinion.

This alternative site promoter (71(5)), together with a further respondent (91(8)), also raised concerns that whilst they had previously been involved in the plan process, they had not been notified of clarification meetings or this latest consultation.

Natural England (82(1)) expressed disappointment that whilst they had expected this document to build on the strategic policy advice for restoration of minerals sites in the Core Strategy, this has not been achieved. They advise that each site allocation should give a clear indication of future restoration proposals which can be considered as part of a comprehensive vision for restoration of minerals sites on a landscape scale to ensure sustainability objectives are met. The RSPB (83(1), (2) and (3)) also recommends that a strategic, landscape scale approach to restoration is adopted and provide details of the key role minerals sites can play in halting and reversing the massive and on-going declines in biodiversity. RSPB provides a number of examples of good practice across England in achieving this. They acknowledged that one of the key constraints to delivering full biodiversity potential is the emphasis on restoring the best and most versatile agricultural land, however, it is stated that it is possible to deliver biodiversity led restoration schemes whilst preserving the long term potential of best and most versatile agricultural soils. The issue of bird strike is also addressed and examples given of how restoration can avoid impacts, minimising bird strike. RSPB states that the lack of details in the document to deliver biodiversity net gains needs to be addressed and provide details of how this can be achieved, including a list of all of the information which should be included in relation to each mineral site.

RSPB raise significant concerns regarding the conclusions reached in the Habitats Regulations Assessment and highlight that it is the responsibility of the Council, as the Competent Authority under the Habitats Regulations, to ensure that the plan will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of the Natura 2000 network of European

sites. They disagree with the approach of the Habitats Regulations Assessment to screen out a number of sites which have been identified as having potential impacts on European sites and consider that there is not sufficient evidence to satisfactorily conclude these allocations would avoid adverse impacts on these sites. This means that the approach effectively abdicates responsibility for determining if allocations are able to avoid impacts to the development management stage where there would be no guarantee that it would be possible to demonstrate no adverse impacts and so the site would be undeliverable. This is a risk to demonstrating the soundness of the plan, as sound planning does not rely on the allocation of sites where delivery is uncertain. It is recommended that, unless further information can be provided to demonstrate that adverse impacts can be avoided, the sites are screened into the next stage of the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.

RSPB also state that they are disappointed at the narrow focus of the questions posed in the consultation which offer limited scope to comment on a wider range of vitally important issues.

A representation was received from a local resident of Baston (96(2)) raising concerns about the website used during the consultation process and that it was difficult to use, isolating people from the planning process.

Finally, the Environment Agency (99(16)) states that for both minerals and waste sites, Flood Defence Consents will be required for any works in, over, under or within 9 metres of raised sea banks and that this Byelaw distance is set to increase to 16 metres from April 2016.

Appendix Two

Draft Site Locations Document (Preferred Sites and Areas)

December 2015

List of Respondents

Representation Number	Respondent Name	On Behalf Of
3 (1-25)	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust - Elizabeth Biott	
4 (1)	Lynn Carroll	
5 (1-2)	Mrs B Downie	
6 (1-2)	Martin Ott, Savills (UK) Ltd	Mr M Richardson
7 (1-4)	Mr Chris Gilbert	
8 (1)	No name – resident of Baston	
9 (1)	Nick Rickett	
10 (1)	Graham and Hazel Campbell	
11 (1-2)	Jill Groutage	
12 (1)	Michael Mills	
13 (1-5)	Matthew Lee	
14 (1)	Diane Savage	
15 (1)	Linda and Keith Frost and Mrs Jeanne Long	
16 (1-5)	June Walker	
17(1)	Mr M L Trotman	
18 (1)	Malcolm and Diana Wells	
19 (1)	S and D A Bryars	
20 (1-5)	Greatford Parish Council - Lois Webb	
21 (1-5)	Lois Webb	
22 (1)	City of Lincoln Council – Gill Wilson	
23 (1)	Sandra and Graham Kirk	
24 (1-5)	Mr French	
25 (1-8)	Baston Environmental Group – P Rayner	
26 (1)	Quartet Ltd – Dr Charles Lane	
27 (1-4)	Wg Cdr Alfred James Shears MBE	
28 (1-2)	James Lawrie	
29 (1)	Cambridgeshire County Council – Ann Barnes	
30 (1-11)	Cemex UK Operations Ltd – Kirsten Hannaford-Hill	
31 (1)	Witham First District Internal Drainage Board – Guy Hird	

Representation Number	Respondent Name	On Behalf Of
32 (1-6)	Rod Carnan	
33 (1)	Linda Seamer	
34 (1)	Witham Third District Internal Drainage Board – Guy Hird	
35 (1)	Alan and Pamela Varga	
36 (1-4)	Maureen Britten	
37 (1-12)	Historic England – Claire Searson	
38 (1-4)	Nottinghamshire County Council – Eilidh McCallum	
39 (1-2)	National Trust – Kim Miller	
40 (1)	Mr and Mrs Shaw	
41 (1)	Sue Shaw	
42 (1-3)	Dr and Mrs Myszka	
43 (1-2)	David Walker	
44 (1)	David Aldred	
45 (1)	East Lindsey District Council – Alexander Murphy	
46 (1-5)	Boston Borough Council – Peter Udy	
47 (1-8)	Baston Parish Council – James Kelly	
48 (1)	Fisher German LLP – Emma Pattison	GPSS
49 (1)	P W and C A Saint	
50 (1)	Market Deeping Town Council – Candace Brent	
51 (1)	Lincolnshire Wolds Countryside Service – Helen Gamble	
52 (1)	West Stockwith Parish Council – Dave Harford	
53 (1-5)	Amec Foster Wheeler	National Grid
54 (1)	Witham Fourth District Internal Drainage Board – Andy Carrott	
55 (1)	Caroline Wiles	
56 (1)	Marine Management Organisation	
57 (1)	Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board – Guy Hird	
58 (1)	Mark Cork	
59 (1)	Mrs M Copland	
60 (1)	Louise Kidder	
61 (1)	James Everitt	
62 (1-2)	Ben Hunt Planning Ltd – Ben Hunt	GOLAG
63 (1)	Gillian Sloss	
64 (1)	Mr K M and Mrs P Bunch	
65 (1-3)	Richard Aldiss	

Representation Number	Respondent Name	On Behalf Of
66 (1)	Mayor of London – Peter Heath	
67 (1)	Lisa Squires	
68 (1)	Mr S and Mrs M French	
69 (1)	Emma Bush	
70 (1-4)	Highways England – Emma Stewart	
71 (1-10)	Hallettec Environmental Ltd – Simon Hargreaves	Matthew White – The Sir Thomas White Trust
72 (1-2)	Mr S Taylor	
73 (1)	Denis O’Driscoll	
74 (1-8)	Swinderby Parish Council – Reg Ketteringham	
75 (1-3)	Mick George Ltd – John Gough	
76 (1-19)	Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership – Fran Smith	
77 (1-8)	Dr James Hartley	
78 (1)	Paul Doust	
79 (1-9)	Heaton Planning – Kate Todd	Tarmac
80 (1)	Doug Balderson	
81 (1)	Robert Wigfull	
82 (1-11)	Natural England – Roslyn Deeming	
83 (1-15)	RSPB – John Mills	
84 (1-2)	Dr David and Mrs Jennifer Trawford	
85 (1)	Robin Jones	
86 (1)	Martin and Hazel Whitfield	
87 (1)	Sibelco UK Ltd – Michael Hurley	
88 (1-2)	Chris and Diana Granville-White	
89 (1-2)	Ancaster Parish Council- Denise Gascoyne	
90 (1-8)	Mark Westwood	
91 (1-11)	Clover Planning – Ted Clover	Mr A Freeman
92 (1-8)	Anglian Water Services Ltd – Stewart Patience	
93 (1-12)	South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership – Amanda Jenkins	
94 (1-4)	Jane Pleasance	
95 (1-8)	Amanda Edwards	
96 (1-7)	Mark Farmer	
97 (1)	Waterside Garden Centre – Steven Welch	Waterside Garden Centre – Andy Parrott
98 (1-8)	Mark Garratt	
99(1-17)	Environment Agency – Richard Kisby	

This page is intentionally left blank