

**SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED ADDITIONAL MINOR MODIFICATIONS TO THE SUBMISSION
LOCAL PLAN
(MARCH 2017) – CORE STRATEGY**

Blue Text, Underlined:

Minor Modifications additional text to submission consultation draft Local Plan (November 2016) version set out in the Submission Modifications Draft (March 2017)

Minor Modification Deleted text from submission consultation draft Local Plan (November 2016) version set out in the Submission Modifications Draft (March 2017)

Red, Strike-through Text:

Ref No	Page	Paragraph	Change	Reason
ADM1	Cover		Amend the cover to read PUBLICATION VERSION SUBMISSION MODIFICATIONS DRAFT	To reflect the current document
ADM2	7	1.2	Insert the words - Carried out a Publication Version consultation 30th November 2016 to 25th January 2017.	To reflect the current document
ADM3	19	1	Amend the two policies quoted in the paragraph to reflect the numbering in the Core Strategy. The two policies should read SP3 and SP17	Typo correction error amended to reflect the current document
ADM4	20	2	Amend the paragraph so it reads as	This amendment now reflects the

ADM5	24	15	set out in the NPPF by adding the word "and" after indicate otherwise and "unless" after grant permission This way of apportioning growth across the towns and large villages means that the Council is not allocating its growth into a few settlements bringing forward any large urban extensions. Whilst this means of delivering growth may be appropriate in more urban places, East Lindsey does not have a history of delivery of large sites over 300 units. but spreading it across the inland towns and large villages, as set out above this reflects the way the population grows through the in migration of mainly older persons. This probably reflects the fact that t	wording in the NPPF. These proposed minor modifications have come about through a consultation response from Metacre Ltd who appear to have not understood how the Council allocates its growth and believed that the Council were deliberately not choosing sites above 300 units, which is not the case. The rewording of this paragraph makes it clearer.
ADM6	25	20	Amend the table and delete the words " see paragraph 26 below "	
ADM7	25	Table A	Add in the words only the 15% windfall allowance will be part of the 5 year supply calculations after "housing target above"	Raised by Metacre Ltd through the consultation, they believed the other figures in the table were going to be part of the 5 year supply calculations and this is not the case. This minor modification clarifies the position.
ADM8	26	21	Insert additional wording into the sentence and an additional sentence in	This was raised by Robert Doughty Consultants Ltd as a concern that

			<p>order to clarify that the settlement allocations are not targets but minimum allocations. Table B below shows the minimum allocation of housing across the inland towns and large villages as set out in the Settlement Proposals Document. These figures are not targets and should not be read as such.</p>	<p>targets had been set for each settlement. This is not the case and the additional wording in paragraph 21 should help clarify this.</p>
ADM9	27	22	<p>Add in the words "if required" into the paragraph</p>	<p>This was raised by Chestnut Homes during the consultation they wanted additional text to make the wording more flexible. The Council agrees with the consultee and the addition of "if required" should achieve this.</p>
ADM10	27	23	<p>Remove the word "strong" from the second sentence.</p>	<p>This was raised by St Andrews Healthcare. The word "strong" implies a lack of flexibility in the wording of the paragraph, the removal of the word corrects this.</p>
ADM11	28	31	<p>Alter the last sentence of the paragraph to read "Policy SP3 therefore sets out a minimum inland housing target of 6460 but the Settlement Proposals Document has an additional allocated buffer provision for housing which is approximately 7.3% or 568 homes."</p>	<p>This was raised by Lincolnshire County Council through the consultation, they stated that the arithmetic was incorrect. It was not but there appeared to be a lack of clarity for them around how the buffer was reached and how it fed into the site allocations. The alteration in the sentence</p>

ADM12	28				<p>makes this clearer.</p> <p>This was raised by Lincolnshire County Council during the consultation, and by adding this sentence it should make it clearer how the buffer was calculated.</p>
ADM13	28	32		<p>Add in a sentence at the end of paragraph 31 to clearly explain what the 7.3% buffer is. The sentence reads "The buffer is the difference between the target and the amount of housing actually allocated in the Settlement Proposals Document"</p> <p>Insert the words "A windfall site is any site that comes forward that is not allocated in the Settlement Proposals Document."</p>	<p>This was raised by Robert Doughty Consultants through the consultation that there was no definition of a windfall site. The Council agrees that for clarity it should be clear about what the Plan means when it discusses windfall sites.</p>
ADM14	29	35		<p>Insert additional text into the bullet points of the paragraph which read "if it appears that sites are not coming forward and through repeated resubmissions (12 to 18 months)"</p>	<p>This was raised by Chestnut Homes through the consultation who thought the wording was too inflexible. The additional text sets out in a more clear way how the Council could use this type of condition.</p>
ADM15	30	1		<p>Insert an additional sentence at the end of the paragraph which defines brownfield land in the context of the policy and reads "Brownfield land in the context of this policy is that land defined by the NPPF with the addition of agricultural buildings"</p>	<p>This was raised by Robert Doughty Consultants through the consultation they wished to replace brownfield with derelict and/or vacant. The Council believes that the policy is correct in using the term brownfield but</p>

ADM16	34	2	Insert the word "general" before conformity....	there was no explanation to the policy on what that meant. The additional sentence clarifies that for those wishing to use the policy. In the NPPF there is no requirement for full conformity for neighbourhood plans it is only general conformity. Inserting the word, "general" into the sentence brings the paragraph into line with the NPPF.
ADM17	36	Table	Affordable Housing coming forward estimate from the site to the east of Spilsby SPY310	This was raised by Robert Doughty Consultants that the figure shown in the table could be influenced by other infrastructure requirements on the site SPY310. This clarifies that the figure is only an estimate and that the Council understands that it may alter.
ADM18	36	5	Insert the words at the end of paragraph 5 to read "The Council acknowledges that there are a variety of factors involved in bringing sites including the provision of infrastructure and site remediation, these can all have an impact on the amount of affordable housing being brought forward."	This was raised by Robert Doughty Consultants during the consultation process; The consultee discusses other requirements for contributions and their effect on the ability of sites to provide affordable housing and the Council does realise that this can have an impact on delivery and the policy wording does not particularly reflect this. This

ADM19	38	Point 2	<p>The text at paragraph 5 of the policy and the policy itself at point 2 do not agree with each other. The Council is proposing a minor modification to bring these two pieces of the policy together in that the wording of the main policy text at point 2 should be amended to delete the words "the Council" and replace with the word "they".</p>	<p>minor modification corrects the matter.</p> <p>This matter was raised by Chestnut Homes who pointed out that the policy and text did not agree. This minor modification rectifies this matter.</p>
ADM20	45	14	<p>Deletion of the words in the paragraph "should be able" and replaced with "will be encouraged" to satisfy the Councils place making checklist".</p>	<p>This was raised by Robert Doughty Consultants through the consultation process, whilst the Council believes that the Plan is still effective and the word "encouraged" in paragraph 16 of policy SP10 of the explanatory text does indicate that the use of the place makin check list is not mandatory, the word encourage is however missing from paragraph 14 and in order to ensure clarity in the Plan a minor modification is proposed for this paragraph to insert encouraged.</p>
ADM21	53	10	<p>Delete the words "s being impacts" and replace with asset affected.</p>	<p>The sentence in its original form was not clear, changing it provides clarity.</p>

ADM22	53	Criterion 2 bullet point 3	Delete the word " Give " and replace with the word "Have"	Raised by the Council's Conservation Officer that the word "have" is the word used in the NPPF. This minor change brings the policy more into conformity with national policy.
ADM23	54	Criterion 2, bullet point 4	Insert the words 'and should be undertaken by a suitably qualified party' to the end of Criterion 2 Bullet point 4 of SP11.	This was raised by Historic England to ensure work was carried out by a suitably qualified person. The Council support this minor modification as it adds clarity to the text of the policy.
ADM24	64	6	Add in "as set out in Policy SP1"	This clarifies that the settlements that the policy discusses are listed in Policy SP1 – this makes the wording clearer.
ADM25	66	3	In the second sentence of the paragraph remove " but will support in the secondary frontages " and add in at the end of the sentence "but will support amusements in the secondary frontages but will support amusements in the defined coastal amusement areas as shown in the Settlement Proposals Document." Remove the last sentence of the paragraph which reads "Where appropriate, areas designated for these uses will be identified in the Settlement Proposals DPD"	Raised by Morrison's during the consultation that the secondary frontages were not shown on the maps. The Council previously resolved in 2014 that insofar as secondary shopping frontages were concerned there were few locations where there are sufficient retail uses along an unbroken frontage as to warrant a designation. This should have been removed from the Plan. For clarity the Council proposes a minor modification to remove all

	ADM26	67		reference from Chapter 7 relating to Secondary shopping frontages. Renumber the chapter paragraphs.
	11		Delete the words " secondary frontage " from paragraph 11 Delete Paragraph 12	Raised by Morrison`s during the consultation that the secondary frontages were not shown on the maps. The Council previously resolved in 2014 that insofar as secondary shopping frontages were concerned there were few locations where there are sufficient retail uses along an unbroken frontage as to warrant a designation. This should have been removed from the Plan. For clarity the Council proposes a minor modification to remove all reference from Chapter 7 relating to Secondary shopping frontages.
ADM27	68	16	Within Paragraph 16 it is proposed that the 4th sentence is removed in its entirety which reads as follows: "The Council will support tourism-based business in secondary shopping areas including cafes, pubs, restaurants and hot food takeaways in the coastal towns, with the exception of coastal amusements.	Raised by Morrison`s during the consultation that the secondary frontages were not shown on the maps. The Council previously resolved in 2014 that insofar as secondary shopping frontages were concerned there were few locations where there are sufficient retail uses along an unbroken frontage as to warrant a

	ADM28	69	Criterion 1	<p>designated. This should have been removed from the Plan. For clarity the Council proposes a minor modification to remove all reference from Chapter 7 relating to Secondary shopping frontages.</p> <p>Raised by Morrison`s during the consultation that the secondary frontages were not shown on the maps. The Council previously resolved in 2014 that insofar as secondary shopping frontages were concerned there were few locations where there are sufficient retail uses along an unbroken frontage as to warrant a designation. This should have been removed from the Plan. For clarity the Council proposes a minor modification to remove all reference from Chapter 7 relating to Secondary shopping frontages.</p>
	ADM29	70	<p>Within the policy wording delete the words "secondary frontage"</p> <p>Criterion 3 and 7 of Policy SP14 are to be removed in their entirety as they relate to secondary frontages.</p>	<p>Raised by Morrison`s during the consultation that the secondary frontages were not shown on the maps. The Council previously resolved in 2014 that insofar as secondary shopping frontages were concerned there were few locations where there are sufficient retail uses along an unbroken frontage as to warrant a designation. This should have been removed from the Plan. For clarity the Council proposes a minor modification to remove all reference from Chapter 7 relating to Secondary shopping frontages.</p>
	ADM29	70	Criteria 3 and 7	<p>Raised by Morrison`s during the consultation that the secondary frontages were not shown on the maps. The Council previously resolved in 2014 that insofar as secondary shopping frontages were concerned there were few locations where there are</p>

				<p>sufficient retail uses along an unbroken frontage as to warrant a designation. This should have been removed from the Plan. For clarity the Council proposes a minor modification to remove all reference from Chapter 7 relating to Secondary shopping frontages.</p>
ADM30	74	7	<p>Amend the second sentence of paragraph 7 to read "To ensure that those visiting the District have access to these facilities the Council will support caravan and log cabin development the above-sites that are in is-it close..."</p>	<p>Raised by R Webster during the consultation who pointed out that the sentence was not clear about what it referred. The minor modification makes it clear.</p>
ADM31	79	Point 9	<p>Insert the words "or that it can be provided in time to serve the development" at the end of point 9 in the policy.</p>	<p>Raised by Anglian Water Services. At Point 9 the consultee is asking for additional wording at the end of the sentence and the Council agrees that this. This actually allows a developer to provide evidence that capacity is currently available and can be provided which will give confidence to those making decisions on sites in the future. The Council therefore supports this as a minor modification</p>
ADM32	79	Point 11	<p>Insert the words "in line with national policy" at the end of the sentence at</p>	<p>Chestnut Homes raised this point in the consultation and pointed out</p>

ADM33	81	Evidence list	point 11.	that at point 11 of the policy it asks for suitable flood risk assessments on all development, this is not in conformity with national policy. A minor modification at the end of the sentence corrects this point.
ADM34	101	1	Amend the sentence "Economic Baseline Study 2010" to read "Economic Baseline Study 2016" Delete the paragraph and rewrite it breaking it down into two sections to read "The District`s landscapes will be protected, enhanced, used and managed to provide an attractive and healthy working and living environment. Development will be guided by the District`s Landscape Character Assessment and landscapes defined as highly sensitive will be afforded the greatest protection. Development will be supported where it allows for greater public access to the countryside and naturalistic coast, supports visitors to the District, helps provide additional employment opportunities."	Proposed typo error in the year of the Study. This makes the paragraph clearer and more positive and provides greater clarity for development management decisions. This was noted up by one of the development management officers during the consultation.
ADM35	102	2	Delete the words The UK Biodiversity	This was raised by the Greater

	ADM36	102/103	4	<p>Action-Plan and replace them with “The UK Biodiversity Action Plan Biodiversity 2020”</p> <p>Delete paragraph 4 and reword it as follows “There are a number of sites recognised at a local level for their nature conservation or geological value. These sites have been identified for features including their rarity, diversity, fragility or their typicalness in the local biodiversity or geodiversity of the District. The Council will seek to protect these sites when assessing development proposals. A set of criteria for selecting Local Geological Sites (LGSs) for their physiographical/geomorphological importance was published in 2009 and a similar exercise is being considered for these sites. Many sites recognised at a local level for their nature conservation or geological value have already been reviewed against the new criteria.. The_ locally important wildlife sites that meet the selection criteria published by the Greater Lincolnshire</p>	<p>Lincolnshire Nature Partnership who pointed out the UK Biodiversity Action Plan has been superseded. This minor modification ensures that the Plan has the correct information in it.</p> <p>This was raised by the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership who believed that the paragraph was confused and lacked clarity and that some facts were in correct. Rewording the paragraph overcomes this matter and adds correction and clarity to the policy.</p>
--	--------------	----------------	----------	--	--

			<p>Nature Partnership are called Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs) or Local Geological Sites (LGSs). There remain sites from the previous regime of designation, Sites of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) and Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS), which have not yet been tested against the new criteria published by the GLNP. Until such time as these sites have been resurveyed and an assessment made of their current ability to meet the criteria, these sites remain designated and this policy still applies to them”</p>	
ADM37	103	7	<p>Insert the words at the end of paragraph 7 “At the time of writing the Plan, East Lindsey is not within a Nature Improvement Area (NIA) but work on this is ongoing. Where development is within a Nature Improvement Area (NIA) it should contribute to the aims and aspirations of the NIA.”</p>	<p>This was raised by the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership who pointed out the NIAs could come forward during the lifetime of the Local Plan. The insertion of an additional sentence at the end of paragraph 7 covers that eventuality.</p>
ADM38	105	5	<p>Insert the words “exceptional circumstances” and “clearly” into the last sentence</p>	<p>This was raised by the Woodland Trust through the consultation, the word “clearly” is used in</p>

				<p>paragraph 118 of the NPPF, by using the word in policy 24 (SP24) it better mirrors the strong protection given in national policy.</p>
ADM39	114	3	<p>Delete the last sentence of the paragraph “It is considered that any significant commercial energy infrastructure is likely to create an unacceptable impact within the Wolds.”</p>	<p>Raised during the publication consultation by the Viking Link as unsound, which the Council agrees with, the deletion of this sentence does not change the overall context of the paragraph.</p>
ADM40	143	Glossary	<p>Insert an additional definition which reads – “Local Geological Sites (LGS) Areas designated for geology/geomorphology by the local authority and protected through the local plan. A newer designation and one of a number of designations under the umbrella term local sites.”</p>	<p>Raised by the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership as an omission, the Council agrees with this and would recommend it as a minor modification.</p>