

Part A: Personal Details

*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Name and Organisation boxes for the client in 'Your Details', but complete the full contact details of the agent.

	Your Details	Agent's Details* (if applicable)
Name (including title):	Mrs Fran Smith	
Organisation (where relevant):	Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership (GLNP)	
Address:	██████████ ██████████ ██████████	
Post Code:	████████	
Telephone number:	██████████	
Email address:	████████████████████	

NOTE:

Representations will only be accepted that refer to a proposed change shown in the *Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications to the Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan (2017)*, the map changes or to the Habitats Regulations Assessment Report, incorporating Main Modifications (2017) or Sustainability Appraisal Report, incorporating Main Modifications (2017).

Your responses on the above documents will be sent to the Planning Inspector without prejudice to the Inspectors final report.

You should not repeat or re-submit your previous representations, these have already been considered by the Inspector during the examination process.

PART B: Your representations

Please use a separate form for each representation.

B1. To which proposed Main Modification does your representation relate?

Please state the relevant reference number that you are commenting on from the Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications (e.g. MM01):

SP32

Description of the proposed Main Modification (e.g. Page 60, Section 8)

Revised Saltfleet inset map

Please complete a separate form for each representation.

B2. Do you consider this proposed Main Modification is:

Legally compliant?
Please select one answer

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	-------------------------------------

Sound?
Please select one answer

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	-------------------------------------

B3: If you consider the proposed Main Modification to be unsound, please identify which test of soundness your representation relates to?

'Sound' means: is the Main Modification justified, effective, positively prepared and consistent with national policy?

Positively prepared?
Please select one answer

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

Justified?
Please select one answer

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

Effective?
Please select one answer

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	-------------------------------------

Consistent with national policy?
Please select one answer

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	-------------------------------------

Your representation should succinctly cover all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify your representation and any suggested changes.
--

B4. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound?

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan, please also use this box to set out your representations.

At the Examination hearing it was agreed by the Inspector that all sites referred to by Policy SP24 should be included on the maps in order for the policies to be duly enacted. This map includes the SSSI but international sites have been missed.

These international sites include SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites. These overlap with the SSSI designations so a means of adding these designations with clarity should be determined.

A lack of these designations means that the Plan is not:

- Legally compliant because: policies and proposals to protect the integrity of internationally important nature conservation sites will be ineffective because they are unaware of the presence of such sites.
- Sound because: it is not effectively enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 7, 17, 109, 110, 117 and 118

Please be as precise as possible.

B5. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed Main Modification to the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. Having regard to the test you have identified at B3 above where this relates to soundness?

You will need to say why this modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

The map should include all types of designation listed in SP24 including the international sites (SACs, SPAs and Ramsar) that are currently missing so that the policy can be duly enacted.

Please be as precise as possible.

B6. Do you have any comments on the updated Addendum to the Sustainability Appraisal or Addendum to the Habitats Regulations Assessment in respect of this particular modification?

Please be as precise as possible.