

## **Revised Plans Consultation Responses - Residents**

### ***Mr. C. & Mrs. C. Hobbs (11 Albion Crescent)***

I would like my original object to remain as I still feel the points I raised are still relevant to this revised application (copy below) with the following added.

All I can see different is that the applicant has repositioned the building from one corner of the plot to the other side.

This means that the Care Home will front onto Long Leys Road.

The repositioning of the building shows both contempt and disregard to the local surroundings, local community and indeed the elderly residents it proposes to accommodate.

It is totally out of keeping and proportion for this site and area. It will dominate the western side of Long Leys Road and over power the plot. As stressed in my previous submission of concerns, not only does this building look like an office block / warehouse, it is totally unacceptable to approve such a building as accommodation for older people. Dignity of care for the elderly must start at the planning stage and this building is not appropriate for a residential care home in 2017. We have moved away from workhouses and large institutionalised care homes.

Please reject this application on the grounds that it is too big for the plot and location. A single story building with normal residential style features incorporated into the exterior design (examples sent with my last email) would be far more appropriate.

### ***Mr. B. & Mrs. S. Newton (141 Long Leys Road)***

I object to the proposed building on the following grounds:-

1. The height of the building will be out of character with the rest of the buildings in the vicinity.
2. It will increase an already congested traffic flow.
3. It will increase air pollution with the increase in traffic.
4. It will increase the noise levels (The material now used for a 'quick and dirty' road surface is already extremely noisy).
5. The water treatment plant is already overstretched and the proposed structure will further increase the volumes, beyond capability.
6. Parking will be an issues since there is very little, if any parking available.
7. It does seem that Long Leys Road is becoming the dumping ground of Lincoln (allied to this is the proposed Veolia site).
8. The proposed structure will be overlooking the private property of 143 Long Leys Road.
9. Whilst the structure is being constructed it will result in bigger traffic problems, with HGV's coming and going bringing material.

## **Revised Plans Consultation Responses - Consultees**

Lincoln Civic Trust – No objection

## **Original Plans Consultation Responses - Residents**

### ***Mr. C & Mrs. C. Hobbs (11 Albion Crescent)***

In principle I have no objection to a residential care home on this site and indeed I am sure we all agree that good quality residential care is important.

My observations are not based on any expert knowledge of either planning conditions or social science but rather an intuitive feeling of what type of building is right for this site.

In my opinion the proposed development looks more like an office block one would associate with an industrial estate rather than an elderly person's home in a residential area. The design of the building lacks character, charm or appeal. No doubt it is a very functional building and meets all the relevant standards but attractive it is not. Is this the best architects and planners can come up with? Or as mere mortals and established local residents do we have to put up with whatever developers propose?

In mitigation, the developers in their submissions have sighted similar buildings close by on Long Leys Road (Fig 3 Design and Access Statement), but none of these buildings are the same size or have the same footprint or the same back drop as this proposed new building, which will stand isolated from the main residential dwellings in the area. It is clear that it will look out of proportion and not blend to the immediate surroundings in any way. I understand economics of maximising land use but again this warehouse of a building needs modifying. Section 5.2 in the Design and Access Statement is in my opinion not fulfilled and para 5.16 is very much the designers opinion and open to much interpretation.

Travelling from Mitchell Drive north towards the bypass and this will be the only building on the west side of Long Leys Road. It will stand alone and be proportionally and totally out of character. The previous Social Education Centre was a low, single story building and also offered some community facility (local meeting room / Polling Station etc.). This building offers nothing to the community. Remember (and perhaps longer serving Councillors will) that this site was once part of the Long Leys Road allotments. The SEC was given planning permission on the condition that it retained a community function. All this now appears to have been forgotten or lost.

Anyway, moving on, perhaps a two story building with more gables, even bay windows and smaller garden areas would be more appropriate especially for older people and less of a carbuncle on the skyline. This would be more in keeping with this residential area and also would not detract from the requirements under the National Care Standards Act. Nowhere in the National Care Standards Act does it say you have to build a 72 bed institution which lacks form, imagination, taste, character or appeal, to look after old people correctly.

It can be done and indeed has been achieved elsewhere. Perhaps a building on the lines of the examples below would be far more in keeping with the surrounding area?

Please could you ask the developers to reconsider their submission along these lines and move away from their Lego block boxes and off the shelf design that they have submitted?

Further Observations:

- There is no café on the ground floor / reception area para 5.12 Design and Access Statement, so plans and statement wrong.
- The site is on Long LEYS Road not Long LEES Road which the developers refer to throughout their submission. Silly mistake but shows contempt for the area and local residents. Shows they don't really care.
- The transport plan falls down badly when referring to public transport. St Georges bus service very poor. No bus services either direction after 5pm any week day. No bus service on Sundays which will increase traffic with visitors and staff making the trip to the unit. There would also be increase traffic movement due to deliveries and medical services attending the home and don't forget undertaking services. All in all this will be quite an increase in traffic movement to and from this site. On a main route from St Georges to local schools that is often used as a short cut to the A57.
- Para 5.10 Design and Access Statement is a "copy and paste" from another application. It is bad practice and again shows contempt to both the Local Planning Authority and local residents to just copy and paste embellished statements and information from other local authority applications (Please read Para 5.10 Design and Access Statement). I understand that "Niort Way" forms part of the northern ring road round Wellingborough and I would suggest is very difficult to see from Long Leys Road!!!! Not impressed - This is lazy.

I do hope the design of this building can be influenced by Lincoln City Planning Officers and or Council Members to be more in keeping with the local surroundings and less sterile and more characterful for residents who will be living in the new home and locals alike.

I have no problem with an elderly residential unit in this already diverse urban village. After all we have everything from Waste Transfer Stations, Bakeries, Builders Merchants, Secure Psychiatric Unit, Drug and Alcohol Rehabilitation Unit, Cemetery, Domestic Homes, Allotments, unfortunately no shop, community centre, Medical Centre, indeed no local amenities at all. So why not a residential home for the elderly, should fit in well!!!

***Mr. S. Grimm (7 Albion Crescent)***

My concern about this proposed development is based on my own experience of working within the Care Home sector in the when I worked in 50 bed council run Homes. It was difficult with Homes of that size to create an environment that was in any way 'homely', there has been over the years a general move away from large impersonal units like that. This proposal with 3 storeys and 72 older people living there implies that welfare is not the highest consideration in this application, which it should

be. I certainly have no objection to the development of a Care Home on the site proposed but object to the concept in relation to the numbers of people living there, and the idea of the Home having 3 storeys, which in itself will only add to the sense of it being an 'institution'.

While there is a clear need for an increase in places available in Homes for Older People nationally, older people should not be herded into large impersonal institutional living. I am concerned that profit for the company concerned is the main driving force rather than the needs of vulnerable older people.

In addition, I have some concern about the siting of the Home which will have an effect on the landscape as seen from the Common in view of its height. As a new resident to the area it is not personally a major issue but I would want to know that this aspect of the plan has been carefully considered on behalf of the many residents who make use of the Common and enjoy the environment and sense of a rural space so near to the City Centre. The landscape around the West Common is clearly a valued asset to Lincoln and the height of this building would mean it will be clearly seen above the tree line.

## **Original Plans Consultation Responses - Consultees**

### ***Anglian Water***

#### **ASSETS**

##### **Section 1 – Assets Affected**

1.1 Our records show that there are no assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within the development site boundary.

#### **WASTEWATER SERVICES**

##### **Section 2 – Wastewater Treatment**

2.1 The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Canwick Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.

##### **Section 3 – Foul Sewerage Network**

3.1 The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows. If the developer wishes to connect to our sewerage network they should serve notice under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991. We will then advise them of the most suitable point of connection.

##### **Section 4 – Surface Water Disposal**

4.1 The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option.

Building Regulations (part H) on Drainage and Waste Disposal for England includes a surface water drainage hierarchy, with infiltration on site as the preferred disposal option, followed by discharge to watercourse and then connection to a sewer.

4.2 The surface water strategy/flood risk assessment submitted with the planning application relevant to Anglian Water is unacceptable. We would therefore recommend that the applicant needs to consult with Anglian Water and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA).

We request a condition requiring a drainage strategy covering the issue(s) to be agreed.

##### **Section 5 – Trade Effluent**

5.1 Not applicable

##### **Section 6 – Suggested Planning Conditions**

Anglian Water would therefore recommend the following planning condition if the Local Planning Authority is mindful to grant planning approval.

## **Surface Water Disposal (Section 4)**

### **CONDITION**

*No drainage works shall commence until a surface water management strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No hard-standing areas to be constructed until the works have been carried out in accordance with the surface water strategy so approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

### **REASON**

*To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding.*

### ***Lincoln Civic Trust***

OBJECTION – We have no objection to the overall project as we felt that the site was an ideal place to build a care home.

Our concerns are once again based on the accessibility and the site layout particularly the lack of adequate parking and the position of the car park. Since the loss of St Georges Hospital, the public transport in the area has been much reduced and I suspect the demand for public transport from the housing area north of Long Leys Road, is very small. That will mean that most of the people visiting the site either staff or general visitors, will arrive by private transport and the number of spaces suggested on the plans falls woefully short of the actual number of vehicles that will need to be accommodated. The result will be that vehicles associated with the site will either park on Long Leys Road, a major thoroughfare which includes commercial vehicles or will park in the housing estate on the other side of the road which is inappropriate. As to the positioning of the car park, we felt that as many of the vehicle movements would be based over a full 24-hour period, the main car park should be to the rear of the building and as far as possible, away from the proposed building and away from the surrounding residential area.

### ***Summary of Response from Lincolnshire County Council as Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority***

The Authority did not raise any objections on either of the grounds relevant to their functions and requested two planning conditions covering the closure of the existing access when the new access is brought into use; and a further condition covering the layout of the site to ensure that vehicles can park, turn, manoeuvre, load and unload within the site.