

Residents Comments

Mrs C. Wilson, 16 Birchwood Avenue

I object to this application because this is not in keeping with the other properties in the area and will overlook the properties that are here.

also:

Birchwood Avenue at this point is a very busy junction with Skellingthorpe Road at any time of the day traffic queues at busy times this goes back as far as Woodfield Avenue and beyond and if there is a problem on the A46 it gets worse, at times Skellingthorpe road can back up from the railway crossing as far as the junction.

The number of properties will mean maybe the same number of vehicles or even more adding to the congestion. This will add to the noise from doors slamming and car radios and potential garden noise.

I find it difficult to get in and out of my property at the best of times. The entrance and exit will mean that vehicles will be crossing traffic and causing more queues and have a potential to cause accidents as there is a bus stop opposite.

Mr. T. Turner, 5 Landmere Grove

I would like to object because I feel like it will cut out too much light to my property and be overlooked and I feel a three story building will look out of place when the surrounding areas are two storeys.

Mr. Glyn Griffiths, 9 Landmere Grove

If this development is given the go ahead it would be a much larger building than the old Wildlife public house. We would lose the natural daylight and views that we have enjoyed since the demolition of the Wildlife in February 2013.

Us closest to the proposed development will suffer with noise and air pollution for months whilst it is being built.

There is a shortage of car parking spaces of 28 if each flat has two cars per flat which means the over spill will come down Landmere Grove. With the added vehicles this will make it more dangerous for children and the elderly crossing at the bus stop on Birchwood Avenue. There is already congestion at the junction of Birchwood Avenue and Skellingthorpe Road and the additional cars coming to and from the flats will not help.

Can the drains cope with extra water and sewage that will be produced from these proposed flats?

The proposed building will be larger than any other building close by and be out of character locally.

Mr. M. & Mrs. C. Ford, 13 Landmere Grove

We have had an unrestricted view from our property across to the houses on Birchwood Avenue for nearly 40 years and will, if this is approved, be faced with a three story edifice 29 meters from the back window of our property and only 16 meters from the end of our garden.

This will considerably reduce the amount of light to our property and to the solar panels fitted to the roof resulting in increased electricity bills.

Noise levels and dust generated during the building phase will significantly affect our way of life and maybe our health.

If completed, our garden and the rear of our house will be overlooked by at least a dozen windows, on the second and third floors, resulting in loss of privacy and reduced sense of security. Noise levels will also be greatly increased due to the number of residents and their cars.

Previous planning permission for a single story building on this site has been refused twice, so we sincerely hope that our concerns will help result in the same decision this time.

Mr. S. Brader, 15 Landmere Grove, Lincoln

I would like to formally declare I am against the proposed development.

These properties are directly behind my house and garden and will significantly affect my standard of living, as they will have an impact on the daylight into my house and garden and the level of noise – not only during building, but also the amount of residents will be increased. I feel this will impact my health and sense of security.

This together with the fact that my privacy will be severely affected. Currently I have no one looking into my property, I would suggest only single storey dwellings to be considered.

Mr. J. W. & Mrs. D. T. Ward, 17 Landmere Grove

We would like to object strongly to the erection of 30 flats, three storeys high on the old site of the Wildlife Public House, this is going to take a lot of light from our garden, plus if parking is at the back, we will have to cope with noise issues and maybe also people overlooking us.

Mrs. A. Flowers, 23 Meadowlake Crescent, Lincoln

2 things particularly concern me regarding the proposed flats on the site where the Wildlife Public House once stood.

I notice from the plans that the entry/exit will be pretty much opposite Meadowlake Crescent. At busy times it is already very difficult to turn right from Meadowlake Crescent onto Birchwood Avenue - with drivers often having to rely on the good nature

of drivers on Birchwood Avenue to allow you to pull out. The bus stop almost on the junction of Meadowlake Crescent/Birchwood Avenue also makes this a difficult junction. I don't imagine this situation will be any easier for Meadowlake Crescent drivers with traffic joining Birchwood Avenue from the Wildlife site.

I also notice that in the planning statement the applicant suggests that there will be 48 parking spaces available for the 38 properties and implies that because the Wildlife had 60 parking spaces the 48 proposed spaces will have a lesser impact on local traffic levels than the ones the pub had. The Wildlife was built in the 1960s when the estate was much smaller and it was commonplace to drive to the pub. The Birchwood estate had grown considerably and Birchwood Avenue is now a very busy road. I have lived on the estate for over 25 years now and while the Wildlife was open I never saw more than a handful of cars in the carpark except on very rare occasions. I think it's wrong to assume that the number of cars coming from the proposed site will have a lesser impact on local traffic levels.

Hicksons Forecourt Limited – Spar – Shell Service Station, Birchwood Avenue

I wish to send this letter as a representation as an interested party who operates the adjacent Petrol Filling Station (PFS). We have operated our PFS on the site for approximately 7 years. While we support an appropriate residential development of the site we wish to raise the following observations.

- From the plan there is a lack of clarification of the boundary wall treatment adjoining our site.
- The lack of a maintenance strip as required by us and which exists as a right on our site.
- I would also expect the Council to properly consider the relationship of the proposed development to our own operations which operates 6.00am-23.00pm 7 days a week in respect to the issue of residential amenity. In this respect I note that no acoustic evidence is submitted to support the application.

I would like to ensure the above matters are carefully reviewed by officers.

Consultee Comments

Lincolnshire County Council (Education Authority)

The County Council has no education comments to make on this application.

Lincolnshire County Council (Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority)

Notice is hereby given that the County Council as Local Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority:

Requests that any permission given by the Local Planning Authority shall include the conditions below.

The vehicular access shall incorporate 6 metres radii tangential to the nearside edge of the carriageway of Birchwood Avenue and the minimum width of the access shall be 6 metres.

Reason: In the interests of safety of the users of the public highway and the safety of the users of the site.

Within seven days of the new access being brought into use, the existing access onto Birchwood Avenue shall be permanently closed in accordance with a scheme to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To reduce to a minimum the number of individual access points to the site, in the interests of road safety.

The arrangements shown on the approved plan Masterplan 0361-AM2-GP-MP for the parking/turning/manoeuvring/loading/unloading of vehicles shall be available at all times when the premises are in use.

Reason: To enable calling vehicles to wait clear of the carriageway of Birchwood Avenue and to allow vehicles to enter and leave the highway in a forward gear in the interests of highway safety.

No development shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable urban drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall: a) Provide details of how run-off will be safely conveyed and attenuated during storms up to and including the 1 in 100 year critical storm event, with an allowance for climate change, from all hard surfaced areas within the development into the existing local drainage infrastructure and watercourse system without exceeding the run-off rate for the undeveloped site; b) Provide attenuation details and discharge rates which shall be restricted to 5 litres per second; c) Provide details of the timetable for and any phasing of implementation for the drainage scheme; and d) Provide details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed over the lifetime of the development, including any arrangements for adoption by any public body or Statutory Undertaker and any other arrangements

required to secure the operation of the drainage system throughout its lifetime. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drainage scheme and no dwelling shall be occupied until the approved scheme has been completed or provided on the site in accordance with the approved phasing. The approved scheme shall be retained and maintained in full in accordance with the approved details.

Note to Officer:

Please secure the arrangements for the refuse collection outlined in the application submission.

Lincolnshire Police - Force Crime Prevention Design Advisor

Lincolnshire Police has no formal objections to the planning application in principle but would recommend that the attached recommendations are implemented.

External Doors and Windows

Building Regulations (October 1st 2015) provides that for the first time all new homes will be included within Approved Document Q: Security – Dwellings (ADQ).

Approved document Q applies to all new dwellings including those resulting from change of use, such as commercial premises, warehouse and barns undergoing conversions into dwellings. It also applies within Conservation Areas.

This will include doors at the entrance to dwellings, including all doors to flats or apartments, communal doors to multi-occupancy developments and garage doors where there is a direct access to the premises. **Where bespoke timber doors are proposed, there is a technical specification in Appendix B of the document that must be met.**

Windows: in respect of ground floor, basement and other easily accessible locations.

The secured by design requirement for all dwelling external doors is PAS 24:2016 (doors of an enhanced Security) or WCL 1 (WCL 1 is the reference number for PAS 23/24 and is published by Warrington Certification Laboratories).

All ground floor windows and doors and those that are easily accessible from the ground must conform to improved security standard PAS24:2016. **Window retainers should be provided on all windows that are accessible.**

Access Control should be installed to ensure the security and safety of residents. An air lock style (double access point) communal entrance (help prevent unauthorised follow through access) that allows an access control system, with an electronic door release, and visitor door entry system that provides colour images, and clear audio communications linked to each individual unit. This can be built internally to the main communal entrance.

Under no circumstances should a trade person release button or similar uncontrolled access method be used.

Access to the parking facilities should also benefit from access control by way of a secure gate (at least 1.8 height) at the entrance.

Access through the development into both the residential block and communal areas should also have some level of access control to prevent access, crime and anti-social behaviour.

Individual Flat or Unit Doors.

Flat entrance door-sets should meet the same physical requirements as the 'main front door' i.e. PAS24:2016. The locking hardware should be operable from both sides of an unlocked door without the use of the key (utilising a roller latch or latch operable from both sides of the door-set by a handle). If the door-set is certified to either PAS24:2016 or STS 201 Issue 4:2012 then it must be classified as DKT.

Communal Areas & Mail Delivery

Where communal mail delivery facilities are proposed and are to be encouraged with other security and safety measures to reduce the need for access to the premises communal letter boxes should comply to the following criteria.

- Be of a robust construction (Federation Technical Specification 009 (TS009))
- Have anti-fishing properties where advised and appropriate.
- Installed to the manufacturers specifications.
- Through wall mail delivery can be a suitable and secure method.

Lighting

Lighting should be designed to cover the external doors and be controlled by photoelectric cell (dusk to dawn) with a manual override. The use of low consumption lamps with an efficacy of greater than 40 lumens per circuit watt is required; it is recommended that they be positioned to prevent possible attack.

Bin Storage

Internal communal bin and bicycle stores within blocks of flats must have no windows and be fitted with a secure door set that meets the same physical specification as 'front door' and specifically Section 2, paragraphs 21.1 to 21.6 and 21.8 to 21.13.

This will ensure that such stores are only accessible to residents. The locking system must be operable from the inner face by use of a thumb turn to ensure that residents are not accidentally locked in by another person. A bicycle store must also be provided with stands with secure anchor points or secure cycle stands.

External bins stores and home composting containers (supplied to meet 'Code for Sustainable Homes' 'Was 3') should be sited in such a way that they cannot be used as a climbing aid to commit crime.

Utilities

In order to reduce the opportunities for theft by 'bogus officials' the utility meters should, where possible, be located to the outside of the dwelling at a point where they can be overlooked. This will negate the need for an official to enter the building in order to read a meter, which will in turn reduce the opportunity for distraction burglary. Where possible utility meters in multi occupancy developments should be located on the ground floor between access controlled doors (air lock system) so that access can be restricted to the meters.

Note 33.1: Where a utility provider refuses to provide external meters, and there is an obvious (historic) risk of distraction burglary within the location, the developer should consider an alternative supplier.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you need further information or clarification.

Please refer to New Homes 2016 which can be located on www.securedbydesign.com

NHS England

<p>Impact of new development on GP practice</p>	<p>The above development is proposing 38 dwellings which, based on the average of 2.2 people per dwelling for the City of Lincoln area, would result in an increase in patient population of 84.</p> <p>The calculations below show the likely impact of this new population in terms of number of additional consultation time required by clinicians. This is based on the Department of Health calculation in HBN11-01: Facilities for Primary and Community Care Services.</p> <p>Consulting room GP</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="448 589 1217 882"> <tr> <td>Proposed population</td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Access rate</td> <td>5260 per 1000 patients</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Anticipated annual contacts</td> <td>$0.084 \times 5260 = 440$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Assume 100% patient use of room</td> <td>440</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year</td> <td>$440/50 = 8.8$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appointment duration</td> <td>15 mins</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Patient appointment time per week</td> <td>$8.8 \times 15/60 = 2.2$ hrs per week</td> </tr> </table> <p>Treatment room Practice Nurse</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="448 965 1217 1258"> <tr> <td>Proposed population</td> <td>84</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Access rate</td> <td>5260 per 1000 patients</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Anticipated annual contacts</td> <td>$0.084 \times 5260 = 440$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Assume 20% patient use of room</td> <td>$440 \times 20\% = 87.9$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year</td> <td>$87.9/50 = 1.759$</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Appointment duration</td> <td>20 mins</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Patient appointment time per week</td> <td>$1.759 \times 20/60 = 0.6$ hrs per week</td> </tr> </table> <p>Therefore an increase in population of 84 in the City of Lincoln area will place extra pressure on existing provisions, for example- extra appointments requires additional consulting hours (as demonstrated in the calculations above.) This in turn impacts on premises, with extra consulting/treatment room requirements.</p>	Proposed population	84	Access rate	5260 per 1000 patients	Anticipated annual contacts	$0.084 \times 5260 = 440$	Assume 100% patient use of room	440	Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year	$440/50 = 8.8$	Appointment duration	15 mins	Patient appointment time per week	$8.8 \times 15/60 = 2.2$ hrs per week	Proposed population	84	Access rate	5260 per 1000 patients	Anticipated annual contacts	$0.084 \times 5260 = 440$	Assume 20% patient use of room	$440 \times 20\% = 87.9$	Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year	$87.9/50 = 1.759$	Appointment duration	20 mins	Patient appointment time per week	$1.759 \times 20/60 = 0.6$ hrs per week
Proposed population	84																												
Access rate	5260 per 1000 patients																												
Anticipated annual contacts	$0.084 \times 5260 = 440$																												
Assume 100% patient use of room	440																												
Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year	$440/50 = 8.8$																												
Appointment duration	15 mins																												
Patient appointment time per week	$8.8 \times 15/60 = 2.2$ hrs per week																												
Proposed population	84																												
Access rate	5260 per 1000 patients																												
Anticipated annual contacts	$0.084 \times 5260 = 440$																												
Assume 20% patient use of room	$440 \times 20\% = 87.9$																												
Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year	$87.9/50 = 1.759$																												
Appointment duration	20 mins																												
Patient appointment time per week	$1.759 \times 20/60 = 0.6$ hrs per week																												
<p>GP practice(s) most likely to be affected by the housing development</p>	<p>Due to the fact that patients can choose to register at any practice that covers the area of the development, and there are no waiting lists for patients, all practices that provide care for the region that the development falls within are obliged to take on patients, regardless of capacity.</p>																												

¹ Source: Lincolnshire Research Observatory 2011 Census Data

	As such, Woodland Medical Practice, Birchwood Medical Practice, Brayford Medical Practice and University Health Centre may be affected by the development.					
Issues to be addressed to ensure the development is acceptable	<p>This development would put additional demands on the existing GP services for the area and additional infrastructure would be required to meet the increased demands.</p> <p>To mitigate this, the s106 funding would go towards Woodland Medical Practice and Birchwood Medical Practice.</p> <p>Woodland Medical Practice has expressed concerns that they are currently struggling for space and are restricted by the number of clinical rooms they have available. Any increase in patient numbers would exacerbate this issue further. As such the practice has proposed using the section 106 money to refurbish an unused storage/shower room into a room that meets current clinical requirements. Amongst other things, this would require the installation of a window, the laying of suitable clinical flooring and the provision of IT network facilities. This additional space would then be used for additional clinicians.</p> <p>Birchwood Medical Practice would use the funds to adapt an existing non-clinical room into a consultation room. This would allow the practice to increase their clinical capacity, easing the pressure arising from an increase in patient numbers resulting from this development. This refit would also allow the practice to provide a greater range of services for their patients and in turn relieve pressures on other health services within the area.</p> <p>This of course would be subject to a full business case and approval by NHS England, with any proposed expenditure taking place when the s106 funds are released by the developer as per the agreement and within the agreed timescale for expenditure of the funds.</p>					
Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.		Average list size per GP	Required m2	£ per m2	Total cost	£per person
	GP team	1,800	170	1,500	£255,000	142
	GP furnishings	1,800			£20,000	12
						154
	Contingency requirements @ 20%					31
	Total per resident					185
	Total per dwelling (resident x 2.2)					407
	<p>The table above shows the contribution formula which is based on the needs of a Primary Care Health Team and associated administration support. By applying average national list sizes to these groups and identifying the required area and furnishings, a total cost of £185 per patient is determined. This figure is multiplied by 2.2 (the average number of persons per dwelling for City of Lincoln Council) to provide a funding per dwelling of £407.</p>					
Financial Contribution requested	The contribution requested for the development in Lincoln is £15,466.00 (£407 x 38 dwellings.)					

Vicky Allen
Primary Care Support Medical & Pharmacy
February 2018