

Consultation Responses Received by City of Lincoln Council

Lincoln Civic Trust

Our original objections remain valid as the revised plans do not address any of our reason for objecting to the proposals.

Our original Objections:

1. Only access to existing estate and the current development is from Queen Elizabeth Road via the junctions with Burton Road and Riseholme Road. The formation and control of both of these junctions needs to be reviewed and radically changed if the congestion on Queen Elizabeth Road is not to become grid locked.
2. Only two accesses from the existing estate to the new development being Woodburn Close and Garfield Close which in themselves were never designed as busy access roads and are not fit for purpose.
3. No provision for any increase in service provision e.g. Education Medical Retail etc.
4. The noise and pollution levels particularly for the houses nearest to the A46 Lincoln By Pass.

OBJECTION to the revised plans:

1. Do not address any of our previous objections.
2. We question the decision to remove the separate internal footpaths given that the internal roads are to be of "shared" usage.
3. We question the revised noise assessment provided particularly the comments that the Acoustic Screens have little or no value. It would appear that our European neighbours have a totally different view of screens alongside busy arteries in that many of the major roads in particularly Germany and the Netherlands have some very substantial structures to deflect the noise and I would suggest mitigate the pollution levels.

FURTHER COMMENT: We noted the welcome submission by the Lincolnshire County Council Highways Department. We totally agree with their assessment of the number of parking spaces required by each property and suggest that their recommendations should be adopted for all residential developments. We agree with their recommendation concerning the road width particularly when shared access is proposed, but we do not agree with their assessment that the increase in volume created by the development will not create major congestion on Queen Elizabeth Road and create gridlock at the junctions with Burton Road and Riseholme Road as vehicles try to turn out of Queen Elizabeth Road and attempt to make right turns into the estate.

Lincolnshire County Council (as Education Authority)

Thank you for your notification of 05 December 2017, concerning the proposed development at the above site. I have now had the opportunity to consider the impact on the local schools reasonably accessible from the development. Please see below overview in relation to the impact, and details for primary, secondary and sixth-form that follow.

Overview

Please see below table in relation to the number of places required and available in local schools from/for the proposed development:

Type	Children produced by scheme	Sufficient places available 2019/20 (Y/N/Partial)	Places to be mitigated	Contribution sought
Primary	49	N	49	£552,545
Secondary	46	N	46	CIL
Sixth-form	9	N	9	CIL 165,848
			Total	£563,822

Please note, where an application is outline a formulaic approach will be taken in a section 106 agreement, this may result in a higher contribution if a high proportion of large houses are built. This would be finalised at the reserved matters stage. All section 106 agreements should include indexation using the Tender Price Index of the Royal Town Planning Institute Building Cost Information Services (RICS BCIS TPI).

The above contributions would be spent on the following:

Type	Amount	Scheme
Primary	£552,545	To be confirmed following discussions with local primary schools
Secondary	£781,608	N/A – CIL (amount indicated would have been due under s.106)
Sixth-form	£165,848	N/A – CIL (amount indicated would have been due under s.106)

I can confirm that the County Council will ensure that no more than five s.106 agreements are signed towards a specific piece of infrastructure, as detailed above (where known), which will be specific within the s.106 agreement.

Detail

The below table indicates the number of pupils generated by the proposed development. This is on the basis of research by Lincolnshire Research Observatory utilised to calculate Pupil Production Ratio (PPR) multiplied by the number of homes proposed.

House Type (if known)	No of Properties	PPR Primary	Primary Pupils	PPR Secondary	Secondary Pupils	PPR Sixth Form	Sixth Form Pupils
2 Bedroom	124	0.09	11.16	0.09	11.16	0.018	2.232
3 Bedroom	144	0.17	24.48	0.17	24.48	0.034	4.896
4+ Bedroom	41	0.33	13.53	0.27	11.07	0.054	2.214
Unknown		0.2		0.19		0.038	
Total (rounded down)	309	-	49	-	46	-	9

Numbers above are total development less 1 bedroom dwellings that generate no children and 2 bedroom dwellings to be demolished

Capacity is assessed using the County Council's projected capacity levels at 2020/21, this is the point when it is reasonable to presume that the development would be complete or well on the way.

Type	Local School/School Planning Area	Pupils generated	Sufficient places available 2019/20 (Y/N/Partial)	Places to be mitigated
Primary	Lincoln North Primary planning area	49	N	49
Secondary	Lincoln North Secondary planning area	46	N	46
Sixth-form	Lincoln North Secondary planning area	9	N	9

As the development would result in a direct impact on local schools, a contribution is therefore requested to mitigate the impact of the development at local level. This is a recognisable and legitimate means of addressing an impact on infrastructure, accords with the NPPF (2012) and fully complies with CIL regulations; we feel it is necessary, directly related, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development proposed in this application.

The level of contribution sought in this case is in line with the below table.

Type	Places to be mitigated	Contribution per place*	Sub-total	Local multiplier**	Total contribution requested
Primary	49	£12,257	£600,593	0.92	£552,545
Secondary	46	£18,469	£849,574	0.92	£781,608
Sixth-form	9	£20,030	£180,270	0.92	£165,848
Total	-	-	£1,630,437	-	£1,500,001

*current cost multiplier per pupil place based on National Cost Survey

**to reduce cost and to reflect Lincolnshire's lower than average build cost compared to national average

We would suggest the s.106 monies are paid at the halfway point in the development to allow timely investment by the County Council whilst not adversely affecting the developer's viability.

Please note the County Council retains the statutory duty to ensure sufficiency of school places and this includes capital funding provision of sufficient places at maintained schools, academies and free schools. We would invest the funding at the most appropriate local school(s) regardless of their status, but ensure the s.106 funding is used only to add capacity as this is the only purpose for which it is requested.

I look forward to hearing from you, thank you for your notification of the application and thank City of Lincoln Council for your continued cooperation and support.

Yours sincerely

Simon Challis
Strategic Development Officer
Corporate Property Service

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

Environment & Economy
Lancaster House
36 Orchard Street
Lincoln
LN1 1XX
Tel: (01522) 782070
E-Mail: Highwayssudssupport@lincolnshire.gov.uk



To: Lincoln City Council

Application Ref: 2017/1393/RG3

With reference to this application dated 23 November 2017 relating to the following proposed development:

Address or location

Land adjacent to A46 Ring Road and north of Queen Elizabeth Road , Lincoln

Date application referred:
5 December 2017

Type of application: Outline/Full/RM/
FUL

Description of development

Erection of 325no. dwellinghouses, including 8no. flats, facilitated by the demolition of existing flats known as Garfield View and Woodburn View. Associated infrastructure and external works including new footpath link to Clarendon Gardens, the provision of new parking bays to Garfield Close and Woodburn Close and hard and soft landscaping and children's play area

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

Requests that the Local Planning Authority request the applicants to provide additional information as set out below.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUIRED

Highways and Lead Local Flood Authority response dated 28th February 2018:

Travel Plan comments:

The Travel Plan has been submitted to support a planning application for c314 dwellings off Queen Elizabeth Road, Lincoln. Overall the travel plan as submitted contains the relevant information that would be expected in a residential travel plan; however, there are some areas where additional detail or clarity is required. The measures suggested are mainly promotion based. The DfT publication 'Making Travel Plans Work: Lessons from UK Case Studies' states that Travel Plans containing only marketing and promotional works will not achieve modal shift. Most relatively basic travel plans can achieve a 3-5% shift, providing the package of measures included is robust. Such measures should include promotions, car

sharing and walking and cycling measures. However, in order to achieve a higher target and ensure the delivery of mode shift, the development requires additional measures such as discounts on public transport. In order to achieve mode shift, the measures suggested will need to be supported by incentives for change.

Ref	Travel Plan Reference	LCC Comment
1	Policy Background	The primary reader of a Travel Plan is the Travel Plan Co-ordinator [guidance] and/or resident [information] informing the developer's commitment and intentions to reduce single occupancy car travel and promote sustainable transport to and from the site. Whilst planning policy is important, a summary would be sufficient within the TP.
2	Existing Site and Highway Conditions	<p>Informative with useful photographs, however, whilst the isochrones maps give an overview of distance it is difficult for the reader to interpret the relationship between where they are and want to be. A table showing local facilities that the resident may use along with distance and walking/cycling times would be more informative and easier for the reader to assimilate. Either an appendix showing the cycle map or a link in this section would make the information provided on National Cycle Routes more understandable.</p> <p>Public Transport – Bus Services: The Lincoln Central bus station, now behind Sincil Street, is now within the Lincoln Transport Hub with direct connectivity to the Railway Station.</p> <p>Rail Services – the Lincoln Railway Station has secure cycle parking facilities for up to 196 bicycles.</p>
3	Development Proposals	It is a positive to note that secure cycle parking will be provided at each dwelling at the site.
4	Travel Plan Measures	<p>Travel Plan Co-ordinator will also be responsible for undertaking and/or commissioning surveys. The TPC should be appointed in sufficient time to implement pre-occupation measures, such as the Welcome Pack. Prior to circulation of the Welcome packs it is requested that the developer liaise with the County Council to ensure that the contents are comprehensive and up to date.</p> <p>As the post requires the appropriate authority to make decisions and approve budget spend, the TPC should not be a member of the sales staff unless supported by a more senior member of staff. The TPC needs to be in post for the duration of the build out and 1 year post final occupation – this could be for five years or may be longer depending on built out rate. The establishment of a Local Residents Group is a positive measure.</p> <p>As mentioned above, the proposed measures listed are mainly promotion based. There should be at the least, for a site of this size, a firm commitment to the provision of a discounted travel/complimentary bus taster ticket.</p>

		<p>To increase incentive choice a voucher within the pack for either a bus ticket, hi-visibility wear /D Locks or cycle safety checks for cyclists or pedometers for walkers could be used. Residents can then opt for the incentive most beneficial to them.</p> <p>Other measures that could be used to incentivise change in travel habits and maintain the profile of the Travel Plan could include sustainable travel workshops on or around the survey and Dr. Bike sessions alongside the workshops.</p>
5	Targets, Monitoring and Review	<p>LCC Guidance for the Development of Travel Plans states, 6.2.6 "In the majority of cases it is expected that targets will be challenging but achievable. All new site developments should commit to a minimum reduction of 10% in single occupancy car journeys in rural areas and 15% in urban areas. A lower target must be justified." The targets suggested provide for a reduction of 9% (A 6% modal shift). Some assurance that this will be discussed with LCC following the first survey should be provided.</p> <p>The first survey should be completed following 25% occupation and annually thereafter for five years or one year post final occupation whichever is greater. It is further recommended that a %response rate be set to ensure sufficient responses are received to provide meaningful data. If insufficient data is collated then there should be a commitment to undertaking a multi modal travel survey to provide accurate progress of the travel plan the following year alongside the survey.</p> <p>The County Council uses an online travel plan management tool to assist in monitoring of travel plans. This tool provides online survey facilities. Where residents do not have email access, paper versions of the survey can be used. It is recommended that the developer consider encouraging the TPC to use the system. Further information can be found at https://starsfor.org/.</p> <p>Some indication as to the types of remedial action will be taken should the target not be achieved during the monitoring period should also be included. This might be providing additional bus tickets, further promotional work, the TPC undertaking personal travel planning work with residents etc..</p>
6	Budget	<p>Additional details are required in respect of providing an indicative budget that developer considers will be required/committed to fund the various elements of the Travel Plan, such as TPC appointment, surveys, vouchers, promotion of events, travel packs etc... This budget does not need to be part of the S106 but informs</p>

		<p>the LCC that the developer has considered and allowed for sufficient monies to commit to the plan.</p> <p>In order to successfully monitor a travel plan, LCC require a monitoring fee, secured through a Section 106 agreement to be paid by the developer to cover the office time and overheads required to co-ordinate and complete the monitoring programme over the lifetime of the Travel Plan, normally £1000 per annum for 5 years.</p>
--	--	---

Recommendation: That the comment provided be considered and a revised Travel Plan submitted for approval.

Layout:

The raised speed tables should be removed from the design as vertical deflections are not accepted by the Highways Authority.

Shared surface carriageways should be a minimum of 5.5 metres in width, with a 1.8 metre service strip.

Where no footways are provided a 0.5 metre strip has been shown on the drawings adjacent to the carriageway. This strip is not required.

The Highways and Lead Local Flood Authority advises that a minimum of 2 parking spaces is provided for all dwellings with 3 or less bedrooms and 3 spaces for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms. A garage should only be considered as a parking space where it is of adequate size to accommodate both a car and storage. Although parking provision across the site a few plots fall short of the requirement.

The minimum widths of roads that are proposed for adoption should be 5 metres (where footways are to be provided). Isolated narrowings as a speed restraint measure may be accepted.

Drainage:

The drainage system that has been proposed for this development is mainly piped with an infiltrating attenuation basin. The highway does not consider this to be a SUD's system as the entire site is positively drained until the point at which it reaches the attenuation pond.

Based on the information that has been provided to date the site has low ground water levels and is likely to have good infiltration. The use of SUD's drainage features, such as permeable paving and swales should therefore be considered as a means of draining the site. A piped system should only be adopted as a last resort when a SUD's scheme cannot be achieved. The Highways Authority does not believe that this is the case in this instance.

The drainage strategy should therefore be amended and a SUD's drainage system proposed.

Greenfield run off rates should be provided along with calculations to demonstrate that the existing greenfield rates have not been exceeded.

Transport Assessment:

Overall the impact of the development on existing traffic flows in the area will not lead to a situation which could be considered to be a severe impact on the surrounding highway network.

The key junctions that suffer from significant congestion in the peak periods are Riseholme Road roundabout and the Burton Road/Yarborough Road roundabout. There will be some impact from the additional traffic generated by this proposal in the peak periods which will add to the significant queuing that is observed along Burton Road in particular. However, much of this queuing is caused by the delays encountered further down Yarborough Road at the Long Leys Road signalised junction, West Parade signalised junction and Newland signalised junction. Some of this will be mitigated in the short term following the opening of the LEB due to the redistribution of traffic (approx. £500,000 is being secured through CIL towards the LEB).

The additional traffic from this development expected to pass through the Riseholme Road roundabout is less than 1% of the existing flows. Again this will be mitigated in the short term following the opening of the LEB.

Section 106 contribution requests:

A Section 106 contribution of £5000 is required for the monitoring of the Travel Plan.

Highways and Lead Local Flood Authority response dated 8th May 2018:

The amended drainage strategy that has been submitted in response the drainage comments in my response above dated 28th February 2018, does not address the issues raised. No acceptable evidence has been provided to demonstrate that a SUD's drainage solution can not be found for the whole site. Permeable paving and swales (which may be lined to address high ground water issue or used for conveyance where infiltration is poor) could be used as an effective way of draining the site.

As previously stated a piped system should only be accepted as a means of draining the site when all other SUD's options have been found to be unsuitable. The report states that the western side of the site has good infiltration and therefore a SUD's solution should be easily achievable.

Evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed pipe to pond system will effectively drain the site, but as the majority of the system is piped, I do not consider it to be a full SUD's system.

All other comments made in the Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority response dated 28th February (detailed above) still apply.

Case Officer:

Date: 08/05/18

Liz Burnley

for Warren Peppard

Flood Risk & Development Manager

Lincolnshire Police (Crime Prevention Advisor)

Lincolnshire Police have no objections to this application.

It is fully appreciated that this application is only seeking to establish the principle of development and that the finer detail of design will be submitted at a later date. However, the applicant needs to consider the following advice when drawing up a more detailed proposal:

Overall the permeability of this design within the context of a generally low crime area is acceptable however any pathways that are not necessary should be avoided, equally pathways to the rear of any property should likewise be avoided. Where pathways are deemed essential they should be at least 3m, devoid of potential hiding places, well overlooked with good natural surveillance, straight with no hidden curves, well-lit and maintained.

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.

I have studied the online plans (Design and Access Statement) and would request that you consider the following points that if adhered to would help reduce the opportunity for crime and increase the safety and sustainability of the development.

- 1) Properties should be orientated to face streets and public areas. Windows of routinely occupied rooms (e.g. lounge/living room/kitchen) should be positioned to provide effective overlooking of the frontage and contribute to natural surveillance.
- 2) To encourage greater use and reduce the fear of crime, all footpath networks should be directly overlooked by housing.
- 3) It is important that space is clearly defined to delineate public, semi-private or private space. Avoid space which is unassigned. All space should become the clear responsibility of someone.

When it is unclear whether space is public or private it is difficult to determine what is acceptable behaviour. Uncertainty of ownership can reduce

responsibility and increase the likelihood of crime and anti-social behaviour going unchallenged.

- 4) Front gardens on all through roads should effectively be defined using low walls, railings or planting in order to effectively create defensible space to the housing. Boundaries between each property should be clearly defined.
- 5) Gable ends of properties should not directly adjoin public areas, as this often leads to nuisance for the residents. The provision of good gable end surveillance by way of windows can mitigate against this risk.
- 6) The profile of the entrance into the site (entrance gate and raised carriageway crossing) displays a presence which will give the impression that the facility and its grounds are 'private'.
- 7) Front doors should be located where they can be seen from the street and neighbouring houses. They must not be located in deep recesses or behind other obstacles that would provide cover for criminal activity.
- 8) The rear gardens of properties, where possible, should lock into each other, reducing the potential for an offender to gain access to the back of properties without being witnessed.
- 9) Effective division between front and rear gardens needs to be provided e.g., 1.8m high fencing and lockable gates.
- 10) It is strongly advised that if there are any rear access (service) alleyways incorporated, they must be gated at their entrances. The gates must not be easy to climb over or easily removed from their hinges and they must have a key operated lock. Alleyways giving access to rear gardens are frequently exploited by burglars and can become a focus for anti-social behaviour.
- 11) If properties have driveways to the side of the dwellings themselves, windows should be incorporated in the side elevation at landing or first floor level to allow residents to overlook their vehicles.
- 12) Appropriate street lighting should be provided around the site. Good lighting will deter intruders and reduce the fear of crime. Lighting should comply with British Standard 5489 -2013.
- 13) The proposed tree planting should be developed in tandem with any street lighting in order to avoid the scenario of tree canopies obscuring lighting. Street lighting should be provided which complies with British Standard 5489– 2013.
- 14) One of the most effective ways to prevent property crime is to make the property itself as secure as possible. With this in mind, it is highly recommended that all vulnerable ground floor windows and doors be security- tested to comply with British Standard PAS.24:2012 (Secured by Design Standards). *See note above.*

- 15) I would recommend that each dwelling be provided with lighting to illuminate all external doors, car parking and garage areas. Ideally lighting should be switched using a photo electric cell (dusk to dawn) with a manual override.
- 16) In respect of landscaping, it is important that in vulnerable locations, such as entrances, parking areas and footpaths, low planting should not exceed 1000mm in height, and tree canopies should not fall lower than 2m from the ground. This is in order to allow people to see their surroundings better, make a rational choice of routes and eliminate hiding places.
- 17) Car parking should ideally be located within curtilage of the property at the front. If properties have driveways to the side of the dwellings themselves, windows should be incorporated in the side elevation at landing or first floor level to allow residents to overlook their own vehicles. Consideration towards provision of suitable parking for visitors should be an element of this proposal as a failure to consider such a facility may lead to inconsiderate and inappropriate parking within the development.

Recent research conducted by Professor Rachael Armitage (Huddersfield University) on behalf of the Design Council/CABE, Home Office and Secured by Design, has clearly shown that rear parking courts are vulnerable to crime. They have higher levels of vehicle crime and criminal damage than other types of parking, and also facilitate offender access to the rear of properties. Residents do not tend to use their allocated spaces within these courts, preferring to park on street, regardless of whether the street was designed for on street parking.

Other research states: "The recent fashion for placing parking spaces behind buildings has led to many schemes around the country being blighted by cars parked to the front of the house where there is no space designed to accommodate them. It is an inefficient use of land, as a large proportion is used for roads and parking areas; the internal routes result in reduced garden sizes; there is loss of security and privacy to the rear of the home; and, with parking to the rear of the house, residents may be less likely to use their front doors with a consequent loss of activity in the street.

Communal Areas (Public Open Spaces) Play Areas (if to be considered)

Where a communal recreational area may be been created development it is important that adequate mechanisms and resources are in place to ensure its satisfactory future management. If a play-area (toddler) is to be included this should be so designed that it can be secured at night-time to help prevent any misuse such as damage or graffiti. The type and nature of any fencing should be specific to this area but should be to a minimum of 1200mm which can often discourage casual entry.

I would recommend that 'air lock' style access points (at least two) with grated flooring to prevent animal access and the resultant fouling that may occur. Such gating systems will also reduce the risk of younger children exiting onto the adjacent roadways.

One of the attributes of safe, sustainable places is 'Ownership' - places that promote a sense of ownership, respect, territorial responsibility and community. Ownership is

particularly relevant to this outline planning application in respect of social inclusion, particularly when you consider that as much as 40% of the housing proposed could be low cost/affordable homes. It is important to highlight that low cost/affordable housing must be pepper-potted throughout the development rather than concentrated in one area or isolated from the general housing market. Social inclusion promotes a sense of ownership, respect and territorial responsibility within the community.

“Rear servicing can undermine the security of dwellings by allowing strangers access to the rear of dwellings.”

The defensive character of the development should not be compromised through **excessive** permeability caused by the inclusion of too many, or unnecessary segregated footpaths which allows the criminal legitimate access to the rear or side boundaries of dwellings or footpath links. Better places to Live by Design, the Companion Guide to PPG3, Secure by Design, Manual for Streets all promote pedestrian, cycle and vehicular permeability through residential areas by designing roads on a network basis rather than using footpaths.

Should outline planning consent be granted, I would ask that consideration be given by the Authority to require full details of what crime prevention measures are to be incorporated into this development. These should be required as part of Reserved Matters. These measures should ideally take into account the contents of this report.

I would direct and recommend that the current *Police CPI New Homes 2016* is referred to as a source document in the planning and design process.

Further guides are available on www.securedbydesign.com that include SBD Commercial 2015 V2, SBD New Schools 2014 & Sheltered Accommodation. I would ask that you direct architects and developers to these documents and ensure their reference in the various Design & Access statements. Equally please do not hesitate involving this office in and on any further consultations.

Crime prevention advice is given free without the intention of creating a contract. Neither the Home Office nor the Police Service takes any legal responsibility for the advice given. However, if the advice is implemented it will reduce the opportunity for crimes to be committed.

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

We would like to make the comment below with specific reference to:

- Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey
- Reptile Presence / Absence Survey
- Tree Survey
- Design and Access Statement
- Supporting Planning Statement
- Proposed Site Layout
- Site Layout plans 1-3

We accept the results and conclusions of the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and that of the Reptile Presence / Absence Survey. We accept that the majority of land on the site is of low ecological value and that there are no constraints to the potential development of this site due to the potential presence of reptiles. Nevertheless, we would like to highlight the following elements.

Northern boundary hedgerow:

We strongly support that the northern boundary hedgerow is a significant landscape feature and has the potential to contribute to a landscape scale corridor on Lincoln's periphery. We would advocate that this hedgerow is:

- enhanced with native (only) shrub species to increase its diversity;
- augmented with well-spaced native (only) standard trees;
- managed sympathetically for wildlife (see recommendation for LEMP below);
- buffered on its south side by several metres of rough grassland which is managed to provide a sanctuary zone for wildlife (see recommendation for LEMP below).

Central linear woodland:

We strongly support the maximum, preferential retention of especially mature and native trees within the broadleaved, linear woodland which runs east-west across the centre of the site. We strongly support the following measures recommended by the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and proposed by the Design and Access Statement:

- Full protection measures should be implemented to safeguard Root Protection Areas (RPAs) of all trees to be retained during the construction phase.
- Bat surveys should be undertaken to assess both the suitability of trees for bat roosting and the suitability of both the woodland strip and connected hedgerows for bat commuting and foraging.
- The central woodland pedestrian path should not be lit and the lighting of adjacent residential development should be designed to minimise light spill into the woodland in order to maintain a 'dark' corridor. This will provide a significant benefit for bats and invertebrates.
- If trees and underlying vegetation are to be disturbed during the bird nesting season (Feb-Aug incl.), all work must be preceded shortly beforehand by a survey from a qualified and experienced ecologist in order to identify any mitigation measures that should be undertaken.
- We note that on page 39 of the Design and Access Statement "Objectives for design of landscape and open spaces" include a woodland belt of "semi-natural character enhanced by naturalistic planting." We suggest that this would enhance the public's enjoyment and appreciation of this landscape element but would insist that if any planting were undertaken it must include only native species of UK or ideally regional provenance. Whereas non-native, ornamental planting may be more appropriate in much closer proximity to housing, we believe strongly that this woodland feature represents the most significant opportunity on site for the public to engage frequently with a naturalistic environment. Consequently we would insist that any seed/plant supplier should be able to guarantee local/national provenance and/or have Flora Locale accreditation (www.floralocale.org).

We would recommend sowing a suitable hedgerow seed mix (20% grass and 80% wildflower seed) in bordering strips north and south of the woodland belt which received no more than partial shade. For reference, examples include:

- Boston Seeds BS7M: <https://www.bostonseeds.com/library/BS7M-Hedgerow-and-Light-Shade-Wildflower-Meadow-Seed-Mixture.pdf>
- Naturescape N9: <https://www.naturescape.co.uk/product/n9-hedgerow-meadow-mixture/>
- Emorsgate EH1: <https://wildseed.co.uk/mixtures/view/12>

Our recommendation for sowing under the full shade of the woodland strip would be a suitable woodland seed mix. For reference, examples include:

- Boston Seeds BS8P: <https://www.bostonseeds.com/library/BS8P-Hedgerow-and-Heavy-Shade-Wildflower-Seed-Mixture.pdf>
- Naturescape NV10F: <https://www.naturescape.co.uk/product/nv10f-value-woodland-mix-flowersonly/>
- Emorsgate EW1F: <https://wildseed.co.uk/mixtures/view/33>

SUDS infiltration basins:

We note that the FRA and Drainage Strategy states that there is "a requirement for SUDS drainage." We also note that the Design and Access Statement mentions that further soak away tests will be carried out at the proposed locations of the SUDS infiltration basins. Given the permeable limestone geology beneath the site, the infiltration basins cannot be assumed to behave like ponds until infiltration tests show otherwise. They may remain dry except only in periods of heavy rainfall when standing water may only persist for hours or a few days. For this reason, we would recommend that the appropriate seed mix for the SUDS basins would be a neutral or wetland meadow mix for higher infiltration rates and only an aquatic/marginal pond mix for low infiltration rates where the basin is likely to hold standing water for more than half of the year. For reference, examples of appropriate wetland meadow mixes include:

- Boston Seeds BS6M: <https://www.bostonseeds.com/library/BS6M-Wetland-and-Pond-Edge-Wildflower-Meadow-Seed-Mixture.pdf>
- Naturescape N7: <https://www.naturescape.co.uk/product/n7-wetland-meadow-mixture/>
- Emorsgate EM8: <https://wildseed.co.uk/mixtures/view/9>

Open, dry grassland areas:

We strongly recommend that the potential for the creation of lowland calcareous (limestone) grassland should not be overlooked. This habitat is a Habitat of Principal Importance listed under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006 and is a conservation priority within the Lincolnshire Biodiversity Action Plan. Lincoln sits on a north-south corridor of limestone geology which is well suited to support this threatened habitat. Any creation of limestone grassland at this location will enhance the network of sites in the local area and therefore be directly relevant to CLLP policy LP21.

The following locations on site offer the potential of lowland limestone grassland creation due to full sun, dry soil conditions and underlying limestone geology:

- outside of and around the SUDS basins
- to the south of the woodland belt beyond the semi-shade fringe
- in the areas labelled 'Landscape Feature' in Site Layout Plans 1-3

For reference, examples of appropriate calcareous meadow seed mixes include:

- Boston Seeds BS2M: <https://www.bostonseeds.com/products/2/Wildflowers-Seed/11/Wildflower-Seed-Mixtures-20/#product659>
- Naturescape NV13F: <https://www.naturescape.co.uk/product/nv13-value-chalk-limestone-soilmeadow-mixture/>
- Emorsgate EM6: <https://wildseed.co.uk/mixtures/view/7>

We would strongly advise against amenity turf laying wherever possible. This will significantly diminish the biodiversity potential of the site if this is done extensively on public open space. We would also hope that garden plots could receive a flowering lawn or general purpose grassland mix seeding.

If the decision to use turf is mainly due to concern for the rapidity and evenness of establishment, then a general purpose seed mix (e.g. Emorsgate EM1 / Naturescape's N1 or N14) could be sown with an addition of @ 20kg/ha of Westerwolds Rye-grass (*Lolium multiflorum*) to act as a 'nurse grass'. The nurse grass will enable rapid bare ground cover but will eventually give way to the accompanying species. For advice on this technique see <https://wildseed.co.uk/page/annualwesterwolds-ryegrass-as-temporary-nurse-cover>.

If no alternative to turf is acceptable we would advocate that certain areas be considered for turf richer in native species. 'Species-rich Lawn Turf' offered by wildflowerturf.co.uk is an example of a less expensive option of wildflower turf. See examples of wildflower turf here:

- <http://www.wildflowerturf.co.uk/Products/species-rich-lawn-turf.aspx>
- <http://www.allturf.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/wildturf.pdf>
- <https://www.tillersturf.co.uk/flora-meadow-wildflower-turf>

Turf and seeded grass biodiversity will benefit from lower fertility, so again we would advise against imported topsoil, compost or pre-seeding fertiliser.

Ornamental planting:

We would suggest that ornamental planting is best kept in close proximity to dwellings. We would encourage reference to the following resources. RHS 'Perfect for Pollinators':

<https://www.rhs.org.uk/science/pdf/conservation-and-biodiversity/wildlife/rhs-perfect-for-pollinatorsgarden-plants.pdf>

https://www.rhs.org.uk/science/pdf/conservation-andbiodiversity/wildlife/rhs_perfectforpollinators_plantlist-jan15.pdf

We would expect a development of this size to involve a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), a detailed planting plan and a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) to be submitted to the LPA that would follow the appropriate mitigation hierarchy (avoid, mitigate, compensate) and include detail on the following points:

CEMP

- appropriate surveys and mitigation for breeding birds and for bats
- potential risks of construction site lighting, noise, dust, chemical pollution and mitigation plan
- proposed plans to mitigate damage to trees and hedgerows through RPA protection during construction

- soil conservation: prevention of weed development in stored topsoil, utilisation of topsoil on site in garden plots; no imported topsoil for POS grassland establishment; establishment of grassland POS over mineral soil or minimum topsoil as far as levels and costs permit; no pre-seeding fertilisers or organic mulches for grassland POS
- minimal/no turf laying

LEMP

- Mowing of open spaces including dry areas around SUDS basins and SUDS basins
 - Management during the establishment year: Maintain a short turf (c.5-8cm which should be cut throughout the year). This will encourage development of the perennial species and minimise weed development. We would insist that all cuttings should be removed every time.
 - Ongoing management after the first year: Except for thoroughfares, we would insist that management of grassy areas be 1-2 cuts per year only with cuttings always collected. Cutting can be twice per year if grass growth is tall and rapid. Ideally a gap should be left between cuts of at least 10-12 weeks and ideally cuts from June to mid-July should be avoided. Cuts in May and September can therefore work well.
- Hedgerow cutting
 - We advise that a buffer of 1-2m of grassland at hedgerow bases be left unmown as a wildlife refuge but saplings that emerge within this zone be cut down every few years to prevent scrub encroachment over grassland.
 - In order to maximise the biodiversity benefit from hedgerows, they should only be cut on alternate sides every 3 years in January-February according to research cited in this report:
<https://www.woodlandtrust.org.uk/mediafile/100270134/j-wt-161014-wood-wise-summer-2014.pdf?cb=011b6965191740cdbf92535777d1a81b>. Cutting only one side at a time and less frequently will allow production of flowers and fruit for wildlife while minimising bird disturbance.

We would hope that the following enhancements would also be incorporated into the development:

- Bird boxes for garden birds and nesting cups for swallows/swifts house martins o Bat boxes/bat tiles/bat bricks nearest to hedgerows and woodland
- Hedgehog-permeable fencing
- Small, stacked dead wood piles within woodland or under hedgerows for wildlife refuge

NHS England

Over Page...

<p>Impact of new development on GP practice</p>	<p>The above development is proposing 325 dwellings which, based on the average of 2.2 people per dwelling for the Lincolnshire County Council area, would result in an increase in patient population of 715.</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="392 551 1308 898"> <tr> <td>Proposed population</td><td>715</td></tr> <tr> <td>Access rate</td><td>5260 per 1000 patients</td></tr> <tr> <td>Anticipated annual contacts</td><td>$0.715 \times 5260 = 3761$</td></tr> <tr> <td>Assume 100% patient use of room</td><td>3761</td></tr> <tr> <td>Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year</td><td>$3761/50 = 75.2$</td></tr> <tr> <td>Appointment duration</td><td>15 mins</td></tr> <tr> <td>Patient appointment time per week</td><td>$75.2 \times 15/60 = 18.8$ hrs per week</td></tr> </table> <p>Treatment room Practice Nurse</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="392 1003 1308 1350"> <tr> <td>Proposed population</td><td>715</td></tr> <tr> <td>Access rate</td><td>5260 per 1000 patients</td></tr> <tr> <td>Anticipated annual contacts</td><td>$0.715 \times 5260 = 3761$</td></tr> <tr> <td>Assume 20% patient use of room</td><td>$3761 \times 20\% = 752.2$</td></tr> <tr> <td>Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year</td><td>$752.2/50 = 15.044$</td></tr> <tr> <td>Appointment duration</td><td>20 mins</td></tr> <tr> <td>Patient appointment time per week</td><td>$15.044 \times 20/60 = 5$ hrs per week</td></tr> </table> <p>Therefore an increase in population of 715 in the City of Lincoln Council 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	715	Access rate	5260 per 1000 patients	Anticipated annual contacts	$0.715 \times 5260 = 3761$	Assume 100% patient use of room	3761	Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year	$3761/50 = 75.2$	Appointment duration	15 mins	Patient appointment time per week	$75.2 \times 15/60 = 18.8$ hrs per week	Proposed population	715	Access rate	5260 per 1000 patients	Anticipated annual contacts	$0.715 \times 5260 = 3761$	Assume 20% patient use of room	$3761 \times 20\% = 752.2$	Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year	$752.2/50 = 15.044$	Appointment duration	20 mins	Patient appointment time per week	$15.044 \times 20/60 = 5$ hrs per week
Proposed population	715																												
Access rate	5260 per 1000 patients																												
Anticipated annual contacts	$0.715 \times 5260 = 3761$																												
Assume 100% patient use of room	3761																												
Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year	$3761/50 = 75.2$																												
Appointment duration	15 mins																												
Patient appointment time per week	$75.2 \times 15/60 = 18.8$ hrs per week																												
Proposed population	715																												
Access rate	5260 per 1000 patients																												
Anticipated annual contacts	$0.715 \times 5260 = 3761$																												
Assume 20% patient use of room	$3761 \times 20\% = 752.2$																												
Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year	$752.2/50 = 15.044$																												
Appointment duration	20 mins																												
Patient appointment time per week	$15.044 \times 20/60 = 5$ 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> <p>As such, the following practices may be affected by the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lindum Medical Practice • Abbey Medical Practice • Minster Medical Practice • Cliff House Medical Practice • Glebe Park Surgery • Brayford Medical Practice • The Witham Practice • University Health Centre 																												

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 from this development would be split between Minster Medical Practice and Glebe Park Surgery.</p> <p>An occupancy survey which was carried out on behalf of the CCG for Glebe Park Surgery has shown that they are currently working at capacity. The practice list size has increased substantially over recent years and they are anticipating an increase in growth of approximately 5% for the current year. This development would place further capacity pressures on the practice.</p> <p>The practice have proposed using the s106 funding to add a single storey extension to their existing premises and reconfiguring their existing building to allow the repurposing of office space. This would create extra clinical and admin space and enable the practice to be able to better serve the population and allow them to offer services that they are not currently in a position to be able to.</p> <p>Minster Medical Practice is also working at clinical capacity and would need to carry out improvement works to increase the number of consulting rooms in order to be able to provide services for the patients arising from this development.</p> <p>The practice currently has a large ground-floor room used for storing medical records. They have proposed that the s106 funding is used to convert and furnish their loft space to store their patients' medical records and reconfigure the existing storage room into clinical rooms for nurse use. This would free up two existing rooms for GP/other health care professional use. These changes would allow them to provide superior nursing facilities, which would benefit their existing patients as well as increasing capacity for new patients moving into 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.	<table><tr><td></td><td>Average list size per GP</td><td>Required m2</td><td>£ per m2</td><td>Total cost</td><td>£per person</td></tr><tr><td>GP team</td><td>1,800</td><td>170</td><td>1,500</td><td>£255,000</td><td>142</td></tr><tr><td>GP furnishings</td><td>1,800</td><td></td><td></td><td>£20,000</td><td>12</td></tr><tr><td colspan="5"></td><td>154</td></tr><tr><td colspan="5">Contingency requirements @ 20%</td><td>31</td></tr><tr><td colspan="5">Total per resident</td><td>185</td></tr><tr><td colspan="5">Total per dwelling (resident x 2.2)</td><td>407</td></tr></table> <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 the City of Lincoln Council) to provide a funding per dwelling of £407.</p>							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
	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																																											

Financial Contribution requested	The contribution requested for this development is £132,275.00 (£407 x 325 dwellings.)
---	--

Vicky Allen
Primary Care Support Medical & Pharmacy
February 2018

Natural England

Natural England has no comments to make on this application.

Natural England has not assessed this application for impacts on protected species.

Natural England has published [Standing Advice](#) which you can use to assess impacts on protected species or you may wish to consult your own ecology services for advice.

Natural England and the Forestry Commission have also published standing advice on [ancient woodland and veteran trees](#) which you can use to assess any impacts on ancient woodland.

The lack of comment from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment, but only that the application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes. It is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not this application is consistent with national and local policies on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may be able to provide information and advice on the environmental value of this site and the impacts of the proposal to assist the decision making process. We advise LPAs to obtain specialist ecological or other environmental advice when determining the environmental impacts of development.

We recommend referring to our SSSI Impact Risk Zones (available on [Magic](#) and as a downloadable [dataset](#)) prior to consultation with Natural England. Further guidance on when to consult Natural England on planning and development proposals is available on gov.uk at <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-planning-authorities-get-environmental-advice>

Neighbours

Mr N. Williams (375 Burton Road)

Objects in relation to the following:

Proposed footpath to Burton Road

I object to the footpath which the plans propose will run East to West, to the north of our property, from the newly extended Garfield Close to Burton Road. Access for pedestrians is already provided in this regard by the well-used footpath running through the line of trees only a few metres to the north, which the plans propose to retain. Construction of the proposed new path runs contrary to the advice of Lincolnshire Police, in that it is "not necessary," would provide easy access to the rear of my property, would not be directly overlooked and, as such, "should be avoided" as a security concern. Such pathways, Lincolnshire Police recommend, "should be well lit" which would result in persistent light pollution of my property and be to the detriment of local wildlife in the nearby trees (see advice of Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust).

Furthermore, there is regularly evidence of anti-social behaviour on the existing unlit pathway through the trees (discarded beer cans and drug paraphernalia) which the new pathway would bring that bit closer to my property and family. The proposed pathway runs close to the private drive which provides access to my property, which is protected by only a two-bar wooden fence, and which would offer a tempting shortcut to those heading South onto Burton Road.

Instead of the footpath, I support the recommendation of the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust, that this area be retained and developed as an area of lowland limestone grassland.

SuDS pond

Without further detail, access to and around the proposed SuDS pond poses the same security concerns as the footpath, in that it may offer easy, unlit access to the rear of my property. I would also echo the concerns of other residents with regard to the safety provision around the pond.

Finally, although I understand the aim of the SuDS pond is to contain the affects of heavy rain, I should like to point out that, in the ten years or so of living here, there have been no instances of flooding on my property. Should this pond change that situation, I will hold you responsible.

Noise

I see there has been a noise/acoustic assessment of the proposed finished development, but nothing with regard to noise during construction. Currently our property benefits from very little daytime noise, which is of great advantage to me, as a night shift worker who must rest and sleep in daylight hours, both before and after work. It is difficult to see how that peaceful environment can be maintained while you knock down two properties, build a road and dig a SuDS pond just a few feet from my

bedroom window. If, as a consequence, I am unfit for work, the costs to my employer might easily run into many thousands of pounds. Therefore, should the noise become detrimental to sound rest, I shall have to seek alternative accommodation, the cost of which, I believe, should be born by you or the developer.

Mr. M. Stafford (38 Clarendon Gardens)

There is already a considerable build up of traffic at the Queen Elizabeth Road / Riseholme Road and the Queen Elizabeth Road / Burton Road junctions at peak times.

The current road system is simply not capable of coping with the increase in traffic that 325 new dwellings would cause at these junctions at peak times.

For a development of this size to be even remotely feasible, the aforementioned junctions would need to be traffic light controlled, with dedicated turn filter lanes.

I do not believe that there is sufficient available land on either of these roads, at the required points, to build the new junctions required to take the increase in vehicular traffic. It is for this reason that I object to the currently proposed development.

Mr. C. R. C. Greenwold (2 Edendale View, Via Email)

Re the letter about the development of the land adjacent to A46 ring road and North of Queen Elizabeth road Lincoln. I am writing to say I have no objection to this development but seek one assurance that the security fencing behind my property at 2 Edendale view stays in place all through the development and afterwards.

Yours sincerely

C.R.C.Greenwold

Mrs. J. Farrar (1 Riverton View)

It seems that every small available green space is being built on, on the Ermine Estate. Whilst there is always the need for housing, surely some consideration should be given to natural surroundings and appearance of the area for those that are living here? 325 dwellings will have an enormous effect on the Estate and the open land, trees etc. behind Queen Elizabeth Road be destroyed.

Mr. M. Foster (35 Garfield Close)

Two letters setting out objections to the application, dated 09 and 11 December 2017:

Concerning your development on land adjacent to A46 ring road and the demolition of Garfield View Flats. On a number of occasions I have wrote into your department and visited City Hall and spoke to Emma. Regarding my pre-planning application to land adjoining Garfield View I have also been to Sudbrooke Community Centre on the 18th September to discuss my concerns and because of the increase in traffic the possibility of having off road parking to 35 Garfield Close. There seem to be no problem with my pre-planning application, as I was told it could be implemented into the development, however I am none the wiser on what is happening. As this development does affect mine, as well as the demolition of Garfield View that adjoins my land and well with other issues I have not been consulted with. I have no choice but to object to your development.

Concerning your letter dated 11th December. I wrote to your department, on a number of occasions and spoke to Emma as well but to no avail. Regarding your development as it has an impact on my land as Garfield View shares the boundary with my land. I have not been consulted and no permission sought from me in any way. At the meeting or open day on the 18th September I inform your staff of my own development and with the increase of traffic, off-road parking for 35 Garfield Close, that your development will bring. The ponds are a concern for children safety. I understand the line of trees have a tree protection order or preservation on them. Your development is cramming houses onto the site that will affect the quality of life, for those that live in them and nothing is being done, to reduce the traffic noise from the A46 by-pass. I object to your development on the grounds it is not suitable or environmentally friendly.

Consultation Responses Received by West Lindsey District Council **(From Consultees Covering Matters not Sent to CoLC)**

Anglian Water

ASSETS

Section 1 – Assets Affected

- 1.1 There are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site. Anglian Water would ask that the following text be included within your Notice should permission be granted.

"Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence."

- 1.2 The development site is within 15 metres of a sewage pumping station. This asset requires access for maintenance and will have sewerage infrastructure leading to it. For practical reasons therefore it cannot be easily relocated.

Anglian Water consider that dwellings located within 15 metres of the pumping station would place them at risk of nuisance in the form of noise, odour or the general disruption from maintenance work caused by the normal operation of the pumping station.

The site layout should take this into account and accommodate this infrastructure type through a necessary cordon sanitaire, through public space or highway infrastructure to ensure that no development within 15 metres from the boundary of a sewage pumping station if the development is potentially sensitive to noise or other disturbance or to ensure future amenity issues are not created.

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 Development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. A drainage strategy will need to be prepared in consultation with Anglian Water to determine mitigation measures.

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

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 The planning application includes employment/commercial use. To discharge trade effluent from trade premises to a public sewer vested in Anglian Water requires our consent. It is an offence under section 118 of the Water Industry Act 1991 to discharge trade effluent to sewer without consent. Anglian Water would ask that the following text be included within your Notice should permission be granted.

"An application to discharge trade effluent must be made to Anglian Water and must have been obtained before any discharge of trade effluent can be made to the public sewer.

Anglian Water recommends that petrol / oil interceptors be fitted in all car parking/washing/repair facilities. Failure to enforce the effective use of such facilities could result in pollution of the local watercourse and may constitute an offence.

Anglian Water also recommends the installation of a properly maintained fat traps on all catering establishments. Failure to do so may result in this and other properties suffering blocked drains, sewage flooding and consequential environmental and amenity impact and may also constitute an offence under section 111 of the Water Industry Act 1991."

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.

Foul Sewerage Network (Section 3)

CONDITION

No development shall commence until a foul water strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwellings shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the foul water strategy so approved unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON

To prevent environmental and amenity problems arising from flooding.

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.

Burton Parish Council

Although not formally consulted on this application the application appears to suggest this is in Burton Parish.

We have looked at the application and would wish to raise very particular concerns over the traffic increase that this may have on already congested roads. We would wish Highways to carefully consider if this application is suitable from a Highway perspective and whether the current road network has sufficient capacity for this increase. The Parish of Burton would be affected by significant increase in road usage.

If Highways do believe it is acceptable we would ask that planning conditions be included to minimise any impact and to ameliorate the position.

Please could you include the above comment on this application.

Caroline Emerson
Burton-by-Lincoln Parish Clerk

Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue

LINCOLNSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE

Chief Fire Officer: Nick Borrill



My Ref: YS
Your Ref: 137101

Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue
Grantham Fire Station
Harlaxton Road
Grantham
NG31 7SG

Head of Planning Services
West Lindsey District Council
Guildhall
Marshall's Yard
Gainsborough
DN21 2NA

Sent by email to planning.customer.care@west-lindsey.gov.uk

20 December 2017

Dear Sir

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
PLANNING CONSULTATION - LAND NORTH OF QUEEN ELIZABETH ROAD,
LINCOLN**

I refer to the planning application reference 137101. The Fire Authority object to the application on the grounds of inadequate access and water supplies.

It is the opinion of the Fire Authority that in order to remove the objection the following measures are required

1. Access to buildings for fire appliances and fire fighters must meet with the requirements specified in Building Regulations 2010 Part B5. These requirements may be satisfied with other equivalent standards relating to access for fire-fighting, in which case those standards should be quoted in correspondence.

Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue also requires a minimum carrying capacity for access routes and hard standing for pumping appliances of 18 tonnes, not 12.5 tonnes as detailed in the Building Regulations 2010 part B5.

2. Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue recommends that fire hydrants be installed within this development at the developer's expense. However, it is not possible, at this time, to determine the number of fire hydrants required for fire-fighting purposes. The requirement will be determined at the water planning stage when site plans have been submitted by the water companies.

Should you wish to discuss this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me on the telephone number below.



MAKING OUR COMMUNITIES SAFER, HEALTHIER AND MORE RESILIENT

WWW.LINCOLNSHIRE.GOV.UK/LFR

Riseholme Parish Council

Riseholme Parish Council have looked at this application due to the proximity of the site to the Parish.

They have concerns due to the scale of the development.

The concerns relate to the increase in traffic on an already congested road network. As you will know the Riseholme roundabout is backlogged for a considerable period of time during the day. This is exacerbated by show ground events which are increasing.

We would wish that these concerns be referred to the Highways department and for them to consider very carefully how this will impact on the current network.

If it is felt to be an appropriate development we would look to be appropriately conditioned to ameliorate the potential problems.

Neighbours

Mr. & Mrs. Buckthorpe (29 Garfield Close)

I am bring to your attention the following facts. The woodland on the development site has a tree preservation order on it. The woodland is also a habitat for a species of bats, that are protected. I will also be informing other organizations who have an interest in protecting our environment and wildlife. I will remind you of your duty as well as responsibility as Chief Operating Officer, your legal requirements in accordance with the legislation, to protect our environment and wildlife and in no way compromise the legislation already in force.