

## 2 Cottesford Place consultation responses

### **Customer Details**

Name: Mr Douglas Macmillan

Address: 63 Bailgate Lincoln

### **Comment Details**

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I respectfully object to the current proposal for the following reasons:

1. The proposed build will result in loss of light to my property and garden.
2. The proposed build will overshadow my garden.
3. The second floor of the property will overlook my garden and compromise the privacy of it.
4. The proposed build will obstruct the view to the Cathedral from my garden.
5. The extension of the proposed build beyond its existing footprint will cause noise pollution.
6. The proposed build is over-bearing and out of scale in comparison to nearby properties.
7. The dominant nature of the proposed build will, I believe, adversely effect the sense of community, privacy and residential amenity of the rear plots of affected Bailgate properties.
8. The proposed build over-develops the site and will adversely affect the aspect of a conservation area.

---

Reconsultation Response F.A.O Marie Smyth

I wish to object to the proposed development of 2 Cottesford Place. I live directly next to the property with an adjoining wall at the rear of my property.

My objections are as follows:-

1. Scale and height

The proposed house is much bigger than the existing house. The footprint is substantially greater and the height will be 1.6 metres higher. The property will come much closer to the adjoining wall. This means the new house will effectively sit very near boxing my property in.

2. Overlooking

The proposed house will sit directly near to my property which will affect my privacy. The car parking area will also be very near to my property.

3. Noise and disturbance

Due to the close proximity to my property I will inevitably be subjected to prolonged noise and disturbance for the demolition and build period. If built the nearness of the proposed driveway/car parking will mean disturbance to what is currently a very peaceful environment at the rear of Bailgate.

4. Air pollution

I am concerned that the demolition and building so close to my property will mean I will be unable to go outside and use my garden for dust and dirt for a considerable period. I suffer from sinus problems and dust will aggravate my condition.

5. Design

The drawings show a property totally out of keeping with other houses in this conservation area. It is dramatically different from the original application and a significantly larger property than the current one.

6. Loss of light

The proposed property will be very close to the rear of my house and will block out any sky line from my downstairs and possibly 1st floor rear windows and will block out natural light meaning my downstairs will be much darker than presently.

I trust my objections will be taken into consideration by the Planning Committee.

Regards

Elizabeth Cooper

65 Bailgate

-----Original Message-----

From: Elisabeth Marsland |

Sent: 30 March 2022 11:47

To: Smyth, Marie (City of Lincoln Council) <Marie.Smyth@lincoln.gov.uk>

Subject: 2020/0310/FUL 2 COTTESFORD PLACE, LINCOLN LN2 1QF

WARNING: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links, open attachments or reply unless you are confident that the content is safe and do not share inappropriately.

Dear M/s Smyth

Re. The proposed development of the above named property. My house is directly behind the adjoining wall of 2 Cottesford place... My objections are...

- 1) The height of the proposed house is 1.6metres greater than existing property, and it is also much larger and will be much closer to our adjoining wall, which will greatly restrict my privacy.
- 2) The noise will be greater from the proposed property being nearer to the adjoining wall, and also with a new area for a car park being close to the wall too.
- 3) The proximity of the proposed property will block out natural light to my property.
- 4) The drawings show it is very different from the original application, also much larger in all aspects than the current house.

I ask the Planning Committee to consider my objections.

Kind Regards,

Elisabeth Marsland

64 Bailgate,

Lincoln

LN1 3AR

### **Customer Details**

Name: Mrs Janet Wallis

Address: 58 Bailgate Lincoln

### **Comment Details**

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Living at 58 Bailgate where the rear of the properties 58 to 63 Bailgate have gardens uniquely positioned, the proposed build will be a complete contradiction to conservation in historic Bailgate.

The proposed build, in common with another large modern build using "the original footprint" will completely dominate the view & block out a magnificent view of the Cathedral. My concern is the height of the planned new build.

As I suffer from a breathing condition the dust created will prevent my use of outside space. The opening up of pathway from new build to the Assembly Rooms leaves rear of all properties on the church side of Bailgate open to trespassers.

Dear Marie I live at 62 Bailgate and have been sent the letter regarding planning application as above.

I have tried to put in an objection to this planning permission online and to look at the proposed plans but the link does not work or open. I have tried to access the link as sent numerous times and on different days. The link <https://development.lincoln.gov.uk> This therefore will reduce the number of objections that can be received which will affect the outcome of this which I am worried about. This should be taken into consideration. I know Liz said she had emailed you directly too.

I am unable to see the plans but my neighbours have and have informed me. The house currently there is very close to our garden however we can only see the upper windows a bit and the roof. It is at the other side of our wall. The proposed house is planned to be higher in height with the upper floor being proposed to be their living space. This would therefore overlook our garden and be unacceptable as we would have no privacy. It would also block our view of the cathedral. Bearing in mind our house is protected as it is a listed building this should also be taken into mind as it will change the landscape near our properties dramatically and would affect future views, privacy and house sales.

I am happy for the council to come into our garden to see how close this property is to our garden and how this would affect us.

Myself and my husband object to the planning of the proposed building of 2 Cottesford place.

Kind regards  
Maria and Julian Hobden

**Customer Details**

Name: Dr Helen Bushell-Thornalley

Address: 59 Bailgate Lincoln

**Comment Details**

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: No.59 Bailgate - Grade II listed dwelling

We wish to object to the proposed development of 2 Cottesford Place.

The garden of No.59 Bailgate currently enjoys views of Lincoln Cathedral. The proposed development of a larger property that is 1.6 metres higher will completely block the view of Lincoln Cathedral. This view was one of the reasons for purchasing No.59 Bailgate and the removal of the view of this historical landmark will have a negative impact on the market value of No.59 Bailgate. 11.0 PROPOSALS states that the re-orientating of the proposed dwelling from the existing house will take advantage of the site to glimpse views of Lincoln Cathedral. If this was to happen No.59 Bailgate will lose the current views of Lincoln Cathedral from its Grade II Listed Garden.

The proposed property will overlook the garden of No.59 Bailgate, resulting in a lack of privacy in the garden, particularly as the lounge will be on the first floor.

11.0 PROPOSALS states that they are intended to show consideration for other contemporary architecture in the vicinity of this site. This would not show consideration for the Grade II Listed architecture of any of the properties on Bailgate.

The demolition and rebuild will cause excessive noise and environmental pollution. The garden of No.59 is peaceful as it sits back away from the traffic on Bailgate. During the construction of 1 Cottesford Place many months were spoilt in the garden due to noise of building.

The proposed plans for 2 Cottesford Place appear to be larger and higher than the current original footprint. It states in the plans that its footprint will be on the existing dwelling, but the new property would potentially double in size. This increase in property size can be clearly seen within the document 0310 Ful-Revised Detailed Site Layout 652685 where three lined footprints are shown; in green the existing size of the property, in red indicates the extent of proposed dwelling and blue indicates the footprint of dwelling on drawings 20/003/P/19 and ./20. The red and blue lines indicate a significant increase in size of 2 Cottesford Place, which we feel is disproportional to the

current dwellings and would significantly impact on the surrounding dwellings.

3.0 THE SITE p.3 states that the site is located between Bailgate and James Street, and therefore it needs to be fully considered in architectural design and its proximity to other current properties. Bailgate properties 58-63 and their gardens are Grade II Listed, in Conservation Area No.1 and in a monument zone and this needs to be considered.

5.0 SURROUNDING AREA p.8 only mentions properties in James Street. There is no mention of Bailgate properties and their gardens', but they surround a large proportion of the build plot and Bailgate is as equidistant to the plot build as James Street is.

10.0 APPEARANCE p.17 states that the new styling being favoured to best reflect the wider location of the site (Lincoln Cathedral Quarter) and that it will form a more tuneful aesthetic within the James Street area. The proposed property would not reflect the aesthetic of Bailgate or Lincoln Cathedral Quarter. The proposed design of 2 Cottesford Place p.18 does not match the aesthetic of image 23 of Bailgate or image 21 of James Street p. 11.

7.0 HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT p.14 provides a description of properties 58-63, Bailgate - no. 1388451, but no reference is made to the fact that all these properties are Grade II Listed or that their adjoining gardens noted on p.15 are in a monument zone. In this row of properties only No.59 Bailgate is marked as listed on the plans. This omission does not reflect the true facts of the surrounding area. The presence of a modern overbearing property in Cottesford Place would have a detrimental impact on all these historically listed gardens.

In particular, the garden of No.59 Bailgate also houses part of the listed monument wall, which runs adjacent to the proposed build. A modern overbearing property would not sit aesthetically in such proximity to this historic wall in Conservation Area No.1.

13.0 CONCLUSION p.20 states that the proposed development has been designed to best meet the requirements of the Client's brief, whilst minimising impact on the surrounding properties and wider area and the development is considered to be in keeping of the scale, mass, and style of other properties on James Street. However, there is no reflection on the scale, mass, and design of Bailgate properties.

Please visit No.59 Bailgate to view the negative impact that the proposed property would have on the environment.

Claire Bushell-Thornalley

Helen Bushell-Thornalley



**Customer Details**

Name: Mrs Claire Bushell

Address: 60 Bailgate Lincoln

**Comment Details**

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: No.60 Bailgate

We wish to object to the proposed development of 2 Cottesford Place.

The proposed property has a much greater footprint than the existing property and will sit much closer to the adjoining garden wall of No.60 Bailgate.

The garden of No.60 Bailgate currently enjoys views of Lincoln Cathedral. The proposed development of a larger property that is 1.6 metres higher will completely block the view of Lincoln Cathedral. This view was one of the reasons for purchasing No.60 Bailgate and the removal of the view of this historical landmark will have a negative impact on the market value of No.60 Bailgate. The proposed property will overlook the garden of No.60 Bailgate, resulting in a lack of privacy in the garden, particularly as the lounge will be on the first floor.

The demolition and rebuild will cause excessive noise and environmental pollution. The garden of No.60 is peaceful as it sits back away from the traffic on Bailgate. Many months were spoilt in the garden last year by the noise of building No.1 Cottesford Place, which appears to be larger and higher than the original footprint.

On p.14 of the SRA ARCHITECTURE LTD planning doc., a description is given of properties 58-63, Bailgate - no. 1388451, but no reference is made to the fact that these properties are Grade II Listed or that their adjoining gardens noted on p.15 are in a monument zone and owned by these Grade II Listed properties. In this row of properties only No.59 Bailgate is marked as listed on the plans. The presence of a modern overbearing property in Cottesford Place would have a detrimental impact on all of these historically listed gardens.

In particular, the garden of No.60 Bailgate also houses part of the listed monument wall, which sits a few metres away from the proposed build. A modern overbearing property would not sit aesthetically in such close proximity to this historic wall in Conservation Area No.1.

Please visit No.60 Bailgate to view the negative impact that the proposed property would have on the environment.

Claire Bushell-Thornalley

Helen Bushell-Thornalley

**Customer Details**

Name: Mrs Claire Bushell

Address: 61 Bailgate Lincoln

**Comment Details**

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: No.61 Bailgate - Grade II listed dwelling

We wish to object to the proposed development of 2 Cottesford Place.

The garden of No.61 Bailgate currently enjoys views of Lincoln Cathedral. The proposed development of a larger property that is 1.6 metres higher will completely block the view of Lincoln Cathedral. This view was one of the reasons for purchasing No.61 Bailgate and the removal of the view of this historical landmark will have a negative impact on the market value of No.61 Bailgate. 11.0 PROPOSALS states that the re-orientating of the proposed dwelling from the existing house will take advantage of the site to glimpse views of Lincoln Cathedral. If this was to happen No.61 Bailgate will lose the current views of Lincoln Cathedral from its Grade II Listed Garden.

The proposed property will overlook the garden of No.61 Bailgate, resulting in a lack of privacy in the garden, particularly as the lounge will be on the first floor.

11.0 PROPOSALS states that they are intended to show consideration for other contemporary architecture in the vicinity of this site. This would not show consideration for the Grade II Listed architecture of any of the properties on Bailgate.

The demolition and rebuild will cause excessive noise and environmental pollution. The garden of No.61 is peaceful as it sits back away from the traffic on Bailgate. During the construction of 1 Cottesford Place many months were spoilt in the garden due to noise of building.

The proposed plans for 2 Cottesford Place appear to be larger and higher than the current original footprint. It states in the plans that its footprint will be on the existing dwelling, but the new property would potentially double in size. This increase in property size can be clearly seen within the document 0310 Ful-Revised Detailed Site Layout 652685 where three lined footprints are shown; in green the existing size of the property, in red indicates the extent of proposed dwelling and blue indicates the footprint of dwelling on drawings 20/003/P/19 and ../20. The red and blue lines indicate a significant increase in size of 2 Cottesford Place, which we feel is disproportional to the



current dwellings and would significantly impact on the surrounding dwellings.

3.0 THE SITE p.3 states that the site is located between Bailgate and James Street, and therefore it needs to be fully considered in architectural design and its proximity to other current properties. Bailgate properties 58-63 and their gardens are Grade II Listed, in Conservation Area No.1 and in a monument zone and this needs to be considered.

5.0 SURROUNDING AREA p.8 only mentions properties in James Street. There is no mention of Bailgate properties and their gardens', but they surround a large proportion of the build plot and Bailgate is as equidistant to the plot build as James Street is.

10.0 APPEARANCE p.17 states that the new styling being favoured to best reflect the wider location of the site (Lincoln Cathedral Quarter) and that it will form a more tuneful aesthetic within the James Street area. The proposed property would not reflect the aesthetic of Bailgate or Lincoln Cathedral Quarter. The proposed design of 2 Cottesford Place p.18 does not match the aesthetic of image 23 of Bailgate or image 21 of James Street p. 11.

7.0 HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT p.14 provides a description of properties 58-63, Bailgate - no. 1388451, but no reference is made to the fact that all these properties are Grade II Listed or that their adjoining gardens noted on p.15 are in a monument zone. In this row of properties only No.59 Bailgate is marked as listed on the plans. This omission does not reflect the true facts of the surrounding area. The presence of a modern overbearing property in Cottesford Place would have a detrimental impact on all these historically listed gardens.

13.0 CONCLUSION p.20 states that the proposed development has been designed to best meet the requirements of the Client's brief, whilst minimising impact on the surrounding properties and wider area and the development is considered to be in keeping of the scale, mass, and style of other properties on James Street. However, there is no reflection on the scale, mass, and design of Bailgate properties.

Please visit No.61 Bailgate to view the negative impact that the proposed property would have on the environment.

Claire Bushell-Thornalley

Helen Bushell-Thornalley

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Angela Burrows |

> Sent: 02 April 2022 16:33

> To: Smyth, Marie (City of Lincoln Council)

> <Marie.Smyth@lincoln.gov.uk>

> Subject: Contact

>

> WARNING: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links, open attachments or reply unless you are confident that the content is safe and do not share inappropriately.

>

> I would like to object to the plans for rebuild at 2 Cottesford Place, James Street, house would be too large and too near the Boundary wall of Bailgate houses.

> Sincerely

> Angela Burrows

> (71 Bailgate Lincoln LN13AR)

**Customer Details**

Name: Mrs Andrea Root

Address: 66 Bailgate Lincoln Lincoln

**Comment Details**

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: Dear Marie Smyth

Your summary above is much appreciated as information which concerns me and my property 6) Bailgate.

I must strongly object to the erection of a replacement dwelling house as is proposed in the updated plans that are shown here.

As you are aware the Bailgate is an important and Significant historical area . Access to the proposed rebuild is via small and beautiful lanes and whilst I note that the construction times have been considered and specified here a dwelling if this increased size cannot, in my mind , be permissible due to the amount of machinery and material and untold disruption that this will cause the Neighbour good and the small community . It is out of proportion to the needs of the community and the surrounding builds. The aesthetic is disproportionate.

- the visual build and choice of bricks do not concur with the surroundings .
- the increased height causes many issues for our common border and will disrupt our views , access to light and privacy. I have little confidence , if this build were to possibly be permitted that there would be any consideration of the impact on neighbours as we have been requesting for the very large trees within the grounds of this property to be controlled for years. We have had falling branches into our gardens for as long as I can remember .

I really would implore you to reconsider.

Best wishes for a compatible solution for all.

Kind regards

Andrea Root

|

-----Original Message-----

From: Caroline Phillips

Sent: 11 April 2022 16:32

To: Smyth, Marie (City of Lincoln Council) <Marie.Smyth@lincoln.gov.uk>

Subject: 2020/0310/FUL 2 Cottesford Place Lincoln

WARNING: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links, open attachments or reply unless you are confident that the content is safe and do not share inappropriately.

Dear Ms. Smyth,

Re. Proposed development of the above named property.

Would the Planning Committee consider my objections?

The house I live in is directly across the brick wall from the proposed development.

1. The drawings are different from the original application, and are much bigger in every aspect compared to the current house.
2. The size and height of the proposed property will block out natural light to my property.
3. Any noise from the proposed property will be louder because of it being closer to the adjoining wall.
4. The height of the proposed house is 1.6 metres more than the existing property and will be much larger, closer to the adjoining wall and will restrict the privacy I now have.

Many thanks,

Regards,

Caroline Phillips

67 Bailgate,

Lincoln LN1 3AR



Historic England

MIDLANDS OFFICE

Ms Marie Smyth  
Planning Manager  
Lincoln City Council

Direct Dial: [REDACTED]

Our ref: 2020/0310/FUL

18<sup>th</sup> June 2020

Dear Ms Smyth

**T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 & Planning  
(Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990**

**2 Cottesford Place, Lincoln, Lincolnshire, LN2 1QF**

**Description of the proposed development:  
Demolition of existing Dwellinghouse and erection of a replacement Dwellinghouse.**

Thank you for your letter of 28<sup>th</sup> May 2020 regarding the above planning application.

#### **Historic England Advice**

The existing and proposed dwelling are located on Scheduled Monument Li115 Lincoln Roman Colonia (Lindum) and lies within a Conservation Area.

The development and any ground disturbance for investigations / services etc. would require **Scheduled Monument Consent** in addition to any consent your authority might be minded to grant, the proposed scheme for foundations and reference to a soak-away are it appears unsupported by any submitted archaeological evidence. There is no information submitted setting out the significance of the nationally important archaeological site affected not the impact of demolition, construction or servicing of the proposed replacement dwelling or how such impacts might be controlled.

This application appears wholly premature and cannot be safely determined as consulted (see National Planning Policy Framework Paragraphs 189 and 190).

All harm to designated heritage assets (NPPF 192 - 196) requires clear and convincing justification and for such harm has to be set against public benefits with great weight afforded to the conservation of the assets. This is a replacement dwelling scheme and as such offers little or no public benefits and would thus need to eliminate virtually all harm to the significance of the scheduled monument through design, in which respect no evidence is presented.

**No works may commence without Scheduled Monument Consent.**



THE AXIS 10 HOLLIDAY STREET BIRMINGHAM B1 1TF  
Telephone 0121 625 6870 [HistoricEngland.org.uk](http://HistoricEngland.org.uk)



Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.



Historic England

MIDLANDS OFFICE

### Recommendation

Historic England has concerns regarding this application on heritage grounds in particular as regards paragraphs 189 and 190 of the National Planning Policy Framework which are not met by the materials mounted on your website, it appears you are not in a position to safely determine this consent and we would encourage it to be withdrawn and pre-application discussion with your specialists and ourselves undertaken.

We also refer you to the advice of the City Archaeologist and City Conservation Officer

Your authority should take these representations into account in determining the application. If you propose to determine the application in its current form, please inform us of the date of the committee and send us a copy of your report at the earliest opportunity. Please contact me if we can be of further assistance.



Tim Allen  
Team Leader (Development Advice)  
E-mail: [REDACTED]

Cc: City Archaeologist & City Conservation Officer



THE AXIS 10 HOLLIDAY STREET BIRMINGHAM B1 1TF  
Telephone 0121 625 6870 [HistoricEngland.org.uk](http://HistoricEngland.org.uk)



*Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.*



**From:** Allen, Tim  
**Sent:** 06 October 2020 15:12  
**To:** Smyth, Marie (City of Lincoln Council)  
**Cc:** MacIntosh, Alastair (City of Lincoln Council)  
**Subject:** RE: 2020/0310/FUL: 2 Cottesford Place

Dear Marie

Historic England Advice.

The DBA appears solid and well researched, the scheme will need to be supported by pre-determination evaluation (which would also require scheduled monument consent in its own right).

It should be stressed that as replacement (rather than refurbishment) of the existing dwelling would provide no appreciable public benefit in terms of Scheduled Monument Consent the applicant should only have realist hope of gaining SMC for the replacement dwelling if through evaluation (under separate SMC) they can detail up a scheme which eliminates harm to the significance of the scheduled monument (offers of archaeological mitigation cannot provide justification for harm either in terms of the NPPF or DCMS 2013 Policy Statement on Scheduled Monuments).

Best wishes Tim

Tim Allen  
Development Advice Team Leader (North)  
Midlands Region

Historic England | The Axis  
10 Holliday Street | Birmingham | B1 1TF  
|



Historic England



Historic England

Ms Marie Smyth  
City of Lincoln Council  
City Hall  
Beaumont Fee  
Lincoln  
Lincolnshire  
LN1 1DF

Direct Dial: 0121 625 6888

Our ref: P01203641

22 March 2022

Dear Ms Smyth

**T&CP (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015  
& Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990**

**2 COTTESFORD PLACE, LINCOLN, LN2 1QF  
Application No. 2020/0310/FUL**

Thank you for your letter of 15 March 2022 regarding further information on the above application for planning permission. On the basis of this information, we offer the following advice to assist your authority in determining the application.

**Historic England Advice**

The existing and proposed dwelling are located on Scheduled Monument Li115 Lincoln Roman Colonia (Lindum) and lie within a Conservation Area. We welcome the submission of the archaeological desk based assessment and test pit report and positive engagement with its results, whilst Roman levels appear to lie beneath around a metre of cover, important post-Roman and medieval remains are likely to be shallower and may survive at irregular depths across the site within difficult differentiate dark earth / garden soils, hence a conservative approach to ground intrusion is proportionate. The proposed development will affect the significance of the scheduled monument through both ground disturbance and change to its appearance.

The amended scheme reduces the proposed footprint of development from that set out in the original scheme and now includes a strategy to minimise ground disturbance through the removal of existing concrete screed but retention of underlying hardcore, with service routes reused where possible. There would be some excavation beyond the existing footprint associated with the reorientation of the new building and its greater size than the existing house but this appears now shallower. The proposed build-up in slab height would reduce likely ground disturbance at the depth where remains are likely to occur but close control of works is necessary. We note the visualisations include extensive areas of hard surface and a screen wall within the plot, both of which appear excessive in terms of the character of the site and lighter



THE FOUNDRY 82 GRANVILLE STREET BIRMINGHAM B1 2LH  
Telephone 0121 625 6888  
[HistoricEngland.org.uk](http://HistoricEngland.org.uk)



*Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.*



Historic England

interventions with less footing and drainage demands should be considered.

As development with it appears purely private rather than public benefits, in-line with the National Planning Policy Framework all harmful effects on designated heritage assets will need to be eliminated through design (see NPPF paragraphs 195, 199, 200 and 202; all harm to the significance of designated heritage assets requires clear and convincing justification and to be set against public benefits with great weight afforded to the conservation of the significance of the scheduled monument and conservation area.

The development and any ground disturbance would require Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) in addition to any consent your authority may be minded to grant. An SMC application would be considered against the current Government policy for Scheduled Monuments (2013). A detailed methodology for archaeologically controlled works that avoid harm to the monument's significance and proactively manage risk will be required to support such an application as would amended details in respect of landscaping, surfacing, screen wall etc.

Robust conditions for approval of above and below ground detailing to the scheme and the delivery of an archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation would be required in respect of any planning consent to ensure compliance with the NPPF.

### **Recommendation**

Historic England has concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds.

Whilst improved from that previously submitted we consider that the issues and safeguards outlined in our advice need to be addressed in order for the amended application to meet the requirements of paragraphs 195, 199, 200 and 202 of the NPPF.

In determining this application you should bear in mind the statutory duty of section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess, section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to determine planning applications in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Your authority should take these representations into account and seek amendments, safeguards or further information as set out in our advice. If there are any material changes to the proposals, or you would like further advice, please contact us.



THE FOUNDRY 82 GRANVILLE STREET BIRMINGHAM B1 2LH

Telephone 0121 625 6888  
HistoricEngland.org.uk



*Historic England is subject to both the Freedom of Information Act (2000) and Environmental Information Regulations (2004). Any information held by the organisation can be requested for release under this legislation.*



Historic England

Yours sincerely

Tim Allen

**Tim Allen**  
Team Leader (Development Advice)

-----Original Message-----

From: Allen, Tim |

Sent: 14 April 2022 13:43

To: Smyth, Marie (City of Lincoln Council) <Marie.Smyth@lincoln.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Historic England advice on Application no(s) 2020/0310/FUL

WARNING: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links, open attachments or reply unless you are confident that the content is safe and do not share inappropriately.

Hi Marie

We didn't comment on the garden screen walls or surfacing on the initial consult because we were commenting on the fundamentals of the scheme as then put forwards ie the demolition and replacement dwelling on a wholly new slab, now they have scaled back the new dwelling and reduced the ground impacts of demolition and rebuild it's entirely appropriate for us to look at the secondary works.

The minimal dig solution for the surfacing as outlined below would satisfy our concerns at planning stage (subject to detail under Scheduled Monument Consent).

Carrying the screen wall on blocks does reduce the impact (subject to detailing) the requirement on any scheduled monument consent will be that this solution needs to be achieved without harm to the significance of the monument - so if under archaeological control the holes for any of those pads did strike important remains then the footing design would require further modification.

With the caveats above we would not object to grant of planning consent.

Yours Tim (for HE)

Tim Allen MA FSA  
Development Advice Team Leader (North)

Midlands Region  
Historic England  
The Foundry, 82 Granville Street, Birmingham B1 2LH

**Place Directorate**  
Lancaster House  
36 Orchard Street  
Lincoln LN1 1XX  
Tel: (01522) 782070



To: Lincoln City Council

Application Ref: 2020/0310/FUL

**Description of development**

**Demolition of existing Dwellinghouse and erection of a replacement Dwellinghouse.**

**Address or location**

**2 Cottesford Place, Lincoln, Lincolnshire, LN2 1QF**

With reference to the above application received 28 May 2020

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

**Does not wish to restrict the grant of permission.**

**CONDITIONS (INCLUDING REASONS)**

**NO OBS**

Having given due regard to the appropriate local and national planning policy guidance (in particular the National Planning Policy Framework), Lincolnshire County Council (as Highway Authority and Lead Local Flood Authority) has concluded that the proposed development is acceptable and accordingly, does not wish to object to this planning application.

**Case Officer:**  
*Sam Abrams*  
for Warren Peppard  
Head of Development

**Date:** 16/06/2020



Hello

Please be advised that we have no further comments to make on the reconsultation.

Kind regards

Becky Melhuish (pron. Mel-ish)

Growth Manager (Planning Advice) - Development Management Lincolnshire County Council County  
Offices, Newland, Lincoln LN1 1YL



## LINCOLNSHIRE POLICE

POLICE HEADQUARTERS  
PO Box 999  
LINCOLN LN5 7PH  
Fax: (01522) 558128  
DDI: (01522) 558292  
email  
[john.manuel@lincs.pnn.police.uk](mailto:john.manuel@lincs.pnn.police.uk)

Your Ref: App. 2020/0310/FUL

28<sup>th</sup> May 2020

### **Development & Environmental Services**

City Hall, Beaumont Fee  
Lincoln, LN1 1DF

### **2 Cottesford Place, Lincoln, LN2 1QF (Single Residential Dwelling)**

Lincolnshire Police do not have any objections to this application.

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

Please refer to *Homes 2019* which can be located on [www.securedbydesign.com](http://www.securedbydesign.com) Homes 2019.

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.

Yours sincerely,

John Manuel MA BA (Hons) PGCE PGCPD Dip Bus.

Force Designing Out Crime Officer (DOCO)