

# Upper Witham Drainage Board

Comment submitted date: Tue 22 Mar 2022

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above applications. The site is within the Witham Third District Internal Drainage Board area. The Board has no further comments to add to the amendments, over-and-above previous comments submitted (below):-

Board's response from 13th August 2021:-

It is noted the proposed surface water disposal from the development will be at 51l/s to EA Main River Sincil Dyke. It is noted the invert level of the discharge is 4.30m ODN, approximately 1m above the highest recorded levels for the watercourse. However, consideration must be given to the potential effect the proposed method of discharge may have on the receiving watercourse and its embankments at this location. As the applicant is aware, discharge to EA Main River will require an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency.

No development should be commenced until the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority has approved a scheme for the provision, implementation and future maintenance of a surface water drainage system.

All drainage routes through the Site should be maintained both during the works on Site and after completion of the works. Provisions should be made to ensure that upstream and downstream riparian owners and those areas that are presently served by any drainage routes passing through or adjacent to the Site are not adversely affected by the development.

Drainage routes shall include all methods by which water may be transferred through the Site and shall include such systems as "ridge and furrow" and "overland flows".

The effect of raising site levels on adjacent property must be carefully considered and measures taken to negate influences must be approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Regards,

Richard Wright



Warren Peppard  
Head of Development Management  
Lincolnshire County Council  
County Offices  
Newland  
Lincoln LN1 1YL  
Tel: 01522 782070  
developmentmanagement@lincolnshire.gov.uk

To: Lincoln City Council

Application Ref: 2021/0598/FUL

Proposal: **Erection of elderly residential living apartment building comprising of 32 residential apartments and conversion of existing former United Reform Church to form additional 5 residential apartments. To include access from Cross Spencer Street, car park, landscaping, attenuation pond, refuse and cycle storage. To include demolition of former Abacus Motor Group showroom and ancillary motor repair buildings.**

Location: **471 - 480 High Street, Lincoln, Lincolnshire, LN5 8JG**

With reference to the above application received 28 July 2021

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

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

#### CONDITIONS (INCLUDING REASONS) /REASONS FOR REFUSAL

The application is for 25 residential apartments and associated access.

The site is in a highly sustainable location with good access via walking, cycling and public transport (both buses and rail).

Space has been provided within the site specifically for the storage of mobility scooters and aids. 23 car parking spaces are proposed for the site, and that is deemed adequate for a sustainable location such as this. Cycle parking provision has also been considered for visitors and staff. A robust Travel Plan has been submitted which contains measures to encourage and incentivise staff to access the site via sustainable means.

Refuse collection will be undertaken internally within the site, via the access at Cross Spencer Street. Swept

path analysis has been provided to demonstrate that refuse vehicles can undertake this manoeuvre in and out the access.

Junction improvements will be undertaken at Cross Spencer Street/Spencer Street to widen the radius and ensure that all vehicles expected to visit and service the site can do so safely, and without damage to parked vehicles and buildings/walls. There will not be a requirement to restrict right turns out of Spencer Street onto the High Street, the Highway Authority do not foresee a safety issue that would require this restriction to be in place.

Access to Sincil Dyke for maintenance will be retained. A dropped crossing on the High Street will be required.

Lincolnshire County Council will be undertaking public realm works on this area of the High Street, presently programmed for 2023/2024, to improve the environment for pedestrians, in particular. We request a S106 contribution of £5,000 towards the public realm scheme. Should the construction of this development exceed the 2023/2024 financial year, then the public realm works will be reprogrammed until after completion, to ensure there is no damage to the new paving caused by construction vehicles or new utility connections.

The applicant has undertaken intrusive ground investigation, however the boreholes were completed in June rather than the wetter winter months. It is anticipated that the site may be subject to a continuous shallow water table. LCC as HLLFA requested that the applicant undertake further groundwater monitoring, to inform the site drainage strategy, however they have been unable to gain access to the site to do so given the current EA works. It has been agreed that a pre-commencement condition will be placed on the granting of any planning permission, requiring the applicant undertake further intrusive ground investigation to determine the groundwater level during the wetter winter months, with the drainage strategy updated to reflect the findings.

#### Highway Informative 03

The permitted development requires the formation of a new/amended vehicular access. These works will require approval from the Highway Authority in accordance with Section 184 of the Highways Act. The works should be constructed in accordance with the Authority's specification that is current at the time of construction. Relocation of existing apparatus, underground services or street furniture will be the responsibility of the applicant, prior to application. For application guidance, approval and specification details, please visit <https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/licences-permits/apply-dropped-kerb> or contact [vehiclegrossings@lincolnshire.gov.uk](mailto:vehiclegrossings@lincolnshire.gov.uk)

#### Highway Informative 08

Please contact the Lincolnshire County Council Streetworks and Permitting Team on 01522 782070 to discuss any proposed statutory utility connections and any other works which will be required within the public highway in association with the development permitted under this Consent. This will enable Lincolnshire County Council to assist in the coordination and timings of these works. For further guidance please visit our website via the following links:

Traffic Management - <https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/traffic-management>  
Licences and Permits - <https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/licences-permits>

#### Highway Condition 00

No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan and Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which shall indicate measures to mitigate against traffic generation and drainage of the site during the construction stage of the proposed development.

The Construction Management Plan and Method Statement shall include;

- phasing of the development to include access construction;
- the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- wheel washing facilities;
- the routes of construction traffic to and from the site including any off site routes for the disposal of excavated material and;
- strategy stating how surface water run off on and from the development will be managed during construction and protection measures for any sustainable drainage features. This should include drawing(s) showing how the drainage systems (permanent or temporary) connect to an outfall (temporary or permanent) during construction.

The Construction Management Plan and Method Statement shall be strictly adhered to throughout the construction period.

Reason: To ensure that the permitted development is adequately drained without creating or increasing flood risk to land or property adjacent to, or downstream of, the permitted development during construction and to ensure that suitable traffic routes are agreed.

#### Highway Condition 12

Within seven days of the site commencing operation, the existing access onto High Street shall be permanently closed in accordance with details to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To remove accesses within the public highway which are no longer required, in the interests of highway safety and amenity.

#### Highway Condition 33

The permitted development shall be undertaken in accordance with a surface water drainage scheme which shall first have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme shall:

- be based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development;
- provide flood exceedance routing for storm event greater than 1 in 100 year;
- provide details of how run-off will be safely conveyed and attenuated during storms up to and including the 1 in 100 year critical storm event, with an allowance for climate change, from all hard surfaced areas within the development into the existing local drainage infrastructure and watercourse system without exceeding the run-off rate for the undeveloped site;
- provide attenuation details and discharge rates which shall be restricted to greenfield rates;
- provide details of the timetable for and any phasing of implementation for the drainage scheme; and
- provide details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed over the lifetime of the development, including any arrangements for adoption by any public body or Statutory Undertaker and any other arrangements required to secure the operation of the drainage system throughout its lifetime.

No dwelling shall be occupied until the approved scheme has been completed or provided on the site in accordance with the approved phasing. The approved scheme shall be retained and maintained in full, in accordance with the approved details.

To ensure that the permitted development is adequately drained without creating or increasing flood risk to land or property adjacent to, or downstream of, or upstream of, the permitted development.

Note:

There is no precise definition of "severe" with regards to NPPF Paragraph 111, which advises that "Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe." Planning Inspector's decisions regarding severity are specific to the locations of each proposal, but have common considerations:

- The highway network is over-capacity, usually for period extending beyond the peak hours
- The level of provision of alternative transport modes
- Whether the level of queuing on the network causes safety issues.

In view of these criteria, the Highways and Lead Local Flood Authority does not consider that this proposal would result in a severe impact with regard to NPPF.

NO OBJECTION

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.

Note to Officer:

Please secure a S106 sum of £5000 towards the public realm scheme on High Street which will improve the pedestrian environment at the site frontage, to the benefit of the site residents, visitors and staff.

Regards

Case Officer:

*Becky Melhuish*

**for Warren Peppard  
Head of Development Management**

Date: 10/08/22

**Application Number: 2021/0598/FUL**  
**Location: Development at 471-480 High Street, Lincoln comprising of 37 elderly residential living apartments REVISED 25 ELDERLY RESIDENTIAL LIVING APARTMENTS**

<b>Impact of new development on GP practice</b>	<p>The above development is proposing 25 apartments which, based on the average of 1.43 people per dwelling for the one-bedroom apartments and 2.86 people per dwelling for the two-bedroom apartments for the City of Lincoln Council area, would result in an increase in patient population of 44.</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>	
	<b>Consulting room GP</b>	
	<b>(Single)</b>	
	Proposed population	27
	Access rate	5260 per 1000 patients
	Anticipated annual contacts	$0.027 \times 5260 = 143$
	Assume 100% patient use of room	143
	Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year	$143/50 = 2.9$
	Appointment duration	15 mins
	Patient appointment time hrs per week	$2.9 \times 15/60 = 0.7$ hrs per week
<b>(Double)</b>		
Proposed population	17	
Access rate	5260 per 1000 patients	
Anticipated annual contacts	$0.017 \times 5260 = 90$	
Assume 100% patient use of room	90	
Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year	$90/50 = 1.8$	
Appointment duration	15 mins	
Patient appointment time hrs per week	$1.8 \times 15/60 = 0.5$ hrs per week	

<sup>1</sup> Source: Lincolnshire Research Observatory 2011 Census Data

	<p><b>Treatment room Practice Nurse</b></p> <p><b>(Single)</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="470 369 1197 694"> <tr><td>Proposed population</td><td>27</td></tr> <tr><td>Access rate</td><td>5260 per 1000 patients</td></tr> <tr><td>Anticipated annual contacts</td><td><math>0.027 \times 5260 = 143</math></td></tr> <tr><td>Assume 20% patient use of room</td><td>28.6</td></tr> <tr><td>Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year</td><td><math>28.6/50 = 0.572</math></td></tr> <tr><td>Appointment duration</td><td>20 mins</td></tr> <tr><td>Patient appointment time hrs per week</td><td><math>0.572 \times 20/60 = 0.2\text{hrs per week}</math></td></tr> </table> <p><b>(Double)</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="470 772 1197 1097"> <tr><td>Proposed population</td><td>17</td></tr> <tr><td>Access rate</td><td>5260 per 1000 patients</td></tr> <tr><td>Anticipated annual contacts</td><td><math>0.017 \times 5260 = 90</math></td></tr> <tr><td>Assume 20% patient use of room</td><td>18.1</td></tr> <tr><td>Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year</td><td><math>18.1/50 = 0.361</math></td></tr> <tr><td>Appointment duration</td><td>20 mins</td></tr> <tr><td>Patient appointment time hrs per week</td><td><math>0.361 \times 20/60 = 0.1 \text{ hrs per week}</math></td></tr> </table> <p>Therefore an increase in population of 44 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	27	Access rate	5260 per 1000 patients	Anticipated annual contacts	$0.027 \times 5260 = 143$	Assume 20% patient use of room	28.6	Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year	$28.6/50 = 0.572$	Appointment duration	20 mins	Patient appointment time hrs per week	$0.572 \times 20/60 = 0.2\text{hrs per week}$	Proposed population	17	Access rate	5260 per 1000 patients	Anticipated annual contacts	$0.017 \times 5260 = 90$	Assume 20% patient use of room	18.1	Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year	$18.1/50 = 0.361$	Appointment duration	20 mins	Patient appointment time hrs per week	$0.361 \times 20/60 = 0.1 \text{ hrs per week}$
Proposed population	27																												
Access rate	5260 per 1000 patients																												
Anticipated annual contacts	$0.027 \times 5260 = 143$																												
Assume 20% patient use of room	28.6																												
Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year	$28.6/50 = 0.572$																												
Appointment duration	20 mins																												
Patient appointment time hrs per week	$0.572 \times 20/60 = 0.2\text{hrs per week}$																												
Proposed population	17																												
Access rate	5260 per 1000 patients																												
Anticipated annual contacts	$0.017 \times 5260 = 90$																												
Assume 20% patient use of room	18.1																												
Assume surgery open 50 weeks per year	$18.1/50 = 0.361$																												
Appointment duration	20 mins																												
Patient appointment time hrs per week	$0.361 \times 20/60 = 0.1 \text{ hrs per week}$																												
<p><b>GP practice(s) most likely to be affected by the housing development</b></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>The development could impact on the following practices:          Brayford Medical Practice          Brant Road &amp; Springcliffe Surgery          University Health Centre          Portland Medical Practice          The Heath Surgery          Abbey Medical Practice</p>																												

	<p>Due to the location of the development the 3 practices that would be impacted the most are Brant Road &amp; Springcliffe Surgery, The Heath Surgery and Portland Medical Practice.</p>
<p><b>Issues to be addressed to ensure the development is acceptable</b></p>	<p>Lincolnshire Clinical Commissioning Group (LCCG) wishes for the Section 106 contribution from the development on 471-480 High Street, Lincoln comprising of 25 elderly residential living apartments to contribute to the development of additional clinical space at Portland Medical Practice and Brant Road &amp; Springcliffe Surgery.</p> <p>Nationally the NHS Long Term Plan, published in January 2019, seeks to improve the quality of patient care and health outcomes. The plan builds on previous national strategies, including the General Practice Forward View (2016), and includes measures to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve out-of-hospital care, supporting primary medical and community health services;</li> <li>• Ensure all children get the best start in life by continuing to improve maternity safety including halving the number of stillbirths, maternal and neonatal deaths and serious brain injury by 2025;</li> <li>• Support older people through more personalised care and stronger community and primary care services;</li> <li>• Make digital health services a mainstream part of the NHS, so that patients in England will be able to access a digital GP offer.</li> </ul> <p>The strategic direction both nationally through the development of Primary Care Networks (PCN) and locally through the Sustainability Transformation Plan, is to provide primary care at scale, facilitating 100% patient population coverage by primary care and services being delivered in the community in an integrated way. Included within the PCNs is the requirement to provide on-line access to services and appointments, as well as the introduction of additional roles to enhance the delivery of primary care, including Clinical Pharmacists, Physiotherapists, Social Prescribers, Emergency Care and Mental Health Practitioners.</p> <p>NHS Lincolnshire CCG are putting this application in for two practices in NHS Lincolnshire CCG which are Portland Medical Practice and Brant Road &amp; Springcliffe Surgery. The practices are within the LCCG South Lincoln PCN (Primary Care Network) and Marina PCN Network where the housing is being developed. There is a huge variation in the type, age and suitability of current premises within the PCN Networks.</p> <p>The Portland Medical Practice is within the LCCG Marina Primary Care Network where the housing is being developed; there is a huge variation in the type; age and suitability of premises within the PCN of the planned development. The Portland Medical Practice currently has 11 clinical which has 90% utilisation rate depending on the day of the week. The practice is providing primary care to a patient list size of 11,605 (list size as on 1<sup>st</sup> Jan 2021).</p>

	<p>Portland Medical Practice is having significant challenges managing room capacity; their existing clinical space does not provide sufficient capacity to manage the projected patient increase.</p> <p>The existing building at Portland Medical Practice will no longer have the clinical space to provide sufficient capacity to manage the projected patient increase from planning and current housing developments therefore will no longer be fit for purpose to meet the demand from new housing developments. The funding would contribute to the reconfiguration of existing space within the practice creating an additional 2 consultation rooms, enabling the practice to provide additional clinical space for staff and services to meet the patient needs.</p> <p>Brant Road and Springcliffe Surgery is within the LCCG South Lincoln Primary Care Network where the housing is being developed; there is a huge variation in the type; age and suitability of premises within the PCN of the planned development. The practice currently has 10 clinical rooms within in the surgery with 90% utilisation providing primary care to a patient list size of 9223 (Jan 2021).</p> <p>The existing buildings for Brant Road and Springcliffe Surgery will need additionally clinical space to provide sufficient capacity to manage the patients increase from planning and current housing developments therefore will no longer be fit for purpose to meet the demand from new housing developments. The funding would contribute to alterations within the practice to create additional clinical space, enabling the practice to provide additional clinical staff and services to meet the patient needs.</p> <p>The PCN is working to employ additional staff to increase capacity within primary care and as more care is moved to the community from secondary care closer to individuals home. In addition to this Portland is a member of Marina PCN, using the Additional Roles Reimbursement Service (ARRS) the PCN have already recruited a number of roles including first contact practitioners, clinical pharmacists and a mental health practitioner and plan to recruit more roles all of which need clinical space to see patients, increasing capacity within primary care.</p> <p>The additional clinical rooms will also facilitate both collaboration and integrated working of health and wellbeing services, to meet the projected increase in the patient population. Whilst supporting the sustainability of key services in the community enabling an equitable health care provision across the patient population</p>					
<p><b>Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</b></p>		<p>Average list size per GP</p>	<p>Required m2</p>	<p>£ per m2</p>	<p>Total cost</p>	<p>£per person</p>
	GP team	1,800	170	2,300	£391,000	217
	GP furnishings	1,800			£20,000	12
						229
	Contingency requirements @ 20%					46
	Total per resident					275
	Total per dwelling (resident x 1.43) for the single occupancy apartment					393.25
	Total per dwelling (resident x 2.86) for the double occupancy apartment					786.50

	<p>The table above shows the contribution formula which is based on the needs of a Primary Care Health Team and associated administration support. This figure is multiplied by 1.43 for the single occupancy apartment and 2.86 for the double occupancy apartment (the average number of persons per dwelling for City of Lincoln Council) to provide a funding per dwelling of £786.50 for the double occupancy apartment and £393.25 for the single occupancy apartment.</p>
<b>Financial Contribution requested</b>	<p>The contribution requested for the development of £12,136.75 (£7,471.75.00 for 19 x single occupancy apartments and £4,719.00 for 6 x double occupancy apartments).</p> <p>Please note that the expectation is that the appropriate indexation rate and any late payment penalties would also be paid on top of the value specified above.</p>
<b>Trigger point</b>	<p>After reviewing the practice response regarding their capacity to accommodate the increase in patient numbers arising from this development, it's requested that the trigger point for the release for funds for health care be set at payment of all monies upon completion of 50 percent of the dwellings for each phase of the development. This will ensure the practices are not placed under undue pressure.</p> <p>To ensure that there is sufficient time carry out the works and allow the s106 funds to be spent in the most appropriate way, a repayment period of 10 years from receipt of the final payment transfer (for the entire development) to the relevant NHS body will be required.</p>

**Kate Robinson**  
**Locality Improvement and Delivery Manager**  
**18<sup>th</sup> August 2021**

**Kate Robinson**  
**Locality Improvement and Delivery Manager**  
**14<sup>th</sup> March 2022**



Historic England

Ms Julie Mason  
City of Lincoln Council  
City Hall  
Beaumont Fee  
Lincoln  
LN1 1DF

Direct Dial: 0121 625 6870

Our ref: **W:** P01438038

16 September 2021

Dear Ms Mason,

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

**471 - 480 HIGH STREET, LINCOLN, LINCOLNSHIRE, LN5 8JG  
Application No. 2021/0598/FUL**

Thank you for your letter of 27 August 2021 regarding the above application for planning permission. On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

It is not necessary for us to be consulted on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like detailed advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.

Yours sincerely

David Walsh

**David Walsh**  
Principal Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas  
E-mail: david.walsh@HistoricEngland.org.uk



City of Lincoln Council  
Development Control  
City Hall Beaumont Fee  
Lincoln  
LN1 1DF

**Our ref:** AN/2021/132121/01-L01  
**Your ref:** 2021/0598/FUL  
**Date:** 10 August 2021

Dear Sir/Madam

**Erection of elderly residential living apartment building comprising of 32 residential apartments and conversion of existing former United Reform Church to form additional 5 residential apartments. To include access from Cross Spencer Street, car park, landscaping, attenuation pond, refuse and cycle storage. To include demolition of former abacus motor group showroom and ancillary motor repair buildings  
471 - 480 High Street, Lincoln**

Thank you for consulting us on the above application, on 28 July 2021.

**Environment Agency position**

We have no objection subject to the imposition of planning conditions as set out below on any permission granted.

**Protection of the water environment**

We have reviewed the following reports with regard to the risk posed to controlled waters:

- Phase 1: Desk Top Study Report (ref: 21-432) by Arc Environmental, dated 1 July 2021; and
- Preliminary Data Summary Sheet (ref: 21-432) by Arc Environmental

The previous uses of the proposed development site, including as a garage and vehicle repair workshop, present a potential risk of contamination that could be mobilised during construction to pollute controlled waters. Controlled waters are particularly sensitive in this location because the proposed development site is located upon a Secondary A aquifer. The Sincil Dike is also located adjacent to the south of the site and any shallow groundwater in the River Terrace deposits below the site may be in hydraulic connectivity with the surface watercourse.

The application's Phase 1 Desk Study demonstrates that it will be possible to manage the risks posed to controlled waters by this development. Further detailed information will however be required before built development is undertaken. We believe that it would place an unreasonable burden on the developer to ask for more

Ceres House, Searby Road, Lincoln, LN2 4DW  
Customer services line: 03708 506 506  
Email: [LNplanning@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:LNplanning@environment-agency.gov.uk)  
[www.gov.uk/environment-agency](http://www.gov.uk/environment-agency)

Cont/d..

Calls to 03 numbers cost no more than national rate calls to 01 or 02 numbers and count towards any inclusive minutes in the same way. This applies to calls from any type of line including mobile.

detailed information prior to the granting of planning permission but respect that this is a decision for the local planning authority.

In light of the above, the proposed development will be acceptable if planning conditions are included requiring the submission and implementation of a remediation strategy. This should be carried out by a competent person in line with paragraph 183 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Without the following conditions we would object to the proposal in line with paragraph 174 of the NPPF because it cannot be guaranteed that the development will not be put at unacceptable risk from, or be adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of pollution.

#### **Condition 1**

No development approved by this planning permission shall commence until a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site in respect of the development hereby permitted, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. This strategy shall include the following components:

1. A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
  - all previous uses
  - potential contaminants associated with those uses
  - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors
  - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site
2. A site investigation scheme, based on (1) to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those off-site.
3. The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in (2) and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
4. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in (3) are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

#### **Reasons**

To ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution in line with paragraph 174 of the NPPF.

#### **Informative advice**

In so far as it relates to the risk posed to controlled waters, we consider that the Phase 1 Desk Study is sufficient to satisfy Part 1 of this condition. It is understood from the Preliminary Data Summary Sheet that an intrusive site investigation has been undertaken involving the drilling of 9 no. boreholes and the excavation of 9 no.

trial pits, with a final interpretative report to follow. It is noted that both the Desk Study report and intrusive investigation incorporate both the subject site and the associated proposed development site immediately adjacent to the east (under a separate planning application).

We consider that an interpretative site investigation report specific to the subject site of this application will need to be submitted to satisfy Part 2 of this condition. It is noted from the Preliminary Data Summary Sheet and exploratory hole location plan that only one borehole (BH03) has been installed as a groundwater monitoring well within the boundary of this proposed development. This will provide only limited coverage of groundwater quality below the site. Based on the findings of the initial phase of intrusive investigation, further work (including additional monitoring wells) may be required to fully assess the potential risks to controlled waters. We consider that all controlled waters risk assessments should be supported by a minimum of two rounds of groundwater monitoring, with all samples tested for all potential contaminants of concern (with hydrocarbon analysis speciated - TPH CWG). Given the proximity of the Sincil Dike, which is a sensitive receptor, consideration should also be given to the collection of upstream and downstream surface water samples to provide further confidence in the controlled waters risk assessment.

We recommend that developers should:

- Follow the risk management framework provided in '[Land contamination: risk management](#)' when dealing with land affected by contamination
- Refer to our [Guiding principles for land contamination](#) for the type of information that we require in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site – the local authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health
- Consider using the [National Quality Mark Scheme for Land Contamination Management](#) which involves the use of competent persons to ensure that land contamination risks are appropriately managed
- Refer to the [contaminated land](#) pages on gov.uk for more information

### **Condition 2**

Prior to any part of the permitted development being occupied, a verification report demonstrating the completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met.

### **Reasons**

To ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to the water environment by demonstrating that the requirements of the approved verification plan have been met and that remediation of the site is complete. This is in line with paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Condition 3**

If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority) shall be carried out until a remediation strategy detailing how this contamination will be dealt with has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The remediation strategy shall be implemented as approved.

**Reasons**

To ensure that the development does not contribute to, and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution from previously unidentified contamination sources at the development site. This is in line with paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Flood risk**

The development lies within Flood Zone 1 of our Flood Map for Planning so we have no comments on the layout or finished floor levels proposed.

The surface water drainage strategy should be assessed by the lead local flood authority to ensure it is appropriate to the size and nature of the development.

**Environmental permit - advice to applicant**

The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit to be obtained for any activities which will take place:

- on or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal)
- on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culverted main river (16 metres if tidal)
- on or within 16 metres of a sea defence
- involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert
- in a floodplain more than 8 metres from the river bank, culvert or flood defence structure (16 metres if it's a tidal main river) and you don't already have planning permission

For further guidance please visit <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits> and contact our local Partnership and Strategic Overview team at [PSOLINCS@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:PSOLINCS@environment-agency.gov.uk) with regard to any aspect falling within this distance. The applicant should not assume that a permit will automatically be forthcoming once planning permission has been granted, and we advise them to consult with us at the earliest opportunity.

Should you require any additional information, or wish to discuss these matters further, please do not hesitate to contact me on the number below.

Yours faithfully

**Nicola Farr**  
**Sustainable Places - Planning Specialist**

Direct dial 02030 255023

Direct e-mail [nicola.farr@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:nicola.farr@environment-agency.gov.uk)



## Planning Applications – Suggested Informative Statements and Conditions Report

If you would like to discuss any of the points in this document please contact us on 07929 786955 or email [planningliaison@anglianwater.co.uk](mailto:planningliaison@anglianwater.co.uk).

AW Site 178064/1/0129119

Reference:

Local Planning Authority: Lincoln District (B)

Authority:

Site: 471 - 480 High Street Lincoln Lincolnshire LN5 8JG

Proposal: Erection of elderly residential living apartment building comprising of 32 residential apartments and conversion of existing former United Reform Church to form additional 5 residential apartments. To include access from Cross Spencer Street, car par

Planning application: 2021/0598/FUL

**Prepared by:** Pre-Development Team

**Date:** 13 August 2021

## ASSETS

### Section 1 - Assets Affected

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.

## WASTEWATER SERVICES

### Section 2 - Wastewater Treatment

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 - Used Water Network

This response has been based on the following submitted documents: Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy dated July 2021 The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows. If the developer wishes to connect to our sewerage network, they should serve notice under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991. We will then advise them of the most suitable point of connection. (1) INFORMATIVE - Notification of intention to connect to the public sewer under S106 of the Water Industry Act Approval and consent will be required by Anglian Water, under the Water Industry Act 1991. Contact Development Services Team 0345 606 6087. (2) INFORMATIVE - Notification of intention to connect to the public sewer under S106 of the Water Industry Act Approval and consent will be required by Anglian Water, under the Water Industry Act 1991. Contact Development Services Team 0345 606 6087. (3) INFORMATIVE - Protection of existing assets - A public sewer is shown on record plans within the land identified for the proposed development. It appears that development proposals will affect existing public sewers. It is recommended that the applicant contacts Anglian Water Development Services Team for further advice on this matter. Building over existing public sewers will not be permitted (without agreement) from Anglian Water. (4) INFORMATIVE - Building near to a public sewer - No building will be permitted within the statutory easement width of 3 metres from the pipeline without agreement from Anglian Water. Please contact Development Services Team on 0345 606 6087. (5) INFORMATIVE - The developer should note that the site drainage details submitted have not been approved for the purposes of adoption. If the developer wishes to have the sewers included in a sewer adoption agreement with Anglian Water (under Sections 104 of the Water Industry Act 1991), they should contact our Development Services Team on 0345 606 6087 at the earliest opportunity. Sewers intended for adoption should be designed and constructed in accordance with Design and Construction Guidance for foul and surface water sewers offered for adoption under the Code for adoption agreements for water and sewerage companies operating wholly or mainly in England ("the Code"), as supplemented by Anglian Water's requirements.

### Section 4 - Surface Water Disposal

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.

From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. As such, we are unable to provide comments in the suitability of the surface water management. The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a watercourse. Should the proposed method of surface water management change to include interaction with Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be re-consulted to ensure that an effective surface water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented.

## **Consultee Comments for Planning Application 2021/0598/FUL**

### **Application Summary**

Application Number: 2021/0598/FUL

Address: 471 - 480 High Street Lincoln Lincolnshire LN5 8JG

Proposal: Erection of elderly residential living apartment building comprising of 32 residential apartments and conversion of existing former United Reform Church to form additional 5 residential apartments. To include access from Cross Spencer Street, car park, landscaping, attenuation pond, refuse and cycle storage. To include demolition of former Abacus Motor Group showroom and ancillary motor repair buildings.

Case Officer: Julie Mason

### **Consultee Details**

Name: Ms Catherine Waby

Address: St Mary's Guildhall, 385 High Street, Lincoln LN5 7SF

Email: Not Available

On Behalf Of: Lincoln Civic Trust

### **Comments**

Objection PART

Comment. It is good to see this site being considered for this type of development and have no objection to the overall proposal. The design of the buildings is to be commended and it seems to be a very sensible use of an ex-commercial site and with good landscaping could be a great asset.

However, there are two items of concern. Firstly, the access to the site from Spencer and Cross Spencer Street is not appropriate. The access to the site has always been directly from High Street and this would seem far more accessible than adding additional traffic to small residential streets. The volume of vehicle movements will be substantial with deliveries, visiting medical staff and relations all having to enter the site via the residential street with on street parking. Secondly, the number of parking spaces is wholly inadequate for the number of proposed residents. There are no public car parks in the area and this would lead to many vehicles being parked in the small streets in the surrounding area. We see no reason why some of the ground floor of the buildings could not be used for undercroft parking and hence alleviate the problem.



**Directorate of Communities & Environment**

Simon Walters MBA, ACG, MCM  
City Hall, Beaumont Fee  
Lincoln, LN1 1DF

1<sup>st</sup> March 2022

Your Ref: 2021/0598/FUL

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990  
Re-consultation on Planning Permission**

**471 - 480 High Street, Lincoln, Lincolnshire, LN5 8JG**

**Erection of elderly residential living apartment building comprising of 20 residential apartments and conversion of existing former United Reform Church to form additional 5 residential apartments. To include access from Cross Spencer Street, car park, landscaping, attenuation pond, refuse and cycle storage. To include demolition of former Abacus Motor Group showroom and ancillary motor repair buildings (Revised Plans).**

**Lincolnshire Police do not have any objections to this revised 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 PGDPR Dip Bus.

Force Designing Out Crime Officer (DOCO)

**From:** Property Strategy <Property\_Strategy@lincolnshire.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 01 March 2022 10:27  
**To:** Technical Team (City of Lincoln Council)  
**Subject:** RE: Reconsultation on Planning Application

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.

Many thanks for the below consultation, LCC has no comments on the application in relation to education.

Sam Barlow  
Asset Advisor  
Lincolnshire County Council  
County Offices, Newland, Lincoln, LN1 1YL

Mobile: 07920143702  
Email: sam.barlow@lincolnshire.gov.uk  
Chat with me on Teams!  
Website: www.lincolnshire.gov.uk

## Tony Edens Ltd (Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 07 Mar 2022

Dear Ms Mason,

We have looked at the revised plans, and they still don't address any of our concerns and therefore please submit all our previous comments in relation to this resubmission.

Many thanks

Best wishes

Vicki

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jan 2022

Dear Ms Mason,

Please be advised that we would echo all Ms Nissler's concerns and would wish those to be recorded in our objections.

In addition, none of the proposed alterations to the plans address the concerns we raised in our initial objection, especially those of traffic, parking and amenity, including local resources, and our position remains unchanged.

Our other concern is that, should this development prove too large to function well as a home for elderly residents, given that the average size for similar homes is 42 beds and this proposal is almost double that size, what repurposing of the building might take place, and what would be the impact of a change of use to, for example, a hotel or student residence? This may have been a consideration already, as students are mentioned already within the proposal.

We look forward to your response and are happy to meet with the council or planning department to discuss the issues on site.

Best wishes

Vicki

## 13 South Park Lincoln Lincolnshire LN5 8EN (Neutral)

Comment submitted date: Mon 10 Jan 2022

Good morning Julie.

Below I've detailed further comments about the proposed new build on the old Peugeot site. As you know I've had previous problems with submission due to the 'time out' facility on the website so would be grateful if you would copy and paste the following onto the site so that it is visible to all.

I have carefully reviewed the revised plans and say that they have not addressed the original objections I and others have made regarding size, light pollution and privacy for the residents of South Park and Spencer Street or obvious problems that are associated with traffic. The following comments are in addition to my preceding criticisms. Again I would state that we are aware the site should be developed and we have no objection to the erection of a residential home facility providing it is designed to fit in with the residential nature of the surrounding streets and not dwarfing existing houses.

1. It appears that the residents bedrooms have been moved to the opposite sides of the corridor and administrative offices now face onto the back gardens of South Park residents. This does not alleviate our privacy concerns as the windows still afford direct views into our bedroom, bathrooms and gardens 24 hours a day.

2. The illustrations of trees has been removed from the drawings. I assume the Environment Agency have informed the architects that trees can not be planted within 8 metres of the watercourse which in effect states that a privacy barrier of fast growing trees cannot be used.

A fence high enough to screen our houses from a 3+ storey build is not possible. The obvious solution is either to reduce the height of the building to 2 storeys and to move the boundary of the development inward by 8 metres therefore allowing scope for tree planting or fencing.

3. Light pollution. This will be a 24 hour facility. Both indoor lighting and outdoor illumination will evidently be used. The Neighbourhood and Environment Act 2005 states that any new development should reflect the agent of change principle regarding an urban setting, taking into account residents concerns regarding location and nuisance - "addressing an adverse state of affairs that interferes with an individual's use and enjoyment of his or her property".

I cannot see how a 3+ storey building will sit within this legislative definition. It would be possible with a 2 storey build.

We are looking to engage a expert specialist advice on this issue.

3. Additional traffic engendered will substantially compromise parking and access for existing residents. This has been explored in previous threads. Thought must be given to main access from the High Street which would engender specific problems.

4. Taking into account all of the above this will have a hugely detrimental effect on the mental health of current residents.

5. Much weight has been given to the appearance of the plan from a High Street and St.Katherine's perspective. This has no bearing on our side of High Street and I am at a loss as to why the developers website give no consideration to the residents living spaces on South Park and Spencer Street

In conclusion - the reallocation of administrative and residents rooms is like shifting deck chairs on the Titanic. For this development to be welcomed into our community the size of the build should be drastically reduced in size and scope and residents very valid concerns regarding privacy taken into account and actioned.

Janet Nissler

**Comment submitted date: Tue 17 Aug 2021**

I am a retired nurse previously specialising in discharge of elderly and infirm patients from hospital to safe environments. I worked closely with a multidisciplinary team involving hospital and community staff, Adult social Services and government housing departments and I am aware of the increasing need of safe housing for the elderly, supplied in supportive environments that address their activities of daily living.

I am very concerned about the proposed siting of a large care facility and specific to this letter erection of elderly residential living apartments in a 4 storey block on a dense site behind 471 - 480 High Street Lincoln. The developers are a large company specialising in locating land that is commercially viable and consequent acquisition of planning permission; see website [TORSION CARE.CO.UK](http://TORSION.CARE.CO.UK)

There is no mention in the extensive planning documents of who will administer the home /apartments and what the licence will be for.

The proposed site is in a the conservation area of St.Catherines (section 4 subsection 3 / 4) and as such development is subject to stricter regulation to give broader protection to both the appearance of the area and the existing residents. Development should recognise these sensitivities. The design and access heritage statement plan addresses views of the proposal from the High Street and St.Catherines are but not South Park or the back streets where there is low cost high density housing with many elderly residents, young families with children and small local businesses.

Local residents have not been consulted about the size or scale of the proposal which appears to maximise the largest possible occupancy onto the site. Average UK size for residential homes is approximately 50 beds; in total the site will potentially house 113 residents, the size of a hotel. The residential apartment block plan details

a 4 storey building which is far higher than surrounding dwellings.

South Park houses Nos.1-15 date in build from the Victorian area up to the present day and back onto Sincil Dyke, in use as a water course for centuries. The enclosed back gardens enjoyed historical privacy, the Dyke borders been sheltered by mature trees and vegetation, a haven for birds and wildlife. The Environment Agency contracted Bentley Environmental to improve the walls of the Dyke. After protests from residents this work was halted until the end of the bird nesting season as it was being illegally carried out. Within the past few weeks every tree and bush has been destroyed, leaving the back gardens and houses of South Park Nos. 1-15 totally open to view and not enhancing the area at all. The agency will be replanting trees, not at South Park but at the Heritage aviation centre some miles away, with no benefit to the residents of South Park

Consequently all historical privacy has been withdrawn with no restitution offered in the way of screening.

The erection of the 4 storey block will mean the care home residents will have unlimited visual access to our back gardens and into our homes.

24 hour access to the apartment block will mean constant traffic and noise, must be readdressed.

24 hour security lighting will cause immense artificial light pollution for South Park houses 1-15.

Parking is already at saturation point around South Park and Spencer Street. Deliveries to and from the small businesses will be badly compromised, local residents already having parking problems due to the rise in multi occupancy housing.

Local GP surgeries are at full capacity. What measures are in place to cope with 100+ extra elderly clients with multiple pathologies?

A 2 storey apartment block would be acceptable if the development company, after consultation with local residents, provided full screening along Sincil Dyke for the residents of South Park Nos.1-15 in the form of fast growing hedging, high fencing or wall construction. This to be fully funded by the builders and could be on the construction site side of the dyke or on the perimeter of the back gardens.

Full screening would not work if the build is 4 storeys high.

I hope these comments are not seen as negative but suggestions of problem resolution.

Janet Nissler

## Woodbine Cottage, No. 5 South Park Lincoln LN58EN (Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 13 Dec 2021  
Formal Objection to Planning Application 2021/0597/FUL

Mr. C Bonnett  
Woodbine Cottage,  
No.5 South Park,  
Lincoln.  
LN5 8EN

10th December 2021.

Dear Planning Department,

Firstly, could I thank you for alerting me to the fact that the Developers for this proposal have resubmitted plans for the 73 bed Nursing Home which will potentially be built at the back of my home on South Park, Lincoln and on the redundant site at the top of the High St which was formally a car show room.

I have written previously to you with a list of my concerns about the proposal which has been indexed to the Planning Application under the "Comments" section.

I was pleased to hear the revised plans had been submitted and had hoped that the Developers had listened to the concerns of residents both on South Park and the adjoining streets. However, on viewing the plans for the first time I could see very little change to the proposed height and elevation of the building which runs along the length of the Sincil Bank Dyke and looks directly into my property both in terms of my private garden and the windows of my home both upper and ground floors. The only difference I could see on the external visual image of the Sincil Bank side of the development was that the mature trees on the original drawing have now been removed which opens the views up from my home and into the new building and of course vice-verse. This significantly compromises my privacy despite me having a six -foot woven fence forming a boundary to my property at the back of my home.

On further observation I do note that the bedrooms to the second floor of the Nursing Home have been changed into service rooms for the building including a Guest Lounge, Linen Store, Training Room, Laundry and Manager's Office.

Whilst I assume that this is to address the concerns that I and other residents had about our privacy at home being compromised, I am concerned the use of the rooms on the second floor will revert to bedrooms in response to demand for beds once the Nursing Home is up and running.

Could I ask whether the use to the 2nd floor rooms on the Sincil Bank side of this intrusive building would be subject to change of use and therefore must be agreed through planning consent?

People accessing the service areas on the 2nd floor of the new building will have an excellent view into my bedroom, bathroom and kitchen of my home. Surely these can't be right?

As these rooms are now no longer to be used as bedrooms on the 2nd floor and are now service rooms for the building could I enquire whether the windows going to be fitted with obscure glass to protect the neighbour's privacy for those houses which the new building directly affects?

I am disappointed to see that the building remains too large and too high for the plot, and I remain concerned how this building will affect me, my wellbeing and the value and salability of my home in the future.

I have not up to this point formally objected to the development and building of the Nursing Home at the back of my home but as the building remains at a three level (ground floor and two further floors) I now have no other options but to formally

place an objection to the proposed plans.

Objection to the Planning of the Proposed Nursing Home for the following reason

1) The building is three levels high and poses a significant intrusion to my privacy both from the 1st and 2nd levels. Residents on the 1st and 2nd floors of the Nursing Home will be able to see directly into my bedroom, bathroom, kitchen and small conservatory. Accessing my current "private" garden would also be at risk. I feel that having a new building on three levels is over development and perhaps the building would be best moved back some considerable distance from the Sincil Bank dyke which I some way my protect resident's privacy.

2) The 2ND floor of the amended plans denotes that there is a change of use from bedrooms to meeting room, guest lounge, team room and manager's office. I suspect this will encourage increased people to access the second floor and therefore this will increase to my privacy at home being compromised. Frosted glazing to the Sincil Bank side of the development would go some way in reducing this intrusion. Has this been considered I wonder?

3) Would the changes to the upper 2nd floor level be subject to planning consent if the owners of the Nursing Home decide to convert the service rooms back into resident bedrooms as I can see these rooms being converted back into bedrooms due to demand for beds.

4) Increase light pollution during the night- time/ darkness hours... There would be a considerable amount of light generated by residents accessing their bedrooms, and the communal areas of the building. This would impact upon my sleeping and back rooms of my property.

5) I am also concerned that there would be street lighting for the area on the Sincil Bank side of the development which would impact upon my home and perhaps affect my sleep due to the level of light pollution this would create.

6) I am concerned that there are gates which open onto the High Street on the Sincil Bank side of the development. Are vehicles going to be accessing the site from these gates and how often will there be vehicles going up and down at the back of the development? We already have substantial traffic noise pollution from South Park at the front of our properties and having increased traffic at the back of our home would be unacceptable.

7) Noise from the Nursing Home due to vehicles accessing, visitors calling, ambulances, people walking along to site to the gardens at the far end of the development would again cause intrusion and again impact upon my wellbeing...

8) Phase one of this build appears to be the construction of the Nursing Home and further development of the four-floor block of elderly flats further along the Sincil Bank Drain would I assume then commence. Whilst this is not part of the planning application for the Nursing Home, it is part of the long- term plan for this small pocket of redundant, urban land. I again feel this would be an over development of this site, severely impact on the local community and be extremely intrusive to current resident's lives. I urge the planning department to seriously consider the needs of the residents and ask the Developers for reasonable adjustments to be made to the Nursing Home plans... with a maximum height of the building at the back of the elevation to the High Street build being just two floors.

Thank you once again for giving me the opportunity to comment and formally object to the Nursing Home Plans.

I have no objections for this redundant site at the top of the High Street being

developed and brough back into use but feel that more consideration needs to be given by the Developers of how this can be best achieved and with the least impact upon the residents of the area.

Your sincerely

Mr. Christopher Bonnett

Resident of South Park, Lincoln.

Mr C Bonnett.

No. 5 Woodbine Cottage,

South Park,

Lincoln.

LN5 8EN

Dear Sir /Madam

**Concerns over the Planning Application for the site 417-480 High Street,  
Lincoln, Lincolnshire, LN5 8JG.**

*I am writing to raise my concerns over the planning application for the development of the redundant site which lies at the back of my property on South Park, Lincoln and across from the Sincil dyke. I have lived in my current home for the past five years and have raised concerns recently over the removal of the mature trees at the back of my property by the environment agency which I have been told was due to the upgrade of the flood defences in the area.*

*The removal of the trees has caused some distress for me as it has created a lack of privacy at the back of my property, a huge increase in noise pollution from the high street and it has had a huge effect on the amount of wildlife in the area with the reduction on bird species which were present in the garden and along the riverbank. I have not seen the regular kingfishers feeding from the river for a number of weeks nor many of the other bird visitors to the garden.*

*The removal of the trees has created a lot of noise pollution in the garden from vehicles and people on the high street and it is far to say that I feel my property is now exposed to residents living in the second floor flats above the shops on the high street.*

**Not objecting to the development of the land**

*Can I be clear that state that I am not objecting to the development of this site for an elderly person's residential home and older person's flats as I feel this is a really useful and much needed service provision for Lincoln.*

*I work in social care myself and understand from my colleagues working for the Adult Frailty Service that they struggle to find beds for Lincoln people when there is a need for them to have 27/4 care.*

*The High Street profile of how the development will look after building work is completed looks really good and improves the aesthetic of the top of the high street greatly and this is currently run down and looking rather shabby after the car show room closed about three years ago.*

*I would prefer a development for older people rather than social housing due to the problems these developments often bring to the community.*

*I also think it's a really good use of the lovely old chapel which is currently redundant and will help preserve this important architectural building for this area which reflects the social history of Lincoln.*

***My Concerns about the Proposed Development.***

- *Referencing the Sincil Dyke plans and impression on how this will look at building- I feel that the buildings are too high for this site and it's over development. Both buildings, the Nursing Home and the Residential Units would have an impact upon my home and personal wellbeing for the following reasons.*
- *Lack of privacy- My home is parallel with the Nursing Home site. The proposal is a tall, a 73 bed building on three floor and this would overlook my garden and back of the property. Residents would be able to look into my small conservatory, kitchen, bedroom and bathroom causing a lack of privacy. Residents on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floors would be able to see over my six foot fence and into my garden which I am not happy about. Surely this would be an invasion of my privacy?*
- *Invasion of Light from the Nursing Home during the evening and night-time- The Proposal isn't too far back from the Dyke and is very tall. I can*

*see there being a lot of light pollution from this building which potentially could affect my sleep and again my privacy at the back of my property.*

- *Noise- I am not concerned about the amount of noise from the Nursing Home or Residential Residents -I am concerned about that substantial noise from South Park not being able to dissipate at the back of my property as the Nursing Home will create a barrier and the noise will return to the back of my house, therefore there will be increased noise in the garden and along the Dyke. This would be reduced if the Nursing Home and the proposed flats were not such a high profile (height wise).*
- *Lack of sunlight in the afternoons- The Nursing Home proposal would affect the amount of sunlight/sunshine I would receive back the back of the property in the afternoons as the height of the new build would block out the sun in after 3 pm.*
- *Over development of the site.. I feel the business who submitted the proposal for consideration is attempting to over- develop this site. There are references for less flats (16 I think) and more individual units which would look more aesthetically pleasing rather than a thirty six block of flats for elderly residents. Could this perhaps be looked at again? I think I read this in the "Preliminary ecological proposal" paperwork of the application.*

### **Questions about the development.**

*Having looked at the proposed plans in some detail and have the following questions about the landscaping of this site which may address some of my concerns.*

- 1) *On the artists impressions and proposed plans there appear to be trees planted along the side of Sincil Dyke every few meters. Can I ask whether these reference the trees which have now been removed by the environment agency so they are able to complete their work on the site*

*or are they newly planted trees as these would form some screening to my property and therefore create the privacy I would be lacking otherwise?*

- 2) Is the patio area on the Residential Flats site a café area please as this would encourage people to be at the back of my property and possibly create some privacy issues for me?*
- 3) Is there a walk -way from the High St along the side of the water to the pond at the far end of the site?*
- 4) Will there be street lighting on site which will create further light pollution at the back of my property?*
- 5) The impact of the removal of the mature trees on the Drain has been substantial for the wildlife in the area including the bat population and their feeding grounds. Apart from the development of the pond at the end of the site has any further thoughts been given to the wildlife and creating habitats on this development for them?*
- 6) Has the Residential Development got lifts? As this limits access and the type of residents who may want to rent/purchase these properties in the future.?*

*Once again could I take this opportunity to state that I am not opposed to the development of the site or the planning application for a Nursing Home and older person's residential units which are very much needed in the area. I am opposed however to the development on both sites being three storey, my lack of privacy, light pollution and noise escape for the very busy South Park Rd at the front of my property.*

*Thank you for your consideration of this matter and reading my concerns over the planning application..*

*I look forward to hearing from you..*

*Yours sincerely,*

*Mr Christopher Bonnett*

*South Park Resident.*

## 31 Spencer Street Lincoln Lincolnshire LN5 8JH (Neutral)

Comment submitted date: Fri 20 Aug 2021

In response to the planning application for an Elderly Residential Building comprising of 32 residential apartments and the former united Reform Church developments.

We have no objection to the erection of the Elderly residential apartments laid down in the application but we would like to object to a few of items.

The 32 apartment block on the plans seem to end at the bottom right hand end of our garden as we look towards Sincil Dyke. This build on the plans look like they have a ground floor then a 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor estimating as it doesn't have height details that I can see each floor plus floor thicknesses and roof height I estimate the the building will stand 13.7 metres to 15.2 metres which is far too high and will take a lot of our light and the higher level windows of the rear building will overlook our garden which at present is quite private and enclosed. These objections will also effect numbers 32 and 34 Spencer Street Lincoln.

If the plans are accepted could I suggest that the planning department organise and grant permission that all works vehicle which aren't continually in use be allowed to park on the Lincoln fairground Common on South Park Lincoln. The large number of vehicles which will be used to transport the workforce to the site plus the onsite vehicles will have a large impact on parking on Bargate, Tealby Street, Henley Street, Spencer Street, Little Bargate Street, Gibbeson Street and Shakespeare Street because at present parking in day can be a nightmare.

Yours Sincerely Mr & Mrs Paul Pyrah

## 466 High Street Lincoln Lincolnshire LN5 8JB (Objects)

Comment submitted date: Thu 19 Aug 2021

Whilst I am sympathetic to the need for residential care, this proposal is on the scale of a hospice or large hotel, and will change the local population balance significantly. This may be good for the profits of the developers, but it is not good for the local area or the profitability of local businesses. None of the 100+ proposed residents will be customers of local businesses such as the ones run by my employees and tenants.

As the owner of a local long-established business and the properties on the corner of

Spencer Street I object to the size and scope of this proposal and 2021/0597/FUL, along with the proposed access from Spencer Street, for all the local and environmental reasons stated in objections already submitted by local residents.

A development of this size will have a significant and detrimental impact on the properties I own and the proposal offers nothing to improve the local area.

## 6 Spencer Street Lincoln Lincolnshire LN5 8JH (Neutral)

Comment submitted date: Wed 18 Aug 2021

Could I add the attached photo in support of my letter of concern regarding

2021/0597/FUL and 2021/0598/FUL please.

It is a letter from the environment agency regarding the flood defences which I believe demonstrates a government agency's understanding of the need to have more than access points to this site, specifically to have access from the High Street for heavy vehicles.

Kind regards  
Lauren White

Lauren White  
UKCP registered  
Individual and Group Psychotherapy  
6 Spencer Street, LN5 8JH  
01522538715/07913746337  
[www.laurenwhitetherapy.co.uk](http://www.laurenwhitetherapy.co.uk)

Date: 09.08.21

Attn: Development Team, Planning applications,  
Directorate of Communities and Environment,  
City Hall, Lincoln.

**Re: Planning applications 2021/0597/FUL and 2021/0598/FUL , from Torsion Care, for  
471-480 High Street LN5 8JG**

I have some concerns about the two planning applications above. Whilst I feel that in general either of these developments would enhance the area, I believe the proposed access to them needs to be modified. According to the current site plans, the only road access appears to be through Cross Spencer Street. I live in Spencer Street, between the High Street and Cross Spencer Street. This is a narrow road with a sharpe turning into Cross Spencer Street, and I cannot see how this could sustain the coming and going of works vehicles, during the build, without negatively impacting - through noise, dirt, as well as potential structural damage caused by vibration, - the nearby houses (and cars at the turning point of the road). I work at home and this could also put my livelihood at risk.

There are sizeable car parks planned, accordingly to the site maps, so the problem would persist after completion, with presumably delivery lorries, refuse trucks, as well as cars trying to access the site. At the moment there are double yellow lines on one side of this part of Spencer Street, which means I can park outside my house. I am worried that in order to cope with the increased traffic flow the council may decide to put double yellow lines on both sides of the road. I feel this would devalue my property. In the light of all of the above, if these planning applications were approved I would have to consider selling up and moving elsewhere.

I am not against the site being accessed from Cross Spencer Street but I feel this should not be the only access. At the moment the plot is accessed from the High Street which I feel would more easily sustain the entry and exit of large vehicles, and some cars, without damaging the environment.

I would like to discuss this further with the planning department please.

I would be grateful if you can confirm receipt of this letter please.

Yours faithfully

Lauren White.



Ceres House  
Searby Road  
Lincoln  
LN2 4DW

Our Ref: Lincoln/FB/01  
Date: 18 August 2021

To the Occupier,

**Lincoln Flood Defence Scheme  
Works to Sincil Dike, Lincoln**

Further to my previous letters regarding channel surveys and vegetation clearance, I am now writing to set out our flood defence improvement plans for the Dike between the High Street and Spencer Street Footbridge.

During times of prolonged heavy rainfall, the river channels in Lincoln run at full capacity to enable the upstream water to get through the city. Sincil Dike carries 50% of that flow, and therefore, it needs to be maintained such that this is not compromised.

Works are currently progressing well with the vegetation clearance. In the next couple of weeks, we are due to enter the in-channel phase of the works. This will involve installing steel sheet piles along both sides of the channel starting at Spencer Street footbridge and working towards the High Street. After lengthy assessment, it has been concluded that steel piles are the only practical solution for this particular length as they will provide long term strength and stability to the channel and minimise future erosion of the banks.

Our contractors, JBA Bentleys, will be working Monday to Friday between 8am and 6pm. This is when the heavier machinery will be working. However, we will be accessing the site outside these hours with light vehicles and pedestrians. Occasionally, we may have to work on Saturday mornings and the hours will be between 8am and 1pm. We do not propose to work on Sundays or Bank Holidays except in an emergency.

We intend to access the works area from within the redundant Peugeot garage, with light vehicles from Spencer Street and HGV's via the High Street entrance.

The first thing that we have to construct is a platform in the channel so that we can start the piling works. This will be a temporary structure and has been designed such that the flow in the channel will not be impeded. In developing the scheme, we have utilised a team of ecologists so that the channel biodiversity is not compromised. We will be working on both sides simultaneously and the piles will be installed using a silent/ncn-vibration piling method in order to minimise disruption and inconvenience. Once the piles have been installed, a sloping rock revetment will be placed above them to minimise any future erosion.

Please find enclosed a map of where the works are taking place.

customer service line  
03708 506 506

incident hotline  
0800 80 70 60

floodline  
03459 88 11 88

[www.gov.uk/environment-agency](http://www.gov.uk/environment-agency)

## 12 South Park Lincoln Lincolnshire LN5 8EN (Objects)

Comment submitted date: Mon 16 Aug 2021

As a resident of South Park for 7 years I am objecting the proposal named above for a few reasons.

1. Due to the recent essential works carried out by the environment agency, the back of my property is now completely open. The development of a 4 storey building on that area land will alleviate any privacy to not only my back garden but the rooms at the rear of my property including two children's rooms.

2. Not only will I lose all privacy to the rear of my property. I will also lose a lot of natural light from the mid afternoon through to the evening. This will have a significant impact on the mental health and wellbeing of myself and my young family.

3. I am very concerned about the increased amount of traffic and vehicles wanting to park in the area. The footbridge leading from South Park to Spencer Street will be a convenient access path to the new development and is likely to be heavily used. The car park is often at capacity with a number of residents relying on the spaces there due to not having a driveway. Has any consideration been made to protect parking spaces for local resident through a residents pass scheme or similar?

4. I am also concerned about the potential increase in traffic because of the amount of children and young families in the area. Any increase in traffic puts additional risk to the young people in the area who are quite often seen playing in the streets, commuting to local schools and accessing the park on South Park.

5. The increase in refuse and refuse disposal is also a concern. We naturally have a lot of rodents in the area already due to the water. How often will refuse be collected for such a huge number of dwellings and what measures have been discussed to keep any rodent infestations at bay?

6. Noise pollution is also a concern. This is both during development and afterwards. How long will the development take? What measures are in place to ensure there is no negative impact to the lifestyle and wellbeing of the residents during this time? Once the development is complete, the constant turnover of staff and deliveries, refuse collection etc will have a significant impact on the wellbeing of residents trying to relax in their garden.

7. We have already seen a huge impact to the local wildlife in the area. We no longer see the range of birds, fish and reptiles along the banking due to the works carried out by the environment agency. With further developments and loss of natural land, what is being done to encourage the wildlife to return. It states there will be landscaping, what landscaping and will this be targeted to the local wildlife?

8. Air pollution and renewable energy does not seem to have had any consideration in the proposals. Other new developments around the city have taken greater considerations - the new medial school for example, is carbon neutral. The building consists of renewable energy sources, natural lighting and ventilation. Given that this development is in a conservation area has any consideration been done in relation to the impact on the environment?

Whilst I do not disagree that the area needs more post retirement residential

options, I feel that full consideration has not been given to local residents and the new residents of this development. What privacy are they guaranteed against the residents in the area? More needs to be done to protect everyone and to ensure the lifestyle and wellbeing is not impacted. A maximum of 2 storeys plus substantial hedging, walls or fencing around the perimeter of either the development land or the affected private dwellings must be considered. Parking and traffic management must have a thorough discussion before any final decision is made. The proposed access point/parking does not seem sufficient. Any reduction to house valuations should be adequately compensated for as a result of the development.

## Not Available (Neutral)

Comment submitted date: Fri 13 Aug 2021

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above applications. The site is within the Witham Third District Internal Drainage Board area.

It is noted the proposed surface water disposal from the development will be at 51l/s to EA Main River Sincil Dyke. It is noted the invert level of the discharge is 4.30m ODN, approximately 1m above the highest recorded levels for the watercourse. However, consideration must be given to the potential effect the proposed method of discharge may have on the receiving watercourse and its embankments at this location.

As the applicant is aware, discharge to EA Main River will require an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency.

No development should be commenced until the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority has approved a scheme for the provision, implementation and future maintenance of a surface water drainage system.

All drainage routes through the Site should be maintained both during the works on Site and after completion of the works. Provisions should be made to ensure that upstream and downstream riparian owners and those areas that are presently served by any drainage routes passing through or adjacent to the Site are not adversely affected by the development.

Drainage routes shall include all methods by which water may be transferred through the Site and shall include such systems as "ridge and furrow" and "overland flows".

The effect of raising site levels on adjacent property must be carefully considered and measures taken to negate influences must be approved by the Local Planning Authority.

**Tony Edens Ltd 466 - 468 High Street Lincoln  
Lincolnshire LN5 8JB (Objects)**

Comment submitted date: Mon 09 Aug 2021

Planning submission 2021/05987/FUL and 2021/0598/FUL

09/08/2021

Response from

Tony Edens Ltd

466-468 High Street

Lincoln

As the owner of a local business I am registering my objections to the proposed development of the former Abacus Motor Group site.

We do not object to the erection of care home or accommodation for elderly residents.

Our objection is to:

1. The proposal to use Spencer Street and Cross Spencer Street to access the site.
2. The inadequacy of proposed parking allocation and the inevitable impact on local residents and businesses of the compound effects of increased domestic traffic, increased delivery and emergency vehicle traffic, overspill parking and the loss of restriction-free parking for local residents and businesses.
3. The figures used to justify the application are drawn from projections, extrapolations and comparisons with larger cities with very different local infrastructures.

It is not reflective of the lived experience of local residents and businesses, many of whom would be keen to see the old garage forecourt used, but who will be understandably concerned by a proposal to decrease their established amenities.

The current plan is likely to have significant impact on the day-to-day running of our business as well as others locally.

Our reasons are:

1. Despite the proposal's assurances that there is no significant increase in danger, we would ask the council to note that:
  - i. The High Street is not a safe road for cycling as stated in the proposal. Cyclists already regularly use the footpath on both sides of the High Street, but particularly the one passing our shop front and the proposed development, as there is no safe cycleway. The safety of cyclists on the road is significantly compromised by the frequency of bus pull-ins, traffic pulling in and out of the short-term parking spaces lining the road on both sides and to allow rapid passage for police and ambulance traffic accessing the High Street and Tritton Road (via Dixon Street) from the new combined HQ on South Park, so they use the pavement. One of our employees was taken to A&E following an accident where a cyclist using the pavement collided with him as he left the front door of the shop.  
Local cycle paths are unlit and away from public areas, and therefore are no more safe than the road at night or during the winter, as well as not affording access to shops and other local amenities.
  - ii. The proposal cites only 3 minor accidents in the past 5 years. This is potentially vastly inaccurate, as there have been three incidents directly involving my business in that time. One of those accidents is listed above, the second was an insurance claim in January 2018 for damage to our shop frontage and involved a delivery

vehicle crossing both carriageways and the pavement prior to collision with our shop front. Fortunately nobody was injured. The third was an incident involving a car travelling too fast down Spencer Street from the High Street and colliding with our delivery van. The frequent bumps and near misses round the Spencer Street / Henley Street / High Street area are not cited in the report.

iii. Paragraph 3.3.8 of the proposal's transport assessment is irrelevant justification for this application, as this is not a proposed student development, it is not likely to be staffed primarily by students and is not in an area of high levels of student housing. This development is for elderly residents, who, if not car users themselves, are likely to have carers, personal and professional visitors, mobility accessible taxis, all of whom will be more likely to drive to the proposed development from other less well-served parts of rural Lincolnshire than to catch local public transport or cycle.

2. When it is realised that traffic, particularly delivery and maintenance traffic and emergency vehicles, require more space than the street allows when cars are parked, the double-yellow lines will be reinstated past the Cross Spencer Street junction.

This will result in:

- i. The loss of 15 parking spaces currently available to residents and local employees:
  - a. 3 car spaces between 1 Spencer Street and the rear entrance to our shop and delivery yard.
  - b. 8 car spaces between our rear entrance and Cross Spencer Street junction.
  - c. 4 car spaces on Cross Spencer Street itself, currently used during the day, and especially during school collection times and when there is a loss of parking in other areas due to matches and other functions at Lincoln City Football Sincil Bank Stadium.
- ii. A drop in trade when customer parking becomes a challenge.
- iii. An increase in difficulty running a sustainable business when employee parking and delivery vehicle access becomes even more challenging.
- iii. Parking at our rear entrance will become prohibited, creating issues with safely and legally loading and unloading vehicles.
- iv. Frustrated car users parking on double yellow lines due to a serious lack of residential and amenity parking. This is already a problem in this area, as anyone who visits out of hours will have noticed.

3. Access is already difficult for our rear entrance, especially for any vehicle larger than our delivery van. Larger delivery and collection vehicles, including refuse collection, frequently block the road, creating access difficulties and often requiring vehicles to mount and block the pavement. A proposal to use this street for a large development site will cause disruption for local small businesses or disruption to care home traffic, neither of which is going to improve the local area, and is contrary to paragraph 110 of NPPF 2018. This presents an increase in street clutter and a conflict with pedestrians and residential users.

A large care home will require efficient delivery of goods and services, it is also significantly more likely than average to require swift and trouble-free access for disability adapted and emergency vehicles. This could be problematic in an already

congested area of the city. Alternative access via Shakespeare Street is frequently compromised by the requirements of a furniture store and long-established car dealer and garage, which diverts traffic down Spencer Street more often than it is able to accommodate additional traffic.

4. This is an area of low-cost housing, and is heavily occupied by young families. Pedestrian safety is a concern, as is the safety of children (walking and cycling) push-chair users in an already congested area with no alternative parking available.

5. Development and maintenance traffic will cause substantial disruption to access, parking and local business, which would all be avoided if the existing entrance on the High Street were used and the development was for fewer residents with a more future-proof parking plan and consideration of the rural nature of the rest of the county which will influence those servicing and visiting residents of the care home as well as the potential for residents to require travel to other less accessible places.

6. The use of the existing High Street entrance, especially with a 'Left Turn Only' exit, is likely to be safer and will certainly have less impact on the local amenity than using Spencer Street.

7. The provision of more than the bare minimum of car parking in the proposal would ensure that the local streets are not used for over-spill parking. Courtesy parking for other local area users will help reduce conflicting interests and provide mutual benefit and community integration for residents. The current proposal for car parking does not appear to account for additional support services, additional medical carers or the doubling of staff vehicles at handover times.

Over-optimistic projections of vehicle use, parking and access requirements to maximise resident numbers and therefore profit would have a significant detrimental impact not only on local residents and businesses, but also on the residents and staff of the care home with no obviously available, sustainable or long-term solution.