

Present:

Councillor Bob Bushell (*in the Chair*),
Councillor Gary Hewson, Councillor Debbie Armiger,
Councillor Biff Bean, Councillor Chris Burke, Councillor
Sue Burke, Councillor Liz Bushell,
Councillor Natasha Chapman, Councillor David Clarkson,
Councillor Thomas Dyer, Councillor
Rebecca Longbottom, Councillor Bill Mara, Councillor
Ric Metcalfe, Councillor Donald Nannestad, Councillor
Lucinda Preston, Councillor Clare Smalley, Councillor
Mark Storer, Councillor Naomi Twedde, Councillor
Pat Vaughan, Councillor Calum Watt, Councillor
Joshua Wells and Councillor Emily Wood

Apologies for Absence:

Councillor Alan Briggs, Councillor Martin Christopher,
Councillor Matthew Fido, Councillor Adrianna McNulty,
Councillor Neil Murray, Councillor Hilton Spratt, Councillor
Rachel Storer, Councillor Dylan Stothard, Councillor
Edmund Strengiel, Councillor Aiden Wells and Councillor
Loraine Woolley

53. Update Sheet

An update sheet was circulated in relation to planning applications to be considered this evening, which included additional information for Members attention received after the original agenda documents had been published.

RESOLVED that the update sheet be received by Planning Committee.

54. Introduction/House Keeping Rules

Councillor Bob Bushell, Chair of Planning Committee welcomed everyone present at tonight's meeting of the City of Lincoln Council Planning Committee.

He advised that the Committee was made up of democratically Elected Members who would be presented with a recommendation from a professional officer for each application on the agenda.

He explained that after each application had been presented, those interested parties who had registered to speak would then be given five minutes to verbally present their views.

Following this, the Committee would debate each proposal and make the decision having considered all relevant information. Clearly, the process of making the decision would inevitably cause some people to feel aggrieved, however, it was hoped that all interested parties would feel that their views had been considered as part of the process.

He requested that mobile phones be turned off or set to silent throughout the meeting and to please be refrained from attempting to speak from the public gallery unless having formerly registered to speak on an application. In which case, himself as Chair would call you to the speakers table at the relevant time.

Thank you.

55. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were received.

56. Applications for Development

57. Phase 1A (Parcels A1 and A1a), Western Growth Corridor, Skellingthorpe Road, Lincoln

Kieron Manning, Assistant Director of Planning, presented a visual power point display in which he:

a) outlined the detail of the planning site location and proposal as follows:

- A hybrid planning application (2019/0294/RG3) was granted full planning permission and outline consent in January 2022 for the development of the Western Growth Corridor (WGC) Sustainable Urban Extension.
- The full element granted permission for the means of access to the development from Skellingthorpe Road and Tritton Road. Works to construct the Skellingthorpe Road access and the first section of the spine road was currently underway.
- The outline element granted consent for the development of up to 3,200 dwellings, a local centre, primary school, commercial uses, leisure uses, highway infrastructure and open space.
- This current application related to Phase 1A, which had outline consent to be developed with housing. The application proposed 52 two and three storey dwellings. These included detached, semi-detached and terraced properties of 2, 2½ and 3 storeys.
- The application sought to approve all of the reserved matters including the layout of the development, the scale of the dwellings, their appearance, means of access and landscaping. The application also included additional information to satisfy a number of conditions of the outline consent, as detailed in full within the officer's report.
- Phase 1A was located directly to the north east of Skellingthorpe Road, opposite the junction with Birchwood Avenue. This phase comprised parcels A1 and A1a, which sat to the north west and south east of the spine road respectively. Beyond the site to the north east was the Catchwater Drain and open land. To the south east were residential properties off Burghley Road and Haddon Close. To the north west were residential properties on Grosvenor Avenue, Roxborough Close and Belgravia Close. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints abutted the site to the west.
- This represented the first phase of residential development proposed on the WGC site, in accordance with the approved, indicative Masterplan (included within the officer's report), and phasing plan. The phasing plans also indicatively identified that parcels A1 and A1a would deliver 52 units, again, the proposal for 52 dwellings would be in accordance with this.
- The applicant and owner of the land was the City of Lincoln Council. For this reason the application was brought before Full Council acting as Planning Committee this evening.

- The usual statutory and public consultations had been undertaken by the Planning Department, including the consultation of over 500 properties in the vicinity, the display of site notices and the publication of a press advert. In addition to this the applicant and applicant's agent held a public consultation event in October 2023 at The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, providing the opportunity for local residents to view the plans.
 - Revised plans had been received during the course of the application to address comments received from Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) as Local Highway and Lead Local Flood Authority, as detailed in full within the officer's report.
- b) advised that the principle of the development had been established with the approval of the outline planning application and could not be reconsidered as part of the reserved matters application
- c) referred to the site history of the planning application as detailed within the officer's report
- d) also referred to the new Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (CLLP) adopted in April 2023 which:
- Introduced a range of policies relating to energy efficiency (S6 and S7), water usage (S12), electric vehicle (EV) charging (NS18) and the 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (contained within S61).
 - However, as the outline permission was granted pre-adoption of the new plan such matters were not considered, incorporated or conditioned at that stage.
 - Therefore, as this application was now for the approval of reserved matters relating to the approved outline, they could not reasonably be re-visited. These would be referenced where necessary under each respective heading within the officer's report.
 - The scheme, nonetheless, proposed a 32% improvement relating to energy efficiency and biodiversity net gain above that required by current building regulations
- e) provided details of the policies pertaining to the application, as follows:
- Policy S1: The Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy
 - Policy S2: Growth Levels and Distribution
 - Policy S21: Flood Risk and Water Resources
 - Policy S47: Accessibility and Transport
 - Policy S53: Design and Amenity
 - Policy S56: Development on Land Affected by Contamination
 - Policy S57: The Historic Environment
 - Policy S60: Protecting Biodiversity and Geodiversity
 - Policy S61: Biodiversity Opportunity and Delivering Measurable Net Gains
 - Policy S66: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
 - Policy S68: Sustainable Urban Extensions
 - Policy S69: Lincoln Sustainable Urban Extensions
 - Policy S76: Residential Development on Sustainable Urban Extensions
 - National Planning Policy Framework

f) provided details of the issues pertaining to the application, as follows:

- Principle of development
- Developer contributions
- Visual amenity
- Residential amenity
- Access, parking and highways
- Drainage and flood risk
- Trees and landscaping
- Ecology and biodiversity
- Energy efficiency and sustainable transport
- Design and crime
- Contaminated land
- Archaeology
- Other matters

g) outlined the responses made to the consultation exercise

h) concluded that:

- The principle of the use of the site for residential purposes was established by the existing consent.
- The development accorded with the Design Code, it had its own identity and respected the local amenity.
- The well considered tree planting and landscaping would be of benefit to the scheme.
- The proposals would not result in harm to neighbour's amenity and the development would provide an acceptable level of amenity for future occupants.
- The removal of trees had been sufficiently justified and new tree planting would help off-set this loss.
- The tree planting, landscaping and the addition of bat and bird boxes would enable ecology and biodiversity to be enhanced.
- Other matters relating to parking and highways, drainage, flood risk, energy efficiency, contamination, archaeology, design and crime had been appropriately considered by officers and the relevant statutory consultees. These would be managed both by conditions of the original consent and those proposed to be attached to this permission.
- The proposals would therefore be in accordance with the requirements of CLLP Policies S1, S2, S21, S47, S53, S56, S57, S60, S61, S66, S68, S69 and S76 as well as guidance within the SPD and NPPF.

Richard Hall, local resident, addressed Planning Committee raising objections to aspects of the proposed planning application. He covered the following main points:

- He lived on a quiet cul-de-sac on Forest Park.
- He did not live in the area designated during the public consultation for the Western Growth Corridor (WGC).
- We were promised that all development would be from the new junction on Skellingthorpe Road.

- We and other residents were shocked to hear at the latest consultation event that three houses would have vehicular and pedestrian access from Grosvenor Avenue with at least one having a Grosvenor Avenue address.
- This was not appropriate as additional parking, traffic and footfall would result in increased hazards for residents, children, those with mobility and sensory difficulties, as well as increased pollution and negative impact on the local environment.
- At no time was it suggested that the new development would encroach or merge with Forest Park.
- In the past, the Planning Committee had turned down a request for infill building on Grosvenor Avenue the uniform design and its character would be undermined.
- He understood public money was used to acquire marginal land, anticipated for use as a buffer zone and potential wildlife corridor, instead of creating additional profit for the developer.
- The previous boundary fence and hawthorn shrubs at the bottom of Grosvenor Avenue had already been destroyed which meant we were sitting in a building site with no screening of any sort. (The photographs didn't show this). We asked it be replaced as soon as possible to support remaining wildlife and provide residents with much needed screening to the open views of the construction site. Additional planting to a place that had been lost was very important and necessary.
- The three houses proposed would mean the loss of at least three trees and another twenty should the buffer zone not be created.
- We did not want pedestrian or vehicular access to the development from the bottom of Grosvenor Avenue.
- We would request that the boundary fence and hedge screening be reinstated.
- This last point was very important. This was the only part of the development at the moment with no fence or screening of any sort. We were looking out on to a construction site which was obviously noisy and the reinstatement of the fence and hedge screening would be very helpful.
- He concluded by saying that his comments were not against the development itself, just those details highlighted.
- Thank you.

Mark Foster, representing Lindum Homes, addressed Planning Committee in support of the proposed planning application, covering the following main points:

- He introduced himself, a director with Lindum Homes and thanked everyone for allowing him the opportunity to address Committee today.
- It was now two years since he previously addressed Committee as part of the application team for the wider site.
- Since that time members would be aware of the great strides made to bring forward a very complex development.
- The new junction and access into the site from Skellingthorpe Road was moving towards completion later this year.
- Funding was also being secured to deliver the second access, the Tritton Road bridge.
- A further application to facilitate the construction of this bridge was to be considered within your agenda later this evening.
- This continuing upfront investment had been made predominantly to facilitate the building of much needed housing for the City.

- We were really pleased to be sat here this evening with a positive recommendation from your officers for the first phase of residential development of the site.
- As one of the gateways into the wider site, and the first residential development to be brought forward, we wanted to set the standard by which future proposals would be judged, whilst also responding positively to the constraints and opportunities of the site.
- As part of the design evolution of the scheme, we had held two separate public consultations, and worked with key stakeholders to arrive at the proposal before Committee this evening, including your officers, whose feedback and guidance had been critical in moving the scheme forward.
- The existing constraints did have a very specific impact on the lay out, and in particular there were existing features which needed to be positively responded to by the development. These being the Catchwater and the public rights of way to the north of the site, Skellingthorpe Road and Birchwood Avenue to the south, and finally the main development spine road which ran through the middle of the site, and where individual vehicular access was specifically restricted.
- These factors combined led us to the perimeter block layout we were proposing, creating active and predominantly car free frontages to the spine road, the Catchwater and Skellingthorpe Road, whilst also prioritising the views into and out of the wider site.
- The street scenes were defined by variations in scale, massing and detailing as displayed earlier this evening on the screen. These broke up the blocks, particularly along the main spine road, and created visual interest whilst preventing too much repetition, which was the key thing for the applicant.
- The overall design approach was modern, with some traditional features such as bays and dormers to help the development assimilate with its character in this part of the City in which we were building.
- It also had sustainability at its heart, significantly surpassing current building regulations, and even the anticipated 2025 future home standard, in terms of building performance and carbon reduction.
- We also wanted to create a landscape quality to the site, retaining key landscape features but also creating new public open space as well as new routes into and out of the site.
- These routes and connections were specifically important elements raised during our consultation events and had been incorporated into the design.
- We did recognise the concerns of neighbours, and had worked with residents over some time to try to address these where we could, accepting of course that most developments had some sort of impact.
- This had specifically seen the houses moved further away from existing residents on Burghley Road and Haddon Close, with boundary vegetation retained to improve the relationship here.
- We also appreciated the comments made by the residents at Grosvenor Avenue and Mr Hall's speech tonight. These issues were addressed in the officer's report, however, he would add that the turning head at the end of Grosvenor Avenue was unusual in that it already projected somewhat into the site and as such the development had to consider it. We felt that the proposals did respond positively to what was a constraint fronting this road, ensuring the development did not turn its back on Grosvenor Avenue which we felt would be harmful visually.
- Also the pedestrian connection to Grosvenor Avenue was an acclaimed public right of way, meaning a connection did have to be maintained here,

although we did hope in time that Grosvenor Avenue residents did benefit from improved access into the wider site and towards the city centre beyond.

- In conclusion, hopefully members would see that as an applicant team we had provided a comprehensive proposal which would complement the existing character of the area and was befitting of the sites gateway location.
- The aim if the development was approved tonight was for it to be built by Lindum Homes. We were a local housebuilder with our own local workforce and contract supply chain, meaning these houses would be built by local people for local people in what we all hoped would be a truly aspirational place to live.
- Thank you.

The Committee discussed the content of the report in further detail.

The following questions and comments were received from members and responded to by officers:

Councillor Hewson:

- He had been a Councillor for many years and took over a great deal of paperwork from former Councillor Pete Archer. This included a booklet called Swanpool against growth.
- There had always been a mooted awareness that there could be growth in that area. It had taken many years to achieve this growth and the additional housing was essential.
- We could finally vote tonight on the first stage of this much needed development. Officers worked hard with developers to bring forward schemes they considered suitable for planning permission to be received. As Planning Committee, we did not always agree with their advice but legitimate planning reasons for refusal must be established at all times.
- He believed the application in front of members tonight as the first stage of the development, with an impressive entrance to the site would be a gateway to attract people into further phases of the scheme. There was a great deal of green space within the proposals and attractive houses.
- Question: The update sheet included a response from a Mr Whiting regarding Pig Lane Haul Road between 1a Skellingthorpe Road and Phase 1b Tritton Road bridge. He noted that No 1 Skellingthorpe Road was near the Skellingthorpe Road/Boultham Road traffic island junction, which highlighted concerns as to how we numbered these houses, to avoid confusion with conflicting numbers at the further end of Skellingthorpe Road. Also, he requested that letter boxes not be positioned at the bottom of the doors.

Councillor Chris Burke

- He referred to the point made by Mr Porter regarding RAF remains, which had been responded to at Page 24 of the report by officer's and had answered his question. A local photographic historian Andy Blow had produced material around RAF Skellingthorpe area which may be usefully looked at in a supportive way.

Councillor Clarkson

- Question: He referred to Page 54 of the agenda pack Figure 11, which showed various routes and connections in different coloured dotted lines, however there was no key for the diagram?
- He referred to a comment from a resident regarding a three storey building located right at the front of the development, without any high buildings

near it either side. The resident had stated that this would spoil the protected view of the Cathedral. A single three storey building alone in that area would stand out 'like a sore thumb' and was not appropriate at the highest point of the development.

- He accepted that the development had approval and would be going ahead. He objected to the parking courts, which were his main concern. The police provided a response at page 96 of the agenda bundle about these, as they had also done at the time the development received approval two years previously. On page 24 of the report bundle, the applicant and agent stated that they felt positive responses had been made to the issues raised by the police. Having read the pack, and the police's comments he didn't believe this to be the case.
- Question: The parking courts were outside the boundaries of each property and not owned by the residents of the houses. They were screened from the housing by high fences and allocated to residents of the properties. He believed there were two parking spaces per property, although it wasn't very clear; what guarantee existed for use only by the allocated residents of the property?
- Question: Had any parking provision been made for visitors? There didn't appear to be spare capacity for this.
- Question: Leaf matter from local trees would likely build up over time. Who would be responsible for cleaning and maintenance of the parking courts?
- Question: For safety and security concerns, would the areas be well lit? Information on this was not provided.
- Question: Would delivery drivers be expected to drive round to the parking area and deliver to properties via the back door? Would residents be happy to receive callers at the back door? Most likely the delivery drivers would park on the spine road, deliver their parcel to the front door and move on to the next customer.
- He referred to a comment made within the agenda pack that people did not park cars in garages anymore. If garages were built to take modern cars, then people were likely to park in them.
- It was stated that an advantage of a parking barn as opposed to garages was that it held two spaces, one under and one in front. Garages fulfilled the same purpose, one inside and one outside.
- There was an aspiration that there would not be many cars in these places or no more than those that were parking. There was a standard set of an average of 1.5 car parking spaces per property throughout the whole development. This did not apply to the first phase which meant that if a further phase was built some homes would only have one car parking space.
- He referred to comments made by the County Council that there were only a small number of residents in the immediate area that didn't own two cars. This was a meaningless statistic as those people weren't likely to be buying these properties.
- The relatively newer areas not far from this junction at Fulmar Road and Birchwood Avenue could be seen cluttered with vehicles parked on driveways/pavements during the evening. Many families had children still at home with cars. This mode of transport was not going away.
- Car insurers always enquired where your vehicle was parked overnight. The best answer was in a locked garage or on the driveway of your property. A public parking area out of view of the premises was the worst answer to give.

- We had already heard that the first 52 houses would set the high standard for future phases. Prospective buyers would expect a garage to be included.
- There were many security concerns listed by the police that related to having open parking areas around the back of properties providing opportunities for crime and other activities.
- This development would result in a disincentive for people to buy these properties without a garage.

The Assistant Director for Planning offered the following points of clarification to members:

- He deferred the question from Councillor Hewson regarding the haul road to the next planning application on the agenda this evening, the haul road itself.
- The request regarding siting of letter boxes was not a material planning consideration, however, the applicants were here this evening listening to the debate and he was sure they would take the matter of the design and layout of the doors implemented on the scheme into consideration.
- In relation to RAF remains, officers were on board with requirements in relation to archaeology. The City Archaeologist had been consulted and was satisfied with how things had progressed.
- He referred to Page 54 of the agenda pack Figure 11, and gave clarification to the various routes and connections displayed in different coloured lines on the diagram provided.
- The matter of the height of the corner building on the site and to whether or not it was considered to be inappropriate was a matter to be determined by members this evening. The officer view was that typically with a corner development, from an urban design perspective it could accommodate taller buildings to create a punctuated corner, particularly when there was a significant set back from that corner to dwellings/other development on the opposite corner. There was a considerable amount of space at this junction point, the land was lower and dipped down from Skellingthorpe Road into the site, and therefore it could accommodate some additional height. Officers did not consider the height of the corner building to be inappropriate for this reason.
- In relation to comments made that the corner dwelling would affect protected views of the Cathedral, a protected view of the Cathedral did not exist in policy terms, certainly not at this par. The planning authority was not able to protect a view, as members would be aware from regular member training sessions they had received.
- Parking courts/ police comments/safety concerns – Clearly this was something we had to balance in the overall scheme of the development, the benefits of delivering the scheme, the limitations we had and the type of layout. A balance had to be struck in terms of urban design and safe frontages to the scheme to set the tone for the rest of the development. Officers were comfortable that the risk of safety was not of a sufficient level to warrant refusal of planning permission. The police were not objecting to the scheme in that regard.
- Garages – We all had our individual views as to whether people tended to use garages or would use garages to park their cars in new developments, it was not material in terms of consideration of this application. The provision of car barns enabled two spaces to be provided for each property which was considered to be reasonable, and beyond which the Highway

Authority had requested for the scheme. Officers felt this was a suitable way to deal with the development.

- Inevitably with perimeter type developments, which were necessary to some extent in urban design terms, the workings to the development needed to be retained behind, with parking provided to the rear of properties.
- The car barns would be adjacent to each individual property, and would be within the curtilage and ownership of that individual property. The spaces between them off the main highway i.e. the shared access road, would be picked up as part of a management company agreement, yet to be resolved in terms of maintenance and care and repair of shared services.
- Delivery drivers – the main road through the development would not have parking provision, however there were inward routes behind the development which led to the parking courts, likely to be used by delivery drivers. As a Planning Authority we could not legislate as to whether people observed the Highway Code in terms of how they drove, including delivery drivers, however, safe provision existed and the Highways Authority had not raised issue with that. The main concern for us and the Highway Authority in terms of highway safety was the ability for a vehicle to get off the highway and back onto it in forward gear. Delivery drivers could do this by accessing and egressing the site via the routes behind the development which in phase 1 would act as a cul-de-sac.
- In terms of why car barns were the preferred option as opposed to garages, this was for ease of parking for residents and also from a design point of view. Whilst it could be argued it was not the most attractive thing to have a shared parking area, they were functional. Officers would rather see this type of car barn being more aesthetically pleasing than garage courts.

Questions and comments from Members continued.

Councillor Bean

- In relation to Pig Lane access, currently being used for all works traffic, the preferred option when the main road was open was for all works traffic to use the Bell mouth main entrance. Could this be conditioned or a strong assurance be given that once the main road was opened, Pig Lane would not be used for any access for works traffic?
- The people of Burghley Road had been very reasonable in tolerating works traffic till now, it would be helpful for the main road to be used for all works traffic going forward once opened.

Councillor Dyer

- Page 80 of the report contained a response from the Highway Authority stating that this phase of the development went above the desired number of parking bays per property at 2 per dwelling for this scheme. The Highway Authority's view was that as a Council we should be limiting parking provision to encourage sustainable forms of transport and connectivity. Whilst this was noble, and we should have a desire to ensure the availability of cycle links within the entirety of this development together with other sustainable forms of connectivity. He was concerned by the Highway Authority's line of a maximum of 1.5 vehicles per property throughout the entirety of the scheme. The applicant should challenge this moving forward. He did think new build developments should have adequate offroad parking facilities to stop vehicles parking anywhere and everywhere.

- Central Lincolnshire Local Plan – the updated plan was published after the outline planning application was passed. Given the significance of this application, its size and the reputation of the applicant, he was disappointed that the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan was not being adhered to at its fullest, although he accepted that steps had been taken that would not have been required when the original planning application was granted.
- Following Mr Hall's comments on the three houses which would have vehicular and pedestrian access from Grosvenor Avenue, he accepted the officer's response within the report and the reasoning behind that. However, it was a 'tad' cheeky given that we had been assured throughout the process there would only be two accesses to the site. He appreciated however that only three properties were involved. On balance, he was minded to support this application.

Councillor Watt

- He appreciated Councillor Hewson's comments regarding the siting of letter boxes, and more particularly the officer's and developer's view going forward. It was a relatively trivial issue but important to some people's health and wellbeing and he hoped it would be followed through by the developer.
- He appreciated the time taken by officer's to answer his queries regarding cycle routes, although he realised they were not material to this planning application, he hoped the developer would follow through what had been mentioned.
- He was pleased with this application on the basis of its commitment to energy efficiency. This was mentioned extensively in the outline planning permission. He was pleased the homes to be built would be ahead of the future Homes Standard and he hoped this would be carried through to the rest of the development.
- The use of attenuation ponds for drainage would start to address concerns of local residents and others regarding drainage on the site.
- Question: Could officers elaborate on the issues of screening for residents on the development as notified by one of the objectors and the developer during his speech?
- We should be setting good precedents for this development moving forward. It largely encompassed a big chunk of his ward and other streets such as Hartsholme Drive, which he didn't think in the outline planning permission were to have additional houses attached to them, so he had some sympathy for comments made about additional houses being attached to Grosvenor Avenue.
- Question: Could he have reassurance that additional houses were not going to be attached to other areas of the development or other roads abutting the site.
- He supported in principle Councillor Bean's suggestion that a condition should be imposed on Pig Lane once the main road was opened for it not be used for any access for works traffic unless there was a very good reason why not.

The Assistant Director for Planning offered the following points of clarification to members:

- In relation to Pig Lane, the Construction Management Plan stated that the new road would be the principle access for the site, which was conditioned on the outline planning permission consent. He would invite the Planning Team Leader to comment further within his presentation for the next

planning application on tonight's agenda on the haul road, as it was interrelated.

- There was a reason why 2 car parking spaces per household had been agreed for this first stage of the development, although it was intended to be 1.5 car parking spaces throughout the entirety of the scheme.
- This was because 1.5 spaces was a notable reduction in what was typically found on new schemes. Whilst moving towards modal shift was our ambition and where we needed to go, this needed to be supported by all the relevant infrastructure and changes that would happen across the City in general, which were not fully in place at this point in time. In this very first phase we needed to work as we were now, therefore, the two spaces per dwelling were considered to be appropriate and reasonable.
- This matter could be revisited on the original condition of outline planning permission, stage by stage for each reserved matters application, which could potentially vary as each application came forward dependent on the nature of the development and number of properties, typology etc. Some developments would require more parking and some less.
- In terms of the screening, there was a plan within the documentation as part of the proposal, which listed all the boundary treatments including additional screening from new planting, new trees, boundary walls and fence lines. As part of this proposal, at the end of Grosvenor Avenue a close boarded fence would be erected between the existing property at the end of the Grosvenor Avenue and the first of the new properties on Grosvenor Avenue. Officers were satisfied that adequate screening would be provided.
- From a planning point of view, there had never been any stipulation one way or another that any development should or should not be accessed directly from Grosvenor Avenue. Clearly because of the nature of the site, it would be somewhat odd if we didn't have a section of the site which didn't address Grosvenor Avenue, given its location. The change wasn't considered to be harmful although it was something the residents would notice. Only one of those properties had direct vehicular access from Grosvenor Avenue which should limit movements, with the remainder being served from the parking courts as described earlier.

Questions and comments from Members continued

Councillor Tweddle

- Question: Could an assurance be given that trees would be replaced within our policy of 2 to 1? She accepted that the trees to be removed were of relatively low standard, but they were trees nonetheless and they were important.
- In terms of wildlife it was pleasing to welcome bat boxes, bird boxes etc. We talked about climate change, cars, solar panels, and heat source pumps but wildlife was an important part of how we maintained our planet too. The development land was a green area which added to the carbon capture, and it was important it was given mention as well.
- Question: The design - She couldn't say she was overwhelmed by the design of some of the houses, which was a subjective view. For the initial stage of such a big project it would have been good to incorporate some real aspirational design types of houses. Was that due to function over form? Were we limited in how we designed some of these homes by climate credentials or could we make improvements moving forward later in the scheme?

- She disagreed with Councillor Clarkson. She thought the idea of taking cars away from the front of houses was quite important in terms of streetscape, creation of a sense of place, and responsibility to some extent. The area where she lived was very similar to the proposed development being very green, but cars were everywhere. There wasn't adequate parking provision. When it was built in the 1950's, people had less cars. Cars caused problems in terms of how an area looked and felt, grass became churned up and it was sometimes difficult to navigate paths, a pleasing streetscape added to the feel of the place and a community sense of belonging.
- She felt it was ironic to complain about parking spaces being at the rear of the houses, then equally complain about cluttered cars at the front of the homes. We couldn't opt for both choices and by taking the car parking spaces away from the main routes it offered more greenery, a better view and hopefully less cars.
- One of the images of the proposed street scene showed a grass verge straight on to the road, whilst others had paths, then the grass verge and then the road, or road, grass verge then path.
- Question: Had we considered mitigation measures to prevent cars parking on the grass verges; although it was great to see verges along roads, their openness/greenery had to be managed. Parking of cars there would detract from the area.
- The green credentials of the scheme were good, we must be entirely inspirational with what we did with this project. She agreed with Councillor Dyer's point. The applicant was a reputable builder and we needed to set a high standard. This development represented the first 52 houses only. She was aware of the restrictions placed on the first phase of development by the infrastructure required to be in place, and considered that the scheme was unique in its own way as a small start. However, if we were going to reach our climate targets and change the world in the way it was needed fairly urgently, we must be setting the standard in terms of our expectations from our houses and areas. In saying that, the scheme represented the greenest development she had ever seen on Planning Committee, and it was a good start as long as we never lost track of climate change ambitions and held this in high regard when moving forward with the rest of the project.

Councillor Clarkson

- Point of personal explanation: He wished it to be recorded that he was not against parking to the rear of properties, or advocating parking in front of properties, his main objection to the development was the use of parking courts collectively, and the fact that it went against some strong recommendations made by the police. He didn't want vehicles parked on the spine road, or vehicles parked in front of properties; what he did want to see was parking on properties rather than in open parking courts.

Councillor Preston

- She supported Councillor Tweddle's comments regarding biodiversity in ecology.
- She also agreed that compared to a lot of schemes she had seen in her lifetime, this was very impressive in terms of its environmental credentials and aims in terms of sustainability.
- Looking through the agenda papers, she highlighted some key points.
- One of these points related to biodiversity at page 22 of the bundle, where it stated that *'to further strengthen biodiversity, the agent had advised there was no objection to the provision of bat boxes on suitable mature trees, bat bricks within a selection of buildings, bird boxes in the fabric of*

buildings and on suitable trees’. Officers had suggested that this be conditioned on any grant of consent. Although overall she was very impressed with this application she did have small concerns. This statement did seem quite weak in terms of, for example, compensation for some of the losses, a ‘*selection of buildings*’ could be regarded as a subjective comment. For example, it could mean ‘two’.

- She requested reassurance be provided that proper thought would be given to a substantial amount of compensation for the loss of the other trees in terms of these bat boxes. Also, the bird boxes in the fabric of the buildings.
- She was not an expert on these matters, however, there had to be some sustainability to prevent these measures being put into houses, followed by alterations to the properties in 20-30 years’ time which resulted in there being hardly any bird boxes left. These bat and bird boxes needed to be a key part of the design of these buildings rather than just given ‘lip service’.
- She was also going to echo Councillor Tweddle’s concerns regarding the design of these buildings, some of which were better than others. Some attracted interest in terms of their arched windows, as shown at page 53 of the agenda bundle, however, it would be lovely to see some interesting brickwork around them.
- In terms of the white rendering on some of the properties, a block of flats in her ward with similar finish had tended to look tired a few years down the line and hadn’t aged well, which raised concerns.
- The property portrayed at the top of page 55 of the agenda bundle did not have very interesting lintels to the windows. There may be environmental design reasons for this, however, they looked somewhat similar to a ‘childlike’ drawing, with only a small piece of brickwork between some of the windows.
- Overall, these were lovely properties, with some needing a little more thought. She just wanted her comments to be recorded on paper.

The Assistant Director for Planning offered the following points of clarification to members:

- In terms of the trees, as members had seen as part of the documentation, a lot of the trees on site at the moment were in groups, and had been assessed by our tree officer as not worthy of retention and of low amenity value. However, there were a number of new extra heavy standard trees proposed as part of the landscaping scheme for the development. Officers considered this would qualify to offset the loss of those less valuable trees. The wider site also gave significant opportunities for considerable uplift and increase in tree planting biodiversity net gain, because of the nature of the site and the developable areas that would be available. We were satisfied as officers that the issue had been well and truly covered as part of the proposal.
- In respect of the verge issue, the specific details were covered in the full application approved at the same time as the outline planning application for the access into the site, and as such was determined in the consent already given. However, in order to allay concerns regarding some vehicles parking, he added that there were swales along the edge of the road to cause a significant dip which in itself would police all but the ‘avid off-roader’ in a car from parking there. Therefore, hopefully, this would not be a significant problem.
- From a design point of view, clearly the application in front of Committee this evening was for members to determine whether or not they considered

it was acceptable. As officers we were comfortable with the proposal in design terms. In relation to materials, render was suggested on some of these dwellings. All of the materials would be the subject of a planning condition; therefore officers had the opportunity to make sure the best quality possible materials were used. There were better products on the market these days in terms of coloured render which weathered better, was more robust and required less maintenance. Officers felt they could adequately cover this as part of the condition process as well.

- In terms of biodiversity elements and some of the measures proposed in relation to bat boxes, bird boxes, bat bricks, bird bricks etc, together with the reference to a 'selection' of the proposed properties, as required by a condition of the scheme to be delivered, we would consult with Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust to be advised on where the bird/bat boxes etc were most suitable to be located. He had limited knowledge in terms of elevation, where to place bird boxes, not liking to be faced south etc because it was too warm. It would not necessarily be appropriate on every building however, officers would deliver as much as we could through this consultation with the Wildlife Trust.

Councillor Tweddle asked whether the condition regarding rendering should be made more solidified to ensure the surface did not deteriorate in ten years' time?

The Assistant Director for Planning advised that from his perspective, he felt the existing condition covered it, and it was the remit of officers ourselves to make sure we paid due regard to this specifically, which we would do.

No further questions or comments were forthcoming from members.

The Chair moved to the vote.

(Councillor N Chapman did not vote as she left the room before the vote was taken and had not been party to the full debate.)

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- Time limit of the permission
- Development in accordance with approved plans
- Samples of materials including hard surfacing
- Windows and doors to be set in reveal
- Location and sound level specifications for ASHPs
- Surface levels for the estate roads and footways
- Implementation of tree protection measures
- Implementation of tree planting and landscaping
- Scheme for the provision of bat boxes, bat bricks and bird boxes
- Programme of archaeological work completed in accordance with WSI

58. Western Growth Corridor, Skellingthorpe Road, Lincoln - Haul Road

Simon Cousins, Planning Team Leader, presented a visual power point display in which he:

- a) outlined the detail of the planning site location and proposal as follows:

- Submission of access reserved matter was requested for the construction of a Haul Road between Phase 1A Skellingthorpe Road and Phase 1B Tritton Road relating to hybrid (outline) planning permission 2019/0294/RG3
- Outline Planning Permission was granted for the Western Growth Corridor urban extension in January 2021 and at the same time full planning permission was granted for the first length of road and the junction with Skellingthorpe Road. The construction of this first length of road and the formation of the new junction was currently under way.
- Full planning permission was also granted for the first length of road, the construction of the bridge over the railway and the formation of the junction with Tritton Road at the same time as the works detailed above and the application now before Planning Committee sought permission to build a temporary road, a Haul Road, from Skellingthorpe Road, across the length of the Western Growth Corridor site, to the west side of the railway line adjacent to Tritton Road.
- This road would then be used to transport materials to and from the site of the road bridge over the railway to enable it to be constructed.
- The east side of the railway could be accessed from Tritton Road and the commencement of works on that side of the railway did not need a further application in relation to access.

a) referred to the site history to the planning application as detailed in full within the officer's report

b) advised that the application for Outline Planning Permission assessed the proposals for the Western Growth Corridor Sustainable Urban Extension taking account of National and Local Planning Policy; the application for the approval of Reserved Matters should conform to the extant planning permission

c) reported that:

- The application before the Council for consideration now was an application for the Approval of Reserved Matters – this meant the application sought to discharge, or partially discharge, conditions that were included on the Outline Planning Permission granted in 2021.
- The 2021 planning permission was the most significant material consideration and the details of how this proposal accorded with that permission was the relevant consideration for Committee.
- Equally, whilst the usual issues of visual and residential amenity were still relevant, the committee would have to decide how much weight to accord those issues whilst also considering the high level of weight to be attached to planning permission being in place for the new road and bridge which the haul road was intended to serve.
- The conditions which were relevant to the consideration of this reserved matters application were as follows (the 2021 planning permission was attached as an appendix to the application that preceded this one on your agenda – 2023/0736/RM).

- Each condition listed below required details to be submitted and/or compliance with existing approved details on the original permission:
 - i. 12. Details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout, scale (the reserved matters) – the temporary haul road is relevant to the matter of access;
 - ii. 19. Development in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment;
 - iii. 20. Up to date ecological appraisal;
 - iv. 21. Written Scheme of Investigation in relation to archaeology;
 - v. 22. Construction Management Plan;
 - vi. 25. Construction Environmental Management Plan;
 - vii. 29. Implementation of appropriate archaeological works;
 - viii. 34. Highway Construction Management Plan;
 - ix. 51. Air Quality Assessment;
 - x. 66. No removal of trees or hedgerows during bird nesting season;
 - xi. 69. Scheme for recruitment of workers from the local area.

d) outlined the responses made to the consultation exercise

e) referred to the Update Sheet circulated at this evening's Planning Committee which included an additional response received in respect of the proposed planning application

f) detailed measures within the officers report to address all of the above conditions as follows:

- The application for the haul road was a necessary consequence of the original approval of the road bridge over the railway at the eastern end of the site. The bridge and embankment/abutment could not be put in place entirely from the Tritton Road side of the railway.
- The detail submitted with the application indicated that the work in respect of the temporary haul route was programmed to commence before the new road and junction that formed Phase 1a of the development was completed.
- This road and junction work was currently under way and it was proposed that this would be the route into the site for the construction traffic once it was available.
- In the interim it was proposed that the haul road would be accessed from Pig Lane, which was an unsurfaced lane to the west of Burghley Close.
- It was proposed that the lane would be upgraded with a bounded surface suitable for the construction vehicles that would use it, and other temporary works would also be undertaken to facilitate the use of this route.
- Once the Phase 1a road became available traffic would switch to this point of access and then meet with the route of the haul road within the site.
- The applicants had submitted a Construction Management Plan and a Construction Highways Management Plan that detailed how the works would be undertaken and how the construction traffic would be managed, particularly where it entered and left the public

highway on Skellingthorpe Road. These details had been checked and validated by the County Council as Highway Authority.

- The applicants had also provided details as to how the traffic would be managed along the route of the haul road. Pig Lane was also used as a footpath route and also served the property known as Roe Deer House located close to the Catchwater Drain on the northern edge of Western Growth Corridor.
- The haul road would also cross public footpaths and so the management of the construction traffic, as carefully detailed in the documents accompanying the application would be important.
- The route of the haul road across the wider site, had been designed to minimise effect on standing trees and hedgerows and the applicant had submitted an up to date ecological assessment of the impact of the haul road. This also included an assessment of impact where the road would cross ditches and other potential habitat. The detail submitted was comprehensive and provided the necessary reassurance that any significant impact on biodiversity was mitigated.
- The applicants had undertaken an archaeological evaluation of the area of the haul road and the new connecting bridge, which had demonstrated that the Swanpool Roman Industrial site did not appear to continue into the area that would be affected by the proposed works.
- However, the evaluation did identify undated archaeological remains in a number of trenches, and it would therefore be prudent that monitoring and recording of groundworks be required to ensure that any finds or features could be recorded appropriately, especially in the light of Historic England's concerns regarding impacts to the nearby Roman remains, as set out in their letter dated 19/12/23.
- A written scheme of investigation which addressed these issues was currently in preparation in accordance with condition 21 of the outline permission and would be dealt with by planning condition as part of the consent granted.
- The applicants had submitted an assessment of air quality as required by condition 51. One neighbour consultee response had questioned the validity of part of that assessment and their representation was copied in full. The haul road was a significant distance from the nearest residential properties except for where it would utilise Pig Lane or the new signalised junction, and the hours of work would be restricted to 7am to 6pm Monday to Friday and 8am to 1pm on Saturdays. This would be a significant mitigation on the effects of noise on any residents.
- With regard to the scheme of local recruitment there was a condition on the original consent that required that a scheme of recruitment and employment by the contractors for each phase of development should be submitted with each reserved matters application, to demonstrate what measures would be taken to recruit workers from the local area. A statement accompanied the application which satisfied this requirement.

g) concluded that:

- The haul road was a necessary early part of the development which would facilitate the construction of the new road bridge over the railway from Tritton Road.
- The applicants had satisfactorily demonstrated that the impact of this haul road would be appropriately managed and mitigated.

Debbie Grant, local resident addressed Planning Committee raising objections to the proposed planning application. She covered the following main points:

- Good evening ladies and gentlemen.
- She thanked Members for allowing her the opportunity to address Planning Committee this evening.
- She was here to express her deep concerns and objections regarding a development near Lincoln Holiday Retreat, which was not only her home, but also the location of her family business.
- The retreat was nestled at the very end of Pig Lane. It was a haven of tranquillity and natural beauty.
- Its unique selling point lay with providing a retreat location amidst a natural habitat, allowing her guests to unwind in private in hot tubs with the Lincoln skyline view.
- We took pride in offering space through relaxation, exploration through lovely walks, bird watching and creating a pet friendly environment for all to enjoy.
- Over the years we had built a reputation for being a serene escape from the hustle and bustle of city life.
- Our location was a mile walk from Lincoln City Centre or the pub on the riverbank.
- We were an attraction for the wildlife enthusiasts and those seeking the wonder of our beautiful gardens and grounds.
- No longer the modest cultivation of land surrounded us now though. Now in the melancholic air of the sub-let fields, mud was being driven up and down the lane constantly, and degradation had occurred rapidly.
- It was unfair on authorised vehicles and pedestrians.
- Pig Lane, once a lovely journey had turned into navigation through a construction site and many entrances.
- Unfortunately this had impacted her enjoyment, her guest experience and every day running of her business, and consequently, her reputation regarding her means of access
- To cope with the adverse side effects of this, she employed someone seven days a week for two hours a day to clear mud and pot hole fill.
- She stressed that she was not opposed to progress or development, however, the current situation was causing her significant anxiety, frustration and loss of income.
- Despite assurances that businesses would not suffer and support would be provided, the reality was starkly different.
- Attempts had been made to discuss these concerns with the Chief Executive of Lincoln City Council, but they had met with delays.
- This left her as an isolated business owner with services and others reluctant or refusing to use Pig Lane.
- If the haul road crossing Pig Lane would all become a bonded surface, the issue of dry or wet mud would be a growing concern and both brought hazards.
- A sweeper was used on Skellingthorpe Road to disperse mud accumulation and debris, should Pig Lane not have the same respect?.

- The traffic laws were not being adhered to. The sweeper faced a challenge as it could not keep mud clear if the area being treated was not a bonded surface.
- The centre section of Pig Lane was made up of tarmac chippings, the Council obtained a quote for a bonded surface, however this work was not completed before construction work started.
- Clear and visible signage to the Retreat should remain on post to avoid confusion, and in principle, the presence of marshals was welcome to play a crucial role in addressing issues promptly and maintaining control.
- Availability of use should align with the operational hours of any site deliveries and priority should be given to her Retreat guests.
- The verge and dyke maintenance was important to protect the local wildlife, especially the Roe Deer jumping out, to prevent accidents and promote the well-being of the surrounding eco system.
- A security key pad gate was vital to stop unwanted visitors and nuisance experienced since the development started.
- The noise was a concern due to the nature of her business. HGV's cut corners at Pig Lane and mounted the pavement.
- We experienced heavy traffic and long waits, exiting was difficult.
- Increased haulage to the site would impact on the Retreat.
- She would further like to ask if borough pits would be connected to the haulage road alongside the gardens and the lane, this was very concerning and inconsiderate to her business.
- Due to many issues with the water supply of which the Council were aware since the development started, could she have a new water supply before the haulage road was installed.
- The contract farmers now entered and exited Skellingthorpe Road in convoys to access the sub-let fields. Would they also use this haulage road and then in the future drive through the new estate roads?
- She asked for a bridge at Main Drain to be relocated to stop driving through.
- *(Five minutes speaking time now ended)*

Alistair Lewis, representing the Applicant addressed Planning Committee in support of the proposed planning application. He covered the following main points:

- Good evening everyone.
- He was a Contracts Director with Graham Construction the applicant for the reserve matters application for this temporary haul route.
- Graham Construction were a U.K wide civil engineering contractor with considerable experience in the highway and rail sectors.
- Graham was appointed by the City of Lincoln Council in May last year to develop the design proposals for the new road and pedestrian bridges over the railway from Tritton Road.
- This part of the scheme availed from significant Central Government investment via the Levelling Up Fund.
- The construction of a temporary haul road was one of the first activities to be commenced as part of the construction phase of the project, and was essential for its success.
- Without boring the audience too much on why the haul road was essential;
- The new access bridge over the railway was located next to Chieftain Way as detailed on the map during the PowerPoint presentation.

- The bridge would provide access to the eastern end of the overall scheme, and future development of the 1b site, both of which already had planning permission granted.
- The Eastern approach to the bridge would be constructed directly off Tritton Road, however, access to the western side was currently restricted by the railway line and the Catchwater.
- The temporary haul road from Phase 1a to the rail over bridge, some 2 kilometres in length, was essential to build the western abutment and substructure ahead of the main bridge components being delivered.
- The bridge deck beams would not require access via the haul road as they would be lifted in place from the eastern side.
- Significant amounts of granular fill material would also be required to build the approach embankments. We intended to source this from within the site to avoid the need for significant deliveries, utilising the haul road.
- Phase 1a development adjacent to Pig Lane was well underway.
- The new access road from Skellingthorpe Road through the Phase 1a site was due to be completed later this summer.
- As construction of the haul road commenced before Phase 1a was available for use, vehicle access may initially be via Pig Lane. This shared access of Pig Lane was necessary to deliver the materials and equipment to construct the haul route.
- Once Phase 1a roads were completed, vehicular access would switch to the new infrastructure and interface to Pig Lane would be via a single crossing point.
- The route of the haul road had been carefully planned; preconstruction, environmental, geotechnical and archaeological investigations had helped its route to be determined.
- Moreover, the route had been selected to skirt along the existing hedge boundaries wherever possible. This avoided severance of agricultural lands into unsuitable field parcels and also minimised disturbance to the hedge lines and utilised existing field gates.
- The retention of the hedges helped to screen the existing properties from nearly all of the haul route. At its closest point, the Haul road was situated over 200 metres from the residential housing south-west of the Catchwater and over 800 metres south of the Lincoln Holiday Retreat.
- 'At the closest point' represented the start of the haul road, therefore, as the construction of the haul road continued that distance was actually increased.
- To construct the haul road a relatively small workforce would be required, plus some supervisory staff. This was due its linear nature providing limited work performance at any one time.
- A detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan had been developed for the project, including mitigation measures for construction related noise.
- In summary, the successful delivery of the bridge project required access to the western side of the railway via this temporary haul road, in order to build the western approach embankment and abutment prior to the main bridge components being installed.
- The haul road and its location, like the entire project, had been carefully planned to consider ecology, the environment, cultural heritage and stakeholders, to minimise any impact.
- *(Five minutes speaking time now ended)*

The Committee discussed the content of the report in further detail.

The following questions and comments were received from members and responded to by officers:

Councillor Bean

- Thank you. His question went back to his previous question. The haul road mentioned words such as 'as soon as possible' This didn't mean a great deal for local residents. More accurate timings on this were required because he had honestly thought unless he had missed it, that once the bell mouth was opened up, all works traffic would go through there, including any road traffic that was going to go through to the new bridge.
- Question: The Pig Lane road was obviously going to cost quite a sum of money to become a bonded road, together with other necessary provisions he was sure. Why was this money not being used in the first stage of the main road that was going to be built eventually?
- He was concerned for residents because they had already had a year of this, and were going to have to cope with more traffic, even though the bonded road would make a difference, possibly making it quieter with less dust, etc.
- There was a current issue of vibration which was being investigated, and consultations were being held with residents of some of the houses regarding this, together with cracks to their buildings. He was concerned that this application would get the go-ahead before the problems had been discussed and sorted with residents.
- Question: He didn't see why couldn't go through the main road to build this road. He also needed reassurance on timings; it could be 2, 3 or 4 years which was no good for residents. We needed a cap on the timeframe as a matter of urgency and respect to local residents.

Councillor Clarkson

- Three questions first please.
- Question 1: Was any consideration given to routing the temporary haul road along the proposed route of the Spine Road? Would that have resulted in any mitigation on the final cost of the Spine Road and speeded it along?
- He had listened to the reasons why the route of the haul road had been picked and fully appreciated it was essential to the completion of the project. Without it the bridge could not be built and Phase 1a, 1b could not go ahead, and little else without it.
- Question 2: What was the expected completion date for the new junction and the new road? He walked past it every day and had seen significant progress certainly in the last couple of weeks. As we had been told, that would be the main access once ready. When was it expected to be fully functional with permanent traffic lights and pedestrian crossings, signal controlled on each of the four legs?
- On page 109 of the pack, a Construction Vehicle Movements Plan was available, which gave a histogram of expected vehicle movements. He assumed these were return journeys, so 260 per week were actually 130 return journeys. This linked in with Councillor Bean's comments and the letter we were presented with at the start of the meeting from the residents of 1 Burghley Road, and the problems they had been suffering already.
- The plan started 6 May, week commencing 13 May right through to the week commencing 29 July, it projected 150 vehicle movements per day, then in August we moved up to 260. Taking the work timings that were given in the plan, from 7.00am to 6.00pm, 5 days a week and then the half day on Saturdays, through a working week 150 vehicles per week

represented 27 vehicle movements per day, or nearly 2.5 per hour, every 25 minutes or so. When it rose to the maximum of 260 per week, this was 47 movements per day, 4.3 per hour, every 14 minutes. That was significant movement.

- While Pig Lane was being used as the main entry and exit point from there, there was a real safety concern with the current positioning of the temporary traffic lights in that the entry to Pig Lane was within those traffic lights. In other words, it was not controlled by traffic lights. As you approached from the Hartsholme Lake end, when the lights changed colour to green in that direction, people waiting to come out of Pig Lane would either rush to jump the queue that they had just seen moving, or wait and tag on to the end of it. The next point to go green would be Birchwood Avenue, which often led to traffic that appeared to have jumped the lights, however, it was the traffic coming out of Pig Lane tagging on the end.
- Question 3: While Pig Lane was being used as the main exit route from the site, with these considerable number of vehicle movements, plus any other construction related traffic, would there be any additional traffic control onto that point of entry onto Skellingthorpe Road, which was not controlled by traffic lights?
- With 47 movements per day on top of any other construction traffic, that was significant, and created a significant disturbance for residents of Burghley Road and Haddon Close.
- Thank you.

Councillor Dyer

- He was broadly supportive of this application. It was clear we needed the access roads to build a bridge which was desperately needed as part of the development. Unless he had missed it, there wasn't a direct response within the report documents to the concerns raised by Mrs Grant and it was hard not to be moved by what she said regarding the impact of the development on herself and her business. He appreciated the applicants were not here to speak, so hopefully the officers were able to respond to the concerns raised by Mrs Grant. If not, he would find it very hard to support this scheme, specifically as the proposals were impacting not just a local resident, but local business as well.
- There were some comments made within her statement about the Authority not perhaps being as responsive as he would like from a public body. There were other various concerns raised about how the applicant was acting as a neighbour to their most impacted neighbour.
- Question: Could the Planning Authority provide a response to Mrs Grant?
- Question: Was there any condition that could be imposed to ensure that the applicant and developers kept Pig Road clear etc to positively respond to Mrs Grants concerns.? We wouldn't be doing our job as a Planning Committee if we didn't dig a little deeper into the comments that had been put in the report and raised here by Mrs Grant this evening.

The Planning Team Leader offered the following points of clarification to members:

- In response to Councillor Beans comment and that of Councillor Watt earlier, we were not party to the detailed construction timetable for the development as such. However, there was a clear intention within the Construction Environmental Management Plan for both this application and the previous application, together with a condition on the outline

planning permission, that when the new road was available it would be the principle source of access into the site.

- The graph referred to by Councillor Clarkson which talked about traffic movements indicated work would commence on the haul road in May/June time. In consultation with the applicant, we were expecting the new road into the site to be completed during the summer. While it was difficult to be absolutely definitive, discussion with the applicants again had suggested as a pessimistic view that it would be six months before that road was available. He was not sure from a planning point of view he could say any more than that.
- In terms of comments made by Councillor Clarkson in terms of the haul road relative to the Spine Road, as shown on the Masterplan, the Spine Road was an indicative route and subject to change through the master planning process which had recently started for the wider site. As mentioned by the applicants, the line of the haul road was chosen essentially as the line of least resistance across the site, to avoid ecological features and archaeological points of interest.
- The haul road was a substantial construction, the applicants were certainly aware of this and were considering how it could be utilised in the future were it not to be part of the line of the Spine Road through the site i.e. cycleways, footways across the development were being considered.
- In terms of the junction completion date he had mentioned this as the summer, although we didn't have a definitive date from a planning point of view. It was always difficult with these types of work, opening up a development was expensive and complicated Whilst we would all like the stars to line up perfectly, in terms of the new road being available in time for commencement of the haul road, that may not be the case. This was what the applicants were proposing and we were satisfied that there would be an element of overlap, clearly we would want this to be as short as possible.
- In terms of the histogram diagram referred to, together with traffic movements, the temporary traffic lights, traffic control on Skellingthorpe Road; in discussion with the Highways Authority those traffic controls would need to be adjusted for the volume of traffic mentioned. Ideally, by the time the significant numbers of traffic peaks hit the site, the new road would be available which would be fully traffic signalised and controlled.
- He understood Councillor Dyer's comments and the point he was making. He had listened and read Mrs Grants comments with interest. There was a lot of detail that he hadn't reported within the application from the applicant, in respect of how traffic would be managed along Pig Lane, how a significant element of it would be resurfaced to a level that was much improved from its current status, also times of work, and marshalling of the traffic.
- As the applicant had stated, at the closest point the haul road was 800 metres away from Mrs Grants property, which was a significant distance to giving reassurance in terms of noise and air quality. Equally, there was a control in terms of hours of operation. It would be difficult to add another condition stipulating that the road be kept clear, as there was already a requirement on the outline planning permission that access along Pig Lane and to the property to the north was maintained at all times. This was put on the outline planning consent originally, to ensure Mrs Grant would have access to her property and business, and to be able to operate successfully at all times.

Questions and comments from Members continued:

Councillor C Burke

- He referred to the letter from Historic England at page 119 of the agenda bundle, relating to the Roman ceramic industry, the significant remains of which were present on the site. He also referred to and our response as a Council on page 104, paragraphs 5 and 6. The significant part mentioned that a written scheme of investigation which addressed these issues was currently in preparation in accordance with condition 21 of the outline planning consent and would be reported in the update sheet if received before the meeting, otherwise a condition could be added.
- Question: Could officers give guidance as to whether or not a condition needed to be added this evening?

Councillor Smalley

- She felt a little bit disappointed, although she understood we needed change and new homes as a city. It was disappointing to hear from Mrs Grant that actually as a Planning Authority and a developer, we seemed to be letting people down.
- Whilst she was sure Mrs Grant appreciated at the start of the development that there would be some kind of impact, Councillor Smalley was not sure we were being entirely fair to how Mrs Grant had suffered a loss of income, and additional expenditure when reading the letter and looking at the detail of how much it was affecting her. Mrs Grant had reached out and not had much of a response. Councillor Smalley was concerned she wasn't getting a duty of care and felt we had clearly let her down there.
- Supporting Councillor Dyer's comments, we were happy to clean the road which obviously we should, however, when there were other businesses and people refusing to use the road at Pig Lane, we should be making sure that it was safe to use as well.
- Question: She wondered whether any further support or suggestion could be offered as to how we could assist?

Councillor Bean

- Question: Could the planning officer clarify his statement relating to a 'pessimistic view' that it would be six months before the new road into the site would be available, when did that six months start?
- Question: Where did this bring us to as regards to Pig Lane being able to return to its original use if there was no definitive date specified?
- This made it hard for him to vote at this stage of the planning application.
- In all his dealings in the local vicinity with local residents to the scheme, all the residents had been positive towards the contractors, Lindum, saying they had been very helpful and answered all their questions. He wished to put on record that many residents had been happy with the contractors responses to their concerns

The Planning Team Leader offered the following points of clarification to members:

- In response to Councillor C Burke, a condition was suggested on page 105 of the agenda bundle in terms of the archaeological written scheme of investigation that was referred to within the report. The condition dealt with any concerns that the City Archaeologist may hold, and dealt with the issues and representation made by Historic England.
- In terms of the concerns raised again by Councillor Smalley regarding the impacts on Mrs Grant and her business in particular, as previously stated we had a condition on the outline planning permission that Pig Lane

remained open at all times in order she could maintain access, and the two Construction Environmental Management Plans also reiterated this.

- The planning process could go so far in ensuring that a person's business was unaffected by development, and equally as members would appreciate, the applicants were in the room listening to the debate, he had no doubt that they would take away the comments and concerns raised, and we would seek to deal with them.
- In terms of a definitive date for the new road to be available, which he was reluctant to give and could not do so, the graph as part of the agenda bundle indicated a May start for the haul road, therefore six months from then was a pessimistic view of when the main road into the site would be available. It was hoped it would be ready by summer. Six months from May was November, which was why it represented a pessimistic view.

Questions and comments from members continued.

Councillor Clarke

- Could the planning officer offer a point of clarification. He walked past this junction every day and had seen significant progress on the Birchwood Avenue side of the development. The opposite side of the road seemed to be completed, however, since the hoarding fences were erected a few weeks ago it was impossible to see into the site.
- Question: Was as much progress being made behind the hoarding for the road that would lead to the temporary bridge as was visible at the Birchwood Avenue junction?
- Looking at the Birchwood Avenue junction it was hard to think it would be six months before it was completed. They were putting in the sub strata, bringing up the levels, laying the curbing and it looked as if they just needed to complete the fill out of the hole and lay the tarmac.

The Planning Team Leader advised that progress was moving forward rapidly, which was why he had used the word 'pessimistic' over six months. It was difficult to say for certain as unexpected things could happen. He felt that summer was the most likely completion timescale which was earlier than November.

No further comments or questions were forthcoming.

The Chair moved to the vote.

(Councillor N Chapman and Councillor D Armiger did not vote as they left the room before the vote was taken and were not party to the full debate.)

RESOLVED that:

That the application be granted subject to the following condition:

Condition

1. Submission of an archaeological scheme of investigation should it not be received before a decision is taken on the application.

59. Western Growth Corridor, Skellingthorpe Road, Lincoln - Substation

(Councillor Metcalfe and Councillor Smalley left the meeting at this stage in the proceedings. They took no part in the discussions or vote on the final matter to be determined.)

Simon Cousins, Planning Team Leader, presented a visual power point display in which he:

a) outlined the detail of the planning site location and proposal as follows:

- A hybrid planning application (2019/0294/RG3) granted full planning permission and outline consent in January 2022 for the development of the Western Growth Corridor (WGC) Sustainable Urban Extension.
- The full element granted permission for the means of access to the development from Skellingthorpe Road and Tritton Road. Works to construct the Skellingthorpe Road access and the first section of the spine road were currently underway.
- The outline element granted consent for the development of up to 3,200 dwellings, a local centre, primary school, commercial uses, leisure uses, highways infrastructure and open space.
- A reserved matters application for 52 homes within Phase 1A was being presented to Members for consideration tonight. Phase 1A was located to the north east of Skellingthorpe Road, opposite the junction with Birchwood Avenue.
- This application sought full planning permission for the erection of two substations, which were required to facilitate the delivery of the housing proposed within Phase 1A.
- One of the substations was located within Phase 1A, at the north corner of the development site, adjacent to the Grosvenor Avenue turning head. The other was located to the north east of the development boundary and the Catchwater Drain, to the south east of the spine road.

b) referred to the site history to the planning application as detailed in full within the officer's report

c) provided details of the policy pertaining to the application, as follows:

- Policy S53: Design and Amenity

d) provided details of the issues pertaining to the application, as follows:

- Visual amenity
- Highways and drainage

e) outlined the responses made to the consultation exercise

f) concluded that:

- There was no objection to the position of the substations or to their simple, functional design.
- They would not cause harm to the wider context.
- Matters relating to highways and drainage had been appropriately considered by the relevant statutory consultees.

- The proposals would therefore be in accordance with the requirements of CLLP Policy S53.

No comments or questions from members were forthcoming.

The Chair moved to the vote.

RESOLVED that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- Time limit of the permission
- Development in accordance with approved plans