



Officers Report

Planning Application No: 134103

PROPOSAL: Outline planning application for the erection of up to 300no. dwellings, ancillary public open space, landscaping, drainage with vehicular accesses from Hawthorn Road and pedestrian-cycle access from Green Lane with all matters reserved.

LOCATION: Land South of Hawthorn Road Cherry Willingham

WARD: Cherry Willingham

WARD MEMBER(S):

APPLICANT NAME:

TARGET DECISION DATE: 01/06/2016

DEVELOPMENT TYPE: Major - Dwellings

CASE OFFICER: George Backovic

RECOMMENDED DECISION: That the decision to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and the resolution of any outstanding archaeology issues, be delegated to the Chief Operating Officer, to enable the completion and signing of an agreement under section 106 of the Planning Act 1990 (as amended) pertaining to:-

- Capital contribution towards Primary School facilities (£665,309) in lieu of on-site provision;
- Capital contribution (£425 per dwelling) towards Health care provision (Total £127,500)
- Details of the provision, management and maintenance of open space comprising not less than 10% of the total site area,
- Provision of affordable housing on site (type and tenure to be agreed).

And, in the event of the s106 not being completed and signed by all parties within 6 months from the date of this Committee, or, in the event of no resolution of the archaeological issues, then the application be reported back to the next available Committee meeting following the expiration of the 6 months.

Description:

The site is located on the western fringes of Cherry Willingham and comprises a roughly square shaped area of land comprising sections of three fields separated by hedgerows. Hawthorn Road runs along its northern frontage with open countryside beyond. The Cherry Willingham Community School is located to the east with playing fields and tennis courts between the school buildings and the application site. A dense hedgerow runs along this entire boundary. To the south beyond the application site is agricultural land used for pasture with a rolling topography that falls away to the south. To the west of the site is open countryside. A relatively narrow off shot from the application

site extends in a south easterly direction towards Green Lane. Total site area is 13.13 hectares.

Proposal

This outline application seeks permission for up to 300 dwellings, ancillary public open space, landscaping, drainage reserved, with vehicular accesses from Hawthorn Road and pedestrian-cycle access from Green Lane with all matters reserved. Despite the outline nature of the application an indicative masterplan is provided showing that the access would be via two junctions with Hawthorn Road serving the residential development. Areas of public open space and planting are also indicated. A 3 metre wide shared pedestrian / cycle access is also shown linking to Green Lane to the south. A number of attenuation ponds are also proposed which form part of the overall surface water drainage strategy for the site.

The development has been assessed in the context of Schedule 2 of the Regulations and after taking account of the criteria in Schedule 3 it has been concluded that the development is not likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of its nature, size or location. Neither is the site within a sensitive area as defined in Regulation 2(1). Therefore the development is not 'EIA development'.

Relevant history: None

Representations:

Chairman/Ward member(s): Cllr Welburn: Requests that the application is brought to committee for determination.

Cherry Willingham Parish Council: A detailed response to the Transport Assessments and modelling has been submitted (Appendix 1)

Local residents: Objections have been received from:

Numbers 17, 19, 20, 23, 28, 82 (x2), 88, 94 and 121 Jubilee Close; 3 The Chase, Reepham; 1A Minster Drive, 23 Hawthorn Avenue, 3 Kennel Walk, Reepham; 4 Franklin Way, 10 Church Hill, 1 Heathcroft, 9 Elm Avenue, 3 Church Lane, 3 Becke Close and 92 Hawthorn Road. In summary:

With the now closure of Hawthorn Road which is going to cause endless problems for traffic, to have another 300 homes which is another 300 cars plus a lot of families have 2 cars (600) the traffic situation is going to be horrendous. Our village is disappearing into a huge estate. If this gets passed then the next field will be built on, where does it all end? The infrastructure is only just coping now, trying to get Doctor's appointment is hard enough. The roads are in a dreadful state already with the amount of traffic. Cherry Willingham village just cannot cope. Developers don't seem to take this into consideration. We already have more new homes being built off Hawthorn road/avenue. How much more traffic can a village cope with. Will the council

be prepared to spend thousands and thousands sorting out the roads and infrastructure, I don't think so !

Much attention has been given in the plans to encourage use of public transport or to travel by bike or on foot, however, people living in a country location use cars regardless. Access from the proposed site to Lincoln using Hawthorn Road will shortly be cut off by the new by-pass which leaves two ways into town from this site; either via Kennel Lane, Reepham to the main Wragby Lincoln road, or via Cherry Willingham Village. Neither of these roads is suitable for a heavy increase in traffic. The Cherry Willingham route is particularly bad, with many twists and turns, ups and downs and an awkward bridge and is routed right through much of Cherry housing, not to mention passing two schools along the way. It is so bad that I never use it myself unless traffic is very heavy at the Lincoln end. All the traffic currently using Hawthorn Road into town will inevitably be diverted past my property and into Kennel Lane, with its double bends and exit onto the fast moving traffic of the Wragby road. It is not adapted to handle even more traffic from this new development. What is being done to address this potential traffic nightmare?

Several small and large planning applications have been granted in recent years in Cherry Willingham which have gradually reduced the greener areas of the village and increased the population. The addition of 300 homes in one go would increase the housing stock by around 25% and the population by at least 10%. This edge of the village sprawl takes the village into town size territory and the impact on services and infrastructure potentially huge and unmeasured or accounted for in the associated documents.

There should be consideration of the available places at local medical practices, schools, dentists and not just an expression of interest in contributing but a financial agreement with agencies made integral as part of planning consent.

There should also be solid agreements with highways regarding speed limits, footpaths, street lighting and junction improvements. I live in an area of the village where footpaths and lighting were not wholly considered with planning consent and although a retrospective footpath was eventually installed after many complaints, lighting has never been added. The speed limit, at 40mph, especially as it nears village limits is frighteningly exceeded and is not able to be effectively enforced or calmed. These are situations I would fear would occur in the case of this application. We should not rely on accident data alone we should be more proactive than that.

The impact of the closure of Hawthorn Road and the LEB is untested and the traffic reports conducted by the applicant are therefore not necessarily relevant and speculative. As the recent inquiry inspector noted a number of roads and junctions in the vicinity are already reaching if not at capacity.

The condition of Hawthorn Road is poor, it has been patched and minor repairs completed on many occasions but remains hazardous in both dry and wet conditions. The footpath/cycle path is well used, particularly by school

children. Two new junctions onto this road will create hazards for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. Especially should speed restrictions and lighting not be a planning condition.

Main concern is vehicular traffic in the area as there will be only 2 routes out of the site:

Through the centre of Cherry Willingham, passing the Secondary School, onto Fiskerton Rd and then onto the Outer Circle / Monks Rd roundabout. Out of Cherry Willingham via Kennel Road onto the A158. I do not believe that consideration has been given to the fact that Kennel Lane leads onto the A158 the main road to the coast. During the summer months and Bank Holidays this becomes a bottle neck, this situation can only be made worse by village traffic exiting and entering the village using this route. Has any provision been made for traffic control on these 2 routes? The third route currently out of the site via Hawthorn Rd will be closed by Lincoln Council as part of the new Bypass. It is a shame that mention of this proposed planning application was not available to be presented to the Public enquiry which did express concern about possible traffic concerns.

The junction at Green Lane is not suitably marked nor does it provide footpath access to this junction. Visibility from this junction due to its location and width is not very good.

The aesthetic character of the ancient meadow on which this application plans to develop would, obviously, be completely ruined, as will the Cathedral views for the residents of both Jubilee Close and the houses backing onto the rail line. Factors which will have been paid for by these residents in the form of house prices which will clearly be impacted.

Animal life on this meadow would be destroyed or driven out, there are families of rabbits, moles, and of course the horses on this land along with undoubtedly a lot of less visible wildlife.

High-speed broadband access. As fibre is not available at my particular house (despite the local exchange being converted) the only method I have to receive high-speed broadband is the Quickline wireless broadband service as recommended to me by West Lindsey District Council. This requires line of sight to Lincoln Cathedral, and should this be broken by any proposed development it will reduce me to a substandard ADSL circuit. As an IT professional who does most of his work from home this would be a huge problem for me and cause significant issues for my ability to do my job.

I bought this house for the specific reasons that it adjoined a quiet field with Cathedral views. I have an expectation of privacy as most of my garden is obscured from the view of anyone. I have access to high-speed internet as explained above. The removal of all these things will reduce my house price by an amount I have no idea how to quantify.

Any development on this plot would therefore have a direct impact on the

local traffic, the enjoyment of my property and views, my income from my job and my wealth from the value of my property. I have no choice therefore but to object to this application strongly.

As a village we have now had four housing developments in very recent years- Lady Meers, Waterford Lane, Jubilee Close and Cherry Paddocks we need to secure our village status or we will end up being over developed and just an 'extension' of Lincoln. This has happened to other villages and especially North Hykeham.

Finally, our current public transport to the village is not sufficient enough, we don't have a Sunday bus service. 300 new homes being built with the only vehicle access via Hawthorn Road with its impending closure due to the Eastern bypass will drive even more traffic through the village. There cannot be any provisions made as the decision to close Hawthorn Road at Bunkers Hill has already been made. This will mean potentially up to 600 more cars driving past a secondary school and through the village using either Croft Lane or Kennel Lane. I strongly object as I do not believe any consideration has been taken into account for inevitable traffic congestion and potential for accidents in a residential area.

There is no provision for traffic management as part of the plan to reduce the risks to pedestrians. The solution would be to place a number of well-lit crossings on Croft Lane, Hawthorne Road, Church Lane, Waterford Lane and High Street. This would have to be consulted with the local residents as they would be affected by light pollution, invasion of privacy and pollution from vehicles. Increasing the number of vehicles will increase local pollution in all categories which is an unfair imposition for the local residents. There are no details of plans for how the increase in pollution would be mitigated; we live in a quiet village for a reason.

There are no details on emergency vehicle delays to the development with the closure of Hawthorn Road, the increase in traffic through the village may slow response times for people living on the new development and the current residents To dismiss the potential delay is negligent.

The submitted plans show the introduction of a walkway along the boundary line of my property, connecting the new development to the school sports field. I have concerns that this would require lights to be fitted along the route and would shine into the rear of my home, in addition this would increase the footfall to the rear of the property and potentially impact on the noise within my home. At present there is a large degree of waste foliage within the rear area and I am concerned with its removal, how this will impact on my boundary fencing and potential up keep of the area. . The submitted plans do not show if this development will be brought to the same elevation as my property, with their being a drop in height of approximately 2 feet, I have concerns that any homes built would be able to look directly into the rear of my family home and invade our privacy, and ultimately affect the sale price of our home. The village facilities already stretched there does not appear to be due consideration to the village facilities, i.e. GP and school. To the rear of

my property, the plans show the inclusion of soak a way's, how are these to be managed and secured to avoid young children going into the area and potential for any flooding.

I have concerns that there are not enough details as to the type of houses to be build, at present I have a clear view and am concerned at any high buildings and their impact on limiting the light within my property. I have concerns about the noise and dust from the development and how its impact on the environment will be limited. In addition to site working hours in order to avoid any unnecessary disturbance to sleep patterns.

We wish to object strongly to the development on this site as the view from our property across open land will be disrupted. Our 4 year old daughter's bedroom overlooks the fields with animals, and we feel this is much more beneficial than overlooking a new housing development.

Chair of Cherry Willingham Primary School.

We currently have 294 pupils enrolled. In key stage 1 we currently have less than 10 spaces available. Within Key stage 2 we currently exceed the government's good practice recommendations with class sizes averaging 32.

We do not have provision to take pupils across any of the higher year groups. To try and strategically react to increasing demands the head teacher is in the process of converting a previous non-teaching area into an additional classroom for September 2016. This has incurred considerable costs from our capital budget. Once this space is completed we will not have any further options with the existing floor space to meet likely anticipated numbers that would be generated from the new build project. Significant capital would have to be invested to create new teaching space if families want their children to learn in a good, local, nearby community school.

It needs to be noted that a number of parents already bring their children from Lincoln and surrounding villages. Whilst acknowledging the safe learning environment that Cherry school offers it is also due in part because neighbouring schools (Carlton Academy, Scothern, Reepham and Nettleham) are already at capacity. With the increased catchment area it results in an increased traffic flow of parents dropping off/ picking up children in an already congested residential area. Our neighborhood PCSO and policing team are often required to complete audits and intervene in a prohibitive way when children and local residents are put at risk.

With major vehicular access for the development proposed via Hawthorn Road it can be reasonably anticipated that there will be a significant increase at key points of the day. The school along with the LEA, road safety partnership and police have tried to put in place strategies to minimize risk. Options are now limited. Inevitably with increased numbers this may be further compromised. Parents are also likely to then enter Lincoln via Fiskerton road on leaving / returning to school, thus adding further congestion to the east of the city, especially as the northern route out of the village will be blocked through the development of the eastern bypass at some unspecified

date. Until I brought this information to Mrs. Evans the head teacher she has not been made aware of any plans or consulted on the strategic implications for the primary school. On a personal note, Cherry Willingham prides itself as a village community. It has over recent decades adapted to local demands and society's needs. However, throughout this it has remained distinct from Lincoln. The race to become part of suburbia in a greater Lincoln area is not one that we should willingly accept or be driven to. I trust that these significant factors will be taken into account when determining if the proposal goes to the next stage of the consultation process. The implications for public services across parts of the community are likely to be significant in an already over stretched financial environment if recommendations are made to go ahead without effective planning.

Jubilee Park Management Company

We write as the agents for the Jubilee Park Management Co Ltd, the Management Company for the public open space associated with the existing residential development to the south-east of the application site. The land to which I refer is identified on the 'Opportunities and Constraints Plan' within the planning application as 'existing green space' and is adjacent to Jubilee Close. It has been brought to our attention that the application proposes, or at the very least suggests the potential of, a pedestrian connection from the development site through the public open space and onwards to Croft Lane. This land is within our ownership and there is no public right of way that would allow access from the adjoining land through the open space. Furthermore, we have not been approached about the potential for a right of way, nor would we be willing to enter into negotiations on this matter. In short, this is not a pedestrian connection that would be deliverable by the applicant and we lodge an objection to any scheme which proposes this. In addition, it is also noted that the same Opportunities and Constraints Plan identifies possible connections to the north and south of the School's playing field. Again, as far as we are aware, there are no public rights of way over this land and therefore we would severely question the ability of these connections to be delivered.

Freeth solicitors on behalf of Taylor Lindsey

We are instructed to act on behalf of our client, Taylor Lindsey Limited, to submit an objection against the above planning application.

In summary it is submitted that the application proposal does not constitute sustainable development as defined by paragraph 7 of the NPPF and does not represent an appropriate solution to deliver the housing requirements of Cherry Willingham. The site is outside of the settlement boundary and poorly related to the main built up area of the village causing harm both in landscape and sustainability terms and compares weakly to the alternative sites proposed for allocation in the emerging Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. The Development Plan comprises the Saved Policies of the West Lindsey Local Plan (2006). The main relevant policies guiding the principle of development are Policy STRAT12 (Development in the Open Countryside), Policy STRAT3 (Settlement Hierarchy) and Policy SUS1 (Development Proposals and Transport Choice).

In terms of emerging policy the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan will shortly commence public consultation (15 April 2016) on the Proposed Submission Local Plan. The Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee approved this consultation in March 2016 and as part of the background papers, the Proposed Submission Version of the Plan is available to view. Policy LP52 sets out residential allocations in 'Large Villages' and identifies that sites CL1179, CL1181 and CL 4433 should be allocated for development within Cherry Willingham, providing a total of 373 dwellings. These sites are located on the east side of the village, situated adjacent to each other and are owned and promoted by our client, Taylor Lindsey.

Policy STRAT3 defines Cherry Willingham (but excluding Hawthorn Avenue) as a primary rural settlement which is second with the hierarchy to the towns of the district. Whilst Policy STRAT6 allows limited small scale and infill housing within the confines of the settlement boundary, the application site is neither small scale or within the settlement boundary. Accordingly the site is within 'open countryside' and the principle of development falls to be considered under Policy STRAT12. This policy confirms that development will not be granted for development proposals outside of the settlement unless it is essential to the needs of agriculture, horticulture, forestry, minerals extraction or other uses which require a countryside location. The principle of residential development is therefore contrary to the adopted local plan in regards to its location, although clearly regard is required to the NPPF and in particular paragraph 14, the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The merits of the 'planning balance' are considered below

Although adjacent to the settlement boundary, the position of the proposed development has an awkward relationship with the existing built up area of the village. With the exception of the school buildings which broadly form 50% of the eastern boundary of the part of the application site envisaged for development, the site is bordered by open countryside, which is situated to the north, west and south. Even to the east the school's playing fields form approx. 50% of the adjoining land, contributing to the green character and peripheral location of the surroundings. As a consequence the development site relates poorly to the pattern of built development in the village and the scheme would be detrimental and visually intrusive to the character of the countryside and settlement.

The Landscape Character Assessment commissioned by the Parish Council (dated 2014) to inform the Cherry Willingham Neighbourhood Plan recognizes the above point, with land identified as '1B' in the assessment (which covers the majority of the application site), advising that any development, in landscape terms, should be restricted purely to the edge of the settlement. The application site is largely classed as being sensitive to change with a high visual sensitivity and important views existing from Hawthorn Road to the edge of the settlement and the wider landscape. The proposed scheme would have a significantly harmful impact on such views and given the scale and density of the scheme, this will not be satisfactorily mitigated.

The Planning and Design and Access Statement, Indicative Masterplan and the Opportunities and Constraints Plan discuss the merits of the application in terms of walking and cycling provision and accessibility to key services. However, in practice connection to the village centre appears significantly more problematic than reported. Pedestrian routes from the site to the east are shown on the Opportunities and Constraints Plan but there appears no evidence to demonstrate that these routes are available. Two potential routes are identified at the north and southern boundaries of the school playing fields, but no right of way exists and this involves access of private land. The playing field is associated with the school and is not publically accessible open space. In addition the Opportunities and Constraints Plan appears to advocate the potential of a connection through open space associated with the residential development to the south east of the site. The masterplan does not show any route linking to open space and any route would be divorced from the proposed housing and would require land outside of the application site. Again there is no public right of way through the open space identified on the Opportunities and Constraints Plan and this is owned by the management company responsible for its maintenance. Having regard for these factors connection through to Croft Lane from the site does not appear deliverable and this is significantly harmful to the proposed development's accessibility and sustainability credentials. An alternative route is promoted via a proposed pedestrian and cycle link to Green Lane. However, the isolation of such a route is extremely questionable in community/crime safety terms and furthermore involves access via a bridge over the railway line that contains no separate pedestrian path. The distance to the village centre coupled with the safety concerns identified mean that this route is unlikely to be utilised by future residents. As a consequence residents will be left with no option but to access Croft Lane (and the village centre) via Hawthorn Road, which for particularly the southern half of the development is going to be unattractive and a convoluted route. On this basis the development is not considered satisfactorily well connected in pedestrian terms to the main services and facilities of the village and therefore fails the requirements of Policy SUS1 of the Local Plan. This deficiency is contrary to a core planning principle of managing patterns of growth to make the full possible use of non-car modes of transport, including walking.

As referenced above, the emerging Central Lincolnshire Plan has reached the Proposed Submission Consultation Stage and it is likely that the Plan will be submitted for examination prior to the determination of this application. In accordance with paragraph 216 of the NPPF the weight provided to emerging plans shall be dictated by the stage of preparation of the plan and the extent of unresolved objections. Whilst it is clear that full weight would not be appropriate, the emerging Central Lincolnshire Plan is making appropriate provision for dwellings to meet the requirement for Cherry Willingham and the sites proposed for allocation (CL1179, CL1181 and CL4433) have been thoroughly analysed and concluded to represent the best options for development for the village. These sites are significantly better related to the existing settlement in terms of the pattern of development, impact on landscape and accessibility and sustainability credentials.

As identified within this objection the proposed development would create a number of adverse impacts on settlement pattern, landscape character and through the failure to provide sufficiently accessible, safe and desirable pedestrian connections to the village's facilities and services. These adverse impacts would create significant harm against the social and environmental strands of sustainable development and competing against the background of more sustainable development options emerging through the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, it is concluded that the adverse impacts of the proposed development significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole.

Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans

Cherry Willingham Parish Council are in the process of producing a Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to support the proposed allocations to the east of the village within the emerging Central Lincolnshire Local plan (submission version April 2016). The Neighbourhood Plan has not been published as a draft Plan (Regulation 14) as of yet, but there are emerging policies within the document that seeks to refrain from major development taking place to the north of the village. Only once the Neighbourhood Plan has been published will it be available for formal public consultation. In the current West Lindsey Local Plan (2006), Cherry Willingham is considered a 'primary rural' settlement and where only limited (5-10 units) growth is encouraged away from the proposed allocations (STRAT 3). Although the emerging Central Lincolnshire Local plan identifies Cherry Willingham as a 'large village,' it is not focusing on allocating growth to the north of the village where this proposal is located, but instead looking to direct major growth to the east of the village. The proposed development site in contrary to the spatial strategy of both the existing and emerging local plan.

LCC Education

I can advise that a part education contribution is sought from the proposal. I have calculated the level of contribution relative to the proposed number of dwellings, the type of dwellings proposed and the current projected position in both local primary and secondary schools and school-based sixth forms, as we have a statutory duty to ensure sufficiency of provision.

This development would result in a direct impact on local Schools. In this case just the primary schools at Cherry Willingham are projected, notwithstanding the proposed development, to be full in the future to the permanent capacity of the school. A contribution is therefore requested to mitigate against the impact of the development at local level. This is a recognisable and legitimate means of addressing an impact on infrastructure, accords with the NPPF (2012) and fully complies with CIL regulations, we feel it is necessary, directly related, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development proposed in this application.

The level of contribution sought in this case equates to £665,309. This is on the basis of recent research by Lincolnshire Research Observatory utilised to

calculate pupil product ratio (PPR) and then that is multiplied by the number of homes proposed to calculate the number of pupils generated. This is then multiplied by the prevailing cost multiplier per pupil place to give the mitigation cost request. The PPR calculation illustrates that some 59 primary places will be required in the locality as a direct consequence of this development and, as there is insufficient capacity available, we propose the applicant should mitigate the effect of the proposal by payment of a capital contribution to allow creation of more capacity.

At present projections show that, excluding the effect of the development in question, Cherry Willingham Primary School will have no permanent surplus places by 2018 when it is reasonable to presume this development would be complete or well on the way.

As mentioned above, we feel our request complies with the policies and guidance set out in NPPF (2012). It is necessary, reasonable and directly related to the proposed development and we have taken into account up to date projections of pupil numbers in existing schools.

I have used the hypothetical mix of houses provided by the applicant to illustrate the likely level of contribution and formulae could be used in the requested S.106 agreement that details the eventual total to be paid, based on the full or reserved matters application. I set out below the impact in terms of number of pupils relative to the 2, 3, 4+ bedroom dwellings proposed within this application:

House Type	No of Properties	PPR Primary	Primary Pupils	PPR Secondary	Secondary Pupils	PPR Sixth Form	Sixth Form Pupils
2 Bedroom	94	0.09	9	0.09	9	0.018	1
3 Bedroom	78	0.17	13	0.17	13	0.034	3
4+ Bedroom	113	0.33	37	0.27	30	0.054	6

The calculation of the contribution is therefore: 59 Primary Places at £12,257 equals £723,163.00. 52 secondary places at £18,469.00 which is reduced to zero due to capacity at Cherry Willingham Community School. 10 school based sixth form places at £20,030 which is reduced to zero due to capacity at Cherry Willingham Community School.

Total contribution - £723,163 x 0.92 (local multiplier)* =£665,309

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

I would confirm that the County Council seeks that a S.106 agreement is entered into in this case, noting the significant cumulative impact of this application alongside other developments currently proposed in Cherry Willingham and surrounds. Without a capital contribution the education infrastructure will be unable to match pupil numbers and an objection considered otherwise.

The funding could be held by the LPA or County Council and only spent by The County Council on two additional classrooms at Cherry Willingham Primary School. We would suggest the S.106 monies are paid at the halfway point in the development to allow timely investment by LCC whilst not adversely affecting the developer's viability.

Please note LCC retains the Statutory Duty to ensure sufficiency of school places and this includes capital funding provision of sufficient places at academies. We would invest the funding at the most appropriate local school/s regardless of their status but ensure the S.106 funding is used only to add capacity as this is the only purpose for which it is requested.

I can confirm that we will ensure that no more than 5 S.106 contributions are pooled towards a specific piece of infrastructure and that prior to committing the money we will contact the LPA and contributor to make them aware of our intended use of the S.106. This will ensure transparency of use and to reconfirm that no more than 5 contributions are ever pooled towards a specific item of infrastructure.

NHS England

The development is proposing 300 dwellings which based on 2.3 per dwelling¹ for the West Lindsey District Council District Local Authority (WLDC) area may result in an increased patient population of 690. Any future increase in population place constraints on existing premises, for example extra appointments lead to additional consulting/treatment room requirements. The practice that is most likely to be affected by any increase in population as the development is within their catchment area, is the Nettleham Medical Practice at Lodge Lane Nettleham LN2 2RS as their branch surgery is at Cherry Willingham.

The branch surgery at Cherry Willingham is of a typical 1980s construction, there is potential for an extension but with restricted access.

All practices with a general medical services contract is obliged to accept patients who choose to register at their practice if it is within their prescribed practice area, unless there are extenuating circumstances. Patient waiting lists do not exist. The total practice list size is circa 11400 and has grown by 3.6% in the last 2 years any further increase and the level of patient care will be compromised. The development will result in an additional 22.9 clinical hours per week. This will require an increase in clinical staff and generate extra administrative support. This in turn has an impact on consulting space, treatment rooms, waiting room availability and storage for the extra medical records. Nettleham village itself is currently subject to several planning applications under consideration, those proposals will have an overall impact on the practice.

The practice is a training practice which means there are additional GPs required on site. In order to cater for a further 690 population and manage the workforce situation it will be necessary to amalgamate at the Nettleham site and make it easier to offer extra services there.

The S106 contribution would provide capital towards building a notes storage facility at Cherry Willingham along with an extra multipurpose/clinical room. The storage facility will allow the movement of all the medical records from Nettleham to Cherry Willingham thus enabling the creation of 2 consulting rooms at its main site to consolidate its services there.

The table shows the contribution formula which is based on the needs of a Primary Care Health Team and associated administration support. By applying average national list sizes to these groups and identifying the required area and furnishings, a total cost of £185 is determined per patient. This figure is multiplied by 2.3 (the average number of persons per dwelling for WLDC) to provide a funding per dwelling of £425. **The contribution requested is £425 x 300 (dwellings) = £127,500**

LCC Highways (Principal Transportation Projects Officer)

I have been provided with the original Transport Assessment (TA) for this proposal to respond to as I check all TA's for the Highways Authority.

I can confirm that I am awaiting Mouchel Consultants (our Alliance partner) response to the Cherry Willingham Parish Council letter in which they question various aspects of the TA and traffic modelling. I have had to wait for Mouchel's response as they represented the Highways Authority at the Lincoln Eastern Bypass (LEB) enquiry. I want to ensure for consistency that they respond to the queries raised in the letter which are similar to those queries raised at the enquiry as the Highway Authority evidence was ultimately accepted by the Department for Transport.

I do not consider the scheme will have a severe impact on the surrounding highway network in the context of para.32 of the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly with the Lincoln Eastern Bypass due to open in 2018/19. The Inspector at the enquiry for the LEB and the Department of Transport has accepted the Highway Authority evidence provided for the LEB (which included development growth) and therefore on purely traffic impact this proposal is also likely to be acceptable in my view.

A further response from the Highway Authority representing its formal view taking into account the comments above regarding traffic impact, will be made.

LCC Archaeology

This application has a small paragraph dedicated to the archaeological potential of this site and for a development of this size this is insufficient. I was contacted at a pre-application stage to advise if I would require any work to be

done to support an application for development on this site and I recommended that geophysical survey should be undertaken in the first instance. Metal detecting close to this site has recorded a number of multi-period artefacts that could be suggestive of activity in this area. It should always be remembered that absence of evidence is not evidence of absence and little archaeological work has been undertaken in this area.

Insufficient information is available at present with which to make any reliable observation regarding the impact of this development upon any archaeological remains. I recommend that further information is required from the applicant in the form of an archaeological evaluation to be considered alongside the application. This evaluation should provide the local planning authority with sufficient information to enable it to make a reasoned decision on this planning application.

Recommendation: It is requested that the developer is required to supply more information in the form of an archaeological evaluation to be carried out prior to determination. It is recommended that the evaluation should in the first instance be comprised of geophysical survey across the site, dependant on site conditions as overhead lines crossing the site were mentioned in the design and access statement which could interfere with the results. This will then help to identify if and where features of archaeological interest exist and will inform where further intrusive evaluation is required to inform the application to identify the nature, extent and significance of any archaeological features on the site. "Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment, and where necessary, a field evaluation." Policy 128. National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

(Archaeology – awaiting further comments following completion of geophysical survey of the site)

Network Rail

No observations

Lincs Wildlife Trust

We have read the ecological report submitted and are satisfied that provided the recommendations are followed, there should not be any significant negative impacts on protected species or habitats as a result of the proposed works.

We support the proposed inclusion of 'natural' open space and SUDS areas which together form a significant proportion of the development area. The design and access statement indicates that the SUDS ponds will be designed to provide wildlife habitats with shallow margins and surrounded by meadow flora. It is not clear whether any of these will be designed to hold water permanently or whether they will be more ephemeral in nature. We would suggest that to provide the maximum biodiversity gains and with the hope of benefitting the existing great crested newt population which is present in the ponds in Cherry Willingham, a mixture of ephemeral and permanent

waterbodies should be created which will be suitable for a range of amphibians and invertebrates as well as providing a water source for mammals and birds. We would also recommend that consideration is given to the provision of hibernacula within the areas of open space near to waterbodies or terrestrial habitat which may attract amphibians and reptiles.

We support the use of a wildflower mix within the landscaping scheme and would strongly recommend that this consists of native species, preferably of local provenance. We would encourage widespread incorporation of species rich grassland throughout the areas of green space, in association with the SUDS features and where possible on wide grassed verges, as borders surrounding more formal open spaces and as flowering lawns in gardens.

Habitat links should be provided wherever possible to join up areas of green space around and within the development to ensure that they do not become isolated by the built environment and to allow movement of wildlife around the site and into the wider countryside. We support the recommendation by the ecological consultants to raise fences or provide gaps at intervals to allow hedgehogs to pass safely underneath and maintain connectivity between areas of garden.

We would also strongly encourage the inclusion of features for bats on suitable mature trees and would expect a development of this size to incorporate a significant number of bat bricks within suitable buildings on site, and for provision of features for declining urban birds such as swifts, swallows and house sparrows as well as nest boxes on suitable trees. Detailed guidance and specifications for built in features are available within *Designing for Biodiversity: a technical guide for new and existing buildings*, 2nd Edition, RIBA Publishing (Gunnell et al, 2013).

We would wish to ensure that the maximum biodiversity benefits are achieved for this site and would be pleased to have the opportunity to comment on landscaping details for the site.

Trees and Landscape officer: I have no objections to proposed development on this site. Seven trees meet the criteria for a TPO.

There are a range of hedgerow densities, from very sparse with more gaps than hedge, to a hedgerow which appears to be of good quality. Suitable conditions for boundary hedgerows should include a hedgerow protection condition requiring protective fencing to be placed at least 2m from and parallel with any hedgerows which are to be retained. Any boundary hedgerows with gaps or are found to be thin should have a scheme of infill planting to fill gaps and sparse areas. Hedgerow planting should consist of locally characteristic native plants, with the dominant species being 80-85% hawthorn, to be planted in double staggered rows 300mm apart, with 4-5 plants per linear meter.

Existing trees along the hedgerows should have protective fencing erected prior to any site clearance, setting out, or construction commencing, and should be

retained in place until completion. The positions of protective fencing should be calculated for each tree and provided to the council for prior approval.

This development is within agricultural land at the edge of Cherry Willingham. The current edge of the village includes views of the hedgerows and trees down the westerly side of the school and playing field. This proposed development would create a large area of housing much more prominent in views from the road to the north when approaching Cherry Willingham from the west, and close to the roadside. Therefore, to manage the visual impact of the proposed development, and minimise visual impact and intrusion into the countryside views, a landscape belt down the westerly side and a landscape scheme to include some tree planting across the northerly side would help reduce its impact on the surroundings. Any landscape belt along the westerly side should include new hedgerow planting along the boundary line, and a band of native tree planting at 5m wide. Details to be provided by condition.

Assuming any entrance from the road to the north would involve a visibility splay or possibly a road splay to filter on/off the existing road, it is likely that a long stretch of the existing hedgerow would require removing to facilitate the splays. If this occurs, some new hedgerow planting would be required to follow the edge of the new boundary alongside the splays.

Details for appropriate tree and hedgerow protection measures, in accordance with BS5837:2012, should be required and provided to the council for prior approval as part of any subsequent RM or Full application.

Tree protection measures should be positioned at the outer extents of calculated Root Protection Areas.

Any final version of a site layout should ensure all built structures such as buildings, driveways, roads and footpaths are kept outside tree RPA's. Ideally a BS5837 Tree Report should be provided to provide info on tree conditions, but most importantly identify each tree category in the BS5837 cascade chart, tree crown spreads and their RPA's. A scheme of landscaping should be required, including hedgerow infill planting and the required boundary hedge infill planting as a boundary treatment condition

Natural England

No comments to make. The lack of comment does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment but only that the application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites. It is for the planning authority to determine whether or not this application is consistent with national and local policies on the natural environment.

Relevant Planning Policies:

National guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

<http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/>

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

<http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/>

West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The saved policies of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006 (WLLP) remains the statutory development plan for the district. Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), a material consideration, states that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

- STRAT1: Development requiring planning permission;

<http://www2.west-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan/written/cpt3a.htm#strat1>

- STRAT3: Settlement Hierarchy;

<http://www2.west-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan/written/cpt3a.htm#strat3>

- STRAT9: Phasing of housing development and release of land;

<http://www2.west-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan/written/cpt3b.htm#strat9>

- STRAT12: Development in the open countryside;

<http://www2.west-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan/written/cpt3b.htm#strat12>

- STRAT19: Infrastructure Requirements;

<http://www2.west-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan/written/cpt3b.htm#strat19>

- SUS1: Development proposals and transport choice;

<http://www2.west-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan/written/cpt4.htm#sus1>

- SUS4: Cycle and pedestrian routes in development proposals;

<http://www2.west-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan/written/cpt4.htm#sus4>

- RES1: Housing layout and design;

<http://www2.west-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan/written/cpt6.htm#res1>

- RES2: Range of housing provision in all schemes

<http://www2.west-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan/written/cpt6.htm#res2>

- RES5: Provision of play space / recreational facilities in new residential developments;

<http://www2.west-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan/written/cpt6.htm#res5>

- RES6: Affordable Housing;

<http://www2.west-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan/written/cpt6.htm#res6>

-CORE10: Open Space and Landscaping within Developments
<http://www2.west-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan/written/cpt8.htm#core10>

- NBE14: Waste water disposal;
<http://www2.west-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan/written/cpt11.htm#nbe14>

- NBE20: Development on the edge of settlements.
<http://www2.west-lindsey.gov.uk/localplan/written/cpt11.htm#nbe20>

Although not forming part of the statutory development plan, the West Lindsey Landscape Character Assessment (1999) (<http://www.westlindsey.gov.uk/residents/planning-and-building/planning-policy/evidence-baseand-monitoring/landscape-character-assessment/104847.article>) is a background document which forms a material planning consideration, particularly relevant to policies NBE10 and NBE20.

Emerging Planning Policy

The NPPF (paragraph 216) states that decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given); the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies and the degree of consistency with the NPPF.

The **Preliminary Draft Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (PDCLLP)** was released in October 2014 and has been subject to public consultation. The second **Further Draft Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (FDCLLP)** ran its formal six week public consultation period between 15 October and 25 November 2015.

The **Proposed Submission Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (SCLLP)** was agreed on the 14th March 2016 and completed its final public consultation on 26th May 2016. Following the collation of the comments received the Plan **was formally submitted on 30th June 2016 to the Planning Inspectorate for examination.**

The final adopted CLLP will replace the West Lindsey Local Plan. The Submitted Central Lincolnshire Local Plan represents an advanced stage in the development of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and its policies can therefore be attached some weight, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 216. The exact weight of each policy will depend on individual circumstances.

Relevant Draft Policies:

LP1: A presumption in favour of sustainable development

LP2: The spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy

LP3: Level and distribution of growth

LP4: Growth in villages

LP11: Affordable housing

LP12: Infrastructure to support growth

LP13: Transport
 LP14: Managing water resources and flood risk
 LP17: Landscape, townscape and views
 LP18: Climate change and low carbon living
 LP20: Green infrastructure network
 LP21: Biodiversity and geodiversity
 LP24: Creation of new open space, sports and recreation facilities
 LP25: The historic environment
 LP26: Design and amenity
 LP52: Residential Allocations

Main issues

1. Planning Policy
 - i) Provisions of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review
 - ii) National Policy
 - iii) Emerging Local Policy
2. Housing Delivery and Affordable Housing Provision
3. Landscape Character and Visual Impact
4. Highways Impact and Safety
5. Accessibility and Public Transport
6. Local Infrastructure
7. Public Open Space
8. Indicative layout and residential amenities
9. Archaeology
10. Ecology
11. Flood Risk and Drainage
12. Hawthorn Road "Closure"

Assessment:

1) Planning Policy

- (i) Provisions of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The saved Policies of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006 (WLLP) remains the statutory development plan for the district. The Proposed Submission Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (SCLLP) is a material consideration to be considered against its provisions.

The site is outside the settlement of Cherry Willingham as defined in the WLLP 2006. The site is not allocated for residential development. Cherry Willingham is identified as a Primary Rural Settlement within the Local Plan's settlement hierarchy (policy STRAT3).

The application site comprises arable fields and is bounded to the west and south by agricultural land with open countryside to the north on the opposite

side of Hawthorn Road by further open fields. The site has a clear open agricultural character and is considered to be in the open countryside and policy STRAT12 is applicable.

Policy STRAT12 does not support development proposals in the open countryside “unless the development is essential to the needs of agriculture, horticulture, forestry, mineral extraction or other land use which necessarily requires a countryside location, or otherwise meets an objective supported by other Plan policies.”

The application is proposed on previously undeveloped, or greenfield land. It falls on the bottom rung of policy STRAT9’s sequential approach towards the phasing of housing development and release of land.

Large residential development is not in compliance with policy STRAT12. It is at the bottom rung of policy STRAT9. A more detailed landscape and visual impact assessment will be considered below to see if the proposal accords with policy NBE20 of the WLLP.

The principle of development as proposed on this site is contrary to the provisions of the statutory development plan, and the application falls to be refused planning permission unless there are material considerations which indicate otherwise.

(ii) National Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and online Planning Practice Guidance, are material considerations to take into account alongside the development plan.

The NPPF post-dates the Development plan and requires Councils to “identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.” The buffer raises to 20% where there is a consistent record of under delivery.

The latest Housing Land Availability Assessment (May 2016) identifies a need of 11,531 dwellings across five years, which includes a 20% buffer and previous undersupply. The assessment identifies a land supply of 5.33 years (12,283 dwellings) in the five year period 2016/17 to 2020/21. The assessment includes:

- sites under construction;
- sites with full planning permission, but development has not started;
- sites where there is a resolution to grant planning permission;
- sites with outline planning permission;
- sites allocated in an adopted Local Plan; and
- sites not allocated in a Local Plan or without planning permission and which have no significant infrastructure constraints to overcome

- A windfall allowance

Planning Practice Guidance states that “Where evidence in Local Plans has become outdated and policies in emerging plans are not yet capable of carrying sufficient weight, information provided in the latest full assessment of housing needs should be considered. But the weight given to these assessments should take account of the fact they have not been tested or moderated against relevant constraints.”

The latest released five year supply figures are based upon an overall housing requirement for the plan period of 36,960 dwellings - this figure is based on a published Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). It is acknowledged that the methodology employed is yet to have been formally tested within the Local Plan examination – this is expected to be held in the summer 2016. However, substantial evidence reports have been published, including sustainability appraisal of all such sites, which intend to justify the selection of such sites.

Paragraph 49 of the NPPF states that “Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.” As the identified five year supply relies upon departures from the West Lindsey Local Plan Review 2006, then the extant plan no longer meets the objectively assessed housing needs of the Authority – its housing supply policies can be considered to be out of date, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 215. The WLLP’s policies for the supply of housing should therefore be considered out of date. Nonetheless, whilst this may limit the weight to be afforded to such policies within the planning balance it does not mean they should be disregarded or otherwise carry no weight.

The application should therefore be considered against the second bullet point of the NPPF’s presumption in favour of sustainable development, which for decision-taking means:

- approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and
- where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
 - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole; or
 - specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.

(iii) Emerging Local Policy

The emerging Central Lincolnshire Local Plan is a material consideration to take into account against the policies of the statutory development plan. The NPPF (paragraph 216) states that decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given); the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies and the degree of consistency with the NPPF.

The Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (SCLLP) is considered to at an advanced stage in the adoption process as it has now been formally submitted for examination. It therefore represents the final policy position of Central Lincolnshire which will be promoted during the examination process and accordingly can be attached more weight than previous incarnations.

Policy LP2 sets out a spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy from which to focus growth. Cherry Willingham is designated as a Large Village.

This policy states that “to maintain and enhance their role as large villages which provide employment, retail, and key services for the local area” they will “be a focus for accommodating an appropriate level of growth, Most of this growth will be via sites allocated in this plan, or appropriate infill, intensification or renewal of the existing urban area plan. In exceptional circumstances growth on non-allocated sites in appropriate locations on the edge of these large villages might be considered favourably, though these are unlikely to be of a scale over 25 dwellings / 1 ha per site (whichever is smaller)

Under Policy LP52: Residential allocations - Large Villages, three sites are allocated for residential development in Cherry Willingham:

CL1179 – Land north of Rudgard Ave (site area of 1.57 hectares). Indicative number of dwellings 40.

CL1181 – Land east of Thornton Way (8.87 hectares) 200 dwellings.

CL4433 - Land east of Rudgard Avenue (5.93 hectares) 133 dwellings.

These are all contiguous and located on the eastern flank of Cherry Willingham to the south of the railway line and total 373 dwellings. The application site is located to the west of the village and north of the railway line. Looking at the consultation comments above the view is expressed that it is contrary to the strategy of the emerging development plan (SCLLP) and it could therefore be argued also premature in advance of the local plan process.

Annex 1 of the NPPF explains how weight may be given to policies in emerging plans. However, in the context of the Framework and in particular the presumption of sustainable development – arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal of planning permission other than

where it is clear that the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, taken the policies in the Framework and any other material considerations into account. Such circumstances are likely, but not exclusively, to be limited to situations where both:

- The development proposed is so substantial, or its cumulative effect would be so significant, that to grant planning permission would undermine the plan-making process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to the emerging Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan; and
- The emerging plan is at an advanced stage but is not yet formally part of the development plan for the area.

As the Neighbourhood Plan has not been published as a draft Plan (Regulation 14) little weight can be afforded to it. Weight can be attached to the allocations contained within the SCLLP, however these can be subject to change following examination. What is considered important is that the scale of the submitted proposals at 300 dwellings is not materially different to that being promoted through the emerging local allocations which total 373 dwellings. A detailed examination of the impacts arising out of the development of the application site together with an examination of other material consideration will guide the acceptability or otherwise of the current proposals; this is set out below in the “Planning Balance” section.

The Planning Balance

(1) Housing Delivery and Affordable Housing Provision

The development would contribute up to 300 dwellings towards an identified need for housing within Central Lincolnshire. This can be attached positive weight. The agents suggests that the site has good deliverability. The site is not previously developed so is free of potential contamination from historic uses and of any built constraints delaying the commencement of the development. It is also in single ownership with road frontage, meaning the development will not be affected by 3rd party land negotiations and ransoms. The application is by a housebuilder; as a result there is no potential for delays with obtaining a house builder to develop the site.

However, it should be noted that the May 2016 5yr HLS Statement, and emerging Central Lincolnshire Local Plan, both recognise a five year supply of housing land without the inclusion of the application site. Although it is recognised that the 5 year supply has yet to be independently tested the emerging plan has reached an advanced stage and as such this figure should be given significant weight within the planning balance.

Saved WLLP policy RES6 states, “Where there is a demonstrated need the provision of affordable housing will be sought, the Council will seek to negotiate in the region of a 25% contribution towards affordable housing”.

The Lincs Homefinder CBL Partnership, of which West Lindsey is one of 4 partners, provides evidence of a demonstrable need for affordable housing with in excess of 1500 households registered for affordable housing in the district and in excess of 5000 households requiring affordable housing across the partnership area of Central Lincolnshire.

The Submission Central Lincolnshire Local Plan also identifies a need, evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) for 17,400 affordable dwellings across the plan period (2012-2036). It sets a 20% requirement to meet this need (draft policy LP11).

The contribution of 75 on site dwellings as affordable homes (25%) can be afforded significant positive weight in the overall planning balance.

2) Landscape Character and Visual Impact

Within the West Lindsey Landscape Character Assessment the site appears to fall within the boundary of two character areas. Area 6 – Lincoln Fringe and Area 8 – Lincolnshire Lime Woods. It appears to be predominantly located within the former. The key characteristics of the Lincoln Fringe are:

- *Flat agricultural landscape with a number of expanded settlements*
- *Medium sized fields with low hawthorn hedge boundaries and few hedgerow trees*
- *Approached to settlements generally dominated by built form*
- *Views to Lincoln Cathedral*

The most sensitive parts of the landscape include: *“views to Lincoln Cathedral; remaining tracts of open countryside between settlements which often have a relatively non-descript character.”*

Principles for accommodating new development are also set out and include:

- *Scope for a more varied range of buildings (in terms of height scale and style) on the fringes of villages. Buildings can be accommodated provided they are accompanied by sensitively designed tree and woodland planting”*
- *The edges of developments on the outer fringes of settlements are often prominent and would benefit from tree and hedgerow planting. New planting should be designed to integrate the development with the surrounding field patterns and to soften and partially screen views from the surrounding farmland*

WLLP Policy NBE20 states that *“Development will not be permitted which detracts from the rural character of the settlement edge and the countryside beyond.”*

The site which has no special landscape designations will principally be visible from the Hawthorn Road frontage, which acts as its northern boundary. Due to the open nature of the existing arable landscape any development or buildings would have an impact. In this particular case it is considered that the most important boundary would be the western one as this is what traffic travelling eastwards beyond neighbouring open fields would first encounter.

Although it is not possible to screen the site in its entirety it is important in landscape terms that a “soft edge” be provided in order to help integrate any development. This would need to be in the form of tree and hedgerow planting. Landscaping is a reserved matter although an indicative master plan has been submitted. A tree and hedgerow landscape buffer of a minimum 5 metres is recommended to achieve this by the tree and woodlands officer. This is capable of being secured by condition. Travelling westwards along Hawthorn Road the site is partially screened by the existing school buildings and a dense hedgerow interspersed with trees along the extent of the school playing field boundary. It will be necessary to impose root protection conditions to ensure these are not impacted on by the proposed development.

It is acknowledged that the development would lead to a reduction in the open countryside separating Hawthorn Avenue/ Hawthorn Road from the main body of the settlement although there would still be a separation of 370 metres.

It is considered that, with a suitable layout and landscaping scheme (‘reserved matters’) development could be assimilated into the landscape without significant harm occurring. The landscape and visual impacts of the development are therefore not expected to be substantial or lead to a significant adverse effect. Subject to reserved matters, development would not be expected to be contrary to saved policy NBE20.

3) Highways Impact and Safety

Although access is a reserved matter the indicative plans show that there will be two access points directly onto Hawthorn Road. Hawthorn Road will be affected by the Lincoln East Bypass (LEB) which will result in the closure of the western end of Hawthorn Road that currently links to “Bunkers Hill”. Hawthorn Road will have a “left turn in “junction connecting it to the LEB and a “left turn off”. A Transport Assessment (TA) and Supplementary Transport Assessment (STA) have been submitted in support of the application. Two scenarios are examined, one with the LEB and one with no LEB.

A detailed critique of the TA and traffic modelling has been submitted by Cherry Willingham Parish Council (Appendix 1). The LCC Highways, Principal Transportation Projects Officer (PTPO) has confirmed that comments are awaited on this from Mouchel consultants who represented the Highways Authority at the LEB public inquiry and that the queries appear to be similar to those raised at the Inquiry. He also states that *“I do not consider the scheme will have a severe impact on the surrounding highway network in the context*

of para.32 of the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly with the Lincoln Eastern Bypass due to open in 2018/19. The Inspector at the inquiry for the LEB and the Department of Transport has accepted the Highway Authority evidence provided for the LEB (which included development growth) and therefore on purely traffic impact this proposal is also likely to be acceptable in my view”

On this basis there appear to be no grounds on which to withhold consent on the grounds of harm to the interests of highway safety. Any additional comments received will be reported to planning committee.

4) Accessibility and Public Transport

WLLP Policy STRAT1 seeks that development is suitable in terms of:

- iii. The scope for providing access to public transport;*
- iv. The scope for reducing the length and number of car journeys;*
- v. The provision of vehicular and cycle parking facilities;*

Paragraph 34 of the NPPF states that:

‘Decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. However this needs to take account of policies set out elsewhere in this Framework, particularly in rural areas.’

Development is located on the edge of Cherry Willingham, a “Large Village” which provides “*employment, retail, and key services for the local area giving access to services, and public transport connections*” (SCLLP LP4).

In terms of facilities there is a Coop food store located at The Parade which stocks a range of everyday essential items such as bread, milk and eggs. The parade also contains a pharmacy, newsagents, take away hot food outlets, a tea shop and public house. A branch surgery is also located within the parade. The secondary school is located adjacent the site with an existing footway and cycleway along Hawthorn Road. The primary school is located off Lime Grove. The nearest bus stops are located on Croft Lane to the west and travelling south towards Green Lane to the south. There is a frequent regular Lincoln to Fiskerton bus service that runs through Cherry Willingham, services 3 and 3A.

The application proposes a lit 3 metre wide shared pedestrian / cycle way running southwards to connect to Green Lane over the bridge.

The Department for Transport’s (DfT) document entitled ‘Manual for Streets’ (2007) section 4.4 sets out the requirements for pedestrians stating:- “Walkable neighbourhoods are typically characterised by having a range of facilities within 10 minutes’ (up to about 800 m) walking distance of residential areas which residents may access comfortably on foot”. It also states,

however at para 6.3.1, that a 20 minute walk time (equivalent to a 1.6km walk distance) is acceptable subject to an attractive walking environment.

The Institute of Highways and Transportation (IHT) document 'Providing for Journeys on Foot' sets out acceptable maximum walk distances of, 2km for Commuting and school journeys, 800m for town centres, and 1.2km for elsewhere.

The distances quoted below are approximate and taken from the centre of the application site travelling via Hawthorn Road and Croft Lane to the north and via the proposed footpath to Green Lane to the south:

- Cherry Willingham Community School - 600 metres
- The Parade - 1180 metres via Hawthorn Road (north) and 1260 metres via Green Lane (south)
- Cherry Willingham Primary School – 1200 metres via Green Lane (south)
- Bus stops – Croft Lane (770 metres) Green Lane (760 metres)

The distances for access to the schools are within acceptable maximum walk distances. The shops and services at the Parade are within 15 minutes walking distance of the site.

A Travel Plan has been submitted, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 36, to promote alternatives to using private vehicles. This can be secured by a planning condition.

5) Local Infrastructure:

The Local Education Authority, Lincolnshire County Council, has advised that the Cherry Willingham Primary School will not have the capacity to accommodate the proposed development. A capital contribution to enable up to 59 additional primary school places (£723,163) is sought. The applicant has confirmed they will meet this in full, which will need to be secured through a S106 legal planning obligation.

NHS England has advised that the practice that is most likely to be affected by increase in population is the Nettleham Medical Practice at Lodge Lane Nettleham as their branch surgery is at Cherry Willingham. They seek a capital contribution of £425 per dwelling (up to £127,500) in order to provide capital towards building a notes storage facility at Cherry Willingham along with an extra multipurpose/clinical room. The storage facility will allow the movement of all the medical records from Nettleham to Cherry Willingham thus enabling the creation of 2 consulting rooms at its main site to consolidate its services there. The applicant has confirmed agreement to this and it will need to be secured through a S106 legal planning obligation.

It is considered that, subject to a S106 planning obligation to mitigate the impact on Health and Education capacity, development would be compliant with WLLP saved policy STRAT19 which states that "*Development that*

increases demand on infrastructure that cannot be satisfactorily provided for within the existing capacity of on- and off-site service and social/community infrastructure or other services will not be permitted unless extra capacity will be provided to serve the development.”

6) Public Open Space

RES 5 sets out the requirement for the provision of public open space which is 10% for developments of over 10 hectares. This will be delivered by way of a Section 106 obligation to include its future management and maintenance.

7) Indicative layout , public open space and residential amenities

All matters of scale, appearance, layout and landscape are reserved for subsequent approval (reserved matters). Nonetheless, an indicative masterplan) submitted with the application shows how the site could readily accommodate up to 300 dwellings incorporating a mix of housing (including two and a half storeys) public open space and water features. The plan would indicate that development can be achieved without overlooking or having an overbearing impact upon existing residential properties.

Whilst consideration of reserved matters would be subject to a separate application, there is no evidence to suggest at this outline permission stage that residential development could not be achieved on the site without unduly compromising existing amenities or that the development would be otherwise unable to accord with existing WLLP policies STRAT1, RES1, RES2, RES5 and CORE10.

8) Archaeology – The NPPF (paragraph 128) states that *“Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.”*

The applicant has provided the requested additional information in the form of a geophysical survey of the site which has been sent to LCC Archaeology. Comments are awaited in response to this. Standard archaeological conditions will be imposed.

9) Ecology

The NPPF (paragraph 109) states that *‘The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible...’*

An ecological survey report has been submitted in support of the application. This shows that all habitats and plant communities recorded on the site are common and widespread in a local and national context. No nationally rare, nationally scarce or Red Data plant species, were recorded from the site. No reptiles were observed on site during the survey. There are no buildings or other structures on the site and none of the trees within or around the site edges possesses any features with potential to support roosting bats although all of the hedgerows offer excellent commuting and foraging resources for bats.

No signs of past or present use by badgers, such as setts, dung pits or feeding remains, were found anywhere within the site. A limited range of common and widespread birds was recorded on the site and adjacent land including kestrel, wood pigeon, carrion crow, blackbird and yellowhammer.

The report proposes measures to enhance biodiversity which include:

- Retention and protection of existing hedgerows within and around the site
- Landscaping schemes and placement of housing should work with the existing hedgerows to maintain landscape character and connectivity
- Defunct and gappy hedges should be restored by coppicing and laying where appropriate to improve the aesthetic appearance and gapping-up with appropriate native species
- Bat roost boxes and nest boxes for house sparrow and other birds should be incorporated into the development, particularly on elevations opposite hedgerows.
- Light levels adjacent to landscape features such as hedgerows should be kept to a minimum and lighting should be focused downwards to prevent unnecessary light spill.
-

It is considered that biodiversity enhancement measures can be secured by planning condition.

10) Flood Risk and Drainage

A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted, in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF¹. The site lies within Flood Zone 1 (low probability - <0.1% annual probability of river or sea flooding) on the Environment Agency's flood maps. Development of the site will therefore accord with the NPPF's² sequential approach to locating development to those areas at lowest risk of flooding.

¹ Footnote 20 states that a site-specific flood risk assessment is required for proposals of 1 hectare or greater in Flood Zone 1.

² Paragraph 100 onwards.

Planning Practice Guidance³ states that when considering major development, sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) should be provided unless demonstrated to be inappropriate.

The FRA explains that the site is generally unsuitable for soakaways due to a high water table and low permeability.

It is proposed that domestic curtilage roof areas will discharge to adjacent permeable paved driveways, parking spaces and home zones wherever practicable which in turn will be linked to a network of under- drained conveyance swales accepting sheet flows from adjacent adopted roads. The network of under- drained swales will in turn be connected to second stage treatment attenuation ponds which will be allocated across the development land at appropriate locations provisionally sized to cater for 50 plots or thereabouts per pond i.e. 6 ponds in total. This is as suggested by the Environment Agency at the Multi- Agency Meeting (MAG) held on 18th February 2015.

Two outfalls to mimic natural conditions are proposed. These will be split into two areas with each having its own balancing pond and outfalls.

The Northern Outfall Land outfall will be a standalone outfall discharging to an existing culverted watercourse beneath the footpath to the south side of Hawthorn Road which in turn discharges to an existing open drain some 110m east of the north eastern corner of the site on the north side of Hawthorn Road. From there it connects into Westfield Farm drain which is a tributary of Reepham Beck and in turn the Barlings Eau.

The Southern Outfall Land outfalls will be inter-linked with a tributary drain conveying flows to a new piped offsite sewer (Cyden Homes Sewer) running parallel to the Taylor Lindsey Sewer which crosses the site and serves the existing development to the east of the site. The Cyden Homes Sewer will not connect with the Taylor Lindsey Sewer as there is no available capacity in the latter. The Cyden Homes Sewer will flow in a westerly direction away from the "valley" containing the primary and secondary SuDS features before turning south and discharging to an existing headwall on the drain to the north of Green Lane. This headwall currently accepts land drainage outfalls from the adjacent field and the drain currently discharges to an existing 375mm diameter culvert beneath Green Lane, through adjacent land, beneath the railway line and ultimately discharging to the Waterford Lane drain which drains to the south to the North Delph.

Because the application is only in outline, a condition will be required to secure the final drainage details.

11) Hawthorn Road "Closure"

³ [Paragraph: 079 Reference ID: 7-079-20150415](#)

The majority of the representations from residents refer to the “closure of Hawthorn Road” and the LEB with concerns about increases in vehicular traffic through the area as there will be only 2 routes out of the site: Through the centre of Cherry Willingham, passing the Secondary School, onto Fiskerton Rd and then onto the Outer Circle / Monks Rd roundabout and out of Cherry Willingham via Kennel Road onto the A158. In fact there will be a “left on” access from Hawthorn Road onto the LEB that will allow direct access to the proposed “Greetwell Road” roundabout without having to travel through the village. It is likely there will be traffic utilising Kennel Lane via Reepham although there is the option for vehicles travelling on the LEB from the Hawthorn Road junction to use the “Greetwell Road” roundabout to turn around and travel north towards the proposed “Wragby Road” roundabout.

RECOMMENDED DECISION:

That the decision to grant planning permission, subject to conditions, be delegated to the Chief Operating Officer, to enable the completion and signing of an agreement under section 106 of the Planning Act 1990 (as amended) pertaining to:-

- Capital contribution towards Primary School facilities (£665,309) in lieu of on-site provision;
- Capital contribution (£425 per dwelling) towards Health care provision
- Provision of 25% of the units as affordable housing on site (type and tenure to be agreed).
- Details of the provision , management and maintenance of open space comprising not less than 10% of the total site area,

And, in the event of the s106 not being completed and signed by all parties within 6 months from the date of this Committee, then the application be reported back to the next available Committee meeting following the expiration of the 6 months.

Conditions requiring reserved matters and stating the time by which the development must be commenced:

1. No development shall take place until, plans and particulars of the **layout, scale and appearance** of the buildings to be erected, the means of **access** to the site and the **landscaping** of the site (hereinafter called “the reserved matters”) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall be carried out in accordance with those details.

Reason: The application is in outline only and the Local Planning Authority wishes to ensure that these details which have not yet been submitted are appropriate for the locality.

2. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of two years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To conform with Section 92 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

3. The development to which the permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

Reason: To conform with Section 92 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Pre-commencement conditions

4. No development shall take place until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable urban drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme shall:

- a) Provide details of how run-off will be safely conveyed and attenuated during storms up to and including the 1 in 100 year critical storm event, with an allowance for climate change, from all hard surfaced areas within the development into the existing local drainage infrastructure and watercourse system without exceeding the run-off rate for the undeveloped site;
- b) Provide attenuation details and discharge rates for written agreement by the Local Planning Authority
- c) Provide details of the timetable for and any phasing of implementation for the drainage scheme; and
- d) Provide details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed over the lifetime of the development, including any arrangements for adoption by any public body or Statutory Undertaker and any other arrangements required to secure the operation of the drainage system throughout its lifetime.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drainage scheme and no dwelling shall be occupied until the approved scheme has been completed or provided on the site in accordance with the approved phasing. The approved scheme shall be retained and maintained in full in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to minimise the risk of flooding in accordance with the provisions of the National Planning policy Framework.

5. No development shall take place until, full details of the proposed foul drainage for the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall thereafter be implemented in full before the dwellings are first occupied.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory drainage of the site in accordance with West Lindsey Local Plan First Review Policy STRAT1 and NBE14.

6. No development shall take place, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:

- (i) the routing and management of construction traffic;
- (ii) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
- (iii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- (iv) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
- (v) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
- (vi) wheel cleaning facilities;
- (vii) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
- (viii) details of noise reduction measures;
- (ix) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
- (x) the hours during which machinery may be operated, vehicles may enter and leave, and works may be carried out on the site;
- (xi) Measures for tree and hedgerow protection;
- (xii) A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to ensure the protection of habitats and protected species, to include a Great Crested Newt Method Survey as recommended at section 5.1.2 of the Ecology and Protected Species Survey.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and in accordance with saved policy STRAT1 of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review.

7. No development shall take place until a written scheme of archaeological investigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This should provide details of a timetable of site investigation and recording. The archaeological site work shall be undertaken in full accordance with the approved written scheme. The Local Planning authority shall be notified at least 14 days before the commencement of the on-site investigation.

Reason: In order to facilitate the appropriate monitoring arrangements and to ensure the satisfactory archaeological investigation and retrieval of archaeological finds in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

8. The details to be submitted in accordance with condition no. 1 above shall include: -

- (i) A landscape buffer with a minimum depth of 5 metres along the western boundary of the site
- (ii) Details for appropriate tree and hedgerow protection measures, in accordance with BS5837:2012, (Tree protection measures should be positioned at the outer extents of calculated Root Protection Areas)
- (iii) A Landscape Management Plan setting out management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas, inclusive of trees, hedges, ditches and balancing ponds;
- (iv) A Biodiversity Enhancement Scheme setting out measures for habitat creation and management

Reason: In the interests of landscape and visual amenity to help preserve the rural character of the area and in interests of biodiversity enhancement, in accordance with saved policy STRAT 1 of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions to be observed during the development of the site

9. No works shall take place other than outside the bird nesting season (1st March to 31st August),

Reason: To protect biodiversity in accordance with policy STRAT 1 of the West Lindsey Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

10 No trees or hedges shall be removed from the site without the prior written agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and protection of habitats, in accordance with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

11 .The development hereby approved shall not exceed 300 dwellings.

Reason: To maintain the character of this area and in the interests of highway safety and adequate drainage provision in accordance with saved Policies STRAT1, RES1 and CORE 10 of the West Lindsey Local Plan First Review 2006.

Conditions which apply or relate to matters which are to be observed following completion of the development:

12. Development shall proceed in accordance with the submitted Travel Plan. Prior to the occupation of any dwelling, details of the Travel Plan Coordinator shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Copies of the annual monitoring reports shall be supplied to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to promote sustainable modes of transport, in accordance with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

APPENDIX 1. CHERRY WILLINGHAM PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS

Two Transport Assessments (TA) have been prepared by the applicant's traffic consultant in support of this application. When the planning application was submitted no decision had at that point been made by the Secretary of State for Transport on the Highway Orders for the proposed Lincoln Eastern Bypass (LEB) following the Public Inquiry in August 2015. The original Transport Assessment submitted with the application therefore considered the impact of the development assuming the proposed Lincoln Eastern Bypass would not be in place when the development went ahead.

2. Shortly after the planning application was submitted the Secretary of State confirmed the Highway Orders for the LEB in February 2016. This decision means the submitted TA is superseded as the LEB, and in particular the decision to close Hawthorn Road to through traffic where the LEB intersects it, will have a significant impact on some traffic movements generated, or otherwise affected, by the proposed development. For this reason, the applicant's consultant prepared a Supplementary Transport Assessment (STA) which examines the impact of this proposed development with the LEB and other associated highway changes in place.

3. Although the principle of the LEB itself is strongly supported, the decision to close Hawthorn Road to through traffic when the LEB is constructed was and continues to be very controversial locally. Cherry Willingham and other Parish Councils to the east of the LEB objected strongly to these proposals and residents submitted over 500 written objections to the Public Inquiry. It was therefore always likely that any future development on Hawthorn Road and its impact on the local highway network in Cherry Willingham, other local villages and its surrounding network would be highly sensitive from a traffic perspective.

4. After the current planning application was submitted Cherry Willingham Parish Council held two drop-in sessions for local residents to obtain their views prior to submitting the Parish Council's comments on the application to the Planning Authority – West Lindsey District Council. These were very well attended and Traffic and Transport issues were of significant concern to residents.

5. Given the level of local concern and the potential for unanticipated traffic issues to arise following the closure of Hawthorn Road to through traffic it is important that the submitted Transport Assessments comprehensively and robustly assess the likely impact of the proposed development on the surrounding highway network.

6. Having examined the TA and STA in some detail CWPC have a number of comments to make on the Transport Assessments. These comments are set out below.

The Original Transport Assessment

7. The original TA considered the impact of the development without the LEB in place. As such given that it is now envisaged that the LEB will be complete either during or shortly after the construction of this development this TA is now largely superseded provided the LEB proceeds as currently planned.

8. The trip generation rates used in the TA for this development appear to have been based on previously agreed trip generation rates for the Greetwell Quarry Residential Development given planning permission by West Lindsey DC in 2015. The Greetwell Quarry Development is a larger development adjacent to the main Lincoln urban area with significantly better public transport, walking and cycling access for journeys to work than the current application site. The proposed trip rates would appear to be quite low for an edge of village development such as the current application proposes. The current development is in fact more akin to a recent planning application in Saxilby the TA for which was produced by the same consultants as this application. In the Saxilby TA trip generation rates based on the TRICS trip rate database system are higher than those used in the TA for this application. To ensure appropriately robust trip generation rates are used for the current development it is suggested rates are derived from similar sites in TRICS rather than Greetwell Quarry development especially as the current site is more like the previous Saxilby site in character than the Greetwell Quarry site.

9. A brief examination of the traffic modelling submitted with the TA suggests that the LinSig modelling of the Wragby Road/Outer Circle Road junction may contain issues which may (or may not) impact on the modelling conclusions for this junction. These appear to be carried forward to the STA and are therefore discussed below.

This TA identified that without the LEB in place the development would significantly increase the queues and delays at the junction of Hawthorn Road and Bunkers Hill and also impact on other junctions on Wragby Road. The TA correctly states that this impact will not in fact occur if the LEB is in place due to the closure of Hawthorn Road to through traffic. However, if any delays occur with the funding or construction of the LEB this scenario would in fact arise and the impacts on this and other junctions would need to be mitigated by the developer. Should this planning application be determined prior to the final and irrevocable commitment of funding to the LEB the Parish Council would

request planning conditions or other suitable agreements should be put in place as part of this permission to require the applicant to mitigate the effects of the development on Hawthorn Road, Bunkers Hill and elsewhere as appropriate should the LEB not proceed as currently planned or to current timescales in any significant way.

Supplementary Transport Assessment

11. The Supplementary Transport Assessment (STA) was produced by the applicant's consultants to support the original TA and extend it to consider the impact of the development if the LEB and its associated highway network changes are complete.

12. The closure of Hawthorn Road to through traffic affects different journeys on the highway network in and around Cherry Willingham in different ways. Although some journeys, for example, to the south of the River are improved, other journeys from parts of Cherry Willingham to the Carlton Centre or to the existing Lincoln northern bypass are made more difficult. It cannot be assumed that the LEB will automatically improve all journeys too or from Cherry Willingham.

Traffic Flow Forecasts

13. As the LEB produces widespread rerouting of traffic in the greater Lincoln area and around the application site, the Highway Authority requested that the applicant's consultant use the Greater Lincoln Traffic Model (GLTM) to forecast the traffic flows to be used in assessing the developments impact. The GLTM is a wide area strategic model produced and maintained by consultants for the highway authority.

14. The GLTM was used to produce forecast traffic flows for the following scenarios:

- 2021 Do Minimum – This includes the LEB and other committed schemes and developments.
- 2021 Do Something – This includes the 2021 Do Minimum scenario with the addition of traffic generated by the development proposed by this planning application.

15. The STA uses a preliminary assessment methodology based on the total net change in traffic flows at a junction to determine whether a junction needs to be examined in more detail. This has the undesirable consequence that when traffic flows on some arms of a junction decrease and others increase the total net change in traffic at the junction may be very small whilst significant changes may occur on individual junction arms. Whilst it is accepted that the performance of a junction is obviously affected by the total traffic passing through it the distribution of traffic between different junction arms also has a significant effect. For example, traffic rerouting from one arm of a junction to a different arm with a lower capacity may produce little or no net increase in total traffic through the junction but will potentially significantly increase queues and delays on arms with a flow increase whilst only leading to a much smaller reduction in queues and delays on arms where flows decrease. This will be particularly pronounced at higher values of RFC (Ratio of Flow to Capacity) where delay increases much more rapidly with respect to RFC. In respect of this STA it is impossible to tell without further analysis

whether this would have affected the decision on which junctions to assess in further detail but in general the methodology has the potential to mask significant impacts at some junctions depending on the pattern of flow changes.

16. Para 2.34 and 2.35 in the STA include an interesting observation by the applicant's consultant and are repeated below:

"2.3.4 The GLTM results predict that there may be decreases in some traffic streams as a result of the proposed development (i.e. the difference between the Do Minimum and Do Something), and although some of these decreases could be expected as a result of reassignment of network traffic, the changes appear to be disproportionate to the traffic increase associated with the proposals. There are also other unintuitive projected traffic flow changes from the GLTM.

2.3.5 However, the GLTM is a model that has been approved by LCC, the use of which has been specifically requested by LCC in order to assess the traffic impact of the proposed development. Therefore, the traffic projections supplied by LCC from the GLTM have been applied within this STA as requested."

17. This would appear to be saying that the applicant felt that the traffic flows provided for them to carry out their assessment of the development were unintuitive and not representative of the changes in flow likely to be expected. However, as the flows were provided by LCC they were used for the assessment regardless. Whilst we would agree with the applicant's observations, we would not agree that the flows should be used for evaluating the application's impact without first determining whether these unintuitive aspects have a material effect on the evaluation of these traffic impacts.

18. A brief examination of the provided forecast traffic flows diagrams in the STA does raise a number of issues where forecast traffic flow changes produced by the development are counterintuitive. Some illustrative examples include:

- One of the largest traffic flows changes from the Do Minimum to the Do Something scenario in the AM Peak is for traffic travelling on Fiskerton Road south of Cherry Willingham and turning left onto the LEB southbound. This movement is also changed in the reverse direction in the PM Peak. This is unlikely to be produced solely by the development and is more likely to be changes in assignment of existing traffic in the model. If this traffic is being assigned from elsewhere in the network these flow increases may lead to flow decreases on the Hawthorn Road corridor which artificially offsets the impact of the proposed development.

- In the AM Peak 34 additional PCU (passenger Car Units) leave the development onto Hawthorn Road in the direction of Cherry Willingham, however only 19 additional PCU actually reach the junction of Hawthorn Road and Croft Lane. This implies the eastbound flow on Hawthorn Road is actually reduced by reassignment caused by the development which is unlikely unless

it is due to reassignment noise in the model offsetting the true increase in traffic due to the development.

- Traffic from the development wishing to access the existing Lincoln northern bypass and many destinations in and to the north of Lincoln (one of the more significant traffic movements) has three route choices: It can use Kennel Lane; it can travel through Cherry Willingham village and then use Greetwell Road and the LEB; or it can access the LEB using Hawthorn Road before U-turning at the LEB-Greetwell Road roundabout to travel north on the LEB. Traffic flows on Kennel Lane are almost unchanged in both peak periods as is traffic through Cherry Willingham village and it would appear that most traffic from the development is choosing the latter option and U-turning on the LEB.

Based on residents views and local knowledge of traffic routes this is unlikely to be the favoured option in reality regardless of whether the traffic model finds this route preferable based on delay and generalised cost routing. It is possible therefore that the traffic from the development choosing to travel through the village or via Kennel Lane may be underestimated. The fact that traffic through Cherry Willingham Village and on Kennel Lane is almost unchanged by the development is very counterintuitive and is more likely due to the way the strategic model assigns traffic to the network than what will happen in reality.

- In the AM Peak 84 PCU exit the development onto Hawthorn Road westbound. All of this traffic (less any traffic travelling from the development to the Hawthorn Ave residential area which is likely to be negligible) will have to access the LEB southbound via the new Left-In-Left-Out (LILO) left slip from Hawthorn Road onto the LEB. However, the north arm of the Greetwell Road/LEB roundabout only exhibits a net increase of 3 PCU (and only an absolute increase of 29 PCU). This suggests there is a significant southbound reduction in through traffic on the LEB to offset this difference. This is unlikely to be caused simply by the development but appears to offset and mask flow increases caused by the development. This masking of flows on the LEB southbound could have implications on the impact of local traffic from the development on the operation of the LEB and the Greetwell Road/LEB roundabout which are potentially close to capacity at year of opening.

Overall the flow changes due to the development appear in some cases to be masked by reassignment in the GLTM. A more robust approach would be to use the Do Minimum traffic flows as a starting base and manually assign the development traffic onto this base based on the applicant's gravity model presented in the first TA and agreed robust routing patterns. By removing reassignment noise within the model this will provide a far more robust and intuitive assessment. It may be that flow increases due to the development are non-critical when model noise is removed from the equation but this cannot simply be assumed.

19.A brief comparison of the 2021 Do Minimum forecast traffic flows with 2018 forecast LEB year of opening traffic flows submitted to the recent LEB Public Inquiry appear to show some significant differences with the 2021 in places

being significantly lower than the 2018 flows. Although it is recognised that the traffic forecasts have been updated since the Public Inquiry some of the changes seem quite significant (for example - westbound on Greetwell Road in the AM Peak reduces from over 1000 PCU in 2018 to 717 PCU in 2018, the northbound traffic flow on Croft Lane through Cherry Willingham reduces from 350 PCU to 145 PCU, Kennel Lane northbound reduces from 311 PCU to 213 PCU). If the 2021 base flows are too low this could potentially lead to a significant overestimation of the level of spare capacity available within the network post-LEB. The Greetwell Road westbound flow is of particular importance due to the post-LEB impact of the large rise in westbound flow on Greetwell Road in the AM Peak on Wickes roundabout which leads to significant queuing.

20. Some critical junctions have been omitted from the STA. In particular, some of the junctions constructed as part of the LEB scheme have been omitted with para. 2.3.9 Of the STA stating that it has been assumed that junctions on the LEB have been designed to accommodate future growth. We believe this is an unsafe assumption as at the public inquiry some junctions on the LEB were identified where if modelled appropriately may have only limited spare capacity at year of opening. At the Public Inquiry potential issues were also highlighted with previously published junction modelling of some of the roundabouts on the LEB and it is unknown if the accuracy of these existing results have been checked or any design changes made. These junctions include:

- The Left-In-Left-Out (LILO) left slip from Hawthorn Road onto the LEB southbound. In the junction analysis presented at the LEB Inquiry this slip road was identified as having an AM Peak RFC between 0.81 and 0.96 suggesting there is limited scope for additional traffic joining the LEB using this junction. There would also be limited scope for low cost improvements to this junction to mitigate issues arising in the future if the assessment proves to have underestimated the flows at this junction. It may be that due to changes to flow forecasts the traffic flows generated by the development can be accommodated at this junction but given the limited spare capacity this should be robustly demonstrated with an audited model.
- The Greetwell Road/LEB roundabout has previously been shown at the public inquiry to have relatively high values of RFC on some arms and It cannot be assumed without modelling that increases in flows (especially U-turns) at this junction due to the development will not impact on junction capacity. There are also potential issues with the accuracy of the forecast flow increases at this junction in the AM Peak as described above. Additionally, it was also accepted at the inquiry that unequal lane usage correction could have been applied more accurately in the published ARCADY modelling for some of the proposed roundabouts on the LEB resulting in reduced capacity forecasts and it is not known whether the modelling for this roundabout has been subsequently checked.

Junction Modelling

21. The STA carries out detailed junction modelling at a number of junctions potentially affected by the development. The Parish Council do not have the resources to audit each junction model but have the comments on the following junctions.

Greetwell Road/Outer Circle Road Double Mini-Roundabouts (Wickes Roundabout)

22. The important issue at this junction is the performance of the Greetwell Road East arm in the AM Peak. This arm is used by traffic from Cherry Willingham, Fiskerton and villages further east to access Lincoln. The arm currently regularly queues to the bottom of Greetwell Hollow and when a modest amount of additional traffic was diverted onto this arm during the works at the Canwick Road/South Park Ave junction significant queuing occurred. This suggests this arm is currently almost at capacity.

23. The AM Peak flow on this arm was predicted to increase from 560 PCU to 1000 PCU (AM Peak at 2018 year of opening) due to the LEB making this a more attractive route into Lincoln. The latest modelling reduces this increase but is still forecasting a substantial increase to 720 PCU in the Do Minimum scenario.

24. Rather counter-intuitively the Do Something flows are predicting a reduction in flow on this arm in the AM Peak. It would be expected that this route would be a highly attractive route (if uncongested) for development traffic to access the hospital area and north Lincoln and it would be expected that traffic on this arm would increase with the development.

25. The ARCADY modelling carried out by the applicant in the STA predicts the Greetwell Road East arm of this junction to have an RFC of 1.16. i.e. It is significantly over capacity.

26. The capacity of a roundabout arm in ARCADY is predicted from the geometry of the arm and roundabout. One of the most important geometric parameters is the effective flare length of an arm. The applicant has used an effective flare length of 10.0m. This appears to overestimate the capacity of the arm which is geometrically very constrained. Measuring the flare length would suggest that it is much lower at around 1.5m rather than 10m. This would have the effect of reducing the capacity of this roundabout arm potentially by around 10%. Any reduction in capacity although similar for both scenarios would tend to affect scenarios with more traffic flow disproportionately.

27. The ARCADY model for the Do Something scenario predicts a very minor increase in RFC in this arm from 1.16 to 1.18. However as stated above the arrival flow on this arm actually reduces with the development included. If a more likely scenario is adopted with a modest flow increase due to the development it is likely that there would be a significant increase in queues and delays on this arm in the AM Peak. As the junction is overcapacity in both scenarios any additional traffic generated by the development using this route will simply add to and extend the queue. This could lead to traffic from the

development choosing instead to use other less direct, less desirable routes leading to other unassessed impacts elsewhere.

28. A reduction in capacity due to reassessing geometry and the use of a more intuitive development flow allocation to this roundabout arm is likely to lead to a much more significant difference between the Do Minimum and Do Something scenarios. We do not agree that increases in RFC on an arm operating above 100% are less important as the increase in delay for a 1% increase in RFC is much more significant above 100% RFC than at or below 100% RFC.

29. The STA states that improvements for Greetwell Road and the Greetwell Road/Outer Circle Road junction are planned to accommodate the extra traffic likely to result from the LEB. This is not our understanding of the situation unless plans have changed since the LEB public inquiry. Our understanding is that the planned improvements are intended to be funded by developers for later phases of the North East Quadrant development. As no planning permission exists for the later phases of this development and it is unlikely to be in place in the near future these improvements could be some time away from being provided.

Wragby Road/Outer Circle Road/Outer Circle Drive Traffic Signal Junction

30. As modelled in the STA this junction operates at acceptable Degrees of Saturation (DOS) in all scenarios.

31. The LinSig modelling for this junction has been briefly examined although a full check of the model has not been undertaken. Although this junction is not nearby Cherry Willingham its operation will affect many residents who travel through this junction each day.

32. The phase intergreens for this junction appear to contain zero second duration intergreens for several phase to phase movements involving toucan crossings with variable intergreens. It is possible these were incorrectly taken directly from the signal controller specification as although the intergreens are shown as zero duration in the intergreen matrix they are in reality variable and the range of intergreens and likely intergreen should be calculated from parameters elsewhere in the controller specification. This will have the effect of increasing implemented intergreen durations and reducing the performance of the junction, possibly significantly.

33. The cycle time is assumed to have remained at 144 seconds after the opening of the LEB. When the LEB opens this junction will have improved performance due to the reduction of traffic on Wragby Road. This will provide an opportunity to reduce the cycle time from the very high current value of 144s allowing potentially significant delay reductions to be achieved. The development cannot therefore rely on the spare capacity created by the LEB with a cycle time of 144 secs as this would no longer exist when the junction is optimised for the post LEB situation. The comparison should be using post-LEB optimised cycle times.

Conclusions

34. The above comments have been provided with an aim of being constructive and ensuring that the TA and STA fully address concerns regarding of the impact of the development. A number of comments relate to omissions which may be straightforward to resolve or can be demonstrated to be insignificant however a number of issues have the potential of increasing the predicted impact of the development. It is impossible to say by how much and whether they are material without further consideration of these issues.