

**Post\_title: 8.0 Policy Context**

**ID1:** 960

**comment\_author:** Pedals - Spalding's Cycle Action Gr

**comment\_content:**

Chapter 8 Paragraph 8.0.2 We strongly dispute the assertion "The walking and cycling network provide a good alternative to the private car .. We acknowledge that many improvements have been made to cycling provision in Spalding and surrounding area over the years. However, much remains to be done before it can be described as a "network" which is a "good alternative" to the private car. This is effectively admitted later in the plan, in Policy 31 C2. Officers of both LCC and SHDC know from our meetings with them, and from our map and notes which we submitted at the start of this local plan process, that our concerns include: ~ joining up existing cycling routes to provide continuous safer journeys eg to schools addressing the lack of a safe, convenient route from west to east across Spalding's town centre o the need for the proper development and maintenance of the Daffodil Route in Spalding, much of which is on land owned by SHDC. We suggest that the sentence starting "The walking and cycling network..." should be removed and replaced by:"Walking and cycling are healthy, environmentally-friendly, low-cost alternatives to the use of the motor car, particularly in the Sub-Regional Centres. Spalding has several lengths of dedicated cycle provision which have not yet been joined up sufficiently to be considered as a network offering greater benefits to cyclists "

**Officer Comment:**

Reference to a walking and cycling network is intended to relate to all foot and cycle paths in South East Lincolnshire, rather than just Spalding and therefore the use of 'network' is considered appropriate. Provision in and around Boston town is considered to be well-used and therefore is an alternative to the car. Section 8 acknowledges that opportunities exist to enhance the network.

**Officer Recommendation:**

Amend supporting text to make reference to the benefits associated with walking and cycling. Make reference to enhancing cyclepaths through the supporting text.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1:

961

comment\_author:

Borough Council of King's Lynn &

comment content:

Thank you for consulting the Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk on this document. The Borough Council has no objection to the document, but requests that due consideration is given to cross-border impacts on West Norfolk (if any) at the planning application stage. These include, but are not limited to, impacts on the transport network.

Officer Comment:

Comments noted. The Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk will continue to be consulted on every stage of the Local Plan, particularly relating to any cross boundary transport issues should they arise.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

---

ID1: 962 comment\_author: Longstaffs

comment content:

We have studied the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036, draft for public consultation (including site options for development), and would like to make the following comments at this stage of the Plan review. We submitted a site in December 2014 “ for land south of A16 at Crowland for a site suitable for Roadside services. We note from Policy 31, that there d s not appear to be any policy provision for sites for such service provision, which we consider there is currently a shortfall in the area of such services facilities to serve the transport network in this location. On behalf of our client, we are disappointed to note that the site has not been identified as a suitable Roadside services. The site would be well served by the existing Carrington Road junction, it is relatively close to Crowland's centre, and it would from a good alternative use in an area with poor agricultural use due to the poor field shapes resulting from the Bypass routing. We put forward that it should be considered as a Potential Roadside services for the A16.

Officer Comment:

LCC have not identified demand for this type of facility and as such suggest that there is no need for a specific policy or designation for this type of use. It is considered that the Local Plan policies would provide sufficient scope to enable a proposal to be positively considered on its merits. In general, the Highways Authority supports the provision of roadside services as such facilities offer the travelling public opportunity to take a break in their journey for rest and/or refreshment with the obvious benefits to safety. If the site at Crowland between James Road and the A16, is to be promoted access should be off James Road (the old A1073) rather than off the A16. There is a roundabout at the junction of the A16 with James Road. However there is a local perception of excessive traffic congestion at the James Road/Peterborough Road junction and some local opposition might therefore be expected.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1:

963

comment\_author:

Spalding and District Civic Society

comment\_content:

8.0.1 Add at end: 'a situation which will be seriously exacerbated by the housing expansion projected in Chapter 5 of this plan'.

Officer Comment:

Detailed modelling has been undertaken to ensure that the level of housing proposed at the sustainable urban extensions can be accommodated with appropriate mitigation in the form of highways schemes. Transport issues relating to other major development will be addressed through Transport Assessments at planning application stage. This is detailed in the supporting text to the policy.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

ID1:

964

comment\_author:

Lincolnshire County Council

comment\_content:

Transport Policy Comments. These proposals are generally supported. It is recognised that there are considerable challenges in delivering specific proposals and LCC will work closely with the District Councils on these as Highway Authority and as a partner on the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee. The following points are purely factual corrections: 8.0.1 The spelling of King's Lynn (line 1) is not consistent with Kings Lynn (line 7). In line 10 there is a missing word: it should be 'around Spalding and Boston town centres'

Officer Comment:

Support for section is welcome. The JSPC welcome the continued involvement of LCC Highways in the Local Plan process. The factual errors are noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Amend factual errors accordingly.

Post\_title:

**8.1 Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network**

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 653 comment\_author: Mr & Mrs Fordham

comment\_content:

SWRR. On the plan the area where the road may go includes our property. It is right at the edge. It seems completely illogical to bring the road through our property as it would take out many local businesses and would prove expensive to compensate us all. If the road was built between us and Monks House Lane it would be cheaper and only take out a few properties. This also leaves us in limbo as to whether we sell our property or redevelop the site with starter homes.

Officer Comment:

The roadline for the SWRR is, at present, indicative the formal process of designing and approving the exact route has yet to be taken forward

Officer Recommendation:

No changes to the Draft Local Plan are recommended

ID1: 965 comment\_author: Mr & Mrs J S Wright

comment\_content:

Before any building of houses on stage A (Pin045) is undertaken there must be provision for an exit onto Market Way so that the businesses in Pinchbeck Village Centre are not penalised because of limited access. The site highlighted is after all in PINCHBECK and should not become a satellite of Spalding. The relief road through Pin 024 should be completed to Bourne Road A151 before residential building so that there is an access at both ends. This should avoid more congestion at proposed R1 roundabout (Spalding Road Pinchbeck) which already has excess traffic into Spalding Town.

Officer Comment:

Exact layouts for individual sites will be subject to further work and, with the larger sites, involve a master planning approach

Officer Recommendation:

No changes to the draft Plan are recommended

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 966 comment\_author: Mr D Bryant

## comment content:

I have read with interest the Consultation Draft, from which it seems to me that the overall development strategy is well-intentioned. Noting that the proposals are not site specific, and that all potential development sites promoted by landowners and developers are included in the document, I believe the next stage of developing the Local Plan for Boston will be the most important and crucial for the future economy and well-being of Boston. It is a well-known fact that Boston's geographical location on the edge of Lincolnshire and the East Midlands Region has put the town at some disadvantage, despite being the second largest settlement in Lincolnshire. The historic and current highway network does inhibit growth in inward investment and creation of new well-paid employment opportunities. Every effort must be made, and opportunities created, by strategic medium/long term planning to provide considerably shorter journey times by road into the national highway network. This means promoting highways improvements to the A52, A16 and A17 which provide the life-blood in terms of access to Boston and the East Coast resort areas. Our valuable agricultural produce businesses have to use these roads on a daily basis in addition to travel-to-work and tourist/visitor traffic, all of which is vital to our future. Within the local Boston area, whilst there has been some recent improvement in traffic flows journey times through Boston via John Adams Way, the current highway network through Boston remains inadequate for present and future needs if we are to expand and improve the local economy. Encouraging inward investment and creating quality new jobs will be restricted if our highways are not substantially

## Officer Comment:

The sites shown on the map will be assessed to choose Preferred Sites for Development for the next consultation.

On going discussions about the Boston Transport Strategy will help identify suitable development sites.

## Officer Recommendation:

No cahnges to the Drfat Local Plan area recommended

improved to keep on reducing journey times not only for local residents, but also for our businesses and HGV traffic, and also tourists who must not be subjected to delays and slow moving traffic queues, which inevitably discourage them from making return and repeat visits, thereby restricting growth in our economy. The majority of local traffic from the north and east already has to come through Boston to access the out of town retail and leisure facilities. We only have to look at the recent development of Lincoln to see how such investment could benefit Boston. Locally, in terms of our Local Plan, it is imperative that any future development be concentrated in those areas which are least likely to be of further detriment to existing traffic flows. Thus, it is right to identify land for future employment uses to the south of Boston, principally the Marsh Lane and Riverside Industrial Estate area, which has direct access to the A16 without adding to traffic numbers moving through Boston. Similarly, it is right to protect the area for the proposed Distributor Road, which will require developer contributions to attract Government funding, for a highway which is crucial to the future of Boston in every respect. In strategic terms therefore, all future residential development should also be located to the south of Boston, again with access to the A16, and then following the route of the Distributor Road in order to achieve its construction at the earliest opportunity. Development of large scale areas north of Boston will only produce ever increasing traffic problems through Boston, and should be avoided. In conclusion, it does seem that this Consultation Draft, whilst not actually identifying specific development sites, does seek to achieve all major developments to be in the south and west areas of Boston, and that principle should be supported when ultimately allocating sites for

development in the Final Local Plan.

---

ID1: 967 comment\_author: Ernest Goldie

comment content:

I visited Holbeach community centre Thursday the 28th January to view the proposed development plan for the above . At present we pedestrians have a serious on going problem with crossing the A17 West of the roundabout junction with Boston road north . I believe that it would be feasible to extend the central reservation West of this roundabout and install a light controlled pedestrian crossing . This would give us a safe crossing point and hopefully prevent and eliminate the potential risk which presently exists . The crossing of this section of the A17 consists of all manner of pedestrians and cyclists many of the pedestrians are senior citizens and some with mobility scooters , women pushing prams etc. I feel that the cost of carrying out this work would be cost effective in as much that it would give the pedestrian and cyclist peace of mind when crossing this busy stretch of road and go a long way in eliminating risk from traffic .

Officer Comment:

Lincolnshire County Council traffic modelling studies confirm that a combination of proposed housing and commercial development, along with highway improvements at Peppermint Junction, will increase congestion at the Boston Road roundabout by the year 2032. Lincolnshire County Council has therefore been considering options at this location for some time, noting that we have to consider all road users whilst meeting the strict requirements of highway legislation and guidance.

As part of this process we instigated a pedestrian movement count in May 2016, in order to understand the number of pedestrians which cross the roads at each arm of this roundabout, along with those who use the A17 underpass at Penny Hill Road. The results of this survey were compared with Lincolnshire County Council's Policy for the Provision of Pedestrian Crossings and confirmed that the need for a pedestrian crossing (controlled or not) falls well below the required threshold for the introduction of new facilities.

We have also considered Accident Data from the Lincolnshire Road Safety Partnership WINGS accident database which shows there have been 1 serious and 3 slight personal injury accidents at the roundabout for the last 5 years up to 31/05/2016. These included a westbound shunt on the approach to the roundabout, a single vehicle loss of control, an eastbound entry collision with a vehicle already traversing the roundabout and a westbound collision as a car passes a goods vehicle on the roundabout. We have no record of there being pedestrian relating personal injury at this

Officer Recommendation:

No change to the Draft Local Plan is recommended

location.

Whilst the need for a pedestrian crossing falls below the terms of our current policy, the authority has however still considered a range of options, from a pedestrian perspective, and has noted the concerns that you raise in relation to the existing facilities. Especially those in relation to impaired sight lines, the lack of signs relating to pedestrians and that you feel pedestrians are exposed and vulnerable on the central island. The considered options included improving access to the Penny Hill Road underpass and the provision of a footbridge which, whilst they will ultimately separate pedestrians and vehicles, we do accept would be away from the desire line thus increasing the distances people would need to walk and are therefore less likely to be used. We have also given consideration to the provision of a signalised crossing.

It should be noted that roundabouts are primarily designed for, and therefore ideally suited to, optimising the movement of vehicles through at grade intersections. As a result the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) provides evidence that suggests 76% of accidents at this type of junction involve cars and include a high proportion of 'Shunt' type accidents.

The standard clearly states that a signal controlled crossing can only be provided if warranted by site specific conditions; and points to the desirable alternative which is grade separation (i.e. the use of a bridge or underpass), it is therefore deemed that signalised crossings are not desirable due to the significant potential for conflict. With this in mind the Highway Authority (HA) does not support the location of a signalised crossing facility close to the entry / exit of

the Boston Road roundabout as it would almost certainly result in an increase in shunt type accidents and therefore the significantly increased risk of injury to pedestrians using the facility. Further evidence exists that drivers are likely to be confused by a signal head on the approach to a roundabout as being provided to control entry onto the roundabout giving rise to failure to give way accidents on the circulatory carriageway.

Any proposed signalised facility would therefore be required to be installed at least 60 metres from the entry / exit which would present the following issues:

1. The existing central island would have to be extended to accommodate a physical refuge for the controlled crossing point which would require additional land to accommodate a refuge to the appropriate standard through significant carriageway widening
2. The crossing point would be significantly away from the desire line and therefore likely to discourage use and be counter productive
3. Would require significant physical speed reduction measures in order to reduce the 85th percentile speed of the traffic flows to a level that is below required the 50mph that is stated in the standard. The design of such measures on unrestricted single carriageways with high traffic volumes (greater than 8000 vehicles per day) is problematical and cannot be guaranteed. The imposition of a mandatory speed restriction cannot be justified under current national and local policies and would be very difficult to enforce.

I am however pleased to confirm that Lincolnshire County Council propose to make capacity improvements to the existing Boston Road Roundabout, Holbeach, and will also improve the existing at grade pedestrian

facilities so that they meet the current required DMRB standards. The pedestrian facility improvements will improve accessibility, sight lights and introduce signs but will not be signalised. As with all areas of the county, anyone who chooses to cross a road on foot needs to make their own assessment of the possible risks and take their own appropriate actions to mitigate these risks down to a level acceptable to them. Pedestrians will be able to continue to utilise the Penny Hill Rd underpass should they wish.

The improvement work at Boston Road Roundabout, Holbeach, will be co-ordinated along with the separate Peppermint Junction Highways Improvement scheme which is currently due to commence on site in May 2017.

This is a matter of site layout detail that the Plan will take forward through highway engineering design and possibly master planning

---

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 968 comment\_author: John Chapman

## comment content:

Of all the south east Lincolnshire towns Boston has an in depth history of traffic congestion and poor air quality. Air Quality Management Areas have been declared for Boston and whilst this is acknowledged in Section 8 there is a distinct lack of direction for dealing with this issue when compared against the information and Strategy for delivery of the Spalding Western Relief Road. Policy 31: Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network fails to deliver a feasible solution to Boston s transport issues and simply relies upon a vague proposal for safeguarding a corridor for the Boston Distributor Road, associated junctions and crossing points. There is no clarity or commitment to any specific route other than reference in 8.1.9 to potential Quadrant developments and there is therefore no clear strategy for delivering any of the critical transport infrastructures, junctions and rail and water crossings necessary for a distributor road. The Boston Transport Strategy 2006 “ 2021 clearly needs to be updated to enable the Local Plan to include a Strategy for delivery of the Boston Distributer Road and thereafter be included within LTP5. Without this level of detail and certainty the Greater Lincolnshire Local Economic Partnership is unlikely to recognise Boston as a priority for allocating future funding.

## Officer Comment:

In January 2016 the Boston Distributor Road was at a much earlier stage in the design process when compared to that for the Spalding Western Relief Road. This is acknowledged in the last sentence of para 8.1.8. While the supporting text is likely to contain more detail relating to the first phases of the BDR, it is likely that the policy will remain generic to provide flexibility moving forward, as the road will be developer led and the masterplans (and planning applications in some cases) have yet to be agreed with all parties. Additionally more detail is only needed to be provided for the infrastructure expected to be delivered in this plan period. Such detail will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, particularly relating to strategy, delivery and funding. The Boston Transport Strategy is being updated and the finalised strategy is expected to be released imminently. The content of LTP5 is a matter for LCC and its partners when the LTP review commences.

## Officer Recommendation:

Amend the policy to reflect the more detailed approach to Phase 2 of the BDR, and update the supporting text to provide up to date information relating to delivery and the route, where known.

ID1: 969 comment\_author: James Avery

comment content:

With regard to the main employment area of Pinchbeck/Spalding, currently bounded by Wardentree Lane, Enterprise Way and Spalding Road, and Wardentree Lane in its entirety to the A16. Many businesses operate in these locations, some of which have wholly inadequate parking facilities for employees and visitors, with parking spreading onto roadsides and pavements. I would like to ensure further development in the Proposed Employment Area not only considers, but addresses the matter of parking, particularly when an element of traffic from the major development north of the Vernatts will elect to route through Enterprise Way and Wardentree Lane. Cycle Routes. Spalding and the surrounding area do not enjoy a high quality network of cycle routes protecting cyclists. We have a golden opportunity here to deliver safe, well connected cycle and pedestrian routes. Please consider how this could be incorporated as a policy within the Plan in a joined up way, rather than leaving it to developers who might deliver on a piecemeal basis, or not at all. Car parking is currently considered sufficient for Spalding, but is becoming inadequate in Pinchbeck. Projected expansions in population will substantially increase the numbers of vehicles travelling into Spalding and Pinchbeck. Decisions will need to be taken based on sound analysis of such projections.

Officer Comment:

Policy 32 sets out the parking standards for new development, including for non residential use. This should ensure that provision is better placed than previously. Policy 31 makes provision to improve the connectivity and support the development of new multi-user routes, and ensure that major new developments incorporate walking and cycling routes particularly enhancing links to the existing network, to key public transport corridors and to transport interchanges. The selection of housing sites, including those for the SUE's, will be informed by modelling that details how traffic is expected to use the local highway network in the future. Population projections will help inform that process.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 970 comment\_author: Mr Andrew Parks

comment\_content:

Streets and roadways should be wide enough to accommodate parked vehicles and the width of a fire engine as an absolute minimum. Cramped developments with narrow streets, lack of space and minimal parking facilities should be avoided.

Officer Comment:

Policy 32 sets out the parking standards for new development, including for non residential use. This should ensure that provision is better placed than previously. These have been agreed with the Highways Authority.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

ID1: 971 comment\_author: Pedals - Spalding's Cycle Action Gr

comment\_content:

Policy 31 Policy 31 A : The needs of cyclists and pedestrians should not be overlooked in making these improvements to the road-based transport network. Therefore we suggest that this sentence should be added at the end of the list of six points: "The design of all the above projects will make appropriate provision for cycling and walking as well as for the motor vehicle." Policy 31 C1 : We support this. Policy 31 C2m: this should state "alongside the Coronation Channel not "along .... and should be shown on Inset Map 2. We consider that the east bank is appropriate for dual use by pedestrians and cyclists if suitably surfaced and signed.

Officer Comment:

Criteria C3 ensures that appropriate walking and cycling provision is made in all major developments. This is considered appropriate to address this point. Support for C1 is noted. Factual change to C3 is accepted.

Officer Recommendation:

Make factual change to C3 and show potential cycle route on the Policies Map.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1:

972

comment\_author: Pedals - Spalding's Cycle Action Gr

comment content:

Policy 31 C2v, C2vi and C2vii : These should be shown on the appropriate maps. Policy 31 C2 : We request that the following schemes are included in the list of projects: o New River Cycleway south of Spalding. We consulted SHDC and LCC on this proposal in 2015 with a fully-documented report. o Holland Road Bridge to High Bridge (west bank of river). The route southwards from the "Twin Bridges" towards the town centre on the west bank of the river comes to a abrupt halt at the Holland Road Bridge. It is not even possible to cycle on the highway from there to the heart of the town centre because Double Street is one-way north-bound. ~ Wygate Park peripheral road. Off-road cycling provision is sporadic and should be connected, in a locality where coherent cycling provision is emerging within the developing residential areas. ~ Woolram Wygate / Pinchbeck Road junction to the Johnson Community Hospital and Enterprise Way. We understand that Lincolnshire County Council is investigating the opportunities for cycling provision on the B1356 connecting the growing residential area in north west Spalding with the employment areas off the B1356. These projects should be included in the C2 list and shown on the proposals map. Policy 31 C3 : We do not understand this and so are unable to comment. It should be omitted if it is a contradiction of C1. We cannot comment further on this without knowing what point is being made, and how it has influenced the rest of the Plan. We will welcome further information.

Officer Comment:

Only deliverable projects where the routes are known and funding exists will be identified within the policy and on the Policies Map. Criteria C3 ensures that major development aids the provision of off road cycling where this is practicable. At this stage the detailed design of the Spalding Western Relief Road is not available therefore it is not practicable to identify the cyclepath route on the Policies Map or refer to it in the policy. However provision would be covered by C3. Reference to the importance of multi modal connectivity at the SUEs will be made in the supporting text. Amend C3 to ensure legibility.

Officer Recommendation:

Ensure that the cycling schemes listed in the policy are deliverable and identified on the Policies Map. Clarify C3.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 973 comment\_author: Dennis Ottaway

comment\_content:

I believe that both Spalding and Boston need a by-pass. Last year on returning to Spalding after a day out, we joined a queue of traffic opposite Pilgrim Hospital, Boston and it took us over two hours to get across the town because there had been an accident on John Adams Way. Spalding is becoming increasingly congested because all traffic coming from the west has to go through the town centre. A northern by-pass is needed.

Officer Comment:

Policy 31 identifies the Spalding Western Relief Road and the Boston Distributor Road as being essential infrastructure to commence delivery over the plan period.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

ID1: 974 comment\_author: Robert Doughty Consultancy Ltd

comment\_content:

We support the provisions set out in Policy 31 specifically with regard to the safeguarding of the Peppermint Junction improvement scheme at the junction of the A151 and the A17 at Holbeach.

Officer Comment:

Support for the safeguarding of Peppermint Junction is welcome.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 975 comment\_author: Mr Ronald G Meredith

## comment content:

I am impressed with the volume of detail that has obviously been incorporated in this consultation document. In general, I would have no objections to the major thrust and concept of the proposed development for housing and commerce. However, I am concerned that despite refer-ence to the new Spalding by pass and need for some local A road upgrades, I am less than satisfied with you concepts regarding Public Transport, in particular Rail. Notwithstanding planning aspirations to increase the number of businesses and thus employment in the local area, your assumptions fail to recognise that probably quite a large number of new arrivals will be commuting to work outside our immediate area. Nothing will really ease existing road congestion, but if only 10% of new property occu-pants in the corridor between Donington and including Spalding are commuters, then that is a minimum of another 670 + cars per working day out and inbound.. The need to reduce pollution is well addressed in the plan, but with the majority of commuters, we are not looking at Cyclists. The roads serving the corridor above will be unable to adequately cope with needs, added to which will be local employees, shopping trips , medical appointments etc, plus rail hub traffic, I visualise complete and utter road congestion, which will be disadvantageous to vital HGV traffic. Through this area we have a virtually unused railway line, even if there is the anticipated increase in freight traffic. The consultation document makes reference to using the new EMT Franchise as a lever to secure additional services, however, I believe that local requirements should be specified in the plan. I am aware from the

## Officer Comment:

Support for the amount and location of housing and employment land is welcome. The Employment Land Review identifies that in 2001 only 15% of the Plan Area's working residents worked outside the Plan Area indicating a fairly high level of self containment. There is no evidence to suggest that this pattern has not continued given that the economic base of the Plan Area remains broadly the same. It identifies that 85% of residents live and work in the area so there is a high level of containment. The Highways Authority have identified no concerns with the level of development proposed and the impact it could have on the highways network particularly along the Donington-Spalding corridor. Investment by Network Rail has led to a substantial increase of up to 15 additional rail freight services a day passing through Spalding meaning that the rail line is used much more than previously. The amount and frequency of passenger services are not a planning matter, and given the new franchise is not expected to begin until July 2018 proposals cannot be included in the Local Plan – only deliverable proposals can be identified. However identifying the potential for rail within Policy 31 and the need to secure improved services through a new rail franchise will aid discussions with the relevant authorities. Policy 31 identifies the potential to improve Spalding Station. The supporting text to Policy 32 acknowledges that should town centre car parking demand exceed provision opportunities to provide additional facilities to the west of the Joint Line will be explored. Promotion of links with bus routes, improved access between platforms, provision of shops with the station, heating and the timing of services are not planning matters but could be explored further

## Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

recent Transport conference at Springfields, that EMT and Network Rail, will only consider formal applications supported by facts about the potential for increased service demands. I learn that AVIVA will also be seeking this franchise. I have taken the liberty of attaching at Annex A, some suggested demands. We should be looking at Rail as an option for people travelling into Spalding for work as well as shopping and leisure; equally, it should be recognised that people from, South Holland presently, and will in increasing numbers, travel by car to Grantham, Sleaford, Lincoln and Peterborough for onward rail connections as well as shopping. The Plan must recognise these elements of public demand and with the lead times required for such things as possible additional Spalding Station upgrade, additional halts along the line as well as rolling stock; the sooner confirmed requirements can be provided to the rail authorities the sooner we may see results. This plan in its final revised format must provide the persuasive arguments. I would expect that the local Spalding & Peterborough Transport Forum will be making their own submissions in response to the plan, however, the forgoing represent the views of one interested yet concerned local Rate payer. / ANNEX A ANNEX A RAIL RELEVANT IDEAS IN SUPPORT OF THE LOCAL PLAN 1.. Spalding railway station itself requires an upgrade: a.. More car parking, or an agreement with Sainsbury s to annex part of their car park, as well as more bus routes serving the station. b. Lifts or disabled / wheelchair/ pram/ heavy luggage access between both platforms is an essential today, let alone in the future. c. By concession or some other means, incorporate a cafe/paper shop d. Add some form of heated under cover waiting facility on the up line side. 2. For existing commuters, there are grave constraints due to the timing of the first and last trains from

through the Spalding Transport Strategy review. There are no plans to secure a halt at Donington, Pinchbeck or Littleworth. The Spalding RFI will not be taken forward through the Local Plan as no evidence has been submitted by the promoters of the site relating to availability and deliverability.

Lincoln and Peterborough. moreover, there are no Sunday services. Most London and Nottingham commuters are obliged to travel by car to Peterborough, or Grantham if in the north of the area, an earlier train to link with London services seems to be in demand. We require a Sunday service for the many who presently travel by car to Peterborough and Lincoln and we need later running trains in each direction; students at Lincoln university have no easy way of returning to homes in South Holland for the weekend; homebound commuters arriving after 1930 at Peterborough, presently. have no choice but to use their cars. 3. Lincoln is anticipating an enhanced London service, routed via Doncaster. We should be seeking to have a minimum of 2 of these trains in each direction routed via Spalding, one early and one late might be the best option. 4. Gainsborough, is understood to have completed all the necessary work to secure an hourly service between Nottingham & Lincoln, calling at Gainsborough to serve their commuters as well as students and shoppers etc, plus a limited Sunday service. What can be achieved by Gainsborough should be possible for Spalding! 5. The proposed increase in numbers within the Donington / Spalding corridor  $\square$  shroud prompt consideration of the demand for a Halt at Donington and possibly at Pinchbeck. Such would relieve the roads of hundreds of cars. Proceedings to try to secure a Halt at Littleworth to serve the Deepings is believed to be underway; a detailed local survey has been completed, despite lack of apparent support from SHDC. 6. The proposed Interchange rail hub, if it were ever to be built wherever, will cause road traffic congestion . Even if dedicated roads are provided for the site, further prob-blems will arise at the multitude of level crossings in our area, even with the proposed by pass,(7 between Spalding & Donington serving local

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

communities). However, while this will be a recognised inconvenience, any enhanced passenger services might reduce the number of cars needing to use these crossings and thus the problem.

---

ID1:	976	comment_author:	Surfleet Parish Council
comment_content:	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:	
<p>Whilst we accept that the needs of the wider area with regard to delivering a more sustainable transport network look very important, these are needs in our village. We support the protection of existing footpaths, cycle ways and bridleways from development, but there is also a need for a safe cycle way from Surfleet to Spalding. To improve the access to, from and between Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End there needs to be work done on the A16 where it is joined by Station Road and Seas End Road. It is a dangerous junction and drivers have to be very patient waiting to cross from one side of the village to the other. To improve this there could be a roundabout, a bridge on traffic lights. Since there is only a public transport going through Surfleet on the B1356. Access to the surfleet amenities from Surfleet Seas End is either on foot/cycle via the underpass but by vehicle across the A16. This is a route taken by children going to school and all people accessing local services. Any development in the future should have appropriate, safe transport links.</p>	<p>Support for the protection of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways is welcome. There are no plans to provide a cycleway between Surfleet and Spalding although improvements may be made along Pinchbeck Road through the development of the Sustainable Urban Extension. The Local Highways Authority confirms that are no plans at present to undertake highways improvements to the A16 between Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End. Policy 31 ensures that all development should incorporate safe access, and all major development should promote access by sustainable transport.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>	

---

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1:

977

comment\_author:

Robert Doughty Consultancy Ltd

comment\_content:

we support the provisions set out in Policy 31, specifically with regard to the safeguarding of the route of the Spalding Western Relief Road.

Officer Comment:

Support for the safeguarding of the route of the Spalding Western Relief Road is welcome.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

---

ID1:

978

comment\_author:

Robert Doughty Consultancy Ltd

comment\_content:

we support the provisions set out in policy 31 specifically with regard to the safeguarding of the route of the Spalding Western Relief Road.

Officer Comment:

Support for the safeguarding of the route of the Spalding Western Relief Road is welcome.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

---

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 979 comment\_author: Mr R Aiken

## comment content:

Paras 8.1.6 & 8.1.7 My interest in the local plan is mainly the route of the SWRR. Our property exits directly onto Monks House Lane / Wygate Park estate road. All other properties on the Wygate Park, upto the coop shop, exit onto a feeder road before joining the road. I looked at the draft local plan at the council offices in Priory Road, but there was no one available to talk to. I spoke to a councillor at one of the consultation events and it appears there will be no joined up SWRR before the next plan in 2036. There seems to be little evidence of a "Relief Road" in the plan suggested so far.

1 From the south: A relief road would suggest a fairly major route by passing a town and joining a main road for an onward journey. What seems to be suggested here is a road leaving South Drove for no other purpose than an estate road, with no continuity, to suit the developer. South Drove itself is a minor road served by B1172 which is served by the A1175 and some distance from the A16 with which it would seem logical to be joined.

2 From the north:- Likewise the proposed road shown off a new roundabout by the Enterprise park appears to be no more than an estate road to suit the developer. There are really 3 routes at present from the west of Spalding to connect with Enterprise Park (and onwards to A16) and Holbeach.

1 The A151 sign posted route which is Bourne Road, Winsover Road, Railway Station, Pinchbeck Road.

2 From West Pinchbeck, Glenside South, Pinchbeck village. B1356 (not ideal for heavy traffic)

3 Bourne Road. (and Broadway traffic) Monkshouse Lane, Wygate Park, Pinchbeck Road. Monkshouse Lane has mini roundabouts and build outs but with no plan to join up the developers road with the south developers road it d

## Officer Comment:

It is acknowledged that delivery of the SWRR will take place over a longer time period than the current Local Plan. In considering how the phases of the SWRR are delivered in this plan period will be subject to master planning and highway design work and the exact outcomes of this work are not known at present.

## Officer Recommendation:

No changes to the Draft Local Plan are recommended.

s appear that this will be the preferred route from the A151 to the B1356. It is already a bus road. Trucks use it and Monkshouse School time parking does not help. A more useful SWRR could be a road from West Pinbeck or Dozens Bank, running south of Glenside South and linking up with the proposed roundabout on the B1356 by the Enterprise Park. This has been suggested previously and could possibly tie in with development on land to the north of Vernatts Drain. One obvious question. Is the proposed development land suitable for building on anyway? The movement of silt demonstrated so well by the condition of the road surface on South Drove and Tongue End Road, and also the number of properties on Wygate Park which have had to have remedial work done to foundations. I notice there is a SWRR steering committee. Are their findings published or do they have meetings with public access? The sign posted A151 route into Spalding town is not easy for trucks, with parking allowed all along Bourne Rd / Winsover Road. There are similar difficulties on other through routes - Hawthorn Bank, St Thomas' Road, Park Road (to name a few). At some point it will be realised that it may be necessary to create off street parking and keep these as Clearway Routes. This may mean sacrificing a few houses. 'What is the cost of a free parking space everyday on a council maintained road?

---

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 980 comment\_author: Mr I Farmer

comment content:

8.1.13 Walking and Cycling “ I could find no reference to the new coastal footpath and potential opportunities to connect with it.

Officer Comment:

Reference to the England Coastal Trail will be made in the supporting text.

Officer Recommendation:

Add reference to the England Coastal Trail to the supporting text.

---

ID1: 981 comment\_author: Mr John Stuart Birkett

comment content:

Firstly I am concerned regarding the title of the policy. The transport network needs to be not only 'sustainable', but improved, more effective, and 'fit for purpose'. With the exception of the Boston Distributor Road, there are no significant proposals for Boston Borough, and even the distributor road seems unlikely to happen. Although phase 1 might be constructed shortly, there is great doubt over the viability of the scheme. It is noted in paras 8.1.8 and 8.1.9 that the feasibility and delivery prospects for the road are still being investigated, that the benefits are only 'purported' (presumably as opposed to 'established'); and that there is no funding for major river, drain and railway crossings. There is so little certainty about this proposal that one wonders if it can have a place in the local plan " especially if it is to have a major influence on decisions regarding residential land allocations. Also without this proposal, transport proposals in the north of the plan area are almost entirely lacking. Having said that, I support the proposal in principle, and it needs to be properly funded through a combination of public and developer contributions.

Officer Comment:

Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network implies improvements and the content of the policy ensures it will be effective and fit for purpose. The Local Plan should only identify infrastructure that are known and are expected to be delivered (all, or in part, over the plan period), therefore no other significant transport improvements are identified for Boston Borough. Phase 1 of the BDR is under construction. In January 2016 the Boston Distributor Road was at an early stage in the design process therefore the feasibility and delivery details were still being investigated. While the supporting text is likely to contain more detail relating to the second phase of the BDR, it is likely that the policy will remain generic to provide flexibility moving forward, as the road will be developer led and the masterplans (and planning applications in some cases) have yet to be agreed with all parties. Additionally detail is only needed for those elements of the scheme expected to be delivered within this plan period. As elements of the road can be delivered and generate benefits in terms of traffic movements, without the crossings being in place it is likely that parts of the road will be delivered in advance of the crossings. LCC and BBC are seeking funding to aid the delivery of the crossings. It is the role of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to identify greater detail relating to strategy, delivery and funding. Greater detail is now known, and is expected to be developer led through relevant housing allocations.

Officer Recommendation:

Amend the policy to reflect the more detailed approach to Phase 2 of the BDR, and update the supporting text to provide up to date information relating to delivery and the route, where known.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 982 comment\_author: Cllr E Sneath

comment content:

SWRR: The proposed 'road to nowhere' that will feed to these houses [north of the Vernatt's] is nonsensical, the 5 arm roundabout suggested on Pinchbeck road will make an already seriously congested road a nightmare to travel on without any suggestion of a continuously connected South west relief road.

Officer Comment:

Highway design work and the exact layout of the new highway infrastructure is to be taken up in the delivery of the Local Plan. The comments are noted and will be considered in detail when the highway design work commences.

Officer Recommendation:

No change to the Draft Local Plan is recommended

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1:

983

comment\_author:

Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd

comment content:

When dealing with transportation, paragraph 8.1.3 of the Plan, makes reference to encouraging modal shift, so that trips by the private motor car are reduced and the use of public transport encouraged. The reality however is that public transport is declining in Lincolnshire and the mantra that reliance on the car in rural settlements marks them out as inherently unsustainable, is not necessarily the case. The Taylor Review Living working Countryside (2008) consulted with a wide range of bodies and amongst a number of things, dealt with the two issues of housing affordability and travel to work patterns in rural areas, primarily because people living in rural areas are often presumed to have a disproportionately negative impact on the environment. The argument is that more people use their cars to get around and travel longer distances, thereby making a relatively large contribution to climate change. This is the assumption that limits development in rural areas on environmental grounds. However, Taylor found that there is no robust evidence to suggest that there is any systematic difference to global warming between the rural and urban areas. For example, a look at the travel to work patterns across urban and rural communities shows that they are very similar, contrary to arguments used against development in rural areas. The key difference in travel to work patterns is actually that rural residents are more likely to commute under 1 kilometre (35.8% compared to 21.5% urban working residents), while the most common commute for urban residents was between 1 and 5 kilometres. The proportions commuting longer distances were similar for both urban and rural residents as the Table below shows.

Officer Comment:

It is acknowledged that public transport provision in Lincolnshire is not as regular as previously and the Local Plan acknowledges that for many residents living in rural areas the car is likely to remain an essential mode of transport. Reference to modal shift is important however because the Local Plan spatial strategy directs most new development to the Sub-Regional Centres, Main Services Centres and Minor Service Centres where there is greater capacity to incorporate walking and cycling provision in new development and it is relatively easy to access local shops and services by sustainable transport.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

Furthermore, rural and urban residents are almost equally as likely to drive to work (60.5% and 54.8% respectively) and while rural residents are less likely to use public transport, they are twice as likely to work from home as the Table above shows. These figures, derived from the Taylor Review, highlight that rural areas are no more unsustainable on the grounds of the environmental impacts of commuting to work than urban areas. The modes of travel and distance travelled are similar. Indeed although distances are similar, rural journey times may be quicker and therefore less polluting due to less incidence of congestion compared with urban journeys.

---

ID1:	984	comment_author:	Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd		
comment content:	Policy 31 has a safeguarding corridor for the Western Distributor Road but no indication of how this road will be implemented in association with development. Broadgate have land interests to the west of the town and would welcome discussions with the Borough Council to remedy this fundamental shortcoming of the Plan.	Officer Comment:	It is acknowledged that delivery of the SWRR will take place over a longer time period than the current Local Plan. In considering how the phases of the SWRR are delivered in this plan period will be subject to master planning and highway design work and the exact outcomes of this work are not known at present.	Officer Recommendation:	No change to the draft Local Plan are recommended

---

ID1: 985 comment\_author: Nicholas Revill

comment content:

On viewing the plan it would appear that the local authority have become fixated with their pursuit of a Western Relief Road. To a local with any knowledge of how the Town works it is obvious that building on land off of Pinchbeck Road without the Western Relief Road in place and finished is going to bring chaos to an already congested and busy part of Town, with the only way for traffic to enter and exit the area through an industrial estate or the Town Centre. I would happily support the new road if the idea were to build back from the Spalding Common area until Pinchbeck Road was reached, but to build it from either end is a recipe for chaos. Upon speaking to planning officers they could not give a date for the completion of the joined up Western Relief Road, and one officer commented that it could be over 60 years if it ever gets completed at all. Currently the land involved is held by a small amount of interested parties who have done very little to move the schemes along or actually build in haste. This situation should be addressed. I find it amazing that a Local Authority could even contemplate a plan and a strategy for the future of their Town that they have so little control over. How can this be termed a Plan? It is not a plan it is a Pie in the Sky Dream and our area deserves more than dreaming. We need a coherent and deliverable way of finding and putting in place a solution to a housing crisis and a way of contributing to a thriving and sustainable Town Centre. Both go hand in hand.

Officer Comment:

It is acknowledged that delivery of the SWRR will take place over a longer time period than the current Local Plan. In considering how the phases of the SWRR are delivered in this plan period will be subject to master planning and highway design work and the exact outcomes of this work are not known at present.

Officer Recommendation:

No change to the draft Local Plan

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1:

986

comment\_author:

Mr and Mrs Glynne and Carol Jam

comment content:

We oppose the South East Lincolnshire Development Plan for Boston for the following reasons:- Creating a Distributor Road / Rat Run through proposed residential development may have the advantage of getting the developer to pay for it but eventually require traffic calming methods and parking restrictions at costs to the Council. Heavy traffic should not be encouraged through residential areas. If a small town like Sleaford can get a by-pass, surely Boston should continue to lobby for one. PROPOSAL We continue to lobby for a by-pass starting with a link between Sleaford and Spalding roads.

Officer Comment:

A number traffic assessments undertaken in the past and also very recently (in 2016) demonstrate that a by-pass does not provide the traffic relieving solution popular opinion would assume. The traffic assessments have also looked at the existing alternative routes (perceived to be rat-runs) and the Boston Distributor Road provides the best, long term solution.

Officer Recommendation:

No change to the draft Local Plan is recommended

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 987 comment\_author: Mr Peter Sanders

## comment content:

I am strongly opposed to your proposal to put 4000 houses in Pinchbeck to finance the first portion of what is intended to be a western relief Road for Spalding without any idea and timescale for it to be connected to any road other than the B1356 Spalding Road. At the Pinchbeck Consultation I was told by one of the officials that a large roundabout is required here to deal with the level of traffic from these houses plus the existing vehicles commuting to Spalding together with vehicles from Spalding going to The Wardentree Industrial Estate and the A16. As the traffic already backs up to the junction of Enterprise Way it is very clear that the road system beyond will not be able to cope with the extra vehicles which will exceed an extra 4000 vehicles while there is not a south western outlet from the development as well. Previous plans showed these 4000 homes out near Pode Hole and paying for the western Bypass from Enterprise Way to Bourne Road. Without that outlet this number of homes will cause serious congestion. This plan may please the developer but will cause problems to the residents of Pinchbeck and to those on this side of Spalding. Any Western bypass running from the end of Enterprise Way should be the Northern Boundary of Spalding. Any housing north of this will turn Pinchbeck into a suburb of the Town without a clear gap between the two. The SWRR would indeed improve traffic considerably but this plan does not go even halfway to completing it and will in the meantime make the road situation much worse. To meet my concerns the SWRR needs to be the Northern boundary of Spalding with a clear gap to Pinchbeck, and no development in this area should be allowed until realistic plans for the SWRR to at least Bourne Road are

## Officer Comment:

In considering how the phases of the SWRR are delivered in this plan period will be subject to master planning and highway design work and the exact outcomes of this work are not known at present. However 4000 homes are no longer being proposed in this location for the Plan period and development of land outside the Plan period will be managed with the delivery of the road.

## Officer Recommendation:

That the housing numbers for the northern section of the SWRR be revised in the draft Local Plan

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

in place. Pinchbeck is a thriving Village and wants to remain clearly separated from Spalding.

ID1: 988 comment\_author: Mrs L Pears

comment\_content:

Re: Long Sutton - The A17 was constructed for the purpose of deviating traffic away from the villages of Little and Long Sutton. Should these [housing] proposals move forward this traffic will return once more and will have a negative impact on public safety namely pedestrians and cyclists. There have been no proposals put forward to suggest how these areas will be addressed nor have there been any suggestion that moves in favour using public transit rather than relying on the car.

Officer Comment:

New development will inevitably generate additional vehicle movements but the Highways Authority have raised no objections to the impact the traffic from new housing would have on the local road network.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1:

989

comment\_author: Mr Michael Maltby

comment content:

Re: Boston - I wish to comment on certain aspects of the Local Plan as pertaining to the Borough of Boston, and in particular, areas designated for potential housing development marked Fis001 and Fis017 on the development plan map 'Layout\_2'. I note that the primary exit route for Fis001 (and, presumably Fis017) is marked as being at what is locally referred to as 'Shooter's Yard', on Lindis Road, and would inevitably lead to a vastly increased volume of traffic on the local road system. (i) Lindis Road is a Designated Cycle Route (see map 'Layout\_2'), but there is no marked cycle lane on the road, nor shared footpath/cycle lane on any of it's length. Paragraph 2.1.7 of the Plan states: "Access by bicycle to places of work (and study??) is relatively high in Boston Borough; levels are nearly double that of Lincolnshire and four times the national rate." I suspect that the number of cyclists along Lindis Road, going to and from Tower Road Academy - one of the largest primary schools in the whole of the County - and St Mary's RC primary school, plus Boston High School and Haven High Sixth Form Campus would exceed the Boston Borough average. This is all on a road which was never intended to accommodate such a volume of traffic. (ii) I believe that the plan to allow direct vehicular access on to Lindis Road is also deeply flawed because of the dangerous exits at either end. To the south, Lindis Road meets Eastwood Road, Freiston Road and Woodthorpe Avenue at a crossroads with very poor visibility looking west, a junction which frequently leads to delays and frustration on the part of drivers trying to exit Lindis Road. Lindis Road, moving northwestwards, becomes Tower Road, but this, too, has a very difficult junction with Freiston Road and

Officer Comment:

Vehicular access from site Fis017 would not be onto Lindis Road.

Vehicular access from site Fis001 would be onto Lindis Road. Although the Highway Authority agrees with some of the points made, it does not consider that the development of site Fis001 would unacceptably prejudice highway safety. In more detail, the Highway Authority comments that (whilst it has reservations about development that would have the potential to increase vehicular activity on Lindis Road and in particular at the junction of Lindis Road with Freiston Road/Eastwood Road), having regard for the strong message in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) of promoting residential development in sustainable locations (which this most definitely is), it is supportive of this allocation. In more detail the Highway Authority indicates that:

- The new standards in Manual for Streets bring the junction visibility at the site entrance within the prescribed standards. 180 dwellings is very high for a cul-de-sac but, as the site is presented, there is no option for the provision of a second access point. The best that could be hoped for is therefore that the internal layout is 'looped' to give residents options for routes and to all service vehicles to not have to undertake unnecessary reversing manoeuvres;
- The access point would not cause unacceptable conflicts with Monteith Crescent and Hardiway;
- There is poor visibility at the junction of Lindis Road with Freiston Road and, ideally, some improvements would be made here as a condition of any planning permission. However, there is no presently unused

Officer Recommendation:

Site Fis017 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Fis001 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Queens Road, cars trying to exit Tower Road and turning north to join the A16 needing to foul the southbound traffic on Freiston Road in order to see the traffic heading north on Freiston Road. These two junctions have tailbacks of traffic already at school-run times. (iii) The 'Shooter's Yard' access to Lindis Road occurs between the Hardiway and Monteith Crescent junctions on the west side of Lindis Road - making a greater hazard than is surely necessary. In my opinion, if areas Fis001 and Fis017 are to be developed with housing, a far better way of reducing pressure on the local road infrastructure, and diminishing the risk of an increased risk of road traffic accidents would be to place a roundabout on the A52 (Wainfleet Road), combined with a redirected junction of Rochford Tower Lane to a point west of the Ball House pub; this could also serve the area zoned for development 'Nor013' and a redirected minor road which runs north of the A52 to Hilldyke. This would lead to better and safer traffic flows out of the housing developments, and an improvement to the existing minor road junctions with the A52. Access by emergency vehicles would thus be greatly improved to all the affected developments, Fis001, Fis017 and Nor013.

highway land within which engineering works might be undertaken to improve visibility, and the developer is unlikely to be in control of the property at the junction to be able to effect improvement work. The question would then be is the visibility sufficiently poor that the site should not be allocated for residential development? Guidance for this is at para. 32 of the NPPF, and the test is that the residual cumulative impact would have to be 'severe'. Indications from Planning Inspectors' decisions is that the bar for 'severity' has been set very high – with a strong presumption in favour of approving residential development in sustainable locations. Accident data shows that, whilst there have been one serious and two slight injury collisions at this junction in the past five years, these did not involve vehicles leaving Lindis Road and there is no evidence that the poor visibility is causing an injury accident problem;

- Lindis Road is indeed a signed cycle route but, provided drivers give due consideration to other road users, this should not necessarily indicate against the allocation of the site; and
- There is congestion on a number of routes and at junctions within Boston (and elsewhere) at peak periods but the development of the suggested 180 dwellings would not add materially to that congestion such that the site should not be allocated for residential development.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 990 comment\_author: Chestnut Homes

comment content:

Transportation issues are as outlined above at the heart of the success of the Local Plan and this policy, whilst very wide ranging, covers all the salient points including the safeguarding of corridors for both Spalding/Boston Relief/Distributor Road which are key elements of infrastructure to be delivered by the Local Plan. Paragraphs 8.1.8 and 8.1.9 reïect key points made within our case for the inclusion of Q2 as a Housing Allocation as part of a sustainable urban extension.

Officer Comment:

Support for Policy 31 and the content of paras 8.1.8 and 8.1.9 is welcome.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

ID1: 991 comment\_author: Mrs D Ingham

comment content:

Re: Holbeach - Where the houses are built is also crucial for the easiest access to main routes. This is why I objected to the 900 homes (with outline permission) at Manor Farm. Yes they will be just behind us on Fen Road, but they are in the wrong part of Holbeach for exit onto the surrounding roads. Since the houses have been built at Station Road it creates a blind bend turning from Fen Road into Barrington Gate which itself is getting worse. Highways don't seem concerned, but many people along Fen Road are and also about the increase in traffic along here - before 900 houses create even more. If this side of Holbeach is going to be developed at all we shall need a relief road building to take traffic up to the main routes to keep it, including lorries, away from the Market Hill crossroads... We have heard no more about the surgery planned for Church Street in Langwith Builder's old yard, but again it is in the wrong place because the road layout will cause gridlock towards Market Hill junction especially from the proposed 900 homes at Manor Farm... The plan to put roundabouts at Peppermint junction and to build around 900? houses there is by far the best place for most of the increase in population to be. Most important is to keep as much traffic as possible away from the centre of town at Market Hill junction and to prevent lorries from using town - and Fen Road - as much as possible.

Officer Comment:

The Highways Authority identifies that 'services and facilities are potentially accessible on foot and bicycle. The vehicular access and existing bus stops are on Hall Gate and Fen Road,' it would appear that a satisfactory access and transport solution can be delivered, which has been agreed in principle through the planning application process. Hob048 abuts the Peppermint Junction - support for this housing site is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Hob002 is one of the more suitable Potential Housing Sites in Holbeach and should be taken forward as Preferred Option Housing Allocation. Hob048 is one of the more suitable Potential Housing Sites in Holbeach and should be taken forward as Preferred Opti

ID1:

992

comment\_author: Spalding Peterborough Transport

comment content:

We would strongly recommend the re opening of Littleworth to be included in the plan to make this a reality for the future to reduce the current statistic of 81.5% projected to rise to 90.4% of people reliant on the car. HGV movement is due to increase at a rate of 3% per year for this area also. We would support increased passenger services to provide earlier and later trains daily as well as a Sunday service to utilise the recent £280 million spend on the upgrade of the line in our area. Investment into the existing railway network would be more viable with intergrated shuttle buses from the sub regional to the rural area s reducing the need to travel by car to get to work and to attract workers into our area as well as promoting schools, leisure facilities. Increased population which has already been identified with current house building, there now more than ever is a real need for improvements on passenger services in the area as people are having no alternative to travel to work by car which is not sustainable. 41% of residents alone in DSN work in Peterborough or travel into London from Peterborough station. Transport systems need to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport systems. We would like to see guarantees of improvements as well as new stations to support and encourage sustainable passenger travel. We would like to see section 106 monies from Lincolnshire Gateway project and house building programmes used to provide these services and aspirations of the re opening of Littleworth. I can see no commitment in the current proposed plan for reduction of the need to travel by car. We support the encouragement of using the cycle around town and cycle path proposals and recognition

Officer Comment:

The Local Plan is only able to identify infrastructure projects that will be delivered over the plan period. There are no plans to re-open Littleworth Station, therefore it is correct that it is not included in Policy 31. Train and public transport services are not a Local Plan matter. The Local Plan cannot make people use alternative sustainable transport measures, however through the spatial strategy it can promote most new development within higher tier settlements which are better connected to the existing sustainable and public transport network and which have some local shops and services (thereby enouraging residents to use sustainable travel for local shorter journeys). Policy 31 supports the improvement of the sustainable transport network, but recognises that for residents the car is likely to remain an essential mode of transport particularly in the rural areas. National legislation states that developer contributions can only be used to make a development necessary in planning terms; for infrastructure that is directly related to the development and where they are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. It may be reasonable for new development (of 11 dwellings or more or 1000sqm or more) to contribute to sustainable transport measures, such as foot and cycle paths, but seeking contributions for Littleworth Station would be unreasonable without firm plans to re-open it and with no funding from the rail operators. Support for the promotion of cycling is welcome as is the recognition that cycling may not be a viable option for the rural area.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

this is not viable option for rural areas.

---

ID1:

993

comment\_author:

Louise McGuinness

comment content:

We would strongly recommend the re opening of Littleworth to be included in the plan to make this a reality for the future to reduce the current statistic of 81.5% projected to rise to 90.4% of people reliant on the car. HGV movement is due to increase at a rate of 3% per year for this area also. We would support increased passenger services to provide earlier and later trains daily as well as a Sunday service to utilise the recent £280 million spend on the upgrade of the line in our area. Investment into the existing railway network would be more viable with intergrated shuttle buses from the sub regional to the rural area s reducing the need to travel by car to get to work and to attract workers into our area as well as promoting schools, leisure facilities. Increased population which has already been identified with current house building, there now more than ever is a real need for improvements on passenger services in the area as people are having no alternative to travel to work by car which is not sustainable. 41% of residents alone in DSN work in Peterborough or travel into London from Peterborough station. Transport systems need to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport systems. We would like to see guarantees of improvements as well as new stations to support and encourage sustainable passenger travel. We would like to see section 106 monies from Lincolnshire Gateway project and house building programmes used to provide these services and aspirations of the re opening of Littleworth. I can see no commitment in the current proposed plan for reduction of the need to travel by car. We support the encouragement of using the cycle around town and cycle path proposals and recognition

Officer Comment:

The Local Plan is only able to identify infrastructure projects that will be delivered over the plan period. There are no plans to re-open Littleworth Station, therefore it is correct that it is not included in Policy 31. Train and public transport services are not a Local Plan matter. The Local Plan cannot make people use alternative sustainable transport measures, however through the spatial strategy it can promote most new development within higher tier settlements which are better connected to the existing sustainable and public transport network and which have some local shops and services (thereby enouraging residents to use sustainable travel for local shorter journeys). Policy 31 supports the improvement of the sustainable transport network, but recognises that for residents the car is likely to remain an essential mode of transport particularly in the rural areas. National legislation states that developer contributions can only be used to make a development necessary in planning terms; for infrastructure that is directly related to the development and where they are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. It may be reasonable for new development (of 11 dwellings or more or 1000sqm or more) to contribute to sustainable transport measures, such as foot and cycle paths, but seeking contributions for Littleworth Station would be unreasonable without firm plans to re-open it and with no funding from the rail operators. Support for the promotion of cycling is welcome as is the recognition that cycling may not be a viable option for the rural area.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

this is not viable option for rural areas.

---

ID1:	994	comment_author:	Mr & Mrs J Back and Mr & Mrs S
comment_content:	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:	
Traffic is only going to increase ....if Lincs County Council cut the bus subsidies in rural areas. Is the A17 going to be upgraded at all as it is now struggling with cope with the traffic?	There are no plans to upgrade the A17 at present. Public transport provision is not a Local Plan matter.	No change required.	

---

ID1:	995	comment_author:	Mr Simon Foster
comment_content:	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:	
Re: Boston/Fishtoft - The road network to/from Fishtoft is insufficient for additional traffic, especially approaching Skirbeck, Haven Bridge, and Main Ridge East. This must be addressed, as traffic is ever increasing and these developments and others will cause more issues.	There is congestion on a number of routes and at a number of junctions within Boston (and elsewhere) at peak periods, but the proposed developments in Fishtoft and Boston are not expected to add to that congestion to the extent that these developments should not be pursued.	No change required.	

---

ID1:

996

comment\_author:

Long Sutton and District Civic Soci

comment content:

Public transport in rural areas is a challenge to day to day life and to the long term sustainability of our communities. Only some 50% of the population in our area of interest has access to a scheduled bus route. Resident of Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge currently enjoy a good bus service to Spalding and Kings Lynn during the day. Travel to Wisbech (our nearest large town) is only served by two buses each way each day and none at the weekend. Public services cease running at around 7pm as does the Call Connect service. With main leisure services focused in the main towns of Spalding, Wisbech and Kings Lynn, there is no public transport provision for local communities in this corner of SE Lincolnshire for evening activities denying many local people of a visit to the cinema, theatre, big prize bingo, swimming pool, other leisure pursuits or main transport hubs. More pertinently in terms of the Plan's employment policy and its contribution to community sustainability, there is no provision for shift or night time economy workers to travel by bus anywhere in the evenings. That means for employment growth to be sustainable at settlement level either new employment growth needs to be provided at a local level, which in the Society's area of interest there does not appear to be sufficient new allocation to meet the forecast demand for new homes, or the Council needs to find ways of dramatically improving public transport links to the centres of employment. According to the Plan 18.5% of the local population do not have private transport and are therefore primarily reliant on public transport solutions and many of these households are located in rural settlements with no permanent bus route. The County Council have protected rural bus routes in their

Officer Comment:

It is acknowledged that the day time bus service to Long Sutton/Sutton Bridge is good but that unfortunately it does not operate in the evening. Although many leisure services are found in Spalding, Wisbech and King's Lynn, Long Sutton does benefit from a leisure centre which residents are able to use in the evenings. The Local Plan aims to improve connectivity for sustainable transport which may help some residents access facilities. The provision of public transport is not a Local Plan matter. The potential employment sites in Long Sutton cover 9.3ha and reflect the availability of land for employment use in the Long Sutton area in January 2016. This is a suitable amount of land to provide jobs for residents who may choose to live and work in the Long Sutton area, and should appropriately complement the delivery of 580 new dwellings over the plan period. However, additional sites have been put forward to be considered for employment use in Long Sutton which may lead to the mix and extent of employment land being re-considered which should help minimise this issue in the long term. However it is likely that in the rural areas the bus will remain an essential mode of travel for residents, which the Local Plan acknowledges.

Officer Recommendation:

LO002 Bridge Road Industrial Estate and new site LO009 south of Bridge Road is one of the more suitable Potential Employment Sites in South Holland and it should be taken forward as a Preferred Option Employment Allocation.

2016/17 budget settlement but it could well be at risk in the future. We wait to hear what Norfolk County Council plan for their subsidies towards the Kings Lynn “Spalding route which is the primary artery for this part of the district.

---

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1:

997

comment\_author:

Spalding and District Civic Society

comment content:

Policy 31 A1 ix Error? Should this be "former A16 Spalding Road", now B1172?  
8.1.5 'maximising the capacity of the roads in the Spalding area'. Meaning?  
8.1.7 We cannot stress too strongly that key infrastructure should be funded by central government, not developers otherwise there result the kind of planning absurdities shown in this paragraph.  
A) A relief road without a central section (as if approach motorways had been built on both banks of the Humber and the bridge left unbuilt). The claimed benefits of relieving traffic congestion in central Spalding are put off until some indeterminate date after the next 20 years.  
B) Even the central section will be dependent on the creation of some further vast sprawl of greenfield housing on prime agricultural land.  
8.1.15 Public rights of way see comments on Policy 30 above.  
8.1.18 'May be' twice change both to 'will be'.  
8.1.24 As it stands, the final sentence would appear to be nonsense. The length of 'down time' at level crossings depends on the number and length of the trains, not the number of road vehicles waiting to cross. In any case, the 'mitigation' claimed will not substantially materialise until some indeterminate time after 2036.

Officer Comment:

A1 ix should be London Road/B1173 junction, Spalding. 8.1.5 could include changing traffic signals to improve the flow of traffic thereby reducing pinch points that might occur at peak times. 8.1.7 key infrastructure is not wholly funded by central government, contributions can sometimes be secured which both Councils are working towards. This means that a funding package may be utilised that includes central government funding alongside relevant developer contributions. The intention is to build the Spalding Western Relief Road in its entirety, although that is unlikely to happen in this plan period. Therefore the Local Plan refers to a phased approach; the intention is that the central phase will be delivered in the next plan period. It is accepted that it is preferable to develop previously-developed sites, but such sites are not available in sufficient numbers to meet Spalding's housing needs therefore agricultural land would need to be used. 8.1.18 the details of this scheme have yet to be finalised; the final package of mitigation measures would be secured through the planning application process. 8.1.24 The Spalding Western Relief Road once complete will allow vehicles to travel round the edge of Spalding, and use bridges to cross railway lines. This will ensure that when downtime occurs at level crossings, there is minimal disruption to the traffic flow particularly within Spalding town centre.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 998 comment\_author: Lincolnshire County Council

## comment content:

Transport Policy Comments Policy 31: Item B4 The East Midlands rail franchise is due to commence in March 2018, not October. 8.1.8 In line 4 please add "Such an approach is supported by Local Transport Plan 4 and the adopted Boston Transport Strategy, which is currently being reviewed." Countryside Services Comments C.1. "protecting existing footpaths, cycle routes and bridleways from development" should be altered to "protecting existing footways, cycle routes and public rights of way from development" C2. The proposed new multi-user routes are supported, but it would be helpful if they were clearly distinguished on the Policies Map and Inset Maps. These only show "Cycle Routes" and it is not clear which are proposed as multi-user routes, or indeed which are existing and which are new routes. Para. 8.1.15 refers to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan as "emerging". Please delete this word as it has been an LCC Policy document since 2007. Public Health Comments This policy is welcome particularly in supporting a range of transport solutions. The following points are for specific consideration: a) C (3) should apply to all developments, not just major ones. Individual developments should contribute to the overall connectivity of the transport network. b) Development near to existing or new road infrastructure should not make an existing Air Quality Zone worse or give rise to the need for one. If where prevention through location of uses cannot be achieved then design mitigation is encouraged.

## Officer Comment:

B4: Noted although this is now July 2018. 8.1.8: Accepted. C1: accepted C2: accepted. 8.1.15: accepted. Support for Policy 31 is welcome. C3: it is not feasible to require that all development should contribute to overall connectivity of the transport network. Tariff-style contributions are only able to be sought from 11 or more dwellings or 1000sqm of non residential floorspace therefore it is more appropriate that the major development threshold is used.

## Officer Recommendation:

Make changes identified relating to B4, 8.1.8, C1, C2 and 8.1.15. Amend Policies Map accordingly.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1:

999

comment\_author:

Campaign to Protect Rural Englan

comment content:

This is generally welcomed. Sustainable public transport routes in the rural parts of the Plan area are few and far between forcing a greater than average reliance on the motor car for all essential journeys as identified in the text. The 2011 census suggests that the average distance travelled to work for employees in South Holland is around 18km and in Boston around 9.5km. The condition and safety of the local road network is questionable, with some of the most dangerous roads in the Country running through the Plan area. Greater investment in bus services would contribute positively to the sustainability of communities across the plan area, especially rural settlements. According to the Plan, 18.5% of the local population do not have access to private transport and are therefore primarily reliant on public transport solutions and many of these households are located in rural settlements with no permanent bus route. The County Council have protected rural bus routes in their 2016/17 budget settlement but it could well be at risk in the future. The growing use of Call Connect is noted and the County Council have also expressed reliance on other community based volunteer transport systems. In future these might be usefully coordinated at Parish level with larger Parish Councils owning and managing a small public transport vehicle operated by suitably trained volunteers and providing services that connect with neighbouring villages, doctors, hospitals etc. These small scale local initiatives might be funded through developer contributions for set up costs and a commuted sum for say 5 years running costs after which they would largely then pay for themselves as on demand services . Several of the proposed housing

Officer Comment:

Support for the policy is welcome. Public transport provision is not a Local Plan matter. The spatial strategy has helped ensure that most new development will be directed to higher tier settlements which mostly have a bus service and/or local shops and services that can be accessed by foot/bike. This should help minimise the impact a lack of public transport in the rural areas can have on residents. National legislation states that developer contributions can only be used to make a development necessary in planning terms; for infrastructure that is directly related to the development and where they are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. It may be reasonable for new development (of 11 dwellings or more or 1000sqm or more) to contribute to public transport measures but these would need to be negotiated at planning application stage. The Sustainability of Settlements, 2016 identifies that the majority of settlements expected to have allocations have a reasonable standard of public transport, two settlements do not have a scheduled bus service but do have a CallConnect service, and the more limited number of dwellings proposed in those settlements partly reflects public transport access. It is anticipated that residents moving to these settlements would therefore have access to a car.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

sites in the plan are in settlements without a bus stop or within reasonable walking distance of a bus stop which puts into question the sustainability of those proposed allocations. Development of these sites without a sustainable transport solution will impact on the stratification of households on the site and potentially impact on future social cohesion. Our proposal for priority funding in developer contributions in 3.6 would help to assure sustainable transport contributions.

<b>ID1:</b>	1000	<b>comment_author:</b>	Heather Violett		
<b>comment_content:</b>	The proposed route of the SWRR will effectively box in residential development in the North by noise and, eventually, diesel pollution, not to mention the impact on the wide range of wildlife the Vernatts environs enjoys. In addition much of the land ear-marked becomes water logged during wetter winters, and there is the small matter of the major gaspipe which runs through it and over the Vernatts.	<b>Officer Comment:</b>	In considering how the phases of the SWRR are delivered in this plan period will be subject to master planning and highway design work and the exact outcomes of this work are not known at present. The particular ground conditions, underlying infrastructure, impact upon ecology and managing air quality will be part of the highway design work going forward	<b>Officer Recommendation:</b>	No change to the draft Local Plan is recommended

**Post\_title:** 8.2 Vehicle and Cycle Parking

ID1:

1001

comment\_author: Andrew Burling

comment content:

Policy 32 Part A Whilst we have no overall objection to the four principals set out in this policy some of the detail contained in the later text is of concern:- Para 8.2.8 - the provision of a minimum of two parking spaces for all dwellings up to and including three bed dwellings is in our opinion unnecessary. One and two bedroom properties should have a minimum requirement of one parking space, three bed dwellings two spaces minimum and four or more bedroom dwellings three spaces minimum. The parking spaces should include garages. The proposed size of garages stated in this paragraph are way too big, it is not necessary for a garage to be this size to accommodate an average family car (a Ford Focus for example is 4.671m long by 1.881m wide) and propose that the minimum standard for internal dimensions should be 2.6m wide by 5.6m long. If the proposed garage sizes stated at present in this policy are adopted in the Local Plan the effect will be that no two or three bed houses will be built with garages at all as it will be uneconomical both for cost reasons and due to the amount of space required to accommodate them. Para 8.2.9 - Regarding visitor parking provision, one space per two dwellings is excessive and should be limited to one in four and include the ability for this provision to be located on proposed adopted highways.

Officer Comment:

Poor design and inappropriate provision has impacted upon the success of parking schemes in new development in recent years. As such the parking standards are considered to be an appropriate tool to help manage this issue. However, a clause will be added to ensure that should a high quality design be submitted showing the parking can be accommodated safely, and that there will be no long term environmental quality, safety and amenity impacts, the standards could be reduced. The supporting text states that one space can include a garage or car port. The size of the garage will be reduced to ensure that these requirements do not adversely impact upon the viability of development. It is accepted that the requirement for visitor parking is excessive and that should the parking standards be met in full it is appropriate for visitors to park on the highways as this should be a temporary measure.

Officer Recommendation:

Amend policy and supporting text to make reference to the exceptional circumstances. Delete visitor parking standards. Amend the size of the garage within the supporting text.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 1002 comment\_author: James Avery

## comment content:

With regard to the main employment area of Pinchbeck/Spalding, currently bounded by Wardentree Lane, Enterprise Way and Spalding Road, and Wardentree Lane in its entirety to the A16. Many businesses operate in these locations, some of which have wholly inadequate parking facilities for employees and visitors, with parking spreading onto roadsides and pavements. I would like to ensure further development in the Proposed Employment Area not only considers, but addresses the matter of parking, particularly when an element of traffic from the major development north of the Vernatts will elect to route through Enterprise Way and Wardentree Lane. Cycle Routes. Spalding and the surrounding area do not enjoy a high quality network of cycle routes protecting cyclists. We have a golden opportunity here to deliver safe, well connected cycle and pedestrian routes. Please consider how this could be incorporated as a policy within the Plan in a joined up way, rather than leaving it to developers who might deliver on a piecemeal basis, or not at all. Car parking is currently considered sufficient for Spalding, but is becoming inadequate in Pinchbeck. Projected expansions in population will substantially increase the numbers of vehicles travelling into Spalding and Pinchbeck. Decisions will need to be taken based on sound analysis of such projections.

## Officer Comment:

Policy 32 sets out the parking standards for new development, including for non residential use. This should ensure that provision is better placed than previously. Policy 31 makes provision improving the connectivity and supporting the development of new multi-user routes, and ensuring that major new developments incorporate walking and cycling routes particularly enhancing links to the existing network, to key public transport corridors and to transport interchanges. The selection of housing sites including those for the SUE's will be informed by modelling that details how traffic is expected to use the local highway network in the future. Population projections will help inform that process.

## Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 1003 comment\_author: Mr Andrew Parks

comment content:

As for the nominated development areas I fully support the need for additional housing and affordable housing in particular. However, I would like to see special attention being given to open spaces within these developments as well as parking facilities for the affordable housing occupants. Cramped developments with narrow streets, lack of space and minimal parking facilities should be avoided.

Officer Comment:

Developments of 11 or more dwellings or 1000sqm of non residential floorspace may be required to provide for open space and affordable housing. The precise amount and mix of developer contributions will be determined on a case by case basis to reflect infrastructure priorities and needs in each local area. Policy 32 provides the framework within which parking will be sought in new development to help minimise the level of on street parking that has taken place in new developments in the past.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

ID1: 1004 comment\_author: Pedals - Spalding's Cycle Action Gr

comment content:

Policy 32 A1 : The term "unit" needs clarification. If it means each self-contained flat, then we think that a requirement to provide cycle storage in each flat is impractical and unreasonable. If "unit" means each building containing flats, then it is reasonable to expect the cycle storage for all the flats to be provided together at ground-floor level in the building or in the plot within which the building stands. We suggest that A1 should be re-worded: "1. secure, covered, convenient cycle storage within each plot; in the case of flatted developments this may be provided as a communal facility within the curtilage of the building containing the flats. "

Officer Comment:

Accepted.

Officer Recommendation:

Change policy accordingly.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1:	1005	comment_author:	Pedals - Spalding's Cycle Action Gr		
comment content:	Policy 32 B3 : The words "where possible" should be omitted as they duplicate the words "where appropriate" in the first paragraph of Policy 32. Although not a cycling matter, we are surprised by the permissive wording of Policy 32, which states that all new development will be permitted as long as the car and cycle parking standards are met. We suggest this wording: "AI/ new development, including change of use, shall provide vehicle and cycle parking in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Appendix 4. This should include, where appropriate:"	Officer Comment:	Accepted.	Officer Recommendation:	Change policy accordingly.
ID1:	1006	comment_author:	Gedney Parish Council		
comment content:	The Council considers that a major factor of any housing development (including affordable housing) is for adequate parking space to be provided within the development for residents and visitors. The road structure needs to be of sufficient width to allow passage of emergency vehicles regardless of parked vehicles either side of the road.	Officer Comment:	Policy 32 provides the framework within which parking will be sought in new development to help minimise the level of on street parking that has taken place in new developments in the past. The road width will reflect the type of development and the expected traffic flow and will be determind on a case by case basis through negotiations with the Local Highways Authority.	Officer Recommendation:	No change required.

ID1: 1007 comment\_author: Mr R Aiken

comment content:

Para 8.2.3. Town Centre Parking. As long as Spalding operates its "Find a space, stay longer than 2 hours and you will get a parking ticket" there is no hope for a thriving town centre. Parking should be free but if charged for should be pay on exit to avoid fines, but there must be plenty of available space. Para 8.2.8. 2 or 3 parking spaces / dwelling. Good inclusion on all developments.

Officer Comment:

There are no plans to introduce free car parking in the Council operated town centre car parks. The supporting text makes provision for additional space in Spalding town centre to be investigated should demand outstrip supply. Support for 8.2.8 is welcome.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

ID1: 1008 comment\_author: Chestnut Homes

comment content:

There is recognition within the documentation of the reliance on car usage within the local area. It is also acknowledged at paragraph 8.2.4 that the provision of vehicle and cycle parking has a significant influence on the design of residential developments. This policy sets out what appears to be minimal car parking requirements at Appendix 4. Reference is made to negotiations based on a Parking Standards SPD but this is not included in the documentation at present. The policy as drafted is very prescriptive with for example a requirement for within curtilage parking for all 2 and 3 bedroom houses of 2 spaces. This is not how a significant amount of new housing developments are designed, with communal car parking areas very often utilised. With the right design, this can add to an attractive scheme that achieves densities in line with those assumed within the Whole Plan Viability Study. The Parking Policy will be a significant determinant in achieving appropriate densities and hence needs more flexibility than currently drafted. As an example, we work on the provision of one dedicated space per one/two bedroom property, with two spaces for three + bedroom properties. Additional visitor spaces (and dedicated spaces) are then provided dependant on the type of development, tenure, location etc. It will be important to modify this policy to achieve a more workable solution.

Officer Comment:

Policy 32 does set out minimum parking standards. The Parking Standards SPD is expected to focus on design of such space. Poor design and inappropriate provision has impacted upon the success of parking schemes in new development in recent years. As such the parking standards are considered to be an appropriate tool to help manage this issue. However a clause will be added to ensure that should a high quality design be submitted showing that parking can be accommodated safely, and that there will be no long term environmental quality, safety and amenity impacts, the standards could be reduced. The supporting text states that one space can include a garage or car port. The size of the garage will be reduced to ensure that these requirements do not adversely impact upon the viability of development. It is accepted that the requirement for visitor parking is excessive and that should the parking standards be met in full it is appropriate for visitors to park on the highways as this should be a temporary measure.

Officer Recommendation:

Amend policy and supporting text to make reference to the exceptional circumstances. Delete visitor parking standards. Amend the size of the garage within the supporting text.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 1009 comment\_author: Studio 11 Architecture Ltd

comment content:

The requirement for all new residential developments to incorporate secure covered cycle storage will have a significant effect on viability of sites and is unnecessary. Purchasers should have the choice if and how cycle storage is incorporated within their homes. The provision of visitor parking outside of the curtilage of dwellings will have a significant effect on viability of developments as it has a direct consequence on coverage on the site. It also requires further clarification. Who will be responsible for 4 and maintain the visitor spaces? Will LCC Highways adopt the parking spaces as part of a Section 38 Agreement.

Officer Comment:

The availability of cycle parking can have a significant impact on people's decision to cycle or not, therefore it is important that adequate and appropriate cycling parking is provided in new development. This could be a garage, shed or some other space within a dwelling capable of holding a bicycle. It is unlikely that this will have a significant effect on the viability of sites. It is accepted that the requirement for visitor parking is excessive and that should the parking standards be met in full it is appropriate for visitors to park on the highways as this should be a temporary measure.

Officer Recommendation:

Delete visitor parking standards.

ID1: 1010 comment\_author: Spalding and District Civic Society

comment content:

Policy 32 The huge housing increases will produce an increased demand for town-centre parking spaces, which needs to be met by the conversion of existing ground-level car-parking to multi-storey (Victoria Street Sainsbury's?). Therefore, at some point in the policy add: 'Breaking open the existing urban fabric to provide carparks will not be permitted, and where it has already occurred means will be sought to rectify the damage without increasing on-street parking'.  
A2, A3, B1, B5 - very pleasing.  
Pages 96-98 Mis-pagination no p.97.  
8.2.5 Good to see recognition of harm caused by 'car dominated developments'  
8.2.10 Good  
8.2.11 modify in line with Policy 32 comment above.

Officer Comment:

Currently it is considered that there is sufficient capacity within the town centre car parks to accommodate demand. However the supporting text makes provision for additional space in Spalding town centre to be investigated should demand outstrip supply. There are no plans to provide a multi storey car park in the town centre, and schemes can only be identified within the Local Plan that are capable of being delivered. So it is unnecessary to add the suggested text. Support for A2, A3, B1, B5, 8.2.5 and 8.2.10 are welcome. Page numbers will be amended in the final document.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 1011 comment\_author: Lincolnshire County Council

comment content:

Strategic Planning Comments LCC support the provision in Policy 32 for electric charging points. Some other authorities have made provision in residential development policies too. Public Health Comments LCC Public Health supports this approach. Reference to electric vehicle charging points (B (5)) as per NPPF Paragraph 35 is welcome. Could extending this to external domestic charging points be considered?

Officer Comment:

Support for electric charging points is welcome. No evidence has been submitted to support the view that the demand exists to require charging points in residential development.

Officer Recommendation:

No change required.