

Appendix 2 – Report on Representations into the SEQ Design Codes (Final Draft).

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Design Codes (including integral Regulating Plan) for the SEQ have been subject to consultation as follows:

- The Regulating Plan is based upon the Broad Concept Plan referenced in evidence to the Examination in Public for the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan which was subject to consultation in 2016 (developer led);
- The Design Codes have been subject to formal and informal consultation including:
 - Local Ward Member workshops on 10 March 2020 and 2 July 2020;
 - Engagement with statutory consultees and landowners/developers; and,
 - A 6 week formal consultation for all stakeholders (residents, Parish Councils and statutory consultees), including 2 web-based public meetings, between 27 June and 9 September 2020.

1.2 Prior to the public release of the draft Design Code on the 27th July informal consultation was held with both internal and external technical consultees, including;

Internal - Economic Development, Environmental Health, Tree Consultant, Operational Services Manager, Leisure Services, Housing Strategy, Conservation Officer, Lincolnshire Heritage Trust (retained archaeological consultant) and AECOM (retained Ecological Consultant).

External - Lincoln City Council, Lincolnshire County Council (Highways and Lead Local Flood Authority/Education), Heritage England, Environment Agency, Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust, NHS, and the Police Architectural Officer.

For the avoidance of doubt all parties were also consulted formally following issue of the draft Design Code on the 27th July. Comments received are detailed in the report below.

1.3 A total of 30 responses were received to the SEQ Design Code public consultation between the 27th July and 9th September. 3 of these relate to Highfield House, which is currently being marketed, and which lies in Phase 4, seeking confirmation of detailed proposals for the area surrounding this dwelling which do not, as yet, exist. These representations are from Susan Viscomi (x2), the vendor, and Robert Morton, a potential purchaser. A further two representations have been received from the agents acting on behalf of the current live applications on the SEQ (Pegasus Group on behalf of Jesus College Oxford and Deloitte on behalf of the Church Commissioners for England). 2 further representations are from Bracebridge Heath and Canwick Parish, within

whose parish the SEQ lies, and a further representation has been received from Branston & Mere Parish Council. The other 22 representations are from, respectively; Karen Pell, Andrew Smyth, Richard Drew, Simon Ward, Graham Heath, P Hogg, JM Meads, Mr and Mrs Cummings, Douglas Bruce, Kate Trought, Susan Manders (x2), James Grigg, Shaun Jones, Sandra Mitchell, Ian Waller, Mr R Narborough, Judy Lyon, Robert Spandler, Max Baker, Peter Allen-Williams and Christopher Callan.

A limited number of responses object to the principle of development in terms of need and issues such as loss of farmland/open views etc. The principle of development has been established by the allocation of the site within the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and these objections are not relevant to adoption of the Design Codes. A number of other comments were generally supportive of the attempt to adopt design codes and the desire set out within the draft to encourage good quality design.

1.4 A summary of the member Design Code Workshop carried out in March 2020 is appended to the Design Codes (see Appendix 1 of the main report) and is not reproduced here. Separate comments have been received on behalf of local ward members and the Chairman of the Planning Committee on the 27th of July and are summarised below, along with all other consultee responses

2.0 Local Response to Consultation 27th June to 9th September 2020 (excluding those relating to Highfield House)

2.1 A limited number of responses objected to the principle of development in terms of need and issues such as loss of farmland/open views etc. The principle of development has been established by the allocation of the site within the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and these objections are not relevant to adoption of the design codes. A number of other comments were generally supportive of the attempt to adopt design codes and the desire set out within the draft to encourage good quality design.

2.2 More detailed representations (left-hand column) can be dealt with under the headings below with responses provided (right-hand column).

2.3 Transport	
1. Number of representations raise concerns that the proposals will cause congestion, lead to a reduction in air quality and lead to unsafe road conditions.	This is essentially a matter that goes towards the principle of development. The allocation of the SEQ is a response to meeting identified housing needs in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan area. Placing homes closest to places of work and services reduces the need to travel which could not be achieved by a more dispersed pattern of development. Through the provisions of policy LP13 ‘Transport’, LP28 ‘Sustainable Urban Extensions’ and LP30 ‘Lincoln Sustainable Urban Extensions’ means of linking the site to Bracebridge Heath and the wider Lincoln area by sustainable modes of

	<p>transport, such as cycling and public transport, will be achieved by way of planning obligations, along with specific junction improvements. Whilst there may therefore be point sources of congestion which will need to be reduced by specific highway improvements allocation of the SEQ is an appropriate response to accommodating housing growth in a manner which seeks to reduce transport movements in comparison to alternative means of meeting growth.</p>
<p>2. Canwick Rd/Heighington road junction mentioned several times, including history of accidents.</p>	<p>As above not relevant to the Design Codes as such, more to the principle of development. Through the provisions of policy LP13 'Transport', LP28 'Sustainable Urban Extensions' and LP30 'Lincoln Sustainable Urban Extensions' means of linking the site to Bracebridge Heath and the wider Lincoln area by sustainable modes of transport, such as cycling and public transport will be achieved by way of planning obligations, along with specific junction improvements. Whilst there may therefore be point sources of congestion these will need to be reduced by specific highway improvements. LCC Highways will advise on which junctions to prioritize including the safe operation of the highway network.</p>
<p>3. Provision of cycle/pedestrian links within the site and to the city beyond strongly supported, but concerns that they won't be delivered.</p>	<p>Strong emphasis within the Design Codes on provision of cycle/pedestrian links within the site. The Design Code will be material in the determination of subsequent planning applications, as will the provisions of policies LP13, LP28 and LP30, all of which support such provision. It will be necessary for applicants to demonstrate compliance. Off-site links to be achieved by way of planning obligations negotiated in consultation with LCC Highways on individual planning applications.</p>
<p>4. Not enough emphasis is placed on cycle parking provision, with overemphasis on provision for parking of private cars.</p>	<p>Car Parking and Cycle Parking dealt with by chapter 32 of the Design Guide which sets out specific standards. The chapter deals not just with level of private car parking provision but its design. This perhaps gives the impression that parking for private cars is given more emphasis, but this relates to the detail given over to design issues to ensure cars are parked</p>

	safely, and in a manner that does not dominate the street scene. Cycle parking provision simply does not raise these issues.
5. Provision of bus services should be enhanced at an early stage of development	Again supported by policies LP13, LP28 and LP30. Not essentially an issue for the Design Codes as such except insofar as ensuring bus penetration into the site is designed in by reference to the Highway Design Matrix (p21) and the primary road network linking relevant phases (The Regulatory Plan p17). Support for bus services will be further achieved by agreeing Transport Plans for individual applications and obligations where necessary.
6. One suggestion of a dedicated tram line to the city centre.	Whilst policy LP28 requires the provision of public transport infrastructure to be produced in line with the Lincoln Integrated Transport Study this makes no reference to a dedicated tram line. In terms of deliverability and viability provision of walking, cycling and bus measures linked to a mobility hub is seen as a proportionate response to meeting the needs of future residents for sustainable transport measures.

2.4 Landscape	
1.Strong support for inclusion of green spaces.	Noted
2.Strong support for green corridors providing separation of BBH from the rest of the SEQ, although queries also raised about the width of those corridors.	Support noted. The width is a common theme raised by a number of consultees, particularly with regards to the previous Broad Concept Plan. The Regulating Plan is based on the Broad Concept Plan with a number of updates to reflect more up-to-date information including the inclusion of the 'Pipe Line Corridor' and a mobility hub. However, the green corridors in question are a direct take off the Broad Concept Plan. However, it should be noted that both the Broad Concept Plan and the Regulating plan are, of necessity, illustrative in that they give a broad picture of what is required. The text for the relevant character area sets out the roles of these respective areas and it will be for relevant applications to demonstrate compliance and set detail boundaries.

<p>3.Objections to loss of views of Cathedral across open farmland. Views out towards the Lincolnshire Wolds should also be protected</p>	<p>The relationship of the SEQ to both South Common and views out to Lincoln Cathedral have been identified as one of the most significant aspect to development of the SEQ. Whilst inevitably there will be some loss of views due to intervening development in the area west and north of Canwick Avenue both the Regulating Plan and the CA3 'Views and Vistas' identify three view corridors to be protected to allow views of the Cathedral to be framed. At the same time a large expansion of the South Common is promoted which will allow for enhanced public access to the top of Lincoln Cliff. Whilst views of the Lincolnshire Wolds are noted to exist from the bend in Canwick Avenue these views are limited by hedge lines.</p>
<p>4.Support for the provision of wide tree lined avenues.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>5.Green Edge Missing from one side of the Southern Green Corridor</p>	<p>Omitted in error, Regulating Plan now amended to include.</p>

<p>2.5 Infrastructure</p>	
<p>1.Insufficient capacity for schools, hospital/doctors/water supply/playing fields.</p>	<p>The Design Code is intended to inform the design of the SEQ. It includes the location of a number of local centres/mobility hub/schools and playing fields. These will be the locations where any additional infrastructure capacity will be added. Deficiencies in infrastructure will, however, be identified in connection with statutory consultees (such as the Education Authority and the NHS) through the process of dealing with planning applications (applying the provisions of policies LP28 and LP30 of the CLLP), leading to the agreement of contributions within S106 agreements, to underpin additional capacity required.</p>
<p>2.When will playing fields be delivered?</p>	<p>The need for Local Playing Fields/play space, if evidenced, can be agreed as part of the open space package negotiated on individual applications through the provisions of policy LP24 of the CLLP. Such 'Local Usable</p>

	Greenspace' would be provided as each phase is completed. The 'Strategic Formal Playing Fields' are to meet an evidence need beyond the current local plan period (post 2036) within phase 4 to the north east of Lincoln Road.
3.Local centres should be delivered at an early date as part of phase 1.	The first phase of the SEQ is anchored on Bracebridge Heath to make ready use of services that already exists, bearing in mind that there are still significant infrastructure requirements to meet. As such the Broad Concept Plan indicated the first local centre being provided early in phase 2, close to the primary school, which will help create and maintain demand/viability for the local centre and serve residential areas not in close proximity to existing facilities. No change proposed
4.Link between phase 1 and phase 5 missing.	Noted, relevant figures (4.1/5.1/7.1/8.1/9.1/13.1/25.1) now amended to show a primary link between Phase 1 and 5.

2.6 Design	
1.Want to see greater energy efficiency promoted	A 'Climate Emergency' has been declared by the council, which is mapping a course to a zero carbon future. This work will lead to a set of policy responses in the current local plan review which will be material to the development going forward. At present the Design Codes have to sit within the context of the current local plan and its provisions in respect of policy LP18 'Climate Change and Low Carbon Living' and policy LP 'Renewable Energy Proposals' and the targets set by Building Regulations in terms of energy efficiency. The most important aspects of the development remains its overall location relative to existing jobs and services, and the ability to promote sustainable transport patterns. However, the Design Codes have been amended to increase the emphasis on environmental matters, although it is not possible at this time to set targets that go beyond exiting regulations in the form of Building Regulations.

<p>2.Number of representations want to see greater emphasis on single storey dwellings</p>	<p>This representation is embodied in consultation undertaken on the Bracebridge Heath Neighbourhood Local Plan, respondents indicating they would prefer to see only single storey development within the parish. Policy LP 10 'Meeting Accommodation Needs' of the CLLP requires developers to provide housing solutions that contribute to meeting the housing needs of the housing market area. Whilst this will include single storey dwellings, suitably integrated into the overall development, it must be recognised that the SEQ is intended to meet the needs of a much wider housing need, a significant proportion of which will not have a preference for single storey accommodation.</p>
<p>3.Representations support provision of wide tree lined avenues.</p>	<p>There is a strong emphasis within the Design Codes in promoting high quality landscaping. The Primary Route typology seeks wide verges to allow for planting. In addition many primary routes follow ribbons of open space associated with view corridors.</p>
<p>4.Use of streets/buildings in Lincoln to illustrate the Design Code not appropriate/too urban in context.</p>	<p>Agreed that draft document placed too heavy a reliance on vernacular drawn from Lincoln City. The aim, through illustrations and photos, as well as text, is to reflect upon the points being made in the detailed sections. Drawing on vernacular from Lincoln City is relevant to a point, but so is the best of development elsewhere throughout the district and beyond. This is not just in terms of drawing on vernacular to demonstrate elements of individual housing design, but the changing requirements of developments to include features such as SUD's, Wildlife Corridors, pedestrian and cycle permeability and, inevitably, the private car. The district has many good examples of more recent developments incorporating these features, and the illustrative material has been updated to reflect this.</p>
<p>5. A number of representations suggest that 2.5 to 3.5 story dwelling are out of character.</p>	<p>These concerns are perhaps a reflection of wording used within the draft Design Codes and the need to revisit illustrative material to reduce emphasis on 2.5 to 3.5 storey dwellings. The intention of the guide is not to see tall buildings liberally used within the development, rather they that they should be available to designers to punctuate the street scenes they</p>

	<p>are designing. Amendment will remove reference to 3.5 storey dwellings to allow for 'suitably scaled and justified taller buildings over 2 storey where these can be justified and assist in the understanding of a layout through punctuating the street scene'. At same time illustrative material has been revisited to reduce over reliance on street scenes incorporating 2.5 and 3 storey dwellings to provide a more balance perspective.</p>
--	---

<p>2.7 Other Points Arising</p>	
<p>1.One letter of support from local business owner in Bracebridge Heath, proposal good for trade and local centres will offer opportunity for expansion.</p>	<p>Noted. Reflects on the fact that for many businesses the impact of the SEQ, particularly in its early phases, will be positive. The key will be to offer good connections to the centre of Bracebridge Heath in the form of pedestrian, cycle and public transport infrastructure to build upon this opportunity in a sustainable manner.</p>
<p>2.Representations want to see retention of existing public rights of way across the SEQ.</p>	<p>There are remarkably few designated public rights of way across the SEQ given its size. Principle amongst these is the 'Viking Way' running along the edge of the South Common, which the Design Code seeks to retain along it current line. There is also a link between Lincoln Road and Heighington Road, which is also shown to be retained along its existing line running along the eastern edge of the proposed strategic playing fields in phase 4. No amendments therefore required. More importantly the SEQ opens up the opportunity to create many more footpath/cycleway links throughout the area running through green spaces linking proposed neighbourhoods.</p>
<p>3.Will the new 'Planning for the Future White Paper' be used going forward with this plan and how will it affect the development?</p>	<p>The white paper does not set out government policy but is a consultation document on proposed changes to the planning system. As such it cannot be reflected within the Design Code. However, it is notable that there are references within the paper to design and the use of design codes, which continues to remain key to the Governments approach to new development.</p>

<p>4.The development of former St John’s Hospital should be finished before building any further homes.</p>	<p>Given the particular type of scheme, involving conversion of a historic building, it is a relatively niche market. The SEQ seeks to address housing need across a much broader spectrum of housing need. However, development of the SEQ, in particular the fact that the first phase of development is in close proximity to St Johns, will enhance Bracebridge Heath from a marketing perspective and help provide the momentum required to complete this scheme.</p>
<p>5.When will summary of design workshop be provided?</p>	<p>Now included as Appendix B of the Design Guide.</p>

<p>3.0 Local Ward Member Response</p>	
<p>3.1 Representations were received on the 23rd July 2020 from Councillor Carrington, Cllr Tinsley, Cllr Pennell, and Cllr Moran. The main headings and responses are outlined below.</p>	
<p>1.Concerns expressed regarding the status of the ‘Broad Concept Plan’ and its treatment within the Introduction to the Design Codes, referencing the lack of any formal agreement by the Council as per policy LP28</p>	<p>The ‘Broad Concept Plan’ has never been formally approved by the Council. Policy LP28 sets out a requirement for all the sustainable urban extensions allocated in the plan to have such a formally approved plan. However, it is evident that each SUE has been brought forward at different timescales, some, like the SEQ, in tandem with the adoption of the CLLP. The ‘Broad Concept Plan’ produced for the SEQ (developer led initiative) was subject to local consultation and put forward as evidence to the public inquiry into the CLLP, such that it has significant material weight.</p> <p>However, it is recognised that agreement of the Design Codes brings with it the opportunity to formally approve a Broad Concept Plan, albeit one based largely on that previously drafted, with changes limited to those necessary to reflect newly arising matters such as the ‘pipeline corridor’ and the need to incorporate a ‘mobility hub’.</p>

	<p>Accordingly the document has been renamed to reflect this change to the 'Lincoln South East Quadrant Broad Concept Plan and Design Code'. The introduction has been re worded to reference the draft Broad Concept Plan (Figure 1.1) within its correct context and goes on to present two new spatial plans, the 'Broad Concept Regulating Plan' (Fig 5.1) and the 'Broad Concept Plan Phasing Plan' (Fig 4.1).</p> <p>It is considered that these changes both reflect previous work undertaken but allow for full wait to be given to a Broad Concept Plan that sits within the requirements of policy LP28.</p>
<p>2.Strategic Green Space – point to the importance of strategic green space running through the site, the so called 'green river' shown on the indicative map ('The Broad Concept Plan'). Suggest that it has vanished north of Canwick Avenue.</p>	<p>The 'Broad Concept Regulating Plan' at Fig 5.1 matches the 'Draft Broad Concept Plan' in terms of green space in its entirety (including north of Canwick Avenue) except in two respects, the additional introduction of the 'Pipeline Corridor' to reflect a key constraint, and an extension to the green space running north along Canwick Avenue towards the local centre (this is an additional extension, not the area suggested to have 'vanished'). The widths of these elements scale exactly to the 'Broad Concept Plan' although it should be noted that this is a high level indicative plan, final extent and relationship to built elements will be determined via more detail applications.</p>
<p>3.Concerns that green corridors blurred by functionally being within different character areas.</p>	<p>The Regulating Plan sets out clearly the broad extent of green corridors through the SEQ. Inevitably, given their prevalence across the site, the green corridors are either separate character areas in their own right ('The Pipeline Corridor' of the 'Southern Green Edge' for example) or interface with other character areas. It is not considered that they are therefore blurred by being in these different character areas if the Broad Concept Regulating Plan is used as an overriding plan, with the character area descriptions adding detail.</p>

<p>4. Representation made that a broader based and more through reference should be made to local vernacular, including reduce reliance on the many illustrations drawn from Lincoln City</p>	<p>Agreed that draft document placed too heavy a reliance on vernacular drawn from Lincoln City. The aim, through illustrations and photos, as well as text, is to reflect upon the points being made in detailed sections. Drawing on vernacular from Lincoln City is relevant to a point, but so is the best of development elsewhere through the district and beyond. This is not just in terms of drawing on vernacular to demonstrate elements of individual housing design, but the changing requirements of developments to include features such as SUD's, Wildlife Corridors, pedestrian and cycle permeability and, inevitably, the private car. The district has many good examples of more recent developments incorporating these features, and the illustrative material has been updated to reflect this.</p>
<p>5. Note that the SEQ will be a new community linked to neighbouring villages but not coalescing with them. Concerned that it should have a centre of focal point. Not sufficiently clear where the heart of the new community will be, what it will look like or relate to the rest of the SUE.</p>	<p>Point understood. The inclusion of a pipeline corridor along Lincoln Road has bisected the Local Centre proposed on the Draft Broad Concept Plan. At the same time a mobility hub has been introduced. These changes suggest that a more compact local centre including local services, school site, mobility hub, and potential care home sat at the heart of the SEQ, with strong links out into it, might best be promoted, within which more detailed design might be controlled by reference to a further detailed design brief for the district centre.</p> <p>Accordingly a 'District Centre/Community Hub' has been placed in phase three in the angle of Canwick Avenue and Lincoln Road on the Broad Concept Regulating Plan. It forms its own Character Area (CA9 at chapter 22). It is considered that this is the most appropriate location building upon the locational advantages of placing a mobility hub in close proximity to both a secondary school and local services. It will be a focus for pedestrian/cycle and public transport routes through the site and sit at the head of a public transport corridor leading into the wider Lincoln area.</p>
<p>6. Support the principle of a hierarchy of streets but want further detail street pattern to help understand how movement will work within the</p>	<p>The inclusion of a hierarchy of streets is intended to inform detailed design to ensure the stated concerns are met. It is considered to be an unreasonable expectation to design a pattern of streets across a</p>

<p>SEQ, to ensure site lines to major vistas are provided and ensure integration of individual character areas</p>	<p>development of 6000 new homes. The Design Code is intended to place permeability and movement at the heart of the development, both for cyclists, pedestrians and public transport. A number of amendments have been included to strengthen this position and in particular illustrative material included to demonstrate the principles underlying the Design Codes. In terms of Views and Vistas, these are clearly identified and coded in chapter 16. Development proposals will have to demonstrate compliance to be acceptable. Sufficient protection to these proposed corridors is therefore provided.</p>
<p>7. Concern re use of cul-de-sacs.</p>	<p>Whilst concerns expressed, cul-de-sacs are only mentioned twice in the Design Code. Street patterns, function and permeability are all understood, but avoiding 'dead end roads' seems to be the concern.</p> <p>Additional wording proposed to ensure that 'dead ends' are avoided and that where cul-de-sacs are used they allow more than one point of access for walking and cycling so they perform a movement function. Specifically, where a mechanism to access to open space, enabling development to front-out over such space, this could be explicit.</p> <p>Avoiding use of 'courtyards' is an issue of terminology and the Design Code will be strengthened to underline that we do not want rear courtyards but well-designed and overlooked courtyards or squares where car parking is integrated within the layout as a design solution.</p>
<p>8. Building Heights – concerned that the code sets maximum height of 3.5 storey for primary streets and 2.5 storey for secondary streets. Concerned that the wording will allow these heights to become the norm and be out of character with the local area.</p>	<p>These concerns are perhaps a reflection of wording used within the draft Design Codes and the need to revisit illustrative material to reduce emphasis on 2.5 to 3.5 storey dwellings. The intention of the guide is not to see tall buildings liberally used within the development, rather they that they should be available to designers to punctuate the street scenes they are designing. The Design Codes have therefore been revisited to reflect this requirement. At same time illustrative material revisited to reduce over</p>

	reliance on street scenes incorporating 2.5 and 3 storey dwellings to provide a more balanced perspective.
9. There appears to be no bus service associated with phase 1, is this correct	Relevant plans amended to show potential bus route to phase 1 south of Bracebridge Heath and through phase 1 to phase 5, which has also included introduction of a primary route between the two phases to accommodate this.
10. Whilst it is accepted that some elements of the environmental impact of housing are not planning matters, believe that the environmental issue should be more prominent in the narrative of the Code both in terms of positioning and detail of the text.	<p>Reference is made by the representation to the declaration of a climate emergency by the Council and mapping a course to a zero carbon future. This work will lead to a set of policy responses in the local plan review which will be material to the development going forward. At present the Design Codes sit within the context of the current local plan.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above the Design Codes have been reworded, particularly within the introduction, to reflect the declaration of a climate change emergency.</p>
11. The map on p 14 shows the allotments as a 'local centre' within phase 2	The key to the phasing plan had, inadvertently, swapped the shading for the local centre and allotments over. This has been amended.
12. Accepted that phasing will be affected by which developer is ready to progress a particular parcel of land. Concerned that making a start of the scheme the southern extension (Church Commissioners Land) well removed from the core of the SUE will appear to be urban sprawl	The phasing reflects that submitted as part of the evidence to the Local Plan Inquiry. It is based on not only on a logical first phase more closely associated with Bracebridge Heath and existing infrastructure, but reflects the ownership pattern with an eye to early delivery given the importance of the SEQ moving forward for land supply. The point of urban sprawl is not however accepted, the site is well contained by the Eastern by pass and good design, through the Design Code and agreement of sustainable transport links, is key to integration.

4.0 Local Parish Council Responses – Bracebridge Heath Parish Council

<p>1.Representation that varying widths for green corridors from 60m to 200m are set out in the Design Codes and that developers will go for the minimum width.</p>	<p>See 3.0 (2) above. Design Code does not prescribe widths, Regulation Plan shows indicative green corridors in line with the Broad Concept Plan which will be used to assess applications against which will set the detailed extent of the corridors.</p>
<p>2.Wish to see more allotments</p>	<p>The Design Codes set out green infrastructure Provision linked back to the standards set out in policy LP24 and appendix C of the CLLP. Allotments are contained in the ‘Local Usable Greenspace – Urban’ typology for which a standard of 1.5ha/1000 population is identified. If a shortfall of allotments is evidenced further provision can be negotiated in term of individual applications.</p>
<p>3. Bracebridge Heath is short of playing fields.</p>	<p>Like point 2 above standards for local playing pitches are set out in policy LP24 and appendix C of the CLLP and these are referenced within the Design Codes. Again included in the ‘Local Usable Greenspace – Urban’ typology. This is not to be confused with ‘Strategic Formal Playing Fields’ which is subject to an additional quantity standard of 1.1 ha/1000 population. The SEQ regulating plan contains an area to meet the need for strategic formal playing fields, although importantly this is located in the last phase of development beyond the current local plan period to 2036. This reflects the current evidence base which suggests there is no current shortfall of strategic playing fields in the Lincoln area but anticipates the need for such beyond the plan period.</p>
<p>4.Position of playing fields on other side of B1188 not easily accessible for residents leading to increase pressure for existing pitches in BH</p>	<p>As above, the strategic playing fields are to meet the Lincoln area’s needs (including SEQ) beyond plan period. The access standard in appendix C of CLLP is 15km distance or 15 min drive. Within this context the playing fields proposed will be well within this access standard, and well related to the SEQ, and Bracebridge Heath, by a network of footpaths/cycle ways, and in close to the proposed mobility hub.</p>

<p>5.Support LEAPS and NEAPS but want details of equipment to be provided and age ranges...want more for children of older ages.</p>	<p>Appendix A of the Design and Access Code sets out detailed play area specification.</p>
<p>6.Concerned re management of open spaces, want to avoid use of management companies.</p>	<p>Design Code to be amended to reference as policy LP24 (d) which requires 'appropriate mechanisms to be secured which will ensure the future satisfactory maintenance and management of open space'. Amendment to be included requiring developers to approach the Parish Council as first order of preference.</p>
<p>7.Want more detail on landscaping and inclusion of bird and bat boxes. Want to see introduction of wildlife corridors</p>	<p>In general these comments are too prescriptive. A landscape and design matrix is included at page 101 of the design code but gives 'suggested species'. Applications will be supported by ecological appraisals and biodiversity measure agreed (such as bird and bat boxes). There are a large number of green corridors and landscaped edges, and this goes back to the point of these features being multifunctional, in that they provide the potential for the creation of wildlife corridors. (See response in 3.0 (3) above).</p>
<p>8.Want to see adequate planting for swales alongside their effective management</p>	<p>Planting is covered on page 99 of the Design Code. Design Code to be amended to reference management which might either fall to highways next to road or Parish Council/management company in other areas.</p>
<p>9.Want to see insistence on the inclusion of higher standards re renewables/sustainable construction</p>	<p>See 3(10) above.</p>
<p>10.Reference is made to the Design Code illustration showing no gardens for properties on Canwick Avenue, are there measures to reduce noise and air pollution?</p>	<p>Noise measures etc would be a matter for individual planning applications but this seems to be a misconception due to Fig 21.1.....this is a depiction of a gateway <u>from</u> Canwick Avenue, not a gateway <u>to</u> Canwick Avenue, that is these houses are not fronting onto Canwick Avenue. The Canwick Avenue character area text also requires the retention of hedgerows along Canwick Avenue with linear areas of open space running between the</p>

	hedgerows and built development. Add in wording on Fig 21.2.....'gateway from Canwick Avenue into the development'.
11.Concerned that cycle ways will not be delivered and that links to existing areas needed.	Internal to the site strong backing is given to the provision of a permeable network of cycle and pedestrian links against which individual application will be judged. External cycle connections are extremely important and will be achieved via policy LP30, through LCC negotiating appropriate planning obligations via applications. However, the Design Codes to be further amended to set a general context by setting out the need for wider connections to the Lincoln Area (reword to para 1.4)
12.Want to see detailed specification for cycle ways. Want bike hire to be available	Cycleway will be to LCC specification, construction details inappropriate for Design Codes. Mobility hub to provide opportunity for bike hire operation.
13.Want a defined percentage of affordable housing and for these to be 'pepper potted'.	The correct vehicle to define the level of affordable housing is policy LP11 of the CLLP (20%). Not appropriate to be defined in Design Codes. It might or might not be the case that development viability across Central Lincolnshire might change in the future which would be need to be evidence via any Local Plan Review. As such referencing any figure in the Design Code could in any event become rapidly out of date. Policy LP11 also requires 'affordable housing should integrate seamlessly into the site layout amongst private housing.
14. Don't want to see dwellings over 2 storey, 3 storey will be incongruous with existing settlement character.	See response to 3.0 (8) above for proposed amendments.
15. Don't like use of terms like 'high street' or townscape, inconsistent with existing settlement character.	The word 'townscape' is used in two places on page 19 and 56 and has been replace with 'street scape' and 'design'. Likewise 'High Street' has been used once to reference the juxtaposition of uses in local centres to primary routes. This has replaced to reference a need for uses to front primary routes.

16. Reference use of blue render as being out of character.	Reference to blue render was used in the Character Areas sections under 'Materials'. Agreed out of character and it has been deleted.
17. Want to limit the use of terrace dwellings, believing to be to urban in context and would like to see a greater mix of housing that includes bungalows	Policy LP10 of the CLLP requires that developers provide housing solutions that contribute to meeting the housing needs of the market area. This is an important point, the SEQ is a sustainable urban extension which is intended to meet housing needs not only within the local parishes (clearly, given its size) but within the local plan area. As such a mix and of dwelling types and tenures will be sought. Whilst it is considered incorrect to label terraced housing as 'urban' in context, there are plenty of examples of 'traditional' terraced housing in Bracebridge Heath and other more rural settlements, it is acknowledged that the illustrative material needs to reflect a broader spectrum of house types and designs, there being an over reliance on terraced buildings and vernacular examples form Lincoln (see 3.0 (8))
18. Want the regulating plan to be more prescriptive	It is not the role of the Design Codes to be prescriptive, it is to encourage good design and innovation where appropriate.
19. More limestone buildings should be used near St John's, White Hall Farm and the Manor House.	The key point here is that use of limestone buildings should be encouraged across the site in key locations.
20. Want to see use of pedestrian shortcuts within residential areas	Agreed but see no conflict with this requirement and the Design Codes which seek a permeable layout for both cycles and pedestrians. See 3.0 (7) above.
21. Want community centre closest Bracebridge Heath to be in phase 1 not 2.	The response to this concern is similar to 3.0(10) in that the first phase of the SEQ is anchored on Bracebridge Heath to make ready use of services that already exists, bearing in mind that there are still significant infrastructure requirements to meet. As such the Broad Concept Plan saw the first local centre being provided early in phase 2, close to the primary

	<p>school, which will help create and maintain demand/viability for the local centre and serve residential areas not in close proximity to existing facilities. No change proposed.</p>
<p>22. Concerned re lack of infrastructure such as doctors/dentist, library, churches, community halls etc.</p>	<p>Effectively this is an objection to the principle of development. The SEQ brings with it the opportunity to bring forward additional facilities in a phase manner to reflect the needs of the development.</p>
<p>23.Secondary school proposed not big enough</p>	<p>Secondary school site included at LCC Educations request and no objections have been raised in this respect to the size of the site.</p>
<p>24.Want to see inclusion of bus route on Church Commissioners land.</p>	<p>See 3.0 (9) above, to be included.</p>
<p>25.Want to see specification of various roads and laybys to ensure permeable</p>	<p>Inappropriate detail for Design Codes, design will be to LCC standards.</p>
<p>29.Concern that phase 1 will see construction either side of BH causing congestion.</p>	<p>An issue of principle of development. There will inevitable be periods of disruption but Construction Management Plans will be conditioned to reduce levels of disruption in terms of working hours/construction routes. In this respect the LEB will also be open prior to development commencing.</p>
<p>30.Southern green corridor only has one green edge.</p>	<p>Noted, drafting error, has been amended.</p>
<p>31.Key view missed over Witham Valley to the Wolds.</p>	<p>View corridors have been introduced to deal with a specific concern, the historical relationship of the local area with Lincoln Cathedral/Castle. It is not possible to protect every view into and out of the development area without undermining its ability to deliver the new homes needed. In addition, the views from Canwick Avenue are relatively restricted due to landform and the hedge line along this road.</p>

5.0 Local Parish Council Responses – Canwick Heath Parish Council	
1.Representation made regarding photographic content of guide many showing Lincoln Street Scenes.	See response to 3.0(4). Broader selection of illustrations now included
2. Want to see “Summary of the Design Workshop” appended	Now included as Appendix B
3. Concerns expressed regarding the status of the ‘Broad Concept Plan’ and its treatment within the Introduction to the Design Codes, referencing the lack of any formal agreement by the Council as per policy LP28	See response to 3.0 (1)
4.Strategic Green Space – point to the importance of strategic green space running through the site, the so called ‘green river’ shown on the indicative map (‘The Broad Concept Plan’). Suggest that it has vanished north of Canwick Avenue.	See response at 3.0(2).
5.Representation made that a broader based and more through reference should be made to local vernacular, including reduce reliance on the many illustrations drawn from Lincoln City.	See response at 3.0(4). Text revisited to reflect these concerns and a broader selection of illustrative material.
6. Note that the SEQ will be a new community linked to neighbouring villages but not coalescing with them. Concerned that it should have a centre of focal point. Not sufficiently clear where the heart of the new community will be, what it will look like or relate to the rest of the SUE.	See response at 3.0(5)
7. Support the principle of a hierarchy of streets but want further detail street pattern to help understand how movement will work within the SEQ, to ensure site lines to major vistas are provided and ensure integration of individual character areas	See response to 3.0 (6)
8.Concern re use of cul-de-sacs.	See response to 3.0(7)
9. Building Heights – concerned that the code sets maximum height of 3.5 storey for primary streets and 2.5 storey for secondary streets. Concerned	See response to 3.0 (8)

<p>that the wording will allow these heights to become the norm and be out of character with the local area.</p>	
<p>10. Whilst it is accepted that some elements of the environmental impact of housing are not planning matters, believe that the environmental issue should be more prominent in the narrative of the Code both in terms of positioning and detail of the text.</p>	<p>See response to 3.0(10)</p>
<p>11. Accepted that phasing will be affected by which developer is ready to progress a particular parcel of land. Concerned that making a start of the scheme the southern extension (Church Commissioners Land) well removed from the core of the SUE will appear to be urban sprawl.</p>	<p>See response to 3.0(12)</p>
<p>12. The Code appears to ignore the likely consequences of the development on the infrastructure of adjacent settlements, reference made to likely requirements for road improvements on Canwick Hill.</p>	<p>The Design Code correctly focuses on the design of the SEQ itself. It is well understood that there will be the need for off-site infrastructure to link the site with Lincoln. This is made clear in policies LP28 and LP30. Infrastructure requirements for each phase will be determined at the application phase, for instance the two current applications on the SEQ are subject to detailed investigation and negotiations on these points. No amendments proposed.</p>

<p>6.0 Consultee Responses</p>	
<p>6.1 Lincolnshire County Council Highways</p>	
<p>1. "A general comment is that we consider these Design Guides are too prescriptive, they stifle innovative design, and especially given the life-span of this development (>20 years), could prevent us from implementing new/future type ideas that may come forward. Especially in transport and SUDs. There needs to be a mechanism that enables new concepts to be introduced. An example of this is the Government's consultation on e-</p>	<p>This flies in the face of current advice regarding emphasis on Design and the need for Design Codes to promote high levels of design. The Design Code is in addition robust enough to allow for innovation and review. The reference to e-scooters is seen as a good example they will, for instance, still need to run along a surface, and it is hard to see how the Design Codes would be a barrier to this if they are legalised.</p>

<p>scooters, which could become legal soon. How will the street design be adapted to accommodate this new form of transport?"</p>	
<p>2. "Phase 1 needs to connect to Phase 5, the layout seems to indicate that the Southern Green Corridor is a severance to movement between these zones. This is shown on many of the Figures (4.1, 5.1, 8.1,9.1) . We consider it essential for movement, connectivity and public transport that there is some form of transport connection between these areas, otherwise Phase 1 becomes a 900 house cul-de-sac served off the A15 south of Bracebridge Heath and is not connected to the rest of the SUE (and vice-versa)."</p>	<p>Agreed, amendments undertaken to reflect.</p>
<p>3. "Figure 6.1 should be removed. This table of road widths, dimensions, visibility etc is far too prescriptive and does not permit designers to adapt to the local environment. LCC has removed these types of tables from our design guides for these reasons. The principles of the street hierarchy and how they function is well explained in pages 29-44 and this should be the information to guide the design, not the set of inflexible criteria set out in 6.1."</p>	<p>Not acceptable, important to set out required standards, whilst some amendments incorporated to allow for innovation in terms of the design of streets where circumstances allow and without prejudicing highway safety</p>
<p>6.2 Lincolnshire County Council Education</p> <p>No comments received</p>	
<p>6.3 Lincoln City Council</p> <p>No comments received.</p>	
<p>6.4 Environment Agency</p>	
<p>1. We strongly support the provision of such a guide for the SUE, especially as development will come forward in phases, likely led by a range of developers.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<p>2. We are pleased to see the focus in the draft guide on green spaces and green infrastructure, with recognition of their importance to both residents' health and biodiversity. I felt the latter could be given more prominence, and earlier in the document. For example, on page 4 under 'Open Space & Detailed Design Guidance' 'Biodiversity Net Gain' could be added as a separate point. (I would expect term 'net gain' to be used in the document, given its inclusion in the coming Environment Bill.) Although green spaces can offer multiple benefits, it must be ensured that the needs of both people and wildlife are given adequate consideration.</p>	<p>Agreed 'Biodiversity Net Gain' should be stressed. However, not relevant to amend the bullet points on the flowchart on page 4, these are specific references to section headings, not the instructions themselves. Para 1.2 in the introduction amended to include reference to biodiversity/emerging Environment Bill. At same time new design code included specifically referencing Biodiversity (Chapter 27). Paras 3.6 and 3.10 'Green Infrastructure' on page 10/12 amended to reference biodiversity net gain.</p>
<p>3. The proposals for each character area are conveniently set out in the 'built form' and 'landscape and public realm' tables. The 'ecological objectives' are more detailed for some areas than others, covering 'species diversity', areas with limited public access, trees, hedges, wildflower meadows and rough grassland. Presumably local knowledge and site considerations have led to these recommendations. Again 'net gain' could be listed in these sections, assuming it is required in each area as opposed to only in the SUE as a whole.</p>	<p>Character areas re visited to include appropriate references to biodiversity net gain as a landscaping requirement.</p>
<p>4. Apart from limited references to SuDS features offering benefits to wildlife, there is no mention of blue infrastructure. This may be because creation of wetland features has been found to be unsuitable; it would be useful to clarify whether such proposal would be welcome or not.</p>	<p>Blue infrastructure (which is taken to be permanent water features) can be a SuDS feature and are not specifically discounted by the Design Guide. However they are unlikely to be achievable within the SEQ due to the permeable nature of the ground which is benefit in terms of the 'SuDS train' which gives first priority to infiltration as a means of disposing of surface water. No amendments proposed.</p>
<p>5. In section 26, Green Infrastructure provision, it is good to see accessibility and qualities standards, with reference to the Green Flag award scheme. I would like the Guide to give a clearer picture of a linked network, with successive phases required to link together. Improved site</p>	<p>Page 1 includes a reproduction of the Draft Broad Concept Plan. It is more relevant to reference the Regulating Plan (Fig 5.1) on page 18 which clearly sets out the extensive nature of linked 'Green Infrastructure'. Cross referencing with the phasing plan illustrates that the green infrastructure is used to define individual stages and key interfaces with the Lincoln Cliff and</p>

<p>plans could clarify whether there is an overall strategy: unfortunately the figure on page 1 is not clearly printed.</p>	<p>Open Countryside beyond. Accordingly the green infrastructure can be brought forward in a phase manner.</p>
<p>6.The commitment to focus on passive design principles, fabric performance and efficient heating systems is welcome. There appear to be no absolute requirements for housing although ‘national and local targets’ are referenced, and non-residential buildings are to achieve BREEAM Very Good in energy, water and materials. It is disappointing that renewable energy is only mentioned with reference to non-residential buildings; are solar panels on houses encouraged, for example, or is the aim to make buildings efficient enough that they are not needed? As well as operational energy use/carbon production, there is the issue of ‘embodied carbon’, i.e. the energy used in constructing new development. The scope to reduce this in the construction of the SEQ doesn’t appear to have been investigated; this may be an area warranting further consideration. On water efficiency, we are aware that Local Plan Policy LP14 requires developments to meet the Building Regulation water efficiency standard of 110 litres per occupier per day.</p>	<p>See 3(10) above, the route to achieving this aims is through the current Local Plan review, the Design Code as it stands is rooted in the adopted CLLP and current government advice.</p>
<p>7.I note there is no explicit mention of climate change in the document, although it is presumably one of the drivers behind the tree planting and energy efficiency proposals; there is one mention of carbon in section 33.</p>	<p>Given that the Council has declared a climate change emergency this is a relevant point. Introduction specifically amended to reference this point. It is notable that in allocating large scale urban extensions policies LP28 and LP30 are entitled ‘Sustainable Urban Extensions’. As such sustainability lies at the heart of the allocation of the SEQ, and the Introduction would benefit from rewording to reflect on the fact that the SEQ is a ‘SUE’, which can therefore be explicitly associated with measure to tackle climate change.</p>
<p>6.5 Historic England</p>	
<p>1.HE strongly welcomes the concept of a Design Code and there are many positive elements.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>2. "... regarding the South Common character area, Green Edge and absence of analysis of how the development should fit the pattern of development in long views from uphill Lincoln. Overall, there is little reference to the historic environment and some of the design detail is somewhat generic in places"</p> <p>"Historic England would object to the South Common character area which suggests housing could potentially reach the boundary of South Common. This should instead show the character area of open land with a rural character to form a buffer between development and South Common (as indicated on the masterplan)..... The buffer area should extend as far south as necessary in accordance with detailed Heritage Impact Assessments."</p>	<p>There is a misunderstanding here regarding the purpose of this character area which in part reflects the wording of this character area section (CA2 p51). The character area has been renamed 'South Common Extension Area' and the text reworded to set out that the predominant roll of this area is to provide a substantial extension to South Common. At the same time the text has been further strengthened to refer to the interface between built development and the extended South Common. There is therefore a green edge within the character area, which has been further highlighted on Figure 15.1, and the text worded to single out the green edge as being the most important interface in the SEQ, given its context.</p> <p>Text further amended to indicate; 'The broad extent of the proposed extension of the South Common is identified on the Regulating Plan. The precise boundary of this extension will be fixed through the determination of relevant planning applications backed by an appropriate Heritage Impact assessments, including an assessment of visual impact from the higher reaches of Lincoln on the opposite side of the Witham Valley'.</p>
<p>3. "The green edge on the north and west of the development area north of Bracebridge Heath should be bespoke; rather than matching the other green edges proposed. If a road was to be acceptable it would need to be a lane with no infrastructure, such as streetlights etc. Boundaries facing northwards across open land would need to be formed by native hedgerows. A very low density of detached dwellings should be specified with strong planting and restricted development to create a 'feathered' green edge, not a harder urban edge. These houses would be very high value with a view of the Cathedral and higher densities would be better sited elsewhere, such as around the local centre. Again further assessment would need to be undertaken to illustrate if this element would be acceptable."</p>	<p>Touched on above, agree that this green edge should be singled out for particular attention given its importance for the setting of the scheme as a whole. Agree with other comments which are drawn out within the text (for instance there is already reference to 'Street Lighting should only be used where necessary'... bolstered by reference to careful design in those instances to shield light cast). Whilst reference to 'very high value' housing needs to be treated with care, agree that lower densities would be needed to provide a 'softened' feathered edge. In this respect the illustration and photos in the first draft tend to illustrate quite a hard edge with no spacing between buildings. This has been amended to reflect a much softer 'feathered edge' approach as requested.</p>

<p>4. "2.5 storeys may be acceptable for the area North and West of Canwick Avenue, but it should be clear that this overrides more generic codes for building types along primary roads for example. The maximum height in metres of 2.5 storeys would need to be specified within the Design Code to ensure that the height is controlled."</p>	<p>The area HE is interested covers 4 specific character areas;</p> <p>South Common – DC already indicates ‘mostly 2 storey...limited use of 2.5 storey to add further degree of interest’ - No change needed.</p> <p>Views and Vistas – DC indicates ‘to west of Canwick Avenue primarily 2 storeys, with selective use of 2.5 storey...limited to 2 stories towards south common character area’ - No change needed</p> <p>Pipeline Corridor – DC indicates ‘mostly 2 storeys to west of Canwick Avenue within limited use of 2.5 storey to emphasis key locations’ - No change needed.</p> <p>Canwick Avenue – DC indicates ‘primarily 2 storeys, with selective use of 2.5 storey’ ‘Primary School up to equivalent of 3 storeys (residential)’. The school is the only are where there are conflicts with HE’s request, which has not been amended on the basis that the school is at the eastern edge of the area of concern, it’s a public building and will be highly visible from Canwick Avenue and ideally wants to make a statement, and is located against a back drop of 3 storey elements at St Johns.</p> <p>Only point of concern here is that there is a conflict with ‘Primary Streets’, massing and scale for which allows for 3.5 storey in key locations. The Design Codes have been cross referenced back so this does not apply in the area to the west of Canwick Avenue, to reflect similar constraints in the other character areas.</p>
<p>5. "Road infrastructure crossing or in view corridors should be minimised, including lighting. The junction for the primary route just north of Bracebridge Heath should be to the side of the view corridor to avoid the junction intruding into views along the corridor."</p>	<p>Some crossing of the view corridors are inevitable if areas of the SEQ are not to become isolated pockets of development. The primary route is located along one of the view corridors in association with phase 1. However a linear area of open space is provided adjacent to the road to open up the view.</p>

<p>6. "As stressed previously, this is an important opportunity to include a pub / leisure facilities just to south of the allotments (with buildings/infrastructure largely hidden by planting in views from uphill Lincoln to retain the 'feathered' edge), which would enrich people's experience of the area and open space, and great views of the cathedral, helping create a 'great place' with a distinct character associated with historic Lincoln."</p>	<p>The Design guide opens up this edge with full public access, careful siting of benches/picnic spots/play equipment will allow access and enjoyment. If a leisure facility where to be put forward this could be given further consideration through the application process. No amendments proposed.</p>
<p>6.6 Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust</p>	
<p>1. The GLNP supports the inclusion of the considerations towards the natural environment, including ecological objectives for each character area and a section on green infrastructure. This shows that the design guide has been developed in line with the duties put in place by the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and policy within the NPPF regarding protecting and enhancing biodiversity. Beyond what the guide already includes, consideration should be given to policy set out within the NPPF in regards to biodiversity net gain, natural capital and ecological networks.</p>	<p>Support noted. Representations are in a similar vein to those provided by the EA on the topic of 'net biodiversity gain'. Reference should be made to the response set out in 6.4(2) above.</p>
<p>2. Natural capital is a key tool for the understanding of society's reliance on the natural environment. The GLNP supports the reference to the natural environment's value to society in regards to health and wellbeing and flood prevention. However, it is important that the full range of multiple benefits are made clear, for example the role of natural space in regards to climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p>	<p>Noted. See 6.4(7) above.</p>
<p>3. To ensure that the natural environment, including the elements which benefit society, are resilient to current and future pressures, the NPPF (170d) requires that planning decisions seek to establish new ecological networks and enhance existing ones. While the design guide includes a strategic approach to green infrastructure it should make it clear that any development should implement this with an objective to enhance the</p>	<p>Noted. Number of amendments undertaken throughout the Design Code to reference net biodiversity gain and the recreation of wildlife corridors. The measures contained in the document are intended to create multifunctional open space and green infrastructure across the site in a comprehensive manner. Planning applications will, ultimately, be the vehicle to agree the 'specifics' relating to net biodiversity gain.</p>

<p>wider ecological network. The GLNP has produced Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping (BOM) for Central Lincolnshire, this should be used to inform any work to enhance and create ecological networks, for example creating habitat adjacent to South Common and Canwick Park Golf Course.</p>	
<p>4.Any natural space to be included within the SUE’s green infrastructure should be implemented at the start or prior to the commencement of works to ensure that habitats are mature by the time development completes. This could be achieved by initiating habitat creation prior to the beginning of each phase.</p>	<p>Agreed that strategic infrastructure will need to be delivered in association with the development of each phase and will be controlled via strategies for implementation associated with comprehensive applications for those phases to ensure timely delivery. This element is specifically controlled by policy LP28.</p>
<p>5.In regards to verges, the GLNP would support the use of native grass and wildflower species with a suitable management programme to ensure the best possible outcomes for biodiversity. Where appropriate natural boundaries such as hedges should be utilised and comprise of native species. This would contribute to any requirements in regards to biodiversity net gain and the protection and enhancement of biodiversity in the NPPF.</p>	<p>Noted, no specific amendments required in this respect.</p>
<p>6.The GLNP supports the retention of existing landscaping as part of the overall character. Any tree planting as part of the development’s green edges should consist of native species. They should also be species which are appropriate for fulfilling multiple objectives including improving air quality and mitigating and adapting to climate change.</p>	<p>Noted, this is reflected in the Design Guide.</p>
<p>7.In regards to 12 Green Edges, green edges should make the most of native species and nature sensitive management to enhance biodiversity and promote ecological connectivity which is integral to ensure that multiple benefits, such as for health and wellbeing and climate change mitigation and adaptation, are provided. They are also a good opportunity to provide biodiversity net gains and enhance wider ecological networks.</p>	<p>Role of green edges in providing for net biodiversity gain and wildlife corridors has been stressed.</p>

<p>8.The GLNP supports the inclusion of ecological objectives regarding the key character areas. Any landscaping should be undertaken with the wider ecological network in mind making use of evidence, such as data held by the Lincolnshire Environmental Record Centre and the Central Lincolnshire BOM, to protect and enhance existing biodiversity both locally and at a landscape scale. Use of native species should be prioritised over ornamental and non-native species. It is also important that appropriate management strategies are in place to ensure that the benefits to biodiversity are not lost.</p>	<p>Noted, amendments undertaken to key character area text to strengthen role of landscaping in providing for net biodiversity gain.</p>
<p>9.The multiple benefits of natural space should be recognised and taken into consideration when planning open space provision; it should be clear that the primary reason for implementing a particular natural feature, such as trees or SuDS, is not necessarily the sole benefit of the feature to the local population. Open space should be designed to take advantage of these opportunities for multiple benefits.</p>	<p>Noted, further amendments undertaken to strengthen these points.</p>
<p>10.In regards to 29 Landscape Design Matrix the GLNP supports the retention of existing landscaping as part of the overall character. Any tree planting or habitat creation as part of the development’s green edges should consist of native species. They should also be species which are appropriate for fulfilling multiple objectives including air quality and climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p>	<p>Noted. The Green Edge tree planting scheme shows a limited palette of <u>suggested</u> species, all of which are native. The list is not intended to be exhaustive.</p>
<p>6.7 Police Architectural Liaison Officer</p>	
<p>1.I would like to note my appreciation for the inclusion of the ‘Designing out Crime’ section and the thought processes that accompany that inclusion.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>2.Lincolnshire Police do not have any further comments to the Design Guide and would therefore endorse its contents at this stage.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>3.I would direct and recommend that the current <i>NPCC CPI Homes 2019</i> is referred to as a source document in the planning and design process</p>	<p>A copy of this document is required so that it may be assessed, it is not referenced or available on the NPCC website, which suggests that it is not widely circulated.</p>
<p>6.8 AECOM</p>	
<p>1.Lighting design statements (street lighting and furniture e.g. on page 93). Statements (“Street lighting should be used only where strictly necessary ... lighting at appropriate intervals throughout to avoid dark corridors”) are potentially ambiguous. This could be read as dark corridors must be maintained, or that lighting design should be sufficient to avoid creating dark corridors. The former seems more appropriate in context of only using lighting where needed, and consistent with expectations for biodiversity protection and enhancement. Cohesive dark corridors should be maintained through key corridor areas e.g. CA2, CA11 and CA12.</p> <p>Under CA2 it is suggested “Street lighting should be used only where necessary within the open space, and due consideration should be given to bats (subject to results of ecological survey work) in terms of lighting used.” I would suggest this has wider relevance to all strategic green spaces and corridors. However, I do not think it only applicable based on the results of ecology surveys, so would suggest deleting this clause. The aim should be to secure net gains for bats and other biodiversity e.g. through the proposed soft landscaping. Favourable lighting regimes are key for realising this.</p>	<p>Agreed, further amendments undertaken to reflect.</p>
<p>Green Infrastructure Provision (page 97) – this references policy LP24 but does not appear to acknowledge the full scope of the policy. In particular, the holistic aspect has been lost along with the requirement to achieve biodiversity enhancement. I think it desirable to at least reference the need to achieve well-designed multifunctional green space suitable to meet the needs of people and wildlife, including provision of biodiversity</p>	<p>This section (Chapter 26 Green Infrastructure Provision) is intended to reference space standards set out in policy LP24 and appendix C of the CLLP. Proposals for individual character areas in respect of the multifunctional use of open space are set out in the individual character area sections. However, as per the responses set out above at 6.4(2) and (3)</p>

<p>enhancement and new opportunities for public engagement with nature. This then links in with natural play (one type of opportunity to engage with nature) as referenced later in the Guide.</p>	<p>the intention is to revisit the guide to amend to include more references to biodiversity net gain.</p>
<p>Use and activities statements (e.g CA2 page 52) – this comes back to the point above about achieving holistic greenspaces and access to nature. I would encourage all these statements to be reviewed and to be amended to include greater signposting of cross-overs with biodiversity e.g. taking the wording on page 52 as a starting point “Will also accommodate space for informal recreational activities such as picnicking, informal children’s play <u>and access to nature</u>”.</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>CA2: South Common – introductory paragraph (page 51). Suggest amending wording to “The new dwellings will overlook a substantial area of new public open space designed to reflect <u>and enhance</u> the key landscape <u>and biodiversity</u> characteristics of South Common.” This would seem more consistent with policy requirements to deliver net gains for biodiversity.</p>	<p>Noted, further amendment required.</p>
<p>Ecological objectives (page 53) state “Public open space will include areas with limited public access that provide rich habitats for wildlife.” I think this is restrictive and goes against a holistic approach, it sets nature apart. I think the result may also be that it encourages fragmentary biodiversity design, and also impedes long term favourable management. Management is key to delivering rich habitats over the long term. I would suggest re-wording to “Public open space will be designed to provide a cohesive network of species rich habitats for the long term benefit of people and wildlife”. Similar wording and emphasis should be cascaded through the other key corridors e.g. CA05, CA11 and CA12.</p>	<p>Agreed, further amendments required to include wording ‘Public open space will be designed to provide a cohesive network of species rich habitats for the long term benefit of people and wildlife’.</p>
<p>The final objective of “Areas of less intensively managed wildflower meadow should be incorporated within pockets of the open space to provide interest and contrast, increasing species diversity and habitat</p>	<p>Agreed, further amendments required.</p>

<p>cover” will potentially encourage tokenism and fragmentary provision due to use of phrases such as “pockets”. It also conflicts with the stated landscape treatment, which is the preferred wording and approach i.e. “Significant areas of new native planting including swathes of species rich meadow”. While “swathes” is perhaps not ideal wording, when partnered with “significant” it does at least invoke a scale and connectivity of provision more suitable to policy requirements to achieve net gains for biodiversity and the underlying ecological principles of “bigger, better and more joined up”.</p>	
<p>CA5: Countryside Edge – picking up from the above comments. I would emphasise that this is a key green infrastructure corridor. Ecological objectives should therefore reflect this. This should aim to mirror the best of other statements elsewhere (e.g. CA2). I think terms like a “strongly planted corridor” are ambiguous and not necessarily mandatory to achieve substantive biodiversity enhancement (may be interpreted as trees and more trees). I suggest this phrasing is considered further to tease out more clearly what is expected. Similarly, in placing a specific emphasis on rough grassland I think the statement discourages wider review of options and priorities.</p>	<p>Agreed, further amendments required.</p>
<p>CA11: Pipeline Corridor – a good start. I think the general point for landscaping and ecology should remain “Public open space will be designed to provide a cohesive network of species rich habitats for the long term benefit of people and wildlife”.</p>	<p>Agreed, further amendments required.</p>
<p>CA12: Southern Green Corridor – this is introduced as a “<u>large</u> area of open space”. Objectives for landscape and ecology seem a little small-scale in this context. Again this comes back to the points made above e.g. for CA2 and CA11.</p>	<p>Agreed, further amendments required.</p>
<p>SUDS Strategy (page 99) – this is well thought out and specified. A similar specification could be provided for Green Infrastructure. However, with</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>action on the points raised above this is not essential. It is accepted that the wider soft landscaping approach is likely to be more varied and nuanced and therefore it may be best not to tie the hands of the design team too tightly to specific requirements.</p>	
<p>6.9 NHS</p> <p>No comments raised.</p>	
<p>6.10 Heritage Trust</p> <p>No comments raised</p>	
<p>6.10 Economic Development</p>	
<p>In line with the relevant policy in the adopted local plan, the SEQ Design Guide allocates a number of employment generating areas that provide for the 7 hectares of employment land that are required for this site to deliver local employment opportunities. The nature of these employment opportunities are not specifically stated, but it is noted that they are likely to be predominantly retail and office associated with the District centres advocated within the design guide. Bracebridge Heath is one of the larger settlements in the district and already has a well-established employment area on Sleaford Road. The design guide does not appear to offer any scope for the expansion of this employment area. However given the close proximity of the village to Lincoln and the key employment areas there and the fact that the design guide does state it will deliver 7 hectares of employment land throughout the site, albeit across a number of locations, it is accepted that sufficient employment opportunities will be delivered across this area as it develops out. In the event that the North Hykeham Relief Road is delivered, it is suggested that overall employment provision within the vicinity of this SEQ area be reviewed as such a road will make this area a more attractive and accessible location for future employment growth.</p>	<p>Points noted. With regards to the delivery of the North Hykeham Relief Road, whilst it would be open for future Local Plan reviews to look at the provision of employment across the Central Lincolnshire Area, the only area on the SEQ considered appropriate within a locational and landscape context for large scale employment is adjacent to the existing employment on Sleaford Road. This is in phase 1 of the SEQ, and a current planning application will be determined in accordance with the Design Codes, and current local plan policies, which require only 7 ha of employment provision across the SEQ (noting general overprovision against needs for employment growth with the current plan to provide for choice of location).</p>

<p>Accepting that the Design Guide is looking at employment generation via local district centres or smaller allocations such as on the A15 Sleaford Road or B1188 Lincoln Road, then from an Economic Development perspective, other than the point stated above, no real strategic issues with the design guide. More specifically in relation to the proposed employment areas, if they are to serve and deliver primarily local employment opportunities, then having a number of locations across such a large development area is to be welcomed.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>It is noted that in a number of the employment areas that the design guide talks about the possible provision of live work units. Such units have, in the past, had something of a mixed history of success. However, with the consequences of the Covid 19 pandemic still being felt, it does now appear that this may be the time for such units to be much more sought after and popular as more and more people look to change their working habits and increasingly work from home. Therefore, ensuring that the scale of provision is appropriate, this sort of development is to be welcomed.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>The District Centres will presumably be dominated by small local retail parades and other employment generating uses such as the schools and community facility provision. However in looking at how these are developed, attention should be given to the provision of small scale office provision, perhaps above the retail units, or free standing, within these centres. This would both meet the demand for locally based small scale office provision, and also provide additional employment opportunities for local residents that otherwise will have to be met by travelling out of the area. Again the trend for moving away from large cities may increase the demand for such small scale provision in more rural locations such as North Kesteven.</p>	<p>Noted. Consideration to be given to a further development brief for the main SEQ district centre which could flesh out these proposals.</p>

Lastly the fact that some employment provision is slotted for phase 1 of the development plan is warmly welcomed. All too often employment is left to the final phases by which time most of the population have moved in with no local work opportunities, so having employment provision at the outset is considered an essential requirement for a balanced and sustainable development timeline.

Noted.